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Eagle occurs in Scripture as the translation of the Heb. נָחַל (nachal, so called from tearing its prey with its beak); occurs Exod. xix. 4; Lev. xi. 13; Deut. xiv. 12; xxviii. 49; xxxii. 11; 2 Sam. i. 29; Job ix. 26; xxxix. 37; Ps. ciii. 5; Prov. xxxii. 5; xxx. 17; 19. Isa. x. 3; Jer. iv. 13; lxxviiii. 40; xlix. 16; Lam. iv. 19; Ezek. i. 20; x. 14; xvii. 5, 7; Hos. viii. 1; Obad. 4 (Mic. iv. 16; Hab. i. 8), with which all the designations of the kindred dialects agree. Chald. דָּפַן (nashar), Dan. iv. 33; vii. 4, Sept. and N. T. αἰρός (Matt. xxiv. 28; Luke xvii. 37; Rev. iv. 7; xii. 14).

As there are many species of eagles, the nasher, when distinguished from others, seems to have denoted the chief species, the golden eagle, χρυσόμελας, as in Lev. xi. 13; Deut. xiv. 12; and the word, however, seems to have had a broader acceptation, and, like the Greek αἰρός and Arabic نَجْرَة, sometimes comprehends also a species of vulture, especially in those passages where the nasher is said to be bold (Mic. i. 16), and to feed on carcases (Job xxix. 27; Prov. xxx. 17; Matt. xxiv. 29), which, however, the true eagle will occasionally do. See GIER-EAGLE; HAWK; OSPREY; OSSIFRAGE; VULTURE.

1. The characteristics of the eagle referred to in the Scriptures are, its swiftness of flight (Deut. xxviii. 49; 2 Sam. i. 29; Jer. iv. 13; xlix. 16; Lam. iv. 19, etc.); its mounting high into the air (Job xxix. 27; Prov. xxxii. 5; xxx. 19; Isa. xi. 31; Jer. xlix. 10); its strength and vigor (in Ps. ciii. 5); its precocious habits (Job ix. 26; Prov. xxx. 17; compare Αἰλιαν, Αἰμι, x. 14); its setting its nest in high places (in Jer. lxx. 10; comp. Aristotle, Αἰμι, ix. 22; Pliny, x. 4.); the care in training its young to fly (in Exod. xix. 4; Deut. xxviii. 11); its powers of vision (in Job xxix. 29; comp. Homer, Η, xvii, 674; Αἰλιαν, Αἰμι, i. 42; Isidore, Οἰγίγγα, xii, 1; Pliny, xii, 88); and its moulting (Ps. ciii. 5). As king of birds, the eagle naturally became an emblem of powerful empires (Ezek. xxiii. 3, 7), especially in the symbolical figures of Babylon (Dan. vii. 4), and the chernubin (Ezek. i. 10; x. 14, Rev. iv. 7), like the griffin of classical antiquity. See CREATURE, LIVING. Eagles are referred to in Prov. xxx. 17 as first picking out the eyes of their prey.

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

By thy understanding wilt thou the hawk tower,
Spread his wings southwest?

Perchance on thy bidding the eagle will soar,
Or it is thou that he will make lofty his nest?

A rock will he inhabit, and there he roost;
Upon the peak of a rock, even the citadel:
Wherehe has spied fowl,
From afar his eye will look;
Then his blood will sip blood;
Aye, wherever [are the] shin, there [is] he!

To the last line in this quotation our Saviour seems to allude in Matt. xxiv, 29. Wherefore the carcass

III. — I.
is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" that is, whatever the Jewish people, who were morally and judicially dead, might be, there would the Roman armies, whose standard was an eagle, and whose strength and firmness resembled that of the king of birds, in constant pursuit and devotion. The adroi of Matt. xxiv, 29; Luke xvii, 37, may include the Vultur falkus and Neophron percnopterus; though, as some eagles prey upon dead bodies, there is no necessity to restrict the Greek word to the Vulturizide (see Lucian, Xenop. p. 1; comp. Seneca, Ep. 90; Martial, vi. 63). The image of an eagle is ancient, and has long been, a favorite military ensign. The Persians so employed it, which fact illustrates the passage in Isa. xlvi, 11, where Cyrus is alluded to under the symbol of an "eagle" (G225) or "ravenous bird" (compare Xenoph. Cyrop. vii, 4). The same bird was similarly employed by the Assyrians and the Romans. Eagles are frequently represented in Assyrian sculptures attending the soldiers in their battles, and some have hence supposed that they were trained birds. Considering, however, the wild and intractable nature of eagles, it is very improbable that this was the case. The representation of these birds was doubtless intended to portray the common feature in Eastern battle-field scenery, of birds of prey in the air, that satisfy their hunger upon the bodies of the slain. These passages have been some commentators referred to the vulture, on the assumed ground that the eagle never feeds on carrion, but confines itself to that prey which it has killed by its own prowess. This, however, is a mistake (see Forskal, Descri. Anim. p. 12; compare Michaelis, Orient. Bibl. ix, 37 sq., and new Orient. Bibl. iii, 48 sq.); no such chivalrous feeling exists in either eagle or lion; both will feed ignominiously on a body found dead. Any visitor of the British zoological gardens may see that the habit imputed is at least not invariable. (See also Thomson, Land and Book, i, 401. Aquila bifasciata, of India, was shot by Col. Sykes at the carcasse of a tiger; and A. rapaz, of South Africa, is "frequently one of the first birds that approaches a dead animal."

Of all known birds, the eagle flies not only the highest, but also farther than any other bird, the great eagle, (H. ii. xxi. 308). To this circumstance there are several striking allusions in the sacred volume. Among the evils threatened to the Israelites in case of their disobedience, the prophet names one in the following terms: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as the eagle dieth" (Deut. xxix, 40). The march of Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem is predicted in the same terms: "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots as a whirlwind: his horses are swifter than eagles" (Jer. iv. 19); as is his invasion of Moab also: "For thus saith the Lord, Behold, he shall fly as an eagle, and shall spread his wings over Moab" (chap. xlviii, 40); i.e. he shall settle down on the devoted country as an eagle over its prey. (See also Lam. iv. 19; Hos. viii. 2; Hab. i. 8.)

The eagle, it is said, lives to a great age, and, like other birds of prey, sheds his feathers in the beginning of spring. After this season he appears with fresh strength and vigor, and his old age assumes the appearance of youth. To this David alludes when gratefully reviewing the mercies of Jehovah, Who satisfactorily sustains the "youth" with the "strength renewed like the eagle's" (Psa. ciii. 5): as does the prophet, also, when describing the renovating and quickening influences of the Spirit of God: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, and they shallwalk and not faint" (Isa. xl, 31). Some Jewish interpreters have illustrated the former passage by a reference to the old fables about the eagle being able to renew his strength when very old (see Bochart, Hieroz. ii, 747). But modern commentators for the most part are inclined to think that these words refer to the eagle after the moultting season, when the bird is more full of activity than before. Others prefer Bengel's explanation, of pursuing a truth which is difficult, so that in point of strength thou art like the eagle."

The passage in Mic. i. 16, "Enlarge thy baldness as the eagle," has been understood by Bochart (Hieroz. ii, 744) and others to refer to the eagle at the time of its moultting in the spring. Oedman (Verwischte Samml. i. 164) erroneously refers it to the prophet to point to the Vultur barbatus (Gypterus), the bearded vulture or lammergeyer, which he supposed was bald. It appears to us to be extremely improbable that there is any reference in the passage under consideration to eagles moultting. Allusion is here made to the custom of shaving the head as a token of mourning; but there would be little or no appropriateness in the comparison of a shaved head with an eagle at the time of moultting. But if the  

mer  

s  

u  

notion here conveyed is very applicable to the whole head and neck of this bird, which is destitute of true feathers. The direction of the prophet is to a token of mourning, which was usually assumed by making bald the head; here, however, it would be enlarged, extended, as the baldness of the eagle.

Exactly answering to this idea is Mr. Bruce's description of the head of the "golden eagle": "the crown of his head was bare; so was the front where the bill and skull joined. The meaning of the prophet, therefore, seems to be that the people were not to content themselves with shaving the crown of the head merely, as on ordinary occasions, but, under this special visitation of retributive justice, were to extend the baldness over the entire head.

With reference to the texts referred to above, which compare the watchful and sustaining care of his people by the Almighty with that exhibited by the eagle in training its young ones to fly, especially the spirited one in Deut. xxxii. 11-12:

As an eagle will roose his nest. Over his fledglings will he hover. A flock will he guide, his proper offspring. He will give them his pliosions: (No) Jehovah, he alone would guide him (i. e. Israel).

And there was not with him a strange god—"

we may quote a passage from Sir Humphrey Davy, who says, "I once saw a very interesting sight above one of the crags of Ben Nevis, as I was going in the pursuit of black game. Two parent eagles were teaching their offspring, two young birds, the manoeuvres of flight. They began by rising from the top of the mountain, in the eye of the sun. It was about midday, and bright for this climate. They at first made small circles, and the young birds imitated them. They paused on their wings, waiting till they had made their first flight, and then took a second and larger gyration, always rising towards the sun, and enlarging their circle of flight so as to make a gradually ascending spiral. The young ones still and gradually followed, apparently flying better as they mounted; and they continued this sublime exercise, always rising, till they became mere points in the air, and the young ones were lost, and afterwards their parents, to our aching sight." The expression in Exod. and Deut., "beareth them on her wings," has been understood by Rabbinical writers and others to mean that the eagle does actually "bear" her offspring on her wings and shoulders. This is putting on the words a construction which they by no means are intended to convey; at the same time, it is not improbable that
the parent bird assists the first efforts of her young by
dying under them, thus sustaining them for a moment,
and encouraging them in their early lessons. (Comp.
Axian, Anim. ii, 40; Oppian, Cymeg. iii, 115; Jerome in
Jesus. xlvi; Naumann, Naturgesch. d. Vögele, i, 215; on
the contrary, Aristotle, Anim. ix, 22.)

Finally, the eagle was an Assyrian emblem, and
hence properly is the refer-
ence in Hab. i, 8. The
eagle-headed deity of the
Assyrian sculptures is that
of the god Niaroch (q.v.);
and in the representations of
battles certain birds of
this order are frequently
shown accompanying the
Assyrian warriors in their
attacks, and in one case
bearing off the entrails of
the slain. From the As-
syrians the use of the eagle as a standard (q.v.) de-
sended to the Persians, and from them probably to
the Romans. In all ages, and in most countries, as the
 proverbial “king of birds,” it has been the symbol of
majesty and power. The tribes, like the lion among
beasts.

2. The eagle, in zoology, forms a
genera of birds of prey, mostly distinguished for their
size, courage, powers of flight, and arms for attack.
The bill is strong, and bent into a plane pointed hook,
without the notch in the inner curve which character-
izes falcons; the nostrils are concealed by a naked
 cere or skin of a yellow or a blue color; the eyes are
lateral, sunken, or placed beneath an overhanging
brow; the head and neck covered with abundance of
longish, narrow-pointed feathers; the chest broad,
and the legs and thighs exceedingly stout and sinewy.

Eagles, properly so called, constitute the genus Aquila,
and have the tail feathered down to the toes; they
are clothed in general with brownish and rust-colored
feathers, and the tail is black, grey, or deep brown.

Sea-eagles (genus Haliaetus) have the tail or legs half
barred and covered with horny scales; not unusually
the head, back, and tail more or less white. The
larger species of both measure, from head to tip of
tail, 3 feet 6 inches or more, and spread their wings
above 7 feet 6 inches; but these are proportionately
broad to their length, for it is the third quill feather
which is longest. If the crow be allowed to a strain within bounds their rapidity of flight, while by
their breadth the power of continuing on the wing is
little or not at all impeded. The claws of the fore
and hind toe are particularly strong and sharp; in
the sea-eagles they form more than half a circle, and
in length measure from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of an inch. These ma-
jestic birds have their abode in Europe, on the shores
of the Mediterranean, in Syria and Arabia, wherever
there are vast woody mountains and lofty cliffs; they
occupy each a single district, always by pairs, except-
ing on the coasts, where the sea-eagle and the osprey
(Pandion haliaetus) may be found not remote from the
region possessed by the rough-legged eagles—the first
because it seeks to subsist on the industry of the sec-
ond, and does not interfere with the prey of the third.
It is in this last genus, most generally represented by
the golden eagle (Aquila chrysaetos) that the most pow-
erful and largest birds are found. That species in its
more juvenile plumage, known as the ring-tailed eagle,
the imperial eagle, or morganick (A. heliacus), and the
booted eagle (A. primnta), is found in Syria; and at
least one species of the sea-eagles (the Hal. ossefranga,
albitrix, or albopectus) frequents the coast, and is
even of stronger wing than the others. These build
usually in the cliffs of Phoenicia, while the others are
more commonly domiciliated within the mountains.
According to their strength and habits, the former
subsist on antelopes, hares, hyraxes, bastard, stork, tor-
toises, and serpents; and the latter usually live on

fish; both pursue the catta (percecles), partridge, and
lizard. The osprey alone being migratory, retires to
Southern Arabia in winter. Not excepting the last
mentioned, are so exclusively averse to carrion as is
commonly asserted: from choice or necessity they all,
but in particular the sea-eagles, occasionally feed upon
carcasses of horses, etc.; and it is well known in the
East that they follow armies for that purpose. Hence
the allusions in Job and Matt. xxiv, 29, though vul-
tures may be included, are perfectly correct. So again
are those which refer to the eagle’s syrie, fixed in the
most elevated cliffs. The swiftness of this bird, stop-
ing among a flock of wild geese with the rushing sound
of a whirlwind, is very remarkable; and all know its
towering flight, suspended on its broad wings among
the clouds with little motion or effort. Thus the pre-
dictions, in which terrible nations coming from afar
are assimilated to eagles, have a poetical and absolute
truth, since there are species, like the golden, which
really inhabit the whole circumference of the earth,
and the natives alluded to bore eagles’ wings for stand-
ards, and for ornaments on their shields, helmets, and
shoulders. In the northern half of Asia, and among
all the Turkish races, this practice is not entirely aban-
donned at this day; and eagle ensigns were constantly
the companions of the chieftains of several of these
Persia, Egypt, the successors of Alexandria, the Etrus-
cans, the Romans, the Celts, and the Arabs’ had eagle
signs of carved work, of metal, or the skins of birds
stuffed, and set up as if they were living. These,
named $\sqrt[3]{\text{say},}$ a “ravenous bird,” Isa. xi, 6, 1,
whence $\sqrt[6]{\text{say},}$ aquila, erige, simurrg, hamura or hama-
ora, karakish (the birds of victory of different na-
tions and periods of antiquity), were always symbo-
cal of rapid, irresistible conquest. A black eagle was
the ensign of Khald, general of Mohammed, at the bat-
tle of Aisladin, and the carved eagle still seen on the
wall of the citadel of Cairo, set up by Karakish, the
vizier of Salal-ad-din, to commemorate his own name
and administration, indicates a species not here enu-
erated. At least four distinct kinds of eagles have
been observed in Palestine, viz. the golden eagle
(Aquila Chrysaetos), the spotted eagle (A. metace),
the common species in the rocky districts (see Ibis, i, 29),
the imperial eagle (Aquila heliacus), and the very com-
mon Circetus gallicus, which preys on the numerous
reptilia of Palestine (see the vernacular Arabic names
of different species of Vulturidae and Falconidae
Loche’s Catalogue des Oiseaux ouvres, en Algerie; and

in Ibis, vols. i, ii, Tristram’s papers on theornithology
of North Africa). The Hel, nesher may stand for any
of these different species, though perhaps more partici-
EAGLE

ular reference to the golden and imperial eagles and the griffon vulture may be intended. The Ag. helicor, here figured, is the species most common in Syria, and is distinguished from the others by a spot of white feathers on each shoulder. (See the Penny Cyclopedia, s. v. Falconide; Hebenstreit, Aquile naturae et S.S. historia, et historia naturalis et e Monument. vet. illustrat., Lips. 1747.) See BIRD.

EAGLE, in the Church of England, the desk or lector from which the lessons are read is often in the form of an eagle with outspread wings. The usage is probably derived from the fact that, in ecclesiastical symbolism, the eagle is the accompanying symbol of the apostle John (see Jamieson, Sacred and Legendary Art, i, 135).

E'nnis (Ma'yrh, Vulg. Eneas, Syr. Mons), a name given (1 Esdr. ix, 21) as that of a third son of Emmer (Immer); apparently in place of Harim, and his first two sons Massach and Eliah of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 21). Fritzsche suggests (Exeg. Handb. in loc.) that eai Ma'yrh is a mispronunciation of the 𐤃𐤉𐤃𐤊𐤆, "and of the sons of," of the Heb. text, the three names following having been omitted by the Greek translator.

Ee' (properly יָשָׁנָה, o n'm, o'n), the organ of hearing. In Scripture the term is frequently employed figuratively. To signify the regard of Jehovah to the prayers of his people, the Psalmist says, "His ears are open to their cry." (Psalm xxxiv, 15). To "uncover the ear" is a Hebraism, and signifies to show or reveal something to a person (1 Sam. xx, 2). The Psalmist, speaking in the person of the Messiah, says, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened." (Ps. xl, 6). Ainsworth reads, "Mine ears hast thou digged open." The Sept., which Paul follows (Heb. x, 5), reads the passage thus: "A body hast thou prepared me." "Make the ears of this people heavy," occurs in Isaiah vi, 10, that is, render their ears insensible and deaf; with a similar meaning, the prophet Jeremiah speaks of "ears uncircumcised" (vi, 10). Among the Jews, the slave who renounced the privilege of being made free from servitude in the sabbatical year submitted to have his ear bored through with an awl, which was done in the presence of some judge or magistrate, that it might appear a voluntary act. The ceremony took place at his master's door, and was the mark of perpetual servitude (Exod. xxi, 6). See EAR-RING.

EARS, TOUCHING THE, an ancient ceremony in the baptism of catechumens, which consisted in touching their ears and saying Ephphatha, "him opened." This was joined with the imposition of hands and with exorcism, and is said to have signified the opening of the understanding to receive instruction on the faith. Ambrose derives the custom from our Saviour's example in saying Ephphatha, when he cured the deaf and dumb. The practice never became general.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. i. c., ch. ii, § 13.

EARS OF CORN יֶבֶן הַנָּבָה, mel'lah, so called from being cut off. Deut. xxiii, 25; דֵּבֶן הַנָּבָה, shibboleth, from its growth, Gen. xli, 5 sq.; Ruth ii, 2; Job xxiv, 24; Isa. xvii, 5; דֵּבֶן, karmel, prop. a cultivated field, as often; hence produce or ears therefrom, i.e. grist. Lev. ii, 14; xxiii, 14; 2 Kings iv, 42; דֵּבֶן, 'ab'ab, green ears, Exod. ix, 31; Lev. ii, 14; אֶבֶן, Matt. xii, 1; Mark ii, 28; iv, 28; Luke vi, 1). The remarkable productiveness of the cereals in Egypt has been proverbial from the days of Joseph (Gen. xli, 47) to the present time. Josutt states in his Christian Observer, that when in Egypt he plucked up at random a few stalks out of the thick grain-fields. "We counted the number of stalks which sprouted from single grains of seed, carefully pulling to pieces each root in order to see that it was one plant. The first had seven stalks, the next three, then eighteen, fourteen.

Each stalk would bear an ear." Even greater numbers than these are mentioned by Dr. Shaw, and still more by Pliny. It also often happens that one of the stalks will bear two ears, while each of these ears will shoot out into a number of lesser ears, affording a most plentiful increase. See CORN.

EARLY, EAR, EAR-ing, an old English agricultural term for ploughing, occurs in Gen. xiv, 6; Exod. xxxii, 21; 1 Sam. viii, 12, as a translation of the term פֶּשֶׁת (chesh, ploughing, as it is elsewhere rendered). (See Crit. Biblica, iii, 210.) The same now obsolete word is used by our translators in Deut. xxxii, 3; Isa. xxx, 24, to represent the Heb. word יִבֶן הַנָּבָה (shab), 'to till, as it is often elsewhere rendered). See AGRICULTURE; EGYPT. So Shakespeare says "to ear the land that has some hopes to grow" (Richard ii, iii, 2). It is etymologically connected with the Latin ara, to plough. It is directly derived from the Anglo-Saxon eorn, "to plough," and is radically the same with harrow. What we call arable land was originally written earlande. The root ar is one of wide use in all the Indo-European languages (see Muller, Science of Language, p. 289). See PLUGH.

Eardley, Sir CULING, one of the founders of the Evangelical Alliance, was born in Hatfield in 1805. He was a son of Sir Culling Smith, baronet, succeeded to the baronetcy in 1829, and in 1847 assumed by royal license his maternal name of Eardley, his mother having been a daughter of the last lord Eardley. He was educated at Oxford, but did not graduate, having scruples as to subscribing the oaths administered in taking the degree of A.B. He represented Pontefract in one short Parliament previous to the Reform Bill, and in 1846 was an unsuccessful candidate for Edin- borough in opposition to lord Macaulay, sir Culling bas- ing his claim chiefly on his opposition to the Maynooth
Early, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New Jersey, Oct. 17, 1770; was converted at about nineteen; entered the itinerancy in 1791; was superannuated in 1821, and died in June of the same year, having preached for thirty years. His first two years in the ministry were spent as missionary to New Brunswick, where he endured much hardship in zealously laboring for his Master's cause. His after ministry in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland was very useful to the Church. — Min. of Conferences, i, 380.

Early English, a title often given to the first pointed or Gothic style of architecture in England. It is also called the Lancet Style, and also (in the nomenclature of the Ecclesiastical Society) the First Pointed Style. "It succeeded the Norman towards the end of the 12th century, and gradually merged into the Decorated at the end of the 13th. It first partook of the heaviness of the Norman, but soon manifested its own beauty and peculiarity of character. The arches are usually equilateral and lancet-shaped; the doorways are often divided into two by a single shaft or smaller pier; the windows are long and narrow, and, when gathered into a group, are frequently surmounted by a large arch, which springs from the extreme moulding of the window on each side. The space between this arch and the tops of the windows is often filled with circles, or with trefoils or quatrefoils, which constituted the earliest form of tracery. Each window, however, is generally desolate of any tracery in itself" (Chambers, a. v.). The mouldings, says Parker, in general consist of alternate rounds and deeply-cut hollows, with a small amphitrite of fillets, producing a strong effect of light and shadow. "Circular windows were more used in England during the prevalence of this style than in either the decorated or perpendicular, and fine specimens remain at York and Lincoln cathedrals, and at Beverley Minster. Groined ceilings are very common in this style; in general they have only cross springers and diagonal ribs, with sometimes longitudinal and diagonal ribs at the apex of the vault, and good bosses of foliage at the intersections. The pilasters usually consist of small shafts arranged round a larger circular pier, but others of different kinds are to be found, and a plain octagonal or circular pillar is common in country churches. The capitals consist of plain mouldings, or are enriched with foliage and sculpture, characteristic of the style. The most prevalent base has a very close resemblance to the Attic base of the ancients, though the proportions are different, and the lower torus is worked with a considerably larger projection. The buttresses are often very bold and prominent, and are frequently carried up to the top of the building with but little diminution, and terminate in acutely-pointed pediments, which, when raised above the parapet, produce in some degree the effect of pinacles. Flying buttresses were first introduced in this style. Pinacles are but sparingly used, and only towards the end of the style. The roofs appear always to have been high-pitched. The ornaments used in this style are by no means so various as in either of the others; occasionally small roses or other flowers, and bunches of foliage, are carved at intervals in the hollow mouldings, but by far the most common and characteristic is the toothed ornament, which is often introduced in great profusion, and the hollows entirely filled with it. The foliage is very remarkable for boldness of effect, and it is often so much undercut as to be connected with the mouldings only by the stalks and edges of the leaves; there is frequently considerable stiffness in the mode in which it is combined, but the effect is almost always good: the prevailing leaf is a trefoil. Towards the latter part of the style crockets were first introduced. The style may be said to begin in the later half of Richard the First's reign, about which time St. Hugh began his cathedral. During the reign of King John the Early English style had obtained the complete mastery; but the reign of Henry III was the great period of the Early English style, which bad now obtained perfection. That king himself and his brother Richard were great builders. The most perfect example of the style is that at Salisbury Cathedral. Towards the end of the reign we have examples, such as the presbytery of Lincoln and the chapter-house of Salisbury, of what may be almost called the Decorated style, though the mouldings and many of the details are pure Early English. This kind of work must best be called Transitional. See Architecture.

Earnest. άνάθεμα is evidently the Hebrew ַָּה (crabon), a pledge, in Greek characters. It is a mercantile term which the Greeks and Romans appear to have adopted from the Phoenicians (kindred in dialect with the Hebrews) as the founders of commerce. With a slight alteration in the letters, but with none whatever in the sense, it becomes the Latin arrabona, in the old English expression Earl's or Art's money) and earnest. These three words occur in the Heb., Sept., and Vulg. in Gen. xxxviii, 17, 18, and in ver. 20, with the exception that the Vulg. there changes it to pygmas. The use of these words in this sense is great; it illustrates their general import, which is that of an earnest or pledge, given and received, to assure the fulfillment of an engagement. Hezchel explains άνάθεμα by πρόσωπον, something given beforehand. The Hebrew word was used generally for pledge (Gen. xxvii, 17), and in its cognate forms for surely (Prov. xvi, 18) and...
AUSTAGE (2 Kings xiv, 14). The Greek derivative, however, acquired a more technical sense, as signifying the deposit paid by the purchaser on entering into an agreement for the purchase of anything (Suid. Lex. s. v.). This idea attaches to all the particular applications of the word, as anything given by way of warranty or security for the performance of a promise; part of a debt paid as an assurance of paying the remainder; part of the price of anything paid before-hand to confirm the bargain between buyer and seller; part of a servant's wages paid at the time of hiring, for the purpose of ratifying the engagement on both sides. The idea that the ear-ring whom to be returned upon the fulfilment of the engagement, or to be considered as part of the stipulation, is also included. A similar legal and technical sense attaches to earment, the payment of which places both the vendor and purchaser in a position to enforce the carrying out of the contract (Blackstone, ii, 30). The payment of earnest-money under the name of arrabon is still one of the common occurrences of Arab life. Similar customs of paying down at the time of a contract "something to bind the bargain" have prevailed among all nations. (See Smith's Dictionary of Class. Arab. s. v. Arrabon.) See EAR BARGAIN.

The word is used three times in the New Testament, but always in a figurative sense: in the first (2 Cor. i, 22) it is applied to the gifts of the Holy Spirit which God bestowed upon the apostles, and by which he may have intended to hire them for his service of his Son; and which were the earnest, assurance, and commencement of those far superior blessings which he would bestow on them in the life to come as the wages of their faithful services: in the second (2 Cor. v, 5; Ephes. i, 13, 14) it is applied to the gifts bestowed on Christians generally upon whom, after baptism, the apostles laid their hands, and which were to them an earnest of obtaining a heavenly habitation and inheritance, upon the supposition of their fidelity. This use of the term finely illustrates the augmented powers and additional capacities promised in a future state. Jerome, in his comment on the second passage, explains, "Si arrabo tantus, quanta erit possessio? If the earnest was so great, how great must be the possession!" (See Kypre, Macknight, and Middleton on these passages; Le Moyne, Not. ad Var. Soc. p. 466 468.) In a spiritual sense, it denotes those gifts and graces which the Christian receives as the earnest and assurance of perfect happiness in a future world. (See Clauswitz, De Arrabalone, Halle, 1747; Winzer, Comment, in loc. Lips. 1836; Schultess, in Keil and Tischmacher's Analet, ii, i, 215 sq.) There is a marked distinction between a promise of this kind as to respect, that the latter is a part-payment, and therefore implies the identity in kind of the deposit with the future full payment; whereas a pledge may be something of a totally different nature, as in Gen. xxxviii, to be resumed by the depositor when he has completed his contract. Thus the expression "earnest of the Spirit" implies, beyond the idea of security, the identity in kind, though not in degree, and the continuity of the Christian's privileges in this world and in the next. Moreover, a pledge is taken back when the promise which it guaranteed is fulfilled; but whatever is given as earnest, being a part in advance of the whole, is of course retained. See PLINUS.

EAR-RING stands in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of three Heb. words of considerably different import. See RING.

1. בָּשָׂם (agil, from its roundness), properly a ring, specially an ear-ring (Num. xxxi, 50; Ezek. xvi, 12), nearly all the ancient ear-rings exhibited in the sculptures of Egypt and Persopolis being of a circular shape. These also were sometimes spoken of in (though not an exception to the almost universal practice of Asiatics, both in ancient and modern times. That they were not, however, usually worn by men is implied in Judg. xxxix, 24; Job xlii, 11; Prov. xxiv, 12; Hos. ii, 13. The material of which the ear-ring was made was generally gold (Exod. xxxiii, 2), and its form circular, as we may infer from the name כָּשָׂם, by which it is described (Num. xxxvi, 50; Ezek. xvi, 12): such was the shape usual in Egypt (Wilkinson's Egyptians, iii, 370). They were worn by women and by youth of both sexes (Exod. i. c.). It has been inferred from the passage quoted, and from Judg. viii, 24, that they were not worn by men; these passages are, however, by no means conclusive. In the former an order is given to the men in such terms that they could not be mentioned, though they might have been implicitly included; in the latter the amount of the gold is the peculiarity advertised to, and not the character of the ornament, a peculiarity which is still noticeable among the inhabitants of southern Arabia (Wellsted's Travels, i, 321). The mention of the sons in Exod. xxxiii, 2 (which, however, is omitted in the Sept.), is in favor of their having been worn, and it appears unlikely that the Hebrews gave an exception to the almost universal practice of Asiatics, both in ancient and modern times. That they were not, however, usually worn by men is implied in Judg. xxxix, 24; Job xlii, 11; Prov. xxiv, 12; Hos. ii, 13. The material of which the ear-ring was made was generally gold (Exod. xxxiii, 2), and its form circular, as we may infer from the name כָּשָׂם, by which it is described (Num. xxxvi, 50; Ezek. xvi, 12): such was the shape usual in Egypt (Wilkinson's Egyptians, iii, 370). They were worn by women and by youth of both sexes (Exod. i. c.). It has been inferred from the passage quoted, and from Judg. viii, 24, that they were not worn by men; these passages are, however, by no means conclusive. In the former an order is given to the men in such terms that they could not be mentioned, though they might have been implicitly included; in the latter the amount of the gold is the peculiarity advertised to, and not the character of the ornament, a peculiarity which is still noticeable among the inhabitants of southern Arabia (Wellsted's Travels, i, 321). The mention of the sons in Exod. xxxiii, 2 (which, however, is omitted in the Sept.), is in favor of their having been worn, and it appears unlikely that the Hebrews gave an exception to the almost universal practice of Asiatics, both in ancient and modern times. That they were not, however, usually worn by men is implied in Judg.
xiv, 24, where gold ear-rings are mentioned as distinctive of the Ishmaelitish tribes. The men of Egypt also abstained from the use of ear-rings; but how extensively they were worn by men in other nations is shown by the preceding group of heads of different foreigners, collected from the Egyptian monuments. By this also the usual forms of the most ancient ornaments of this description are sufficiently displayed. Those worn by the Egyptian ladies were large, round, single hoops of gold, from one inch and a half to two inches and one third in diameter, and frequently of still greater size, or made of six single rings soldered together. Such probably was the round *opus* of the Hebrews. Among persons of high or royal rank the ornament was sometimes in the shape of an asp, whose body was of gold set with precious stones. Silver ear-rings have also been found at Thebes, either plain hoops like the ear-rings of gold, or simple studs. The ancient Assyrians, both men and women, wore ear-rings of exquisite shape and finish, especially the kings, and those on the later monuments are generally in the form of a cross (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 234, 235).

Lan the ear-rings appear to have so far been regarded with superstitious reverence as an amulet; thus it is named in the Chaldean and Samaritan versions *ןֶּבֶל*, a holy thing; and in Is. iii, 20 the word יָשַׁב, prop. amulets, is rendered in the A.V., after the Sept. and Vulg., ear-rings. On this account they were surrendered along with the idols by Jacob's household (Gen. xxxv, 4). Chardin describes ear-rings, with talismanic figures and characters on them, as still existing in the East (Brown's *Antiquities*, ii, 303).

The earth properly the name of the planet on which we dwell. See Geography.

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

1. *אָדָם*, *adamah*, is the earth in the sense of soil or ground, particularly as being susceptible of cultivation; hence the expression הָרָעָה, lit. "man of the ground," for an agriculturist (Gen. ix, 20). The earth supplied the elementary substance of which man's body was formed, and the terms *adam* and *adamah* are brought into juxtaposition, implying an etymological connection (Gen. ii, 7). See Adam.

2. The opinion of the ancient peoples was that the earth was formed of earth. The earth was among the Greeks (Hesiod, *Op. et Di*. 61, 70; Plato, *Rep.* p. 260), the Romans (Virgil, *Georg.* ii, 341; Ovid, *Met.* i, 82), the Egyptians (Diod. Sic. i, 10), and other ancient nations. It is evidently based on the observation of the material into which the body is resolved after death (Job x, 9; Ex. xii, 7). The law prescribed earth as the material out of which altars were to be raised (Exod. xx, 24); Bähr (*Symb.* 1, 488) sees in this a reference to the name *adam*; others, with more reason, compare it with the *ara de cepite* of the Romans (Ovid, *Trist.* v, 5, 9; Horace, *Od.* iii, 8, 4, 5), and view it as a precept of simplicity. Naaman's request for two mules' burden of earth
EARTH

(Earthquake) (2 Kings v. 17) was based on the idea that Jehovah, like the heathen deities, was a local god, and could be worshiped acceptably only on his own soil. See Ground.

2. More generally γῆ, e'reta, which is explained by Von Bohlen (Introdc. to Gen. ii, 6) as meaning etymologically the low in opposition to the high, i.e. the heaven. It is applied in a more or less extended sense: 1, to the whole world (Gen. i, 1); 2, to land as opposed to sea (Gen. i, 10); 3, to a country (Gen. xxi, 32); 4, to a mass of ground (Gen. xxiii, 15); and, 5, to the ground on which a man stands (Gen. xxvi, 3); also, in a more general view, 6, to "the inhabitants of the earth" (Gen. vii, 11; xi, 1); 7, to heathen countries, as distinguished from the land of Israel, especially during the theocracy; i.e. all the rest of the world excepting earth and 2 Kin. viii, 23; 2 Chron. xiii, 9, etc.; particularly the empire of Chaldea and Assyria (Ezra i, 2); 8, in the New Testament especially, "the earth" appears in our translation as applied to the land of Judaea. As in many of these passages it might seem as if the habitable globe were intended, the use of so many terms as "the earth" should have been avoided, and the original rendered by "the land," as in Lev. xxv, 23; Isa. x, 28, and elsewhere. This is the sense which the original bears in Matt. xxiii, 35; xxvi, 35; Mark xv, 38; Luke iv, 23; xxi, 23; Acts i, 17; James v, 17. For a spiritual sense, the word is employed (in the N. T.) in contrast with heaven, to denote things earthly and carnal (John iii, 31; Colos. iii, i, 2). See Wemys, Symbol. Dict. s. v.; comp. World.

To demand earth and water was a custom of the ancient Persians, by which they required a people to acknowledge their dominion; Nebuchadnezzar, in the Greek of Judith (ii, 7), commands Holofernes to march against the people of the West, who had refused submission, and to declare to them that they were to prepare earth and water. Darius ordered his envoys to demand earth and water from the king of the Scythians, and Megabyzus required the same of Amyntas, king of Macedonia, in the name of Darius. Polybius and Plutarch notice this custom among the Persians. Some believe that these symbolical demands denoted dominion of the earth and sea; others, that the earth represented the promise of a future kingdom, as the sea and water, the wine, bread, which is the second part of human nourishment. Ecles. xv, 16, in much the same sense, says, "The Lord hath set fire and water before thee; stretch forth thy hand unto whom thou wilt; and ch. xxxix, 26, "Fire and water are the most necessary things to life and death." The same consideration is as the first principles of the generation, birth, and preservation of man. Prescribed persons were debarred from their use; as, on the contrary, wives in their nuptial ceremonies were obliged to touch them. See ELEMENT.

11. The idea which the ancient Hebrews had of the figure of the earth can only be conjectured from incidental hints occasionally given in Scripture (Isa. xi, 22; Prov. vii, 27; Job xxvi, io; Ps. xxiv, 2; xxxxi, 6). From these passages, taken together, says Rosenmüller (Afterthama'k) 1, i, 133 sq.), we obtain the notion of the earth's disk as circular, rising out of the water, and surrounded with the ocean, the heaven being spread over it as a canopy. Though floating free in the boundless immensity of space, yet, through the Creator's mighty, it remains firmly fixed, without moving (1 Chron. xxvi, 30; Ps. xxiii, i; civ, 5; cxix, 90). It is also fixed there, however, to infer the popular notions of the earth's figure from what may have been nothing more than the bold imagery of poets. Some have supposed that so long as the Hebrews were a nomadic race, they conceived of the earth as resembling a round tent, with the expanse as its covering; but that in later times, when domiciled in Palestine, they spoke of it as a splendid palace resting upon its many pillars (2 Sam. xxii, 8; Ps. lxv, 3; civ, 5; Prov. viii, 25, 29, and the LXX. and Warnke, Hitzig, Theol. Thes. 116 sq.; Ovid, Metam. i, 5 sq.; comp. Fasel, Prop. Ec. i, 10 [Sanchoniathon, ed. Orelli, p. 9 sq.] Zenodavesta, i, 170 sq.) also vary in their representations on this point, describing the earth sometimes as an oblong square, sometimes as a cube, sometimes as a pyramid, sometimes as a chlamys, or overspread mantle.


Earthen Vessel of Earthware. See Portery.

Earthquake (σείση, ra 'askh, a shaking, earthy). The proximate cause of earthquakes, though by no means accurately defined, seems referable to the action of internal heat or fire. That the earth was once subject to the action of a vast internal power springing probably from the development of subterranean or central heat, the elevations and depressions, and the generally scattered and torn character of its exterior make sufficiently evident. A power similar in kind, but more restricted in degree, is still at work in the bowels of the earth, and occasionally breaks down all barriers and devastates certain parts of the world. There is good reason for believing that earthquakes are closely connected with volcanic agency. Both probably spring from the same cause, and may be regarded as one mighty influence operating to somewhat similar results. Volcanic agency, therefore, is an indication which its causes are the first may be taken as indications of the existence (either former, past, actual or possible) of the latter. (See Hitchcock's Geology, p. 234 sq.) The manifestation of these awful phenomena is restricted in its range. Accordingly, geologists have laid down certain volcanic regions or lands within which such manifestations take place. Over these regions various traces of volcanic agency are found, such as either gaseous vapors, or hot springs, or lenticular substances, and in some instances (occasionally) active volcanoes. Several sources of bitumen are found on the Tigris, in the Persian mountains and on the Kaspii, in Armenia, as well as along the Euphrates. At Hit, especially, on the last-mentioned river, it exists on a very large scale, and, having been much used from the earliest times, seems inexhaustible. Abundant traces of it are also to be seen in the rains, owing to the over-all incirvity of Hillah, the ancient Babylon. Syria and Palestine abound in volcanic appearances. Between the River Jordan and Damascus lies a volcanic tract. The entire country about the Dead Sea presents indubitable tokens of volcanic agency. Accordingly, these places are justly considered to come within one of the volcanic regions. The chief of these are; (1) that which extends from the Caspian...
EARTHQUAKE

Sea to the Azores; (2) from the Aeolian Isles to the Moluccas; (3) that of the Andes; (4) the African; (5) the Icelandic. "Syria and Palestine are embraced within the first band, and these present earthquakes are as frequently been subject to earthquakes. (See Stanley, Palest. p. 279, 283, 285, 363; Volney, Trav. i, 261; Rüeggert, Riesen, p. 205.) See PALESTINE.

That earthquakes were among the extraordinary phenomena of Palestine in ancient times is shown in the books of Judges and Kings and in the New Testament. The place of the earthquakes is usually given as being among the Hebrews, and a source of religious admonition and devout emotion. An earthquake, when great, overturns and changes the surface of the earth, subverting mountains, hills, and rocks, sinking some parts, elevating others; turning rivers into lakes and lakes on dry lands, and drying up those that already existed; and is therefore a proper symbol of great revolutions or changes in the government or political world (Heb. xii, 26). See WUMS, Symbolical Dict. s. v. In Psalm xviii, 7, we read, "Then the earth shook and moved not, the mountains trembled and were also of the hills moved and were shaken, because he was wroth" (comp. Hab. iii, 6; Nah. i, 5; Isa. v, 23). It was not an unnatural transition that any signal display of the will, sovereignty, or goodness of Providence should be foretold in connection with, and accompanied as by other signs, when the destruction of the sinners is immediately below, so by earthquakes and their fearful concomitants (see Joel ii, 28; Matt. xxiv, 7, 23). Earthquakes are not infrequently attended with fissures of the earth's surface; instances of this are recorded in connection with the destruction of Korah and his company (Num. xxvi, 32; comp. Josephus, Antiv, iv, 3, 5), and at the time of our Lord's death (Matt. xxvii, 51); the form γ may be paralleled by a similar occurrence at Oropo, in Ca- lauria, A.D. 1783, when the earth opened to the extent of 90 feet and a depth of more than 200 feet, and again, in the latter part of the bed of the Tiber at Lisbon, in which the quay was swallowed up (Pfaff, Schreibgesch. p. 115). These depressions are sometimes on a very large scale; the subsidence of the valley of Siddim, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, may be attributed to an earthquake. Similar depressions have occurred in many districts, the most remarkable being the submersion and subsequent re-elevation of the temple of Serapis at Puteoli. The frequency of earthquakes about the Dead Sea is testified in the name Bela (Gen. iv, 22; comp. Jerome ad Isa. xv). Sevilleti, that the source of an earthquake nearly fails to inspire, "conveying to the mind of the spectators a universal and unlimited danger" (Humboldt's Kosmos, i, 212), rendered it a fitting token of the presence of Jehovah (1 Kings xix, 11); hence it is frequently noticed in connection with his appearance (Judg. vi, 4, 2 Sam. xxiv, 8; Ps. lxxvi, 18; xvii, 4; civ, 32; Amos viii, 8; Hab. iii, 10). Earthquakes, together with thunder, lightning, and other fearful phenomena of nature, form no small portion of the stock of materials which the interpreters of the German rationalistic school employ with no less liberality than confidence in order to explain after their manner the events recorded in the Scriptures which have been commonly referred to the immediate agency of God. Hezel, Paulus, and other miracle-exploders would, for this resource, find their "occupation gone." But, if there is reason for the statement that truth is sometimes stranger than fiction, it is found esp. in the course of events and phenomena of nature, as in the case of earthquakes, which may sometimes be observed that their "natural" causes are most unnatural, unlikely, and insufficient. See MIRACLES.

The first visitation of the kind recorded as having happened to Palestine was in the reign of Ahab (about 870 B.C.), and affected the cities of Zimri (xix, 11, 12), which were not erected to go forth and stand upon the mountains before Jehovah: "And behold Jehovah passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before Jehovah; but Jehovah was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but Jehovah was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire: and Jehovah was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice." A terrible earthquake, accompanied by "fire" is recorded under the name of Judah" (B.C. 781), which Josephus (Ant. ix, 16, 4) says "shook the ground, and a rent was made in the Temple, so that the rays of the sun shone through it, which, falling upon the king's face, struck him with the leprosy; a punishment which the Jews say was to express the wrath of God consequent on Uzziah's usurpation of the priest's office. That this earthquake was of an awful character may be learned from the fact that Zechariah (xiv, 5) thus speaks respecting it: "Ye shall flee as ye fled before from the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah. And I will shake the heavens above, and the earth beneath." This phenomenon appears from Amos (i, 7) that the event was so striking, and left such deep impressions on men's minds, as to become a sort of epoch from which to date and reckon; the prophet's words are, "two years before the earthquake." See UZZIAH. From Zach. xiv, 4 we are to infer that the event was not something which occurred at this time in the Mount of Olives, the mountain being split so as to leave a valley between its summits. Josephus records something of the sort, but his account is by no means clear, for his words (υστομενον το εσωτερικον τον παρα της τατη της εσωτερικης) can hardly mean the "half of the western mountain," which seems to think, but the "half of the western mountain," i.e. of the Mount of Evil Counsel, though it is not clear why this height particularly should be termed the western mountain. We cannot but think that the two accounts have the same foundation, and that the Mount of Olives was really affected by the earthquake. Harkins (comment. on Zechariah, "corruption," may have originated at this time, the rolling down of the side of the hill, as described by Josephus, entitled it to be described as the destroying mountain, in the sense in which the term occurs in Jer. ii, 25. See AZAL.

The only important or clear earthquake mentioned in the New Testament (except the doubtful one of Matt. xxviii, 2) is that which happened at the crucifixion of our Lord (Matt. xxvii, 51; comp. Luke xxi, 44-5; Mark xv, 33). The concomitant darkness is most naturally held to have been an attendant on the earthquake. Earthquakes are not seldom attended by accompaniments which obscure the light of day during (as in this case from the sixth to the ninth hour), and are not infrequently mentioned by historians (o'clock P.M.) several hours. If this is the fact, then the record is consistent with natural phenomena, and the darkness which sceptics have pleaded against speaks actually in favor of the credibility of the Gospel. Now it is well known to naturalists that such obstructions are by no means uncommon. It may be enough to give the following instances. A very remarkable volcanic eruption took place on the 19th of January, 1833, in the volume of Concepcion, situated in the Bay of Fonseca (usually called the coast of Concepcion), in Central America. The eruption was preceded by a rumbling noise, accompanied by a column of smoke which issued from the mountain, increasing until it assumed the form and appearance of a large dense cloud, which, when viewed at the distance of thirty miles, appeared like an immense plume of feathers, rising into the air, with considerable velocity, and moving in every direction. In the course of the two following days several shocks of earthquakes were felt; the morning of the 22d rose fine and clear, but a dense cloud of a pyramidal form was observed in the direction of the north. This gradually increased, and, at 11 o'clock A.M. it had spread over the whole firmament, entirely obscuring the light of day. The darkness equalling in intensity that of the most clouded night: this darkness continued with little intermission for three days; during the whole time a fine black pow-
der continued to fall. This darkness extended over half of Central America. The convulsion was such as to change the outline of the coast, turn the course of a river, and form two new islands. Precisely analogous phenomena were exhibited on occasions of earthquakes that took place at Cartagena in Central America, when there prevailed a dense black fog, which lasted for three days (Recreations in Physical Geography, p. 382).

In the case of the volcanic eruption which overwhelmed Herceulaneum and Pompeii (A.D. 79), we learn from the younger Pliny that a dense column of vapor was first seen rising vertically from Vavonis, and then spreading itself out laterally, so that its upper portion resembled the head, and its lower the trunk of a pine. This black cloud was pierced occasionally by flashes of fire as vivid as lightning, succeeded by darkness more profound than night, and ashes fell even at Mi-

An earthquake appears to exert a very marked influence on our atmosphere: among other effects, Lyell (Principles and Aspects, 4th ed., p. 400) speaks of gusts of wind, interrupted by dead calms; evolution of electric matter or of inflammable gas from the soil, with sulphureous and mephitic vapors; a reddening of the sun's disk, and a haziness in the air often continued for months (Joel ii, 30, 31). Other interpreters, however, understand the earthquake in Matt. xxiv, 21-22 to have been merely some special and supernatural operation of God, in attestation of the marvellous work that was in progress, producing a tumultuous motion in the immediate locality, and in connection therewith a sensible constellation in the minds of the immediate actors; hence there is no other historical allusion to it. This view is confirmed by its being in the second case connected with the angel's descent (Matt. xxviii, 8; comp. 1 Sam. xiv, 15). Like the one that occurred at Philippi (Acts xvi, 10), it is perhaps to be regarded as a somewhat exceptional phenomenon, wrought for a specific purpose, and consequently very limited as to its sphere of action. Nor does it appear from any notices of Scripture that the phenomena of earthquakes, in the ordinary and extensive sense of the term, played more than a very occasional and subordinate part in the scenes of national history. Treatises in Latin on the earthquake at our Saviour's passion have been written by Berger (Viteb. 1710), Posner (Ien. 1672), Schmerauch (Lubben. 1756), Schmid (Jen. 1688). See Darkness.

An earthquake devastated Judaea some years (31) before the birth of our Lord, at the time of the battle of Actium, which Josephus (Ant. xv, 52) reports was such "as had not happened at any other time, which brought great destruction upon the cattle in that country. About ten thousand men also perished by the fall of houses." Jerome writes of an earthquake which, in the time of his childhood (about A.D. 315), destroyed Rabula Moab (Jerome on Isaiah, xv). The writers of the Middle Ages also speak of earthquakes in Palestine, stating that they were not only formidable, but frequent. In 1834 an earthquake shook Jerusalem, and injured the chapel of the nativity at Bethlehem. In 1887 (Jan. 1) Jerusalem and its vicinity were visited by severe shocks of earthquake, yet the city remains without serious injury from these subterranean causes. This last earthquake totally overthrew the village of Safed, in Galilee (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 229), and caused a full account of the nativity at Bethlehem, affecting various parts of Syria, see Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. vol. ii, ch. iv. Comp. Bulunger, in Graevi Theesar. v, 516 sq.; Förblicher, Handb. d. alt. Geogr. i, 636 sq.

East is the rendering of the following terms in the English Bible. See Geography. 1. צִ֥רְחָ֥ה, צָרְחָ֥ה, properly denotes the rising, sc. of the sun, and strictly corresponds with the Gr. ἀνα- ρρων, and the Lat. oriens. It is used tropically for the east indefinitely (Psa. cxii, 12; Dan. viii, 9; Amos-xii, 12, etc.): also: definitely for some place in relation to others, thus, "The land of the east," i.e. the country lying to the east of the land of Canaan, when there was no direct route to the east (Isa. xliii, 7); "the east of Jericho" (Josh. iv, 19); "the east gate" (Neh. iii, 29), and adverbially "eastward" (1 Chron. vii, 28; ix, 24, etc.). Sometimes the full expression צִ֥רְחָ֥ה עַל עַם, צָרְחָ֥ה, is used (indefinitely, Isa. xii, 25; definitely, Judg. xi, 18). See below.

2. צָרְחָ֥ה, ke'dem (with its modifications), properly means what is in front of, before (comp. Psa. cxxxix, 5; Isa. xi, 11 [12]). As the Hebrews, in pointing out the quarters, looked towards the east, צָרְחָ֥ה, Jore, came to signify the east, as הַגָּדֶ֥ת, behind, the west, and צָרְחָ֥ה, the right hand, the south. In this sense kedem is used in each of the seasons (Gen. xxi, 2; xiii, 11, etc.; (d) relatively, Num. xxxix, 11, etc.; (c) definitely, to denote the regions lying to the east of Palestine (Gen. xxix, 1; Num. xxxix, 7; Isa. ix, 11; sometimes in the full form צָרְחָ֥ה עַל עַם, צָרְחָ֥ה, "land of the east" (Gen. xxv, 6), the inhabitants of which are denominated צָרְחָ֥ה עַל עַם, "children of the east." See BNEK KEDEM.

Sometimes kedem and mirach are used together (e.g. Exod. xxvii, 18; Josh. xix, 12), which is after all, not so tautological as it appears to be in our translation "eastward" and "east." It may be that in the use of this etymological distinction, it is natural that kedem should be used when the four quarters of the world are described (as in Gen. xiii, 14; xxviii, 14; Job xxiii, 8, 9; Ezek. xvii, 18 sq.), and mirach when the east is only distinguished from the west (Josh. xi, 8; Psa. 1, 1; ch. xxvii, 7; Ezek. viii, 7). On the other hand, kedem is used of the east as the leading or the first day of the week (Gen. vii, 10), while on the other quarter (Dan. viii, 9; xi, 44; Amos viii, 12); exceptions to this usage occur in Psa. cvii, 8, and Isa. xiii, 5, each, however, admitting of explanation. Again, kedem is used in a strictly geographical sense to describe a spot or country immediately before another in an easterly direction; hence it occurs in such passages as Gen. ii, 8; iii, 24; xx, 1; xiii, 11; xxxv, 6; and hence the subsequent application of the term, as a proper name (Gen. xxv, 6, eastward, unto the land of Kedem), to the lands lying immediately eastward of Palestine, viz. Arabia, Mesopotamia, Babylon, etc. On the other hand, mirach is used of the far east with a less definite significance (Isa. xii, 2, 25; xiii, 5; xlvii, 11). In describing aspect or direction, the terms are used indifferently (comp. kedem in Lev. i, 16, and Josh. vii, 2, with mirach in 2 Chron. v, 12, and 1 Chron. x, 9), etc.

"The East" is the name given by the ancient Hebrews to a certain region, without any regard to its relation to the eastern part of the heavens, comprehending not only Arabia Deserta and the lands of Moab and Ammon, which really lay to the east of Palestine, but also Armenia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Babylon, and Chaldea, which were situated rather to the north than to the east of Judaea. Its geographical boundaries include Syria, the countries beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, and the shores of the Indian Ocean and of the Arabian Gulf. The name given to this entire region by the Hebrews was צִ֥רְחָ֥ה עַל עַם, צָרְחָ֥ה, (dvar rashah), or the land of Kedem or East; but the Babylonians it was called צִ֥רְחָ֥ה, or Apshur, Arabia. Its miscellaneous population were called by the former "sons of the East," or Orientalis, and by the latter either Arameans, or the "people of the West." The Jews themselves also apply to them the Babylonian name in some of their books written after the Captivity (2 Chron. xxvii, 1; Neh. ii, 9). The Arabs anciently denominated the eastern quarters of the earth, and do so till this day, either by one of these names. To this region belong the "kings of the East." (Isa. xix, 11; Jer. xxxv, 19-25,
EAST

Heb.). The following passages may suffice as instances showing the arbitrary application of the term "east" to this region. Balaam says that Balak, king of Moab, had brought him from the mountains of the east (Num. xxiii, 7), i.e. from Pethor on the Euphrates. Isaiah places Syria in the east (Isa. xi. 11), "the Syrians from the east" (bishop Lowth). The distinction seems to be drawn between the east (Eze. xxvii. 1, Jev 1) and the land of the children of the East." It occurs again in Judg. vi. 3, "Even the children of the East came against them" (Sept. or. iv. into and Vulg. excit. Orientium nationum). The preceding facts enable us to account for the prodigious numbers of people, and sometimes kings, in war against the peoples (Judg. vi. 5; vii. 12), and the children of the East were like grasshoppers for multitude," and for the astonishing carnage recorded (Judg. viii. 10), "there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew the sword." It seems that the inhabitants of this region were distinguished for their proficiency in the arts and sciences (comp. 1 Kings i. 4, 30), and were addicted in the time of Isaiah to superstition (Isa. xxvi). See ARABIA.

The east seems to have been regarded as symbolical of distance (Isa. xvi. 11), as the land stretched out in these regions without any distinct region. And Josephus, ii. 6, the house of Jacob is said to be "replenished from the east" (Ἐδρασθή απὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ), which some explain as referring to witchcraft, or the arts of divination practised in the East, while others, with greater probability, understand it of the men of the East, the diviners and soothsayers who came from the east (comp. Job xv. 3). The correct text may, however, be ΔΈρασθη, with sorcery, which gives a better sense (Gesen. Theolur. p. 1105). See WITHCRAFT.

3. *Avaroλος, sun-rise.* This word usually occurs in the plural, and without the article. When, therefore, we read Matthew ii. 1, 2, that *αυρανολοι* came to Jerusalem saying we have seen his star in την αυραδολον, we are led to suspect some special reason for such a variation. The former phrase is naturally rendered as equivalent to Oriental Magi, and the indefinite expression is to be explained by reference to the use of ὑerule in the Old Testament. The latter phrase offers greater difficulty. If it be taken in the east, the questions arise why the singular and not the customary plural should be used? why the article should be added? and why the wise men should have seen the star in the east when the place where the child was lay to the west of their locality (unless, indeed, they are not in relation to the East, as is often the case, and not the wise men themselves, to whom it seems to refer). Pressed by the difficulties thus suggested, the majority of recent interpreters take πν ἑαυτοῦ in την αυραδολον literally in την ηραντε, and trace a correspondence of this with the ὑerule of the preceding clause, they inquired for the child, whom they knew to be born, because they had seen the rising of his star, the signal of his birth. Alfred's object to this, that for such a meaning we should expect αναρις, if not in ver. 2, certainly in ver. 9; but the construction falls under the case where the article, by indicating something closely associated with the subject, supersedes the use of the demonstrative pronoun. In the Sept. αυρανολος is used both for kedem and Diosk. It should be observed that the expression is, with but few exceptions (Dan. viii. 9; Rev. xxi. 19; comp. vii. 2; xvi. 12), from which it would seem to have been John’s usages (here αναρις, αυρανολος (Matt. ii. 1; viii. 11; xxiv. 27; Luke xxiii. 29), and not αναρις. It is hardly possible that Matthew would use the two terms indifferently in succeeding verses (ii. 1, 2), particularly as he adds the article to αναρωλος, which is invariably absent in other cases (comp. Rev. xix. 18). He seems to insist upon dividing the sexes in the locality—that it was the country called Δέρασθη, or αυρανολος (comp. the modern נאталיו), as distinct from the quarter or point of the compass (αναρις), in which it lay. In confirmation of this, it may be noticed that in the only passage where the article is prefixed to kedem (Gen. x. 30), the term is used for a definite and restricted locality, namely, Southern Arabia. See STAR IN THE EAST.

The only other terms rendered "east" in the Scriptures are xrv (charroth), pottery, applied to a gate of Jerusalem, improperly called "east gate" (Jer. xix. 2), but meaning the potters’ gate (q. c.), i.e. one which led to the "potters’ field" in the valley of Hinnom (see Strong’s Harmony and Exposition, Appendix ii, p. 11). See JERUSALEM. נאטל (mortal), a going forth, as it is elsewhere usually rendered, applied postically to sun-rise (Ps. lixv. 6). For "east wind," "east sea," see below.

EAST, TURNING TOWARDS THE. 1. The earliest churches faced eastward; at a later period (4th or 5th century) this was reversed, and the sacramental table was placed at the east, so that worshippers facing it in their devotions were turned towards the east. The Jewish custom was to turn to the west in prayer. Socrates says (Hist. eccl. 1, ch. v.) that the Jews did not face the east when they prayed. Antiocic had its altar on the west, i.e. towards Jerusalem. 2. Many fanciful reasons are assigned, both by ancient writers and by modern ritualists, for worshipping towards the east. Among them are the following: "(1) The rising sun was the symbol of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, and since people and the Church were not always able to face towards some quarter of the heavens, they chose that which led them to Christ by symbolical representation (Tertullian, Apol. i, 16). (2) The east was the place of paradise, our ancient habitation and country, which we lose in the fall of Adam by the fall, and whither we hope to be restored again, as to our native abode and rest, in the second Adam, Christ our Saviour (Ap. const. iii. ii. c. 57). (3) The east was considered the most honorable part of the creation, being the light of light and brightness. (4) Christ made his appearance on earth in the east, and thence ascended into heaven, and there will appear again at the last day. The authority of many of the fathers has been added by ecclesiastical writers in support of these views. The author of the Questions to Antoninus, under the name of Athanasius, gives this account of the practice: "(Cf. duct. hot. bk. vi. ch. v.) that he changes the east, as if we thought God any way shut up in those parts of the world, but because God is in himself the true Light. In turning, therefore, towards the created light, we do not worship it, but the great Creator of it; taking occasion from that most excellent element to adore the Creator before all elements and ages in the world." A little attention to geography shows that these are nothing but fancies. That part of the heavens, for example, which is east at six o’clock in the morning, is west at six o’clock in the evening, so that we cannot at both these periods pray towards that quarter of the heavens where (according to Wheatly) God is supposed to have his peculiar residence of glory, unless, if we turn to the east at morning prayer, we turn to west at even song. Not only so, but two individuals on opposite sides of the globe, though both suppose that they are praying with their faces to the east, are, so far as it respects each other, or any particular quarter of the heavens, praying in opposite directions, one east and the other west, one looking towards that quarter, the other away from it. So that all such reasons are rendered futile by the geography of the earth on its axis, every degree of longitude becomes during the twenty-four hours both east and west.”
and himself scorch'd by "a vehement east wind" (Gen. xii, 6; John iv, 8); and often in the prophets, when a blighting desolation is spoken of, it is associated with the east wind, either as the instrument of, or as a lively image of the evil (Ezek. xvii, 10; xix, 12; Hos. xiii, 15; Hab. i, 9, etc.). This arose from the fact that in Egypt, Palestine, and the lands of the Bible generally, the east wind, or a wind more or less strong, blows from his burning shores, and consequently is destructive to the vegetation which is necessary to promote vegetation. In Egypt it is rather a south-east than an east wind, which is commonly found most injurious to health and fruitfulness; but this also is familiarly called an east wind, and it plays a great part in the popular tales, and even in the accounts of modern travellers on the subject: "In the spring the south wind oftentimes springs up towards the south-east, increasing to a whirlwind. The heat then seems insupportable, although the thermometer does not always rise very high. As long as the south-east wind continues, doors and windows are closed, but the fine dust penetrates everywhere; everything dries up; wooden vessels warp and crack. The thermometer rises suddenly from 16-20○ up to 30-36○, and even 38○ at Beaufort. This wind works destruction upon everything. The grass withers, that it entirely perishes; and it blows the sand into the buildings (Egypt. Miss., p. 111)." It is stated by another traveller, Wansleib, with special reference to the strong east wind employed on the occasion of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, which took place shortly after Easter: "From Easter to Pentecost is the most stormy part of the year, for the wind commonly blows during this time from the Red Sea, from the east" (see in Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Rocks of Moses, p. 9, etc.). There is nothing, therefore, in the scriptural allusions to this wind which is not fully borne out by the reports of modern travellers; all that is asserted is as true now, as it has ever been, an unwelcome visitant, and carries along with it many disagreeable effects. See WIND.

Easter (mēra), a Gr. form of the Heb. מַעֲרָחָה, and so Latinized by the Vulgate paques, i.e. Passover. Easter is a word of Saxon origin, and imports a goddess of the Saxons, or, rather, of the East, Estera, in honor of whom sacrifices were annually offered about the Passover time of the year (spring), the name became known by a system of association of ideas to the Christian festival of the resurrection, which happened at the time of the Passover: hence we say Easter-day, Easter-Sunday, but very improperly; as this is by no means referable to the goddess, but only to the god (Germ. Zahl, p. 200). So the present German word for Easter, Ostern, is referred to the same goddess, Estera or Ostera.—Calmet, s. v. The occurrence of this word in the A. V. of Acts xii, 4—"intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people"—is chiefly noticeable as an example of the want of consistency in the translators. See AUTHORIZED VERSION. In the earlier English versions Easter had been frequently used as the translation of מַעֲרָחָה. At the last revision Passover was substituted in all passages but this. It would seem from this, and from the use of such words as "robbers of churches" (Acts xix, 35). "town-clerk" (xvi, 30), "sergeant" (xvi, 35), "deputy" (xiii, 7, etc.), as if the Acts of the Apostles had fallen into the hands of a translator who acted on the principle of choosing, not the most correct, but the most familiar equivalent of the passage, Thucydides, (On the Use of the N. T. p. 21).—Smith, s. v. For all that regards the nature and celebration of the feast referred to in Acts xii, 4, see PASSOVER.

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

The day of Easter was celebrated with every demonstration on the part of the Christians. There was a solemn celebration of the Lord's Supper; the baptism of catechumens; appropriate salutations, and demonstrations of joy; the liberation of prisoners, and the manumission of slaves. Charities were dispensed, and the doors of justice were closed. The heathen were forbidden to celebrate public spectacles in order that the devotions of Christians might not be interrupted. The week following was considered as a continuation of the festival. During this time, those who had been baptized at Easter continued their devout seclusion in the churches, and they were bound by baptism. On the Sunday following they laid aside their garments of white, and were welcomed as members of the Church.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. xx. ch. v.

EASTER CONTROVERTIES. There was much controversy in the Church as to the days on which our Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated. The churches of Asia Minor celebrated the death of the Lord on the day corresponding to the 14th of the month Nisan, on which day, according to the opinion of the whole ancient Church, the crucifixion took place. The orthodox party referred to the words of our Lord in the Synoptics concerning the crucifixion. The other party on the second Sunday also were of the opinion that the crucifixion should be annually commemorated on the particular day of the week on which it occurred, that is, Friday. The resurrection was accordingly commemorated by the former party on the 13th of Nisan, and by the latter on the 14th of Nisan; the words of our Lord in the Synoptics (Matt. xxvii. 62) are in favor of this view. The two parties also differed with regard to the fasting preceding Easter. The Western churches viewed the death-day of Christ exclusively as a day of mourning, and they did not terminate the time of fasting until the Sunday following Good Friday. The Eastern party on the other hand, looking upon the death of Christ as the redemption of mankind, terminated fasting at the hour of Christ's death (2 o'clock in the afternoon), and immediately after celebrated the Agape and the Lord's Supper. In addition to these two parties, there was a third, the Ebionite sect, which kept the 15th of Nisan, and the 16th of Nisan, both of which a few years later were celebrated by bishops of Ephesus. Victor, at first intended to excommunicate the Asiatic churches, and therefore issued an encyclical to the Christians of those regions, but whether he really carried out his threat is not certain. The words of Eusebius ( Hist. Eccl. v. 24) show that the movements of Victor are by some understood as implying a real execution of the excommunication, while the more common opinion is, that, in consequence of the indulgent remonstrances against such a usurpation of power by the Western bishops, especially by Irenee, the threat was abandoned.

Thus far the controversy between the Asiatic and the Western churches had only concerned two points, namely, (1) whether the day of the week or the day of the month on which the death of Christ occurred should be commemorated; (2) when the fasting ought to be terminated. Now a third point, namely, as to the time when the 14th of Nisan really occurred. Many of the Church fathers are of opinion that, according to the original calculation of the Jews up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the 14th of Nisan had always been after the spring equinox, and not before as is the case today. This was the only evidence of calculation of the later Jews that the 14th of Nisan occasionally fell before the equinox. They therefore insisted that the 14th of Nisan, which for both parties within the Church determined the time of Easter, should always be after the equinox. As the year of the Jews is a lunar year, and the 14th of Nisan always a full moon day, the Christians who adopted the above astronomical view, whenever the 14th of Nisan fell before the equinox, would celebrate the death of Christ one month later than the Jewish Passover. As the Christians could not long rely on the Jewish calendar, they had to make their own calculations of the time of Easter. These calculations usually differed, partly from reasons already set forth, and partly because the date of the equinox was fixed by some at the 18th of March, by others at the 19th, and by yet others at the 21st of March. The Council of Arles in 314 endeavored to establish uniformity, but its decrees do not appear to have had great effect. The subject was therefore again discussed and acted upon by the Ecumenical Council of Nice, which decreed that Easter should be celebrated precisely on the day of the spring equinox, on the Friday following the 14th of Nisan. It was also provided that the Church of Alexandria,
as being distinguished in astronomical science, should annually inform the Church of Rome on what day of the year the Easter is fixed, and the Church of Rome should notify all the churches of the world. But even these decrees of the Council of Nice did not put a stop to all differences, and it was reserved to the calculation of Dionysius Exiguus (q. v.) to gradually introduce uniformity of practice into the whole Church. Some countries, like Great Britain, did not abandon their ancient practice until after a long resistance. At the time of Charlemagne uniformity seems to have been established, and no trace is to be found of the Quartodecimani. The revision of the calendar by Pope Gregory XIII, in the whole, retained the Day of Easter, but more accurately the Easter full moon, and made careful provision for avoiding any future deviation of the calendar from the astronomical time. By these minute calculations, however, the Christian Easter sometimes, contrary to the decrees of the Nienfe Council, coincides with the Jewish Passover. This, for instance, was the case in 1825.—Mosheim, Church Hist. i. 68; Neander, Church Hist. i. 298; ii. 301, 302; Mosheim, Comm. i. 523; Wetzel, Die christliche Paschafest der ersten Jahrhunderte (1848); Rottberg, in Zeitschrift fur kirchliche Wissenschaft, ii. 1862, vii. Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen Lex., iii. 871; Steitz, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xi, 140; Steitz, Die Differenz der Occidentalen u. der Kleinasiaten (in Stud. u. Krit. 1865). (A. J. S.)

Easter, John, a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister. Dates of his early life are wanting. He joined the itinerancy in 1782, and located in 1792. His ministerial career was "brilliant," and "his success almost unparalleled." In 1767, on Brunswick Circuit, Va., eighteen hundred souls were added to the Church under his ministry. William McKendree and Enoch George, afterwards bishops in the Church, were brought to God through his preaching. —See Wakeley's Heroes of Methodism, p. 219; Life and Times of Jesse Lee, p. 336 et al.

Easter, John, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Norfolk Co., England, Sept. 21, 1800, and joined the Wesleyan Methodists in 1824. In 1830 he emigrated to America, and settled in Geneva, N. Y. He entered the itinerancy in 1832, and took a superannuated circuit in 1888. His death was caused by a stroke, at Geneva, on July 4, 1842. Mr. Easter was a man of great worth, and a useful and beloved preacher. —Minutes of Conferences, iii. 345.

Eastern Church, a designation given, 1. Specifically to that which is commonly called the Greek Church, in distinction from the Western (or Latin Church); title claimed by itself is Κυριακή και άποστολική εκκλησία της ιεράπολος: The Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church. See GREEK CHURCH, Bishop Coxe, in the Churchman's Calendar, calls it the "Grand Trunk, or main stem of the Catholic Church." 2. The name Eastern Church, or, more properly, Eastern churches, is given to Eastern Christendom, divided into the churches named in the following list, which gives their statistics to the close of 1867, as far as they can be ascertained:

1. The Greek Church.—Russia (in Europe, 51,000,000; in Siberia, 2,000,000; in the provinces of the Caucasus no official account of the ecclesiastical statistics has yet been made; the total population of this part of the empire is 4,257,000), the population connected with the Greek Church may be estimated at about 1,500,000, hence total population of Russia connected with the Greek Church is about), 55,000,000; Turkey (inclusive of the dependencies in Europe and Egypt), about 11,500,000; Austria, 2,921,000; Greece (inclusive of the Ionian Islands), 1,220,000; United States of America (chiefly in the territory purchased in 1867 from Russia), 50,000; Prussia, 150,000; China, 200; total, 69,629,700. The figures referring to Russia, Austria, and Prussia are from an official census; those for the United States are from consular and missionary reports; those for Greece, in Pekin; those on Turkey and Greece are estimates almost generally adopted. See GREEK CHURCH; RUSSIA.

2. The Armenian Church.—According to D. Petermann (in Herzog's Real-Encyclopedia), the total number of Armenians scattered in the world is about 2,500,000. Of these, about 100,000 are connected with Rome, and are called United Armenians; 15,000 are Evangelical Armenians, and all others belong to the National (or "Gregorian") Armenian Church. The number of the latter may therefore be set down at about 2,350,000. The greatest number (about 2,000,000) live in Turkey, about 170,000 in Russia, and 30,000 in Persia. See ARMENIAN CHURCH.

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

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

5. The Copts and Abyssinians.—The Copts may be roughly estimated at about 200,000, the Abyssinians at about 30,000. See ABBYSSINIAN CHURCH; COPTS. Together, therefore, the population connected with these Eastern communions embraces a population of about 76,500,000. All these bodies lay claim to having bishops of apostolic succession, and consequently all of them are embraced in the union scheme patronized by the High-Church Anglicans. Both the Low-Church and the Broad-Church parties dislike the idea of a union with the Greeks, Copts, Abyssinians, and the other Eastern communions; but the High-Churchmen, of all shades of opinion, are a unit on this subject. The most consistent fact in the history of this movement is the official transmission of a Greek translation of the pastoral letter issued (1867) by the Pan-Anglican Synod to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church (Schem, in Methodist Quarterly Review, 1868, p. 290).

On the Eastern churches, besides the articles on the separate churches in this Cyclopedia, see Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church (N. Y. 1867, 8vo); Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church (London, 1847-1850, 4 vols. 8vo). A list of the patriarchates, sees, etc., of the Eastern Churches is given in the Greek and Roman Calendar, 1868, p. 96.

Eating (properly ἔστιν, ἀφαί, ἑαυτόν). The ancient Hebrews did not eat indifferently with all persons; they would have esteemed themselves polluted and dishonored by eating with those of another religion or of an odious profession. In Joseph's time they neither ate with the Egyptians nor with the Egyptians with them (Gen. xiii, 32), nor in our Saviour's time with the Samaritans (John iv. 5). The Jews were scandalized at his eating with publicans and sinners (Matt. ix, 11). As there were several sorts of meats the use of which was prohibited, they could not conveniently eat with those who partook of them, fearing to contract pollution by touching such food, or if by accident any particles of it should fall on them. See FOOD. At their meals some suppose they had each his separate table; and that Joseph, entertaining his brethren in Egypt, seated them separately, each at his particular table, while he himself sat down separately from the rest of the brethren, who ate with him; but he sent to his brethren portions out of the provisions which were before him (Gen. xiii, 31 sq.). Elkannah, Samuel's father, who had two wives, distributed their portions to them separately (1 Sam. i, 4, 5). In Homer, each guest is supposed to have had his little table apart, and the master of the feast distributed meat to each
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(Odyss. xiv. 446 sq.). We are assured that this is still practised in China, and that many in India never eat out of the same dish, nor on the same table with another person, believing they cannot do so without sin, and this not only in their own country, but when travelling and in foreign lands. This is also the case with the Brahmins and various castes in India, who will not even use a vessel after a European, though he may only have drunk from it water recently drawn out of a well. The same strictness is observed by the more scrupulous among the Mohammedans, and instances have been known of every plate, and dish, and cup that had been used by Christian guests being broken immediately after their departure. The ancient manners which we see in Homer we see likewise in Scripture, with regard to eating, drinking, and entertainments. There was great plenty, but little delicacy; great respect and honor paid to the guests by serving them plentifully. Joseph sent his brother Benjamin a portion five times larger than those of his other brethren. Samuel set a whole quarter of a calf before Saul (1 Sam. ix. 24). The women did not appear at table in entertainments with the men; this would have been an indecency, as it is at this day throughout the East. See BANQUET.

The Hebrews, as we are told, did not sit at table, but afterwards imitated the Persians and Chaldeans, who reclined on table-beds or divans while eating. (See Gier, De cett. Ebr. ratione comandli, Lips. 1833). This mode of reclining at meals was common in the East, and also among the Greeks and Romans. Under the Roman emperors the couches were sometimes made semicircular. See ACCRETION. At the present day, in the East, the custom is to sit or recline upon the floor at meat, and at other times on cushions. Many of the Arabs use no knife, fork, spoon, or plate in eating their victuals (these being used only by foreigners, and that as a special privilege); they dip their hands into the milk which is placed before them in a wooden bowl, and lift it to their mouth in their palm. Dr. Russell states, "The Arabs, in eating, do not thrust their whole hand into the dish, but only their thumb and two first fingers, with which they take up the morsel, and that in a moderate quantity at a time." The present mode of eating in Syria and Palestine is thus described by Dr. Jowett: "To witness the daily family habits, in the house in which I lived at Deir el Kamar (not far from Beyrount), forcibly reminded me of Scripture scenes. The absence of the females at our meals has already been noticed. There is another custom, by no means agreeable to a European, tc which, however, I would willingly have endeavored to submit, but it was impossible to learn it in the short compass of twenty days' visit. There are on the table, in the evening, two or three messes of stewed meat, vegetables, and sour milk. To me the privilege of a knife, and spoon, and plate was granted; but the rest all helped themselves immediately from the dish, in which it was no uncommon thing to see more than five Arab fingers at one time. The bread, which is extremely thin, tearing and folding up like a sheet of paper, is used for the purpose of rolling together a large mouthful, or sopping up the fluid and vegetables. But the practice which was most revolting to me was this: when the master of the house was found to have a dainty morsel, he took it out with his fingers and applied it to his mouth. This was true Syrian courtesy and hospitality, and had I been sufficiently well-bred, my mouth would have opened to receive it. On my pointing to my plate, however, he had the goodness to deposit the choice morsel there" (Bosworth, p. 219). Niebuhr's account is as follows (De script. Arab., p. 52). "The table of the Orientals is arranged according to their mode of living. As they always sit upon the floor, a large cloth is spread out in the middle of the room upon the floor, in order that the bits and crumbs may not be lost, or the carpet defiled. (On journeys, especially in the deserts, the place of this cloth is supplied by a round piece of leather, which the traveller carries with him, Travels, ii. 372.) Upon this cloth is placed a small stool, which serves as a support for a large round tray; on this the food is served up in various small dishes of copper, well tinned within and without. Among the better class of Arabs, one finds, instead of napkins, a long cloth, which extends to all who sit at table, and which they lay upon their laps. Where this is wanting, each one takes, instead of a napkin, his own handkerchief, or rather small towel, which he always carries with him to wipe himself with after washing. Knives and forks are not used. The Turks sometimes have spoons of wood or horn. The Arabs are so accustomed to use the hand instead of a spoon, that they can do without a spoon even when eating bread and milk prepared in the usual manner. Other kinds of food, such as we commonly eat with a spoon, I do not remember to have seen. It is, indeed, at first, very unpleasant to a European, just arrived in the East, to eat with people who help themselves to the food out of the common dish with their fingers; but this is easily got over, after one has become acquainted with their mode of life. As the Mohammedans are required, by their religion, very often to wash themselves, it is therefore even on this account advisable that their cooks prepare their food with as much cleanliness as those of Europe. The Mohammedans are even obliged to keep their nails cut so short that no impurity can collect under them; for they believe their prayers would be without any effect if there should be the least impurity upon any part of the body; and since, now, before eating, they always wash themselves carefully, and generally too with soap, it comes at length to seem of less consequence whether they help themselves from the dish with clean fingers or with a fork. Among the sheiks of the desert, who require at
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a meal nothing more than pillaw, i.e., boiled rice, a very large wooden dish is brought on full, and around this one party after another set themselves till the dish is emptied, or they are satisfied. In Merlin, where I once ate with sixteen officers of the Waiteole, a servant placed himself between the guests, and had nothing to do but to take away the empty dishes, and set down the full ones which other servants brought in. As soon as ever the dish was set down, all the sixteen hands were immediately thrust into it, and that to so much purpose, that rarely could any one help himself three times. "They eat, in the East, with very great rapidity; and at this meal in Merlin, in the time of about twenty minutes, we sent out more than fourteen empty dishes." See DINE.

The Hebrews, like the modern Orientals, rose early, about the dawn of the day, when they breakfasted. They were accustomed to take a slight repast about noon; and this to husbandmen and mechanics was probably the principal meal (1 Kings xx, 16; Ruth ii, 14; Luke xiv, 12). Wilkinson says, "That dinner was served up at midday among the ancient Egyptians may be inferred from the invitation given by Joseph to his brethren: 'Bring these men home, and slay and make ready, for these men shall dine with me at noon' (Gen. xlvi, 16); but it is probable that, like the Romans, they also ate supper in the evening, as is still the custom in the East." Supper appears to have been the principal meal among the Hebrews, as it was among the Greeks and Romans. Among the Romans it anciently took place about three o'clock; but in the East, as at the present day in Persia, about six or seven in the evening, in order to avoid the enfeebling heat of the afternoon (Mark vi, 21; Luke xiv, 16; 24; John xii. 2). In 1 Sam. ix, 13, we read that the people would not eat of the feast until Samuel had arrived and consecrated the sacrifice. But this circumstance affords no evidence of the custom of asking a blessing on food. In the time of Christ, however, it was common before every meal to give thanks (Matt. xiv, 19; xv, 36). See MEAL-TIME.

In closing this subject, we may properly notice the obligations which are considered by Eastern people to be contracted by eating together. Niebuhr says, "When a Bedouin sheik eats bread with strangers, they may trust his fidelity and depend on his protection. A traveller will always do well, therefore, to take an early opportunity of securing the friendship of his guide by a meal." The reader will recollect the complaint of the Psalmist (xlii, 9), penetrated with the deep ingratitude of one whom he describes as having been his own familiar friend, in whom he trusted—

established Church, but, on account of his Puritanism, came to New England with the Rev. John Davenport in 1657, and was co-pastor with him at New Haven. He returned to England in 1646, and formed a Congregational church at Duckenden, Cuckshir. By the Act of Uniformity he was compelled to cease preaching in 1662, and died June 9, 1665. He published A Defence of sundry Positions and Scriptures alleged to justify the Congregational Way (1646); second part, 1646:—The Mystery of God incorrupt, or the Word made Flesh cleared up, etc. (1650) or further Confirmation of the Scriptures, produced to prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ, distorted and miserably wrested and abused by Mr. John Knowles, etc. (1651):—

1. (Sept. Γυμίη [Vat. MS. omits], Vulg. Hebāl.) A various reading for Īnāl (q. v.), the son of Joktan (1 Chron. i, 22; comp. Gen. x, 28).

2. (Γαύμιθ v. r. Παύμιλα [Alex MS. Γαύμιλα], Vulg. Hebāl.) The fourth son of Shobal, son of Seir, the Horite of Idumea (Gen. xxxvi, 23; 1 Chron. i, 40). B.C. ante 1294.

3. (Sept. Γαύμιη, Josephus Γαύμιλαν, Vulg. Hebāl.) A mountain on the northern part of the tribe of Ephraim, on the north-eastern side of the valley in which was situated the city of Shechem (now Nablous), in Samaria (q. v.). See Mills, Three Months at Nablous (London, 1864).

1. It was here that the Israelites were enjoined to erect an altar, setting up plastered stones, and respond to the imprecations uttered in the valley, according to the divinely prescribed formula, upon those
who should prove faithful to the Sinitic law (Deut. xi. 29; xxviii. 4, 13), while the responses to the blessings were to be uttered by the other division of the tribal representatives stationed upon the opposite mountain, Gerizim. Both the benediction and the anathema were pronounced by the Levites, who remained with the ark in the centre of the interval (compare Deut. xxviii. 11, 15, with the site of the Talmud, Sota, 36, quoted in Herzweiler's Penta-
teucho). But, notwithstanding the ban thus apparently laid on Ebal, it was further appointed to be the site of the altar of the mountain, an altar of large unshewn stones, plastered with lime, and inscribed with the words of the law (Deut. xxvii. 2-8). On this altar peace-offerings were to be offered, and round it a sacrificial feast was to take place, with other rejoicings (ver. 6, 7). Scholars disagree as to whether there were to be two erections—a kind of cromlech and an altar; or an altar only, with the law inscribed on its stones. The latter was the view of Josephus (Ant. iv. 8, 44; v. 1, 19), the former is un-
hesitatingly adopted by the latest commentators (Keil, Comment. on Josh. viii. 32). The terms of Moses' in-
junctions are not so clear as to infer that no delay was allowed in carrying out this symbolic transaction. It was to be "on the day" that Jordan was crossed (xxvii. 2), before they "went in unto the land flowing with milk and honey" (ver. 3). Accordingly Joshua ap-
ppears to have seized the earliest practicable opportunity, after the ascertaining affairs of the siege of Jericho, the execution of Achan, and the destruction of Ai had been dispatched, to carry out the command (Josh. viii. 30-35). After this Ebal appears no more in the sacred story. By a corruption of the above-cited texts, the Samaritans transferred the site of the appoin-
ted altar to the opposite mountain, which has hence at-
tained the greater notoriety. See Gerizim.

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

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

(2.) Gerizim was very near Shechem (Judg. ix. 7), and in Josephus' time their names appear to have been attached to the mounts, which were then, as now, Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south. Since that they have been mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela (Asher, i. 66) and Sir John Maundeville, and among modern travellers by Maundrell (Mod. Trav. p. 482).

The main impediment to our entire reception of this view rests in the terms of the first mention of the place by Moses in Deut. xii. 30: A. V. "Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way which the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the charnian over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh?" Here the mention of Gilgal, which was in the valley of the Jordan near Jericho, of the valley itself (Arakah, mistranslated here only, 'charnian'), and of the Canaanites who dwelt there, and also the other terms of the injunction of Moses, as already noticed, seem to imply that Ebal and Gerizim were in the immediate neighbourhood of Jericho. This is strengthened by the narrative of Joshua, who appears to have carried out the prescribed ceremony on the mounts while his camp was at Gilgal (comp. vi. 22; ix. 6), and before he had (at least before any account of his having) made his way so far into the interior of the country as Shechem.

This is the view taken by Eusebius (Onomasticon, s. v. Palaeb.); "He does not quote the passage in Deut.,

but seems to be led to his opinion rather by the diffi-
culty of the mountains at Shechem being too far apart to admit of the blessings and cursings being heard, and also by his desire to contradict the Samaritans; to add to this that he speaks from no personal knowledge, but simply from hearsay (lambda), as to the existence of two such hills in the Jordan valley. The notice of Eusebius is merely translated by Jerome, with a shade more of accuracy, to the words of the text (\alpha\varepsilon\u0391\u03b6\u03b1\u03bd\u03b1\u03b5\u03b9\u03a6\u03c9, lambra), and expression of difficulty as to the distance, but without any additional information. Procopius and Epiphanius also followed Eusebius, but their mis-
takes have been disposed of by Reland (Pisistr. p. 503-
4; Moret, p. 139-138).

With regard to the passage in Deut., it will perhaps assume a different aspect on examination. (1.) Moses is represented as speaking from the east side of Jordan, before anything was known of the country on the west, beyond the exaggerated reports of the spies, and when everything there was wrapped in mystery, and localities and distances had not assumed any proportions. (2.) A closer rendering of the verse is as follows: "Are they not on the other side the Jordan, beyond (\alpha\varepsilon\u0391\u03b6\u03b1\u03bd\u03b1\u03b5\u03b9\u03a6\u03c9, lambra), the word rendered 'the backside of the desert' in Exod. iii. 1) the way of the sunset, in the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the Arabah over against Gilgal, near the terebinths of Moreh?" If this rendering is correct, a great part of the diffi-
culty has disappeared. Gilgal no longer marks the site of Ebal and Gerizim, but of the dwelling of the Canaanites, who were, it is true, the first to encounter the Israelites on the other side of the river, in their native lowlands, but who, we have it actually on rec-
ord, were both in the time of Abraham (Gen. xii. 6) and of the conquest (Josh. xlvii. 19, 16) located about She-
chem. The word now rendered "beyond" is not rep-
resented at all in the A. V., and it certainly throws the locality much further back; and, lastly, there is the striking landmark of the trees of Moreh, which were standing by Shechem when Abraham first entered the land, and whose name probably survived in Morthia, or Mamortha, a name of Shechem found on coins of the Roman period (Reland, Miscell. p. 137 sq.).

See Gilgal.

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

This is evidently the view taken by Josephus. His statement (Ant. v. 1, 19) is that it took place after the subjugation of the country and the establishment of the tabernacle at Shiloh. He has no misgivings as to the situation of the mountains. They were at She-
chem (int. 2, 6), and, from these, after the cere-
mony, they were returned to Shiloh.

The narrative of Joshua is more puzzling. But even with regard to this something may be said. It will at once be perceived that the book contains no ac-
count of the conquest of the centre of the country, of those portions which were afterwards the mountain of Ephraim, Efraim, or Galilee. We lose Joshua at
Gilgel, after the conquest of the south, to find him again suddenly at the waters of Merom in the extreme north (x, 43; xi, 7). Of his intermediate proceedings the only record that seems to have escaped is the fragment contained in viii, 30-35. Nor should it be overlooked that some doubt is thrown on this in Josh, viii, 30-35, by its omission in both the Vat. and Alex. MSS. of the text.

The distance of Ebal and Gerizim from each other is not such a tumbling-block to us as it was to Eusebius; though it is difficult to understand how he and Jerome should have been ignorant of the distance to which the voice will travel in the clear elastic atmosphere. One might have gathered it from the instances of this (Sinai and Pal. p. 15); others equally remarkable have been observed by those long resident in the neighborhood, who state that a voice can be heard without difficulty across the valley separating the two spots in question (see also Jona, p. 571).

It is well known that one of the most serious variations between the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch and the Samaritan text is in reference to Ebal and Gerizim. In Deut. xxvii, 4, the Samaritan has Gerizim, while the Hebrew (as in A. V.) has Ebal, as the mount on which the law was given. Both the commentaries on the law were to be erected. Upon this basis the Samaritans ground the sanctity of Gerizim and the authenticity of the Temple and holy place, which have existed there. The arguments upon this difficult question will be found in Kennicott ( Dissert., ii), and in the long view of its position and name by Gill (Bible, p. 777), and lastly Gersinus, De Pent. Sac., p. 61. Two points may merely be glanced at here, which have apparently escaped notice.

1. Both agree that Ebal was the mount on which the cursings were to rest, Gerizim that for blessings. It appears inconsistent that Ebal, the mount of cursings, should be the site of the altar and the record of the law, while Gerizim, the mount of blessing, should remain unoccupied by sanctuary of any kind.

2. Taking into account the known predilection of Orontids for ancient sites on which to fix their sanctuaries, it is much easier to believe, (in the absence of any evidence to the contrary) that in building their temple on Gerizim, the Samaritans were making use of a spot already enjoying a reputation for sanctity, than that they built on a place upon which the curse was laid in the records which they received equally with the Jews. That this was the effect of the sanctity of Gerizim by the Samaritans we seem an argument for its original sanctity. On the other hand, all critics of eminence, with the exception of Kennicott, regard this as a corruption of the sacred text; and when it is considered that the invariable reading in Hebrew MSS. and the ancient versions, both in this passage and the corresponding one in Josh, viii, 30, is " Ebal," it seems strange that any scholar would for a moment doubt its correctness. Kennicott takes an opposite view, maintaining the integrity of the Samaritan reading, and arguing the point at great length; but his arguments are neither sound nor pertinent ( Dissertations on the Hebrew Text, ii, 20 sq.). The Samaritans had a strong reason for corrupting the text, seeing that Gerizim was their sanctuary; and they desired to make it not merely the mountain of blessing, but the place of the altar and the inscribed law. See SAMARITANS.

Ebal is rarely ascended by travellers, and we are therefore in ignorance as to how far the question may be affected by remains of ancient buildings thereon. That such remains do exist is certain, even from the very meagre accounts published (Bartlett, W. d. about Jerusalem, App. p. 261 sq.; and Narrative of Rev. J. Mills in Trans. Pal. Archd. Assoc., 1855), while the mountain is evidently of such extent as to warrant the belief that there is a great deal still to discover.

The report of the old travellers was that Ebal was more barren than Gerizim (see Benjamin of Tudela, and Maundrell, in Early Travels in Palestine, p. 89, 483: Wilson, Lands of the Bible, ii, 71), but this opinion probably arose from a belief in the effects of the curse mentioned above. At any rate, it is not borne out by the latest accounts, according to which there is little or no perceptible difference. They are not isolated mountains, but culminating points of a chain.

Their declivities facing the vale bear a singular resemblance to the sides of the Altar; they are equally ragged and bare; the limestone strata here and there project, forming bold bluffs and precipices; but the greater portion of the slopes, though steep, are formed into terraces, partly natural and partly artificial. For this reason both mountains appear more barren from below than they are in reality, the rare, yet naked supporting walls of the terraces alone being thus visible. The soil, though scanty, is rich. In the bottom of the vale are olive groves, and a few straggling trees extend some distance up the sides. The broad summits and upper slopes have no trees, yet they are not entirely bare. The steeper banks are here and there scantily clothed with dwarf shrubbery; while in spring and early summer, rank grass, brambles, and thistles, intermixed with myriads of bright wild flowers—anemones, convolvulus, tulips, and poppies—spring up with a profusion among the rocks. And as we rose to the bottom to top by beautiful gardens' (Mills; see also Porter, Hand-book, p. 392). The slopes of Ebal towards the valley appear to be steeper than those of Gerizim (Wilson, p. 45, 71). It is also the higher mountain of the two. There is some uncertainty about the measurements, but the following are the results of the latest observations (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 178):

Nablia, above sea, 1672 ft. Gerizim, do. 1890 1.
gosed the king favorably towards Christianity. In 826, the king, with his wife, his oldest son, his nephew, and a suite of 400 men, came to the emperor's court at Mayence and was baptized. The mission in Denmark was now placed under Ansgar, and Ebbo returned to his diocese (840). He took an active part in the affairs of the state, and in the war of the sons of Louis against their father, he, with most of the bishops, took side with the sons. He presided at the assembly of bishops which in 838 compelled Louis to do public penance, as such an act, according to the law, made him fit to bear arms. But when, in 834, Louis regained his power, Ebbo was arrested and kept a prisoner in the convent of Fulda. He was brought before the Diet of Diedenhofen in 835, and confessed himself guilty of offences which, in the opinion of the judges, made him unfit for any further administration of his office. He was again confined in the convent of Fulda, where he remained until the death of Louis in 840. He then prevailed upon Lothaire, who made an attempt to possess himself of the whole empire of his father, to reinstate him as an antipope (840). In May, 841, king Charles, the brother of Lothaire, again expelled him; and as, at the conclusion of peace, Lothaire did not take a special interest in Ebbo, he lost his archbishopric forever. In the last years of his life, king Louis of Germany appointed him, with that of the Pope, cardinal-priest of the diocese of Hildesheim. He died March 29th, 851. Ebbo compiled an Indiculum Ebodii de ministria Remianis ecclesiis, an instruction for the clergy of his diocese as to their mode of life, and an Apologia Archipriestis Remianae cum ejusdem genii sanctitatem invicem legitimis legationibus. They are of small size and no value.—Herszog, Real-Encyclop. xix, 447; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 349. (A. J. S.)

'Ebd' (Heb. id. "بثפ," servant [q. v.], i. e. of God; comp. Abdo), the name of two men.

1. (Many MSS., and the Syr. and Arab. Versions, have "بثפ", Eber; Sept. 1103; Alexandre. M. 103; Vulg. Ebed and Obad.) The father of Gaal (q. v.), who headed the insurgents at Shechem against Abimelech, tyrant judge of the Israelites (Judg. ix. 26-33). B.C. ante 1212.

2. (Sept. אֹבְדָּשׁ v. אֹבְדָּשׁ, Vulgate Abed.) Son of Jonathan, and family-head of the lineage of Adin; he returned with 50 menales from the captivity (Ezra viii, 6). B.C. 459.

'Ebed-jeus, surm Name of the influential Nestorian theologian, was born in Mesopotamia about the middle of the 13th century. After having been for five years bishop of Sigara, in Arabia, he was made Nestorian bishop of Soba or Nisibe in 1290. Where Ebed-Jeus pursued his studies is not known, but the works which he has left us show that he was fluent in the Arabic, well acquainted with the Greek, and his dogmatical writings especially display an extensive knowledge with philosophy and dialectics. He seems also to have been familiar with the works of the great Jacobite Bar-Hebræus. His works, with which he is generally connected, are mostly of a theological character; on the interpretation of the O. and N. T., on the Logos, sacraments of the Church, and a treatise on the truth of the Faith (pub. by A. Mai in Syriac and Lat., Script. Vet. x. 317: ÉpîÔme ou Collection of the Canons of Conoceia (also published by Mai), are apostolici ob Ecclesiam orthodoxam: Prima christianae doctrina Diffusa (A Description of the Countries that permitted the preaching of the Apostles):—23 Canons of the Apostles, edited by St. Clement:—5 other Canons of the Apostles, published also by St. Clement:—The Paradise Eden, containing 50 dialogues divided into two parts, called Roucha and Elias, beginning with the Trinity, and ending with the Resurrection. (Comp. Asseman, Bibl. Or. iii, 1, p. 325 sq.) Of literary importance is his catalogue of 200 Syri.

ian writers (ably edited by Assemane, Bibli. Or. i, 1, p. 1-362), at the close of which his own writings are also given.—Hoefner, Noue. Biegn. Gr. xvi, 594; Herzog, iii, 613; Assemane, Bibli. Oriental. i, part i. (J. H. W.)

'Ebed-Jeuß, a Chaldaean patriarch and Syrian writer; born about the middle of the 3rd century. He received his education at Gogarta, and was afterwards bishop of that place. In 1554 he was elected as the successor of Saluka, first patriarch of the Nestorians, and confirmed by the Pope in 1562. Ebed-Jeuß was a man of great erudition; he was familiar with the writings of the Greeks and Latin fathers, and was also master of the Arabic, Chaldee, and the Syriac. Many of the Nestorians were converted by him, and the numbers of the Chaldees were augmented under his administration. He died a few years after his visit to Rome (1562), in a monastery at the village of Serot in Mesopotamia. We have from him a poem in three parts: Sur le voyage à Rome, le retour et la mort de Saluka; Poème à la louange de Pie IV; A Confession of Faith, read at the 22d session of the Council of Trent.—Assemane, Bibli. Oriental. i, 536; iii, p. 322; Hoefner, Noue. Biographie Générale, xiv, 569. (J. H. W.)

'Ebed-Melech (Heb. Ebed-Melekh, servant of the king, i. a. Arabic Abd-al-Malek, Sept. Ḥabūl[i] 'Abdāl Vultaga Abimelech), an Ethiopian at the court of Zedekiah, king of Judah, who was instrumental in saving the prophet Jeremiah from death by famine (Jer. xxxviii, 7-13), and who, for his humanity in this circumstance, was promised deliverance when the city should fall into the enemy's hands (Jer. xxxix, 15-18). B.C. 589. See Jeremiah. He is there styled a eunuch (עָנָךְ), and he probably had charge of the king's harem (comp. xxxviii, 22, 23), an office which would give him the privilege of private access to the king; but his name seems to be an official title—'king's slave, i. e. minister. See Eunuch.

Ebeh. See Reed.

Ebel. See Talmod.

Ebel, Johann Wilhelm, a Protestant mystic and theosophist, was born in 1784 at Passenheim, in the province of Eastern Prussia. In 1802, while a preacher in the Established Church of Prussia, he attracted the attention of his ecclesiastical superiors on account of his connection with the theosophist Schönherr (q. v.). Subsequently he was appointed preacher at Koenigsberg, where he gathered around him a circle of enthusiastic followers, among them numerous men and a larger number of women. Foremost among the latter were the countess of Kanitz and the countess von der Gröben. In 1837, at the request of the Consistory of that city, a suit was instituted against him and his friend Dietzel, which belongs among the most remarkable trials of the kind in modern times. He was in 1842 acquitted from the chief charge of the establishment of a new sect, but deposed from office for violating his official duties by communicating to others theosophical and philosophic views differing from the doctrines of the Church. He died in 1861, at the villa of his friend the countess von der Gröben. Ebel wrote a number of works, chiefly of a mystic nature, among which are the following: Die Weisheit von Omen (1822);—Der Togensebruch (1824): Die geistliche Erziehung (1825);—Bibeltwarte u. Winke (1827);—Die eigene Entdeckung (1828). A full account of Ebel, his doctrines and followers, is given in Dixon, Spiritual Wares (London and Philadelphia, 1868), where is also printed for the first time a paper by professor Sachs, which was the chief evidence used against Ebel. See also Ebel, ein neuer Lehrmeister im heiligen Schrift (Lepizig, 1838), and Ernst count von Kanitz (follower of Ebel), Ausführung nach Actenquellen, etc. (Basel, 1862). (A. J. S.)
Eben ( Heb. אֶבֶן ebon, stone), stands as a prefix in several geographical names, which designate monuments set up to commemorate certain events [see Stone]: e.g. Eben-bohan; Eben-ezer; Eben-kerer; Eben-zohlekheth.

Eben-bohan. See Bohan.

Eben-ezer. See Ezr.

Eb'en-ezer (Heb. with the art. E'ben ha-E'zer, אֶבֶן הַאֶזֶר, "stone of the help; Sept. ἡ ἀλαταία ἡ ἡμέραν"); Josephus translates λίθος ἡμέρας, the name given to a place marked by a monotonous stone which Samuel set up as a memorial of the divine assistance in battle obtained against the Philistines (1 Sam. vii. 12). See PILLAR. Twenty years before this, the same spot (mentioned in the history under the same name by anticipation of its subsequent designation) witnessed the discomfiture of the Hebrew hosts, the death of the high priest's son, and a pursual of the void hand by the Philistines (1 Sam. iv. 1; v. 1). Its position is carefully defined (1 Sam. vii, 12) as between Mizpeh—"the watch-tower," one of the conspicuous eminences a few miles N. of Jerusalem—and Shen, "the tooth" or "crag," apparently some isolated landmark. Neither of these points, however, is identified with certainty—at least not the latter. According to Josephus' record of the transaction (Ant. vi, 2, 2), the stone was erected to mark the limit of the victory, a spot which he calls Corblege, but in the Hebrew Beth- 
car (q. v.).

Eusebius and Jerome affirm (Onomast. s. v. בֵּית-כָּרָה, Almeiner) that it lay between Jerusalem and Ashkelon, near πανοικισμός ιωνίας, the site of the ancient village called Belec-far. The situation answer in every respect to that assigned to Beth-car; and the name may possibly be an Arab corruption of the latter. It lies in the direct route from Mizpeh to the plain of Philistia, and is just on the borders of the latter province, whence a pursual of the void hand would start (Porter, Handbook for Syn. and Phil., p. 288). But, as this is very far from the probable site of Mizpeh (Nebby-Samwil), it is hardly possible to fix the position of Eben-ezer at that of Beth-car. The monumental stone in question may rather have been set up at the point where the pursual began to dissolve, and we may therefore seek its locality nearer the Israelitish metropolis, possibly at the modern village Bdele, a short distance west of Nebby-Samwil (Robinson, Researches, ii, 133, note). See Shen.

Eben-zelelth. See Zohlekheth.

E'Ber (Heb. id. אֶבֶר, country beyond), the name of five men.

1. (Sept. "Edip," and "Edip," Vulg. "Iber") Ezer (as the name should be Anglicized) was the son of Salah, and father of Peleg, being the third post-deluvian patriarch after Shem (Gen. x, 24; xi, 14; 1 Chron. i, 18, 25). B.C. 2418-1948. He is claimed as the founder of the Hebrew race (Gen. x, 21; Num. xxiv, 24). See Ezer. In Luke iii, 35, his name (E'dip) is Anglicized Eber.


Eber. Paul, a companion of Luther and Melanchthon, and an eminent Hebrew scholar and theologian, was born at Kissingen, Nov. 8, 1511. He received his first instruction from his father, and continued his studies at Anspach. The sudden death of his mother caused his father to recall Paul from Anspach, and while on his way home he was thrown from his horse and became humpbacked. In 1526 he had so far recovered that he could resume his studies at Nuremberg, and in 1532 he entered the university at Wittenberg. Here he was employed as amanuensis to Melanchthon, with whom he became so intimate that he considered him on all important matters, and hence Eber received the name of Philip's Repository (Repositorium Philippi). He was also a faithful disciple of Luther. In 1536 he began to lecture on grammar and philosophy, and in 1541 he accompanied Melanchthon to the Diet at Worms. In 1544 he succeeded Melanchthon in the chair of Greek at Wittenberg, in 1549 dean of the philosophical faculty, and in 1551 rector of the university. After the death of Förster (1556) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and chaplain to the royal chapel at Wittenberg. These positions he soon changed for others, and in 1559 he was made regent-superintendent of the university, and, as doctor of theology, a member of the theological faculty of the university. From this time to the day of his death, Dec. 16, 1560, he devoted himself entirely to theology and to the faithful discharge of his duties as regent-superintendent. After the death of Melanchthon he was regarded as the head of the university. He took large part in the Adiaphoristic and Crypto-Calvinistic controversies, but always showed himself moderate and learned. His principal works are: Expositio Evangelii (Frank, 1576); Calendarium historicum (1531, 4to); Historia populi Judaico a vito ex Babylonico crisi usque ad ultimum evisum Jerusalem (Witich, 1458; new ed. 1562, and trans. into German, French, and Dutch); Unterricht u. Bekenntn. vom h. Sacrament des Leibes u. Blutes unseres Herrn (Witich, 1565); Biblia Veteris Testamenti (Vitemb, 1568); Expositori Evangelii (done by Lechler, 1559, 1576).—Hofer, Neue Biogr. Gntz, 599 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encycl. iii, 618 sq.; Plank, Geach, der protest. Thol. iv, Theil i (Lpz. 1798), 448-529; Sixt, Paul Eber (Heidelberg, 1843, and another book by the same author, Anspach, 1847); Pressel, Paul Eber nach gleichzeitigen Quellen (1863); ibid. 3, 644 sq.

Eberhard, Johann August, a Rationalistic theologian of Germany, was born in 1739 at Halberstadt. He studied theology at Halle, and was in succession preacher at Halberstadt, Berlin, and Charlottenburg. On the latter position he obtained by express order of king Friedrich II. In 1776 he was appointed professor of philosophy at Halle, where he opposed the idealism of Kant and Fichte. He died in 1809. Eberhard is a representative of what is called "the vulgar Rationalistic school" (Vulgir-Rationalismus). He wrote a considerable number of theological, philosophical, historical, and other works. Among his theological works are: Novi Apologia de Sacerdotibus (Berlin, 1772, 9th ed. 1788); Vberbruchung zur natürliche Theologie (Halle, 1781); Geist des Christenthums (Halle, 1807-1808); und Nützlichkeit der Vernunft (Berlin, 1781).—Brockhaus, Conversations-Lex. s. v. (A. J. S.)

Eberlin, Anton, one of the German reformers, was born in Swabia towards the end of the 15th century. He entered the Franciscan order, and was chosen president of the Franciscan convent of Konstanz, from which, in consequence of some difficulties, he was, in 1519, transferred to Ulm. Here he became acquainted with Luther's writings, and having adopted his doctrines, had to leave Ulm in 1521. Repairing to Basle, he became very popular, but was driven away by the bishop of Basle. He found an asylum with Ulrich von Hutten and Francis of Sickening, and wrote with them several works on ecclesiastical and monas-
EBERT, Jacob, an eminent Hebrew scholar, was born at Sprottau in 1494. He was professor of Hebrew and theology at the university then in Frankfort on the Oder, now in Berlin, and at one time its recto magnificus. So versed was he in Hebrew that he could write in that language. He died in 1614. His works are, Historia Jurismentorum (Frankfort on the Oder, 1613); — Institutionum Scripturarum (ibid., 1597); — Electa Hebrew 750 a libro Rabbino Michael Heschonim (1610, 12mo); — Tetra Lectora hebrew in textus exegesis, etc.; — Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xxvi, 699 sq. (J. H. W.).

EBERT, Theodor, son of Jacob Ebert (q. v.), succeeded his father as professor of Hebrew at the university in Frankfort on the Oder. He married also the honor of being rector with his father. Ebert died in 1630. Among his principal works are, Vita Christi, tribus de curis rhymorum quadraturorum hebræorum (Frankf., in 1615, 4to); — Animale, pollicita Centuriae (1619, 4to); — Manufactiae auctorat ad discem saeculorum actione (cœxi, 1620, 4to); — Chronologiae hebræorum Læmigg Secerni Doctorum, ab O. C. ad (saeq. psbeatam (1620, 4to); — Eulogia pspsistorum et politicorum quia huncum hebræicam et religiosas orientales eccehersam (1628); — Poëtica Hebraica (1638, 8vo), in which the Hebrew answers are more extensively exemplified than in any other work. — Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 610; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, p. 274.

EBIT'asaph (Heb. Elqaph), אֶבִּיתָסָפָה, prob. a contraction for אֵבִיתֶסָפָה, Abihasapp; Sept., Abihasaph and Ἀβίασαφ, the son of Elkannah and father of Assir, in the genealogy of the Kohathite Levites (1 Chron. vi, 23). B.C. cir. 1660. In ver. 37 he is called the son of Korah, from a comparison of which exegetes (Exod. vi, 24) most interpreters have identified him with the Abihasaph (q. v.) of later passage; but (unless we understand not the three sons of Korah to be meant, but only three in regular descent), the pedigrees of the two cannot be made to tally without violence. See Assir. From 1 Chron. ix, 19, it appears that he had a son named Kore. In 1 Chron. xxvi, 1, his name is abbreviated to ASAPH.

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

1. The Name. — The name is derived from the Hebrew בָּשָׁם, Basham, poor. This term was anciently applied in derision to Christians in general (Epiphanius, adfl. Hier. xxix, 1), and came later to designate Jewish Christians (Origen, cont. Celsum, ii, 1). First (Lexicon, s. v.) makes the derivation refer to Matt. v, 3, making "Ebonites" equivalent to " oppossed pious exiles," meaning a pious tribe. (Vial, ibid., iii, 27) fancifully derives the name from the poverty and meanness of the Ebonite doctrine concerning Christ. — Tertullian (De Praeparet. Haeret., c. xxxiii) derives it from a founder, Ebon, who maintained the authority of the Jewish law, and rejected the miraculous conception and divine nature of spirit. The derivation first given is now generally adopted.

2. History. — Dörner (Person von Christ, Edinb. transl. i, 189 sq.) in German Ebonit tendency as far back as the Epistle to the Hebrews. "From that zeal for the law with which Paul had to contend, the Judaizing spirit was led not at first to impeach the Christology, but rather the Soteriology, or the work of Christ. But the historical importance of the Jewish law showed itself. The party which the Epistle to the Hebrews had in view must have over-estimated the law of the O. T. regarding holy times, places, acts, and persons alike, and have been wanting in the Christian knowledge which knows how to secure to the O. T. its abiding significance, which it has as a divine institute without imperilling the newness and conclusive completeness of Christianity." Epiphanius traces the origin of Ebonitism to the Christians who fled to Pella after the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 66 (adfl. Hier. xxix, 1). According to Hesychius (Hist. Eccl., iv, 22), one Theodore of Alexandria, excommunicated by the bishops of the second century, "began to corrupt the Church secretly on account of his not being made a bishop." "We find the sect of the Ebonites in Palestine and the surrounding regions, on the island of Cyprus, in Asia Minor, and even in Rome. Theodore and most of his Ebonites Christians also sometimes attached themselves to it. It continued into the fourth century, but at the time of Theodoret was entirely extinct. It used a Hebrew Gospel, now lost, which was probably a corruption of the Gospel of Matthew" (Schaff, Church History, i, § 68, p. 214).

3. Doctrines. — Dr. Schaff sharply distinguishes Ebonism from Gnosticism as follows: "Ebonism is a Judaizing, pseudo-Petrine Christianity, or a Christianizing Judaism; Gnosticism is a paganizing or pseudo-Pauline Christianity, or a pseudo-Christian heathenism. The Ebonist is a particular division of the Christian religion; the latter a vague expansion of it" (Church History, i, § 67).According to the same writer, "the characteristic marks of Ebonism in all its forms are, degradation of Christianity to the level of Judaism, the principle of the universal and perpetual validity of the Mosaic law, and eminence to the apostle Paul. But, as there were different sects in Judaism itself, we have also to distinguish at least two branches of Ebonism, related to each other, as Pharisaism and Esseniism, or, to use a modern illustration, as the older desist and the speculativistic rationalism of the two schools of Unitarianism in England and America. (1.) The common Ebonites, who were by far the more numerous, embodied the Pharisaic legal spirit, and were the proper successors of the Judaizers opposed in the epistle to the Galatians. Their doctrine may be reduced to the following propositions: (a) Jesus is, indeed, the promised Messiah, the son of David, and the supreme lawgiver, yet a mere man, like Moses and David, sprung by natural generation from Joseph and Mary. The sense of his Messianic calling first arose in him at his baptism by John, after he was exalted higher and higher by the Holy Spirit. Hence Origen compared this sect to the blind man in the Gospel who called to the Lord without seeing him, 'Thou son of David, have mercy on me!' (b.) Circumcision and the observance of the whole ritual law of Moses are necessary for salvation for all." (c.) Paul is an apostate, higher and higher, and all the apostles, for the worst we cannot be discarded. The sect considered him a native heathen, who came over to Judaism in later life from impure motives. (d.) Christ is soon to come again to introduce the glorious millennial reign of the Messias, with a Kingdom of God, which shall with power and great glory come out of Jerusalem for the establishment of the Kingdom.

The second class of Ebonites, starting with Esseniistic notions, gave their Judaism a speculative or theosophic stamp, like the heretics of the Epistle to the Colossians. They form the stepping-stone to Gnosticism.
Among these belong the Elkesalites" (Schoff, Ch. Hist. i, § 68, 214 sq.). The pseudo-Clementine homilies teach a speculative form of Ebionism, essentially Judaizing in spirit and aim [see Clementines, ii. p. 588; and contrast the letter of Polycarp, i. 10, 11; 20; Dorrer, Person of Christ, Edinb. trans., p. 293 sq.).

4. Ebionism has reappeared, since the Reformation, in Socinianism (q. v.), and in the other forms of what is called Unitarianism (q. v.). Some Unitarian writers have undertaken to show that Ebionism was the original form of Christian doctrine, and that the Church dogma of Christ is the product of development; so Priestley, in his History of the Corruptions of Christianity (Birmingham, 1782). Bishop Horsley replied to Priestley in his Charge to the Clergy of St. Albans (1783), and in other tracts, collected in Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley (Dundee, 1812, 3d ed.).

Horsley, in this controversial criticism of Dr. Bull's learned treatment of the subject in his reply to Zwickler (see Bull, On the Trinity, Oxford, 1855, 8 vols. i. 116, ii. 376; iii. 175 et al. See also Waterland, Works, Oxf. 1848, 6 vols. iii. 554 sq.). A far abler advocate of the Socinan view is Baur, in his Christenthum d. drei ersten Jahrhunderte; Lehre u. d. Dreieinigkeit Gottes; Dogmen-geschichte, etc. Baur's position is clearly stated, and refuted by professor Fisher (Am. Prob. and Theol. Rev. Oct. 1864, art. i). "Baur agrees with the old Socinians in the statement that the Jewish Christianity, which with Baur is identical with the Judaizing or Ebionite element; and this type of Christianity prevailed through the larger part of the second century. (See Fisher, i. c., for a criticism of this view, and for a brief but luminous sketch of Ebionism. On the other side, see N. Amer. Rev. April, 1864, p. 569 sq.)


Ebnerian Manuscript (Codex Ebnerianus), usually designated as No. 105 of the Gospels, 48 of the Acts, and 24 of the Pauline Epistles), a beautiful curvilinear Greek MS. of the entire N. T. except Rev., consisting of 125 quarto vellum leaves; assigned to the 12th or 13th century, formerly belonging to Schöner of Eschenbach, of Nuremberg, and now in the Bodleian Library (No. 136). A fac-simile and description are given by Tregelles, in Horne's Intro. p. 220. See Manuscripts, Biblical.

Ébodos (Egypt.), a city mentioned only by Ptolemy (xvii. 18) as situated in the sea-board quarter of Arabia Petræa (see Reland, Phot. p. 463), in 652° and 152°, and in the river Agathopolis, as lying on the Roman road 25 Roman miles S. of Elusa (q. v.). Dr. Robinson (Researches, i. 287) discovered the site in the modern el-Abdâb (otherwise Avjac, ib. p. 560), eight hours from the site of Elusa, at the junction of Wady es-Swamm with Wady el-Birein (ib. p. 294). It contains extensive ruins, situated on a rocky ridge on the Roman road 25 Roman miles S. of Elusa (q. v.). Dr. Robinson (Researches, i. 287) discovered the site in the modern el-Abdâb (otherwise Avjac, ib. p. 560), eight hours from the site of Elusa, at the junction of Wady es-Swamm with Wady el-Birein (ib. p. 294). It contains extensive ruins, situated on a rocky ridge on the Roman road 25 Roman miles S. of Elusa (q. v.). Dr. Robinson (Researches, i. 287) discovered the site in the modern el-Abdâb (otherwise Avjac, ib. p. 560), eight hours from the site of Elusa, at the junction of Wady es-Swamm with Wady el-Birein (ib. p. 294). It contains extensive ruins, situated on a rocky ridge on the Roman road 25 Roman miles S. of Elusa (q. v.). Dr. Robinson (Researches, i. 287) discovered the site in the modern el-Abdâb (otherwise Avjac, ib. p. 560), eight hours from the site of Elusa, at the junction of Wady es-Swamm with Wady el-Birein (ib. p. 294). It contains extensive ruins, situated on a rocky ridge on the Roman road 25 Roman miles S. of Elusa (q. v.).
confine one to the lands of our empire and dominion) as farre as to the island Meroeb, for the space of 996 miles, there is little eben found: and that in all those parts between the few other trees to be found but date-trees, which peradventure may be a cause that eben was counted a rich tribute, and observed the third portion, after gold and ivory" (Holzheimer's Flora, ii. 4). It is sometimes stated that the ancient supposed ebony to come only from India. This arose probably from the passage of Virgil (Georg. ii. 117): "Sola India nigrum fert ebenum." But the term "India" had often a very wide significance, and included the whole of Ethiopia, the purely Arabic "Ethiopia," however, mention both Indian and Ethiopian ebony, as Dioscorides and Pliny; while some mention the Indian, and others the Ethiopian only, as Lucas (Phars. x. 304): "Nigritis Merœcæ secunda colonia, leta comis eboni." The only objection to the above conclusion of any weight, is that Achmea is in the plural form. To this Bochart and others have replied, that there were two kinds of ebony, as mentioned by Theophrastus, Dioscorides, etc., one Ethiopian, the other Indian. Fuller and others maintain that the plural form is employed because the ebony was in pieces; whereas, "ginna palangas, que ex India et Ethiopia magnu numero afferebantur." "Philagynus vocant Herodotus et Arabianus in Peripoli. Plinius palangas, aut philaganes, varietate scriptura, id est, fustos teretes, et qui navibus supponunt, aut quisque idem onus plures bauitant" (Bochart). This view was received by the foreign authors. Of Woods, as Shittim and Almugumm, are also used in the plural form. Besides abrus, Arab authors, as stated by Bochart (l. c.), mention other words as similar to and substituted for ebony: one of these is called alsi, also xemas and xemasin, in the plural form semasian, described as "nigrum lignum ad palangas conferendam." Hence, in the Koran, those who are tormented in Gehenna, it is said, will issue from the fire after a certain period of confinement in it: "They will go forth, I say, like the wood semasian," that is, black, from being burnt in the fire. Such a wood was known we have the testimony of Dioscorides: "Some sell semasina or scanthine wood for ebony, as they are very similar." Some critics, and even Sprengel, in his late edition of Dioscorides, read exevius instead of oxiinov, for no other reason apparently but because xevius was a substance which Egyptian arms are acquainted with, whereas, semasina is only known to those who consult Oriental writers, or who are acquainted with the products of the East. Bochart rightly reprehends this alteration as being unnecessary, in view of the existence of so many words, easily made use of among the modern Arabs, and cites a notice of Arrian to the same effect (Bochart, l. c.). The above word is by Dr. Vincent translated semasium; but this is a herbaceous oil-plant.

If we look to the modern history of ebony, we shall find that it is still derived from more than one source. Thus Mr. Holtzappel, in his recent work on Turning, describes three kinds of ebony. (1.) One from the Mauritius, in round sticks like scaffold poles, seldom exceeding fourteen inches in diameter, the blackest and finest in the grain, the hardest and most beautiful. (2.) The East Indian, which is grown in Ceylon and the Peninsula of India, and exported from Madras and Bombay in logs from six to twenty, and sometimes even twenty-eight inches in diameter, and also in planks. This is less wasteful, but of an inferior grain and color to the above. (3.) The African, shipped from the Cape of Good Hope in billets, the general size of which is from three to six feet long, three to six inches broad, and two to four inches thick. This is the least wasteful, as all the refuse is left behind; but it is the most porous, and the worst in point of color. No Arabian ebony is exported; this, however, is more likely to be owing to the different routes which commerce has taken, although it is again returning to its ancient channels, than to the want of ebony in the ancient Ethiopia. From the nature of the climate, and the existence of forests in which the elephant abounds, there can be no doubt of its being well suited to the group of plants which have been found to yield the ebony of Mauritius, Ceylon, and India, the genus Diospyros of the family Ebenaceae; several species yield varieties of ebony as their heart-wood, as D. ebenum in the Mauritius, and also in Ceylon, where it is called kulacora. It is described by Retz as "folis ovato-lanceolatis, acuminatis, gemmis hirtis;" and he quotes as identical D. globerrima (Fr. Rothb. Nov. Act. Hort. ii. 540, tab. 6). D. ebenum yields the bastard ebony of Ceylon, and D. hirsuta the Calamander wood of the same island, described by Mr. Holtzappel as of a chocolate-brown color, with black stripes and marks, and stated by him to be considered a variety of "D. enebra," the true ebony of Ceylon, a stock of the is the ebony-tree of Coromandel, and is figured among Coromandel plants (l. No. 46); it grows to a large tree in the mountainous parts of Ceylon, and in the Peninsula of India—in Malabar, Coromandel, and Orissa. The black part of the wood of this tree alone forms ebony, and is found only in the centre of large trees, and varies in quantity according to the size and age of the tree. The outside wood is white and soft, and is soon destroyed by time and insects, leaving the black untouched (Roxb. Fl. Ind. ii. 580). Besides these, there is in the Peninsula of India a wood called blackwood, by the native name of Faam, which grows on foreign trees; it grows to an immense size, is heavy, close-grained, of a greenish-black color, with lighter-colored veins running in various directions. It is yielded by the Dalbergia latifolia. To the same genus belongs the Siam, one of the most valued woods of India, and of which the tree has been called Dalbergia siamensis. The wood is remarkably strong, of a light grayish hue, with darker-colored veins. It is called siam and shihium by the natives of India. This is the name which we believe is referred to by Arab authors, and which also appears to have been the original of the semasina of Dioscorides and of the Peripoli. The name may be applied to other nearly allied woods, and therefore, perhaps, to that of the above D. latifolia. It is a curious confirmation of this that Forskal mentions that in his time shihium, with teak and ebony, was among the woods imported from India and Arabia. It is satisfactory to have apparently such competent confirmation of the general accuracy of ancient authors, when we fully understand the subjects and the products of the countries to which they allude. According to Mr. E. Tennent (Ceylon, i. 116) the following trees yield ebony: Diospyros ebenum, D. reticulata, D. ebenus, and D. hirsuta. The wood of the first-named tree, which is abundant throughout all the flat country to the west

Branch of Diospyros Ebenum.
EBRARDUS, an author and theologian of Béthune, in France, who lived during the latter part of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th. He is known only by his writings. One of the principal of these, his Grecismus, a collection of rules of rhetoric, prosody, grammar, and logic, was for many years used as a text-book by the theological schools. These were Liber antiochenus against the Cathari, which was first published under the title Contra Waldenses in Greter's Trias scriptorum contra Waldenses (Ingolstadt, 1614, 4to), and reprinted in Bibli. Patr. Max. (of Lyons, vol. xxiv), and lastly in Greter's Opera Omnia (vol. xii, part ii).—Horae. Real-Encyclopadie, iii, 925.

Ebrarmer or Ebrarmer, the third Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, was born at Cicon, near Terronan, towards the close of the 11th century. Admitted by Lambert, bishop of Arras, to the priesthood, he joined the first Crusaders, and was of the number appointed by Godfrey de Bouillon canon at the holy sepulchre. In 1112, at the behest of Daimbert (q. v.), he was elevated to the patriarchate, in which, after much contention on the part of Daimbert, he was solemnly confirmed by the decree of a council. He was a member of the Council of Nablous (1120), and in 1123 signed the treaty between the crusading princes and the Venetians. A letter of this period, signed by Lambert of Arras, is contained in the 5th vol. of the Miscellanea of Baluze.—Hoefcr, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xvi, 618.

Ebron (Heb. Abromokh, אבְּרֹוקָה, πασσάγε, i. e. of the sea; Sept. 'Ephoam,' the thirtieth station of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Canaan (Num. xxxiii, 34, 35). Since it lay near Ezion-Gaber on the west, as they left Jotapata, it was probably in the plain now known as the Kân’a-n-Nabk, immediately opposite the pass of the same name at the head of the Elanitic branch of the Red Sea (see Robinson's Map in Researches, vol. i). Rommel (in the Hall. Encyclop. i, 167) compares the Arrou of Piolomy (v. 17), in Ara- lia Petraea (66° 10' and 29° 40'), with the Harours of the Peutinger Table; a very improbable supposition. Knobel thinks (Ency. Hamb., in loco) that the Ezion-Gaber in question cannot be the port of that name at the head of the Elanitic Gulf; for, as the next station mentioned is Kadesh, this was too far from the north end of the gulf to be reached in one march; but this objection is of little force, as there is no uniformity in the intervals between the stations. Schwarz (Puteat. p. 213) rightly regards Ebron as merely the name of a "ferry," by which the people perhaps crossed this arm of the sea (?) or where travellers usually crossed it.

Ebutius (wEbətjus), a decurion (εἰκέφυρχ), and a person distinguished for good conduct and prompt action, who was sent with Placidus by Vespasian to invest Jotapata while garrisoned by Josephus (Josephus, War, iii, 7, 9). He was slain while defending Vespasian was a furious salary during the siege of Gamala (6e. iv, 1, 5).

Ecbas'num (Vulg. id., Gr. text being lost), one of the five swift scribes who were selected to attend Ebdras (2 Esdr. xiv, 24).

Ecbatana (1 Esdr. vi, 28) or "Ecbatum" (vada 'Ecbarāvā, 2 Macr. i, 3), Judith i, xlii; Tob. 9, etc.; comp. Josephus, Ant. xii, 17, 7; xi, 4, 6; 'Aȳlera- clown of Ctesias i; Herod. ii, 98; ii, 153), the metropolis of Media (Curt. v, 81), situated 88° and 27° 45', according to Ptolemy (vii, 2, 14), and after the time of Cyrus (Herod. ii, 622 sq.; Tassaun. iv, 21; Xenoph. Cyr. v, 6, 22; Tact. iii, 5, 15) two months in the year the residence of the Persian (later the Parthian) kings. It is somewhat doubtful whether the name of this place is really contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. Many of the best commentators understand the expression מָמָה 'Arba in Ezra vi, 2, differently, and translate it in ara, "in a coffin" (see Buxtorf and others, and our English Bible margin). The Sept., however, give in πόλις, "in a city," or (in some MSS.) in ἀμφίτροιν πόλις, which favors the ordinary interpretation. If a city is meant, there is little doubt of one of the two Ecbatanas being intended; for, except these towns, there was no place in the province of Media, "which contained a palace" (דְּמַלַת), or where records are likely to have been deposited. The name Armathax, too, which at first sight seems somewhat remote from Ecbatana, wants but one letter of Hagmatana, which was the native appellation. The earlier and more correct Greek form of the name, too, was Agbatana (see Steph. Byz. p. 19; comp. Vell. Pat. vii, 173). The modern name of the city, "Ascendana," regards the name as Zendish, Aghara-Tamme, "land rising in horses." Hyde (De rer. rer. Pers. p. 541 sq.) compares it with the Persian Aibaden, "cultivated place;" Ilgen (on Tobit, i. c.) regards it as Shemite; compare Syr. Chamasana, "fortress." For other etymologies, see Simonis Onom. V. T. p. 576 sq.; Gesenius, Thes. p. 70.

Two cities of the name of Ecbatana seem to have existed in ancient times, one the capital of Northern Media, the Media Atropatene of Strabo; the other the Metropolis of Media, the larger and more important province known as Media Magna (see Sir R. Harriwell, in the Journal of the Geographical Society, art. ii). The site of the former appears to be marked by the very curious ruins at Takhti i-Sulaiman (lat. 36° 28', 47° 42' E.), to which the latter is commonly referred, which is one of the most important cities of modern Persia. There is generally some difficulty in determining, when Ecbatana is mentioned, whether the northern or the southern metropolis is intended. Few writers are aware of the existence of the two cities, and they lie sufficiently near to one another for geographical notices in most cases to suit either site. The northern city was the "seven-walled town" described by Herodotus, and declared by him to have been the capital of Cyrus (Herod. i, 98-99, 153; comp. Mos. Choren. ii, 94); and it was thus most probably there that the roll was found which proved to Daris that Cyrus had really made a decree allowing the Jews to rebuild their Temple.

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

The peculiar feature of the site of Tukki-i-Salehman, which it is proposed to identify with the northern Ecbatana, is a conical hill rising to the height of about 150 feet above the plain, and covered both on its top and sides with massive ruins of the most antique and picturesque character. A perfect cone, formed of large blocks of squared stone, may be traced round the entire hill along its brow; within there is an oval inclosure, about 800 yards in its greatest and 680 in its least diameter, covered with ruins, which cluster round a remarkable lake. This is an irregular basin, about 300 paces in circuit, filled with water exquisitely clear and pleasant to the taste, which is supplied in some unknown manner from the springs which stand uniformly at the same level, whatever the quantity taken from it for irrigating the lands which lie at the foot of the hill. This hill itself is not perfectly isolated, though it appears so to those who approach it by the ordinary route. On three sides—the west, the south, and the north—the acclivity is steep, and the height above the plain uniform; but on the east it abuts upon a hilly tract of ground, and here it is but slightly elevated above the adjoining country. It cannot, therefore, have ever answered exactly to the description of Herodotus, as the eastern side could not any how admit of seven walls of circumvalation. It is doubtful whether even the other sides were thus defended. Although the flanks on these sides are covered with ruins, "no traces remain of any wall but the upper one" (As. Jour. x, 52). Still, as the nature of the ground on three sides would allow this style of defense, and as the account in Herodotus is confirmed by the Armenian historian, writing clearly without knowledge of the earlier author, it seems best to suppose that in the peaceful times of the Persian empire it was thought sufficient to preserve the upper enceinte, while the remains of the other sides fell into decay, and ultimately were superseded by domestic buildings. With regard to the coloring of the walls, or, rather, of the battlements, which has been considered to mark especially the fabulous character of Herodotus's description, recent discoveries show that such a mode of ornamentation was actually in use at the period in question in a neighboring country. The temple of the Seven Spheres at Borissipa was adorned almost exactly in the manner which Herodotus assigns to the Median capital (see BABEL, TOWER ON); and it does not seem at all improbable that, with the object of placing the city under the protection of the seven planets, the seven walls may have been colored nearly as described. Herodotus has a little deranged the order of the hues, which should have been either black, orange, scarlet, gold, white, blue, silver—as at the Borissipa temple—or black, white, orange, blue, scarlet, silver, gold—if the order of the days dedicated to the planets was followed. Even the use of silver and gold in external ornamentation—which seems at first sight highly improbable—is found to have prevailed. Silver roofs were met with by the Greeks at the southern Ecbatana (Polybius, x, 27, 10-12); and there is reason to believe that at Borissipa the gold and silver stages of the temple were actually coated with those metals. (See Rawlinson, Herodotus, i, 185.)

Plan of Ecbatana.


The northern Ecbatana continued to be an important place down to the 13th century after Christ. By the Greeks and Romans it appears to have been known as Gazu, Gizaza, or Cazaza, "the treasure city," on account of the wealth laid up in it, while by the Orientals it was termed Shez. Its decay is referable to the Mogul conquests, c. A.D. 1200; and its final ruin is supposed to date from about the 15th or 16th century (As. Soc. Journ. x, pt. i, 49).

In the 26th book of Macalbeses (ix, 3, etc.), the Ecbatana mentioned is undoubtedly the southern city, now represented both in name and site by Hamadan. This place, situated on the northern flank of the great mountain called formerly Orontes, and now Elwend, was perhaps as ancient as the other, and is far better known in history. If not the Median capital of Cyrus, it was, at any rate, regarded from the time of Darius Hystaspis as the chief city of the Persian empire (Propyl. x, 27). It was afterwards recognised as the metropolis of their empire by the Parthians (Oros. vi, 4). During the Arabic period, from the rise of Bagdad on the one hand and of Isfahan on the other, it sank into comparative insignificance; but still it has never descended below the rank...
of a provincial capital, and even in the present de-
pressed condition of Peru it is a city of from 20,000
to 30,000 inhabitants. The Jews, curiously enough,
regard it as the residence of Ahasuerus (Xerxes ?)—
which in Scripture declared to be Susa (Esth. 1, 2;
ii, 8, etc.)—and show within its precincts the tombs of
Esther and Mordecai (Ker Porter, ii, 105-110). It
is not distinguished by any remarkable peculiarities
from the other cities of its class.

The Echecnas of the book of Tobit is thought by
Sir H. Rawlinson to be the northern city (see As.
Soc. Journ. X, i, 137-141). See ACHMETHA.

Eccard. See ECKHARD.

Boco Homo, a name given in art to pictures rep-
resenting the suffering Saviour as described in John
xix, 5: "Then came Jesus forth, weariyng the crown
of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate sat un
then, Behold the man!" It is a comparatively re-
cent subject in art, dating from the 15th century.
There are two forms of it, viz. the devotional picture,
which offers the single head, or half-figure of Christ, to
our contemplation, as the "Man of Sorrows" of the Pas-
ion, and the more or less historical picture, which ei-
erally places him before us attended by Pilate and one
or more attendants, or gives the full scene in numer-
ous figures. For an account of them, see Jamieson,
History of our Lord in Art, ii, 92 sq.

Echclensis or Echelensis, Abraham, a Mas-
onecian doctor, was born at Eczel, Syria, and was
educated in Rome, where he afterwards taught the
Syrian and Arabic languages. In 1630 he was called
to Paris to assist in the preparation of the great Pol-
yclot Bible of Le Jay. For this work Echclensis fur-
nished Rashi in Syrian and Arabic, with a Latin trans-
literation, and the 8d book of Menachem in Arabic.
He undertook also the revision of the Syrian and Arabic
texts, and the Latin versions contributed by Gabriel
Sionita. He returned again to Rome to fill the chair
of Oriental languages offered in that city, and died
there in 1637. Books are numerous; among the
most important are, Linguarum sive Chaldaisorum
perspectiva Studioso Institution (Rome, 1628, 4to).

Sy-
nopsis prophetariorum sapientiarum Arabum inscrip-
ti episcoporum mundum reperientis, ex arabo sermone latini juris
ficta (Par. 1641, 4to):—Sancti Antonii Magni Episcopi
nascentium (Paris, 1641, 8vo):—Concilii Nicaenum II.
acta, etc. (Par. 1614, 8vo):—Sanctorum et mysticae
regulæ, sermone, sermones, admonitiones, responiones, et vita
duplex (Paris, 1646, 8vo):—Sancti Sapientiae, sive ad
scientiam comparationem methodos (Par. 1646):—De
Proprietatis et virtutum medicis omniq. sanctis utraque
instructum (Paris, 1647, 8vo):—Chronicon orientale nunc
primum latinitate donatum cui accessit supplementum Historie
orientalis (Paris, 1655, fol.):—Catalogus librorum Chaldähorum,
tum ecclesiasticorum quam professorum, autore Hubel-Jerem
(Rome, 1653, 8vo), with notes:—Concordantia autem
humanarum orientalis et fidei catholici dogmate
(Mayence, 1655, 8vo).

In this book he seeks to harmonize the sentiments of the Orientals with those of the Roman Church. Leo Allatius assisted him in his work. De Origine nominum Popae... ve de ejus præme
(nota, 1642, 4to), and Ezechielis scriptura (Paris, 1647,
8vo), were works written in the controversy against the Protes-

Ecclesia. See CHURCH.

Ecclesiae Domus. See DOMUS.

Ecclesiae Seniores. See SENIORES.

Ecclesiae Sistatæ, the fourth of the poetical books in
the English arrangement of the O. T., and one of those
usually attributed to Solomon. In the Heb. Bible it is
the last book of the first part of the proph-
ecographia, הַקְּדִישָה, or fourth division of the Jewish
Scriptures. In the Sept. and Vulg. it is placed be-
tween Proverbs and Canticles, as in the A. V. See
BRM.N. It is the fourth of the five Megillot (q. v.)
or Rolls of the Hebrew Bible, and is supposed to be read at the Feast of Tabernacles. The form
of the book is poetico-didactic, without the subtility
of the beautiful parallelism and rhythm which charac-
terize the older poetic effusions of the inspired
writings. The elegance of vigor and charm is manifest
even in the greatest portion of this book (xii, 10),
where the sacred writer rises above his usual level.
(See generally, Berest, in Eichhorn's Bibliothek, x,
955-84; Paulus, in his Neues Testament, i, 201-65;
Zirkel, Ueb. der Prediger, Wü, 1792; Umbri, Co-
beliecher, Gott, 1889; Stieber, Fideic Moderna,
Halle, 1790; Henzi, Eccles. argumentum, Dorpat,
1827; Muhlert, Palaeogr. Beiträge, p. 192 sq.; Hart-
mann, in der Wiss. Zeitschr. i, 29, 71; Ewald, Ueb. d.
Prediger, Gott, 1826; Umbri, in der Stud. u. Krit.
1849; Bruch, Wissensch.-Lehre der Hebräer, Strassburg,
1861.) See SOLOMON.

I. Title.—The Heb. name is הַקְּדִישָה, Kodesh Lecheth, and is evidently taken from the designation which the writer himself assumes (ch. i, 2, 27; vii, 27; xii, 8, 9, 10; Sept. ezkodsho, Vulg. ecclesiae, Auth. Vers.
"preacher"). It is the particle of הָכִּדָּשׁ, kadosh (cognate with הָכֵדָשׁ, vace, Greek καθίσμα, Eng. call), which properly signifies to call to aether a religious assembly (hence הָכִּדָּשָׁה, a congregation). The apparent anomaly of the feminine termination signifies that the abstract noun has been transferred from the office to the person holding it (so the Arab. kalifah, etc.; see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 1199, 1280), and has thus become capable of use as a masculine proper name, a change of meaning of which we find other instances in
Sophereth (Neh. vii, 57), Pochereth (Ezra ii, 57); and hence, with the single exception of Eccles. vii, 27, the noun, notwithstanding its form, is used throughout in the masculine. Ewald, however (Poet. Bick. iv, 189), connects the feminine termination with the noun מָתַנְתָּה (wisdom), understood, and supposes a poetical license in the use of the word as a kind of symbolic proper name, appealing to Prov. xxx. 1; xxxi. x, as examples of a like usage. As connected with the root קְדִישָה, the word has been applied to one who speaks in an assembly
and there is, to say the least, a tolerable agreement in favor of this interpretation. Thus we have the comment of the Midrash, stating that the writer thus designates himself "because he is spoken in the assembly" (quoted in Preston's Ecclesiastes, note on i, 1); the rendering ttscekddsho, which is by the Sept.; the adoption of this title by Jerome (Pref. in Ecol.), as meaning "qui custum, i.e. ecclesiam congre-
gat, quem nos nuncapere possimus Conciliatorum" the use of "Prediger" by Luther, or "Preacher" in the A. V. On the other hand, taking קְדִישָה in the sense of collecting things, not of summoning persons, and led perhaps by his inability to see in the book itself any greater unity of design than in the chapters of
Proverbs, Grotius (in Ecclus. i, 1) has suggested סְעוּרָה
םֶשָּׁר (computer) as a better equivalent. In this he
has been followed by Herder and Jahn, and Mendels-
sohn has adopted the same rendering (notes on i, 1, and vii, 27, in Preston), seeing in it the statement partly that the writer had compiled the sayings of wise men who had gone before him, partly that he was, by an inductive process, gathering truths from the facts of a wide experience. The title of the book, however, indicates that the author did not write only for a literary public, but that he had in view the whole congregation of the Lord; and that his doctrine was not confined within the narrow bounds of a school, but belonged to the Church in its totality (comp. Psa. xliv, 2-4). Solomon, who in Kings viii is described as עֲנִיִּית הַקְּדִישָה as the people to hold communion
with the Most High in the place which he erected for this purpose, is here again represented as the gatherer (טיות) of the people to the assembly of God. It must, however, be borne in mind that, though Solomon is a representative of the people, he does not lose his individuality. Hence he sometimes describes his own experience (comp. i, 16, 17; ii, 9, 12; vii, 23, etc.), and sometimes utters the words of Wisdom, whose organ he is, just as the apostles are sometimes the organ of the Holy Ghost (comp. Acts vii, 28).

Against the common rendering of טוות by preacher or Ecclesiastes, which is supported by Devaux, Gese-
nius, Knobel, Hertzfeld, Stuart, etc., it has been urged:

(1.) The verb טוות does not properly include the idea of preaching: such, however, would naturally be its derived import, inasmuch as popular assemblies are usually convened for the purpose of being addressed.

(2.) It ascribes to Solomon the office of preacher, which is nowhere mentioned in the Bible; it is too modern a title, and is inconsistent with his character, if not with the contents of the book: this, however, only applies to the title in its modern sense, and not to that above generic view.

(3.) It destroys the connection between the design of the book and the import of this symbolic name: this again depends upon the preconception as to the design of the book; the import, as above explained, is not unsuitable. Moresuitable is it, perhaps, to take it as neither a name of rank nor of office, but simply describes the act of gathering the people together, and can, therefore, not come within the rule which the advocates of the rendering preacher or Ecclesiastes are obliged to urge. The construction of the feminine ver. 17, is incompatible with this view.

c. Abstracts are never formed from the active participle; and, d. There is not a single instance to be found where a concrete is first made an abstract, and then again taken in a personal sense. These objections are too minute to be of much force, and are overruled by the peculiar use and application of this word, which occurs nowhere else.

The other explanations of Koheleth, viz., Gatherer or Acquirer of wisdom, and Solomon is called by this name because he gathered much wisdom (Rashi, Rashbam, etc.); Collector, Compiler, because he collected in this book divin experience, wisdom for the good of mankind (Grotius, Mayer, Mendelssohn, etc.); Eclectic, εὐσεβείς, a name given to him in this place because of his skill in selecting and purifying from the systems of different philosophers the amassed wisdom of the past in this book (Rosenthal); Accumulated wisdom—and this appellation is given to this book, and Wisdom was accumulated in him (Aben-Ezra); The Ros-enthal, the Gathered State of his heart (Coccetti, Schultens, etc.); An assem-bly, an academy—and the first verse is translated "The sayings of the academy of the son of David" (Döderlein, Nachtigal, etc.); An old man—and Solomon indicates by the name Koheleth his weakness of mind when, yielding to his wish, he worshipped idols (Simonis Lex. Heb. v. s.; Schmidt, etc.); Exclaiming voice, analogous to the title assumed by John the Bap-tist—and the words of the inscription ought to be ren-dered, "The words of the voice of one exclaiming" (De Dieu); So, according to the primitive signification of the word, which implied a certain amount of philo-sophy and rhetoric (Devaux); Philosopher or Mor-alist (Sphohn, Gaab, etc.); The departed spirit of Solomon introduced as speaking throughout this book in the form of a shadow (Augusti, Einleit in d. A. T. p. 210); Koheloth is the feminine gender, because it refers to עמה, the intellectual soul, which is understood (Rashi, Rashbam, Ewald, etc.); it is to show the great excellency of the preacher, or his charming style which this gender indicates (Lorinus, Zirkel, etc.), because a preacher travels, as it were, like a mother, in the spiritual birth of her children, and has tender and motherly affection for his people, a similar expression being found in Gal. iv. 19 (Pineda, Mayer, etc.); it is to describe the infirmity of Solomon, who appears here as worn out by old age (Erciser; Simonia, etc.); it is used in a neuter sense, because departed spirits have no specific gender (Augusti); the termination נ is at all feminine, but, as in Arabic, is used as an azaeza; etc., etc., etc., etc. We believe that the simple enumeration of these explanations will tend to show the weakness of a vague, fanciful, and inappropriateness. (See Dindorf, Qanmomo wumen Cohelot Solomonim tributur, Lpz. 1791.)

II. Author and Date.—These have usually been re-garded as determined by the account that the writer gives of himself in ch. i and ii, that it was written by the only "son of David" (i, 1), who was "king over Israel in Jerusalem" (i, 12). According to this, we have in it what may well be called the Confessions of king Solomon, the utterance of a repentance which some have even ventured to compare with that of the 51st psalm. This authorship is corroborated by the unquestionable intentions manifested throughout the book to particular circumstances connected with the life of the great monarch (compare chap. i, 16, etc., with 1 Kings iii, 12; chap. ii, 4-10, with 1 Kings v, 27-22; vii, 1-8; ix, 7-19; x, 14-29; ch. vii. 20, with 1 Kings viii, 46; chap. xii, 9, with 1 Kings iv, 30). Additional internal evidence has been found for this belief in the account of vii, 26-28, as harmonizing with the history of 1 Kings xi, 3, and in an interpretation (somewhat forced perhaps) which refers iv, 13-15 to the murmurs of the people against Solomon, and the piety of Jero-boam as the comfort of the people, already recognized as their future king (Mendelssohn and Freudenthal).

The belief that Solomon was actually the author was, it need hardly be said, received generally by the Rabbinic commentators, and the whole series of Patristic writers. The apparent exceptions to this in the passages by Talmudic writers, which assign the authorship to Hezekiah (Raba Bathera, c. i, fol. 15) or Isaiah (Shohah. Hakka. fol. 66 b, quoted by Michaelis), can hardly be un-derstood as implying more than a share in the work of editing, like that claimed for the "men of Heze-kiah" in Prov. xxv. 1. Grotius (Prof. in Ecles.) was indeed almost the first writer who called it in question, and started a different hypothesis.

It may seem as if the whole question were settled for all who recognise the inspiration of Scripture by the statement, in a canonical and inspired book, as to its own authorship. The book purports, it is said (Preston, Proleg. in Eccles. p. 5), to be written by Sol-omon, and to doubt the literal accuracy of this statement is to call in question the truth and authority of Scripture. To many it has appeared questionable, however, whether we can admit an a priori argument of this character to be decisive. The hypothesis that every such statement in a canonical book must be re-ceived as literally true, is, in fact, an assumption that inspired writers were debared from forms of composition which were open without blame to others. In the literature of every other nation the form of person-ated authorship, where there is no mention of another, has been recognised as a legitimate channel for the expression of opinions or the quasi-dramatic representation of character. Hence it has been asked, Why should we venture on the assertion that, if adopted by the writers of the Old Testament, it would have made them guilty of a falsehood, and been inconsistent with their inspiration? The question of authorship does not involve that of canonical authority. A book written by Solomon would not necessarily be inspired and canonical. It is said that there is nothing that need startle us in the thought that an inspired writer might
use a liberty which has been granted without hesitation to the teachers of mankind in every age and country. Accordingly, the advocates of a different authorship of the books in question that of Solomon feel themselves at liberty to discard these statements of the text as mere literary devices.

They argue that in like manner the book which bears the title "Wisdom of Solomon" asserts, both by its title and its language (vii, 1-21), a claim to the same authorship, and, though the absence of a Hebrew original led to its exclusion from the Jewish canon, the authorship of Solomon was taken for granted by all the early Christian writers who quote it or refer to it. It has also been asserted that the phrase "words of the wise" in the Hebrew text as the standard of canonicity, and by not a few afterwards. But in reply to this it may justly be said that the traditional character of the two books is so different as to defar any comparison of this kind. See Wisdom, Book of.

The following specific objections have been urged against the Solomonic and for the personated authorship of this book. 1. All the other reputed writings of Solomon have his name in the inscription (comp. Prov. i, 1; Song of Songs, i, 1; Psa. lxxxvii), whereas in this book the name of Solomon is studiously avoided, thus showing that it does not occur as its actual author. Yet he gives other equally decisive intimations of his identity, and the peculiar character of the work sufficiently accounts for this partial concealment. Moreover, in some of his other undoubted writings he employs similar nomen de plane (Prov. xxx, 1; xxxi, 1). The symbolic and impersonal name Koheloth shows that Solomon is simply introduced in an ideal sense as the representative of wisdom. On the other hand, it appears to have an equally tangible application to him historically. 2. This is indicated by the sacred writer himself, who represents Solomon as belonging to "that inasmuch as this makes the great monarch say," "I was (מִבְּֽוֹקֵּֽל) king," but had long ago ceased to be king when this was written. That this is the intended author of the book has been acknowledged from time immemorial (comp. Midrash Rabbin. Midrash Jallit in loc.; Talmud, géïn, 68 b; the Chaldee paraphrase, i, 12; Midrash, Maase, Bi-Shlomo, Ha-Melech, ed. Jellinek in Eth Ho-Midrash, ii, 85; Rashi, p. 12). It is also unnecessary that interpretation, but may naturally be understood as simply referring to past incidents, e.g. "I have been [and shall am] king." The passage certainly gives no support to the idea of a fanciful authorship. 4. This is moreover corroborated by various statements in the book itself. It may otherwise be truly said, e.g. Koheloth comparing himself with a long succession of kings who reigned over Israel in Jerusalem (i, 16; ii, 7): the term king in Jerusalem (ibid.) showing that at the time when this was written there was a royal residence in Samaria; the recommendation to individuals not to attempt to resist the oppression of a tyrannical ruler, but to wait for a general revolt (viii, 2-9)—a doctrine which a monarch like Solomon is not likely to propound; the description of a royal spendthrift, and of the misery he inflicts upon the land (x, 16-19), which Solomon would not give unless he intended to write a satire upon himself. These historical allusions are too vague to be thus pressed into service. As to the political references, we know (1 Kings xi, 15, 23) that insurrectionary manifestations did exist in Solomon's reign, and were aggravated by his rigid and uncommissive policy (1 Kings xi, 10). It has been asked whether Solomon would have been likely to speak of himself as in i, 12, or to describe with bitterness the misery and wrong of which his own government had been the cause, as in iii, 16; iv, 1 (Jahn, Efr. ii, 840). On the hypothesis that he was the writer, the whole book is an acknowledgment of evils which he had occasioned, while yet there is no distinct confession and repentance. There are forms of satiety and self-reproach, of which this half hearted, half scornful retrospect of a man's own life—this utterance of bitter words by which he is condemned out of his own mouth—is the most natural expression. Any individual judgment on this point cannot, from the nature of the case, be otherwise than subjective, and our conclusions must be based on evidence as little as possible. 5. The state of oppression, suffering, and misery depicted in this book (iv, 1-4, v, 7; vii, 1-4, 10, 11; 5-7, 20, etc.) cannot be reconciled with the age of Solomon, and unquestionably shows us a scene then glooming under the grinding tyranny of Persia. In this connection the violent changes, the advent of to-day becoming the ruler of to-morrow (x, 5-7). All this, it is said, agrees with the glances into the condition of the Jews under the Persian empire in Ezra and Nehemiah, and with what knows as to the general conditions of the provinces under its satrapa. But we cannot suppose that these evils, which have been prevalent in all times, were alluded to as specially characteristic of the writer's day. 6. The fact that Koheloth is represented as indulging in sensual enjoyments, and acquiring riches and fame, which "Cept that I may be an ornament what is called (i, 11) the children of men (ii, 3-9; iii, 12, 22, etc.), making philosophical experiments to discover the sumnum bonum, is held to be at variance with the conduct of the historical Solomon, and to be an idea of a much later period. In like manner, the admonition not to seek divine council in the profane books of the prophets (xii, 12) are thought to show that this book was written when the speculations of Greece and Alexandria, had found their way into Palestine. In short, the doctrine of a future bar of judgment, whereby Koheloth solves the problem of this book when compared with the vague and dim intimations respecting a future state in the pre-exilian portions of the O. T., is regarded as proving that it is a post-exilian production. But the untrustworthy character of these arguments is evinced by the parallel case of the book of Job (q. v.). It is also urged that the indications of the religious condition of the people, their formalism and much speaking (v, 1, 2), their readiness to evade the performance of their vows by cassicistic excuses (v, 5), represent in like manner the growth of evils, the germs of which appeared soon after the captivity, and which we find in the developed form in the prophecies of Malachi. In addition to this general resemblance, there is the agreement between the use of נְּוָלֵל for the "angel" or priest of God (v, 6, Ewald, in loc.), and the recurrence in Malachi of the terms נְּנֵל and נְּנוּ, the "angel" or messenger of the Lord, as a synonyme for the priest (Mal, ii, 7), the true priest being the great agent in accomplishing God's purposes. Significant, though not conclusive in either direction, is the absence of all reference to any contemporaneous prophetic activity or to any Messianic hopes. This might indicate a time before such hopes had become prevalent, or after they were for a time extinguished. It might, on the other hand, be the natural result of the experience through which the son of David had passed, or simply take its place in the dramatic personation of such a character. The use throughout the book of Elohim instead of Jehovah as the divine name, though characteristic of the book as dealing with the problems of the universe rather than with the relations between the Lord God of Israel and his people, and therefore typical of a higher estimate of the revela tion as to date nearly where it was. The indications of rising questions as to the end of man's life and the constitution of his nature, of doubts like those which afterwards developed in Sadduceesm (iii, 19-21), of a copious literature connected with the questions, confirm, if it is urged (Ewald), the hypothesis of the later date. It may be added, too, that the absence of any
reference to such a work as this in the enumeration of Solomon's writings in 1 Kings iv, 32, tenets, at least, to the same conclusion. But such considerations drawn a sinistro are highly inconclusive. 7. The strongest argument, however, against the Solomonic authorship of this book is its vitiating language and style. It is written throughout in the Hebrew forms, which developed themselves about the time of the Babylonian captivity. So convincing is this fact, that not only have Grotius, J. D. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Dor- derlein, Spener, Jahn, J. E. C. Schmidt, Nachtigal, Kaiser, Rosenmüller, Ewald, Knobel, Gesenius, De Wette, and others, all acknowledged it, but more learned, less exaggerated, less enthralled, less enthusiastic, and even such unquestionably orthodox writers as Umbreit, Hengstenberg, Gerlach, Vaihinger, Stuttgart, Keil, Elster, etc., declare most emphatically that the book was written after the Babylonian captivity; and there is hardly a chief rabbi or a rabbinical Jew to be found who would have the courage to maintain that Solomon wrote Koheloth. Dr. Herzfeld, chief rabbi of Bruns- wick; Dr. Philippson, chief rabbi of Magdeburg; Dr. Geiger, rabbi of Breslau; Dr. Zunn, Professor Luzzato, Dr. Krochmal, Steinacher, J. J. Gruber, and others, and a host of others, affirm that this book is one of the latest productions in the O.-T. canon. We are more overreigned that these are men to whom the Hebrew is almost vernacular, and that some of them write better Hebrew, and in a purer style, than that of Kohel- oth. But even the most censorious, even the most extravagant, even those who entertain the most extreme interpretations of the text itself will weigh more than the opinion of these or all other learned men. On the other hand, the Rabbinical scholars, who certainly were not inferior in a knowledge of Hebrew, appear to have found no difficulty in attributing this book to Sol- mon. Most of those above enumerated are of very questionable sentiments on a point like this, and it must be borne in mind that a very large, if not equal, amount of learning has been arrayed on the opposite side. The last of the above objections, however, does de- serve a more minute consideration.

Many opponents of the Solomonic authorship of Ec- clesiastes have certainly gone much too far in their assertions respecting the imperity of its language. The Graecisms which Zirkle thought that he had found have now generally been given up. The Rabbinisms likewise that stand these glosses, signifi- cations, and forms which seem to appertain to a later period of Hebrew literature, and the Chaldaism, an abundance of which Knobel gathered, require, as Herzfeld has shown (in his Commentary, published at Brunsschweig, 1836, p. 13 sq.), to be much sifted. Ac- cording to Herzfeld, there are in Ecclesiastes more than between eleven and fifteen "young Hebrew" ex- pressions and constructions, and between eight and ten Chaldaism. Nevertheless, it is certain that the book does not belong to the productions of the first, but rather to the second period of the Hebrew language. This alone would not fully dispose the au- thorship of Solomon, for it would not necessarily throw the production into the latest period of Hebrew literature. We could suppose that Solomon, in a philo- sophical work, found the pure Hebrew language to be insufficient, and had, therefore, recourse to the Chal- daizing popular dialect, by which, at a later period, the book-language was entirely displaced. This supposition could not be rejected a priori, since almost every one of the Hebrew authors before the exile did the same, although in a less degree. It has been thought, however, that a striking difference between the lan- guage of Ecclesiastes and the language of the Proverbs renders that explanation quite inadmissible. This difference would prove little if the two books belonged to the same period, for the history of all literature of their kind is, if Ecclesiastes were the same relation to the Proverbs as the Song of Solomon does; but since Ecclesiastes and the Proverbs belong essentially to the same class,
tions of Ezra; \( \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \) (chap. i. 17, etc.), \( \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \) (ch. i. 18, etc.), \( \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \) (ch. v., 5). (4.) Other peculiarities, such as the frequent use of the participle, the rare appearance of the " rar consecutiv," the various uses of the relative particle, concur with the characteristics already noted in affixing to the language and style of this book the stamp of that transition period when the Hebrew language, since its intercourse with the Chaldee, had already lost its ancient purity, and become debased by the absorption of many Chaldee elements. The prevalence of abstract forms again, characteristic of the language of Ecclesiastes, is urged as belonging to a later period than that of Solomon in the Psalms, and to the period of Hebrew disintegration. The answers given to these objections by the defenders of the received belief are (Preston, Eccles., p. 7, (a)) that many of what we call Aramaic or Chaldee forms may have belonged to the period of pure Hebrew, that the Persian influence on the Hebrew was kept in check by the revenue of the Persian government, and that the Persian did not succeed to the captivity, the dates which have been assigned to it occupy a range of more than 500 years. Grodius supposes Zerubbabel to be referred to in xli, as the "One Shepherd" (Comm. in Eccles. in loc.), and as far agreed with Kell (Einleitung in das A. T.), who fixed it in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Ezra, Nehemiah, Xerxes, and De Wette conjecture the close of the period of Persian or the commencement of that of Macedonian rule; Berthold, the period between Alexander the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes; Hitizig, circ. B.C. 204; Hartmann, the period of the Macedonians ad etc. The following table will show the different periods to which it has been assigned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezra-Nehemiah</td>
<td>Hitizig, circ. B.C. 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander and Antiochus Epiphanes</td>
<td>Berthold, 333-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>Kell, 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>Grodius, 536-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian</td>
<td>Kell, 300-536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Kell, 628-333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supposing it were proved that Solomon is only introduced as the speaker, the question arises why the author adopted this form. The usual reply is, that Solomon, among the Israelites, had, as it were, the prerogative of wisdom, and hence the author was induced to put into Solomon's mouth that wisdom which he intended to proclaim, without the slightest intention of forging a supposititious volume. This reply contains some truth, but it does not exhaust the matter. The chief object of the author was to communicate wisdom in general; but next to this, as an illustration from ch. i. 12 sq., he intended to inculcate the vanity of human pursuits. Now, from the mouth of no one could more aptly proceed the proclamation of the nothingness of all earthly things than from the mouth of Solomon, who had possessed them in all their fulness; at whose command were wisdom, riches, and pleasures in abundance, and who had therefore full opportunity to experience the nothingness of all that is earthly.

On the other hand, if we adopt the traditional view that Solomon was the author, we avoid all these doubtful expedients and pious frauds; and, as no other candidate appears, we shall be safest in coinciding with that ancient opinion. The peculiarities of diction may be explained (as in the book of Job) by supposing that the work was written by Solomon during a season of penitence at the close of his life, and edited in its present form, at a later period, perhaps by Ezra.

111. Canonicity.—The earliest catalogues in which the Jews have a list of the books of the Bible, is said to date from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and it is probable that we have received this book as forming part of the canon (Mishna, Talmud, iii, 5; Talmud, Baba Bathra, 14). All the ancient versions, therefore—viz. the Septuagint, which was made before the Christian era; the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which belong to the second century of Christianity, as well as the cursive manuscripts of the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian era—do not contain this book. But as it has been included in the Canon from the time of the finger, it is therefore to be regarded as canonical. The following passages in the Talmud indicate, however, that the recognition was not altogether unquestioning, and that it was at least questioned how far the book was one which it was expedient to include in the Scriptures and to set forth publicly. Thus we find the statements (Mishna, Shabbath, c. x, quoted by Mendelssohn in his book on the Canon, p. 74; Midrash, fol. 114 a; Preston, p. 13) that the "wise men sought to secrete the book Koheleth, because they found it in words tending to heresy," and that it is "contradictory to the law;" and that the reason they did not secrete it was "because its beginning and end were consistent with the law;" that when they examined it more carefully they came to the conclusion, "We have looked closely into the book Koheleth, and discovered that its meaning is the same as in the Pentateuch." The chief interest of such passages is that they are consistent with the idea that the book is of some importance also as indicating that it must have commended itself to the teachers of an earlier generation either on account of the external authority by which it was sanctioned or, if not sanctioned, on account of the fact that they had a clear conscience in leaving all its meaning, and were less startled by its apparent difficulties. (See Bab. Megilla, 7 b; Bab. Talm. Sabbath, 30 a; Midrash, Pirqe de-Rabbin Abba, xxviii; Mishna, Eduyoth, v; Jerome, Comment. on the Bible, xii, 13.) Traces of this controversy are to be found in a singular discussion between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, turning on the question whether the book Koheleth were inspired, and in the comments on that question by R. Ob. de Bartenora and Maimonides (Surenhus, iv, 349). Within the Christian Church, the divine inspiration of Ecclesiastes is one of the older and most of the Song of Solomon is denied by the Theologus of Mopocastus. In recent times, the accusers of Ecclesiastes have been Augusti, De Wette, and Knobel; but their accusations are based on mere misunderstandings. They are especially as follows: (1) The author is said to incline towards a moral episcopacy. All his ethical admonitions and doctrines tend to promote the comforts and enjoyments of life. But let us consider above all what tendency and disposition it is to which the author addresses his admonition, serenely and contentedly to enjoy God's gifts. He addresses this admonition to that speculation which will not rest until it has penetrated the whole depth of the inscrutable counsels of God; to that murmuring which bewails the badness of times, and quarrels with God about the sufferings of our terrestrial existence; to that gloomy pity which wearies itself in imaginary good works and external strictness, which is not interested in the welfare of humanity, which is not itself the aricle which gathers, not knowing for whom; making the means of existence our highest aim; building upon an uncertain futurity which is in the hand of God alone. When the author addresses levity he speaks quite otherwise. For instance, in the case of the woman who had no orphan to bequeath, it is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart. Sorrow is better than
laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wise man is in the house of mourning, but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth.” The nature of the joy recommended by the author is also misunderstood. Unrestrained merriment and giddy sensuality are not the virtues which our author enumerates. He says to laughter, Thou art mad, and to joy, What art thou doing? He says, ch. vii, 5, 6, “It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise than for a man to hear the song of fools. For as the cracking of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of fools. 18, 11, 12; “I know that there is no good in them, but for a man to rejoice, and to do good in his life; and in many similar passages, but especially ch. xi, 9, 10, and xii, 1, “Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth,” etc. In reference to these passages Ewald says (p. 186), “Finally, in order to remove every doubt, and to speak with perfect clearness, he distinguishes between the eternal judgment, having attained to all the doings of man, and inculcates that man, in the midst of momentary enjoyment, should never forget the whole futurity, the account and the consequences of his doings, the Creator and the Judge.” 10, 11, 12, 13, is, in reference to the conclusion, “In order to make this comparatively small portion of his writing, there is, ver. 13, once more briefly indicated that its tendency is not, by the condemnation of merriment, to recommend an unbridled life, but rather to teach, in harmony with the best old books, the fear of God, in which the whole of consciences consist, or that true singleness of life, satisfying the whole man, and which comprehends everything else that is truly human. It is very necessary to limit the principle of joy which this book recommends again and again in various ways and in the most impressive manner, and to refer this joy to still higher truth, since it is so liable to be misunderstood. 2.) It is objected that in his views concerning the government of the world the author was strongly inclined to fatalism, according to which everything in this world progresses with an eternally unchangeable step; and that he by this fatalism was (3.) led to a base degradation of man with all his doings and, on his dogmatical basis the conviction of the inability of man, notwithstanding all his efforts, to reach his aim. However, this so-called fatalism of our author is nothing else but what our Lord teaches (Matt. vi, 25): ‘Worry not, thought, etc. And as to the moral scepticism, our author says, PS, 72, 13, 15, ‘All his endeavors can do nothing; but at the same time he recommends the fear of God as the never-failing means of salvation. Man in himself can do nothing, but in God he can do all. It is quite clear from ch. vii, 16, 18, where both self-righteousness and wisdom, when separated from God, are described as equally destructive, and opposite to one another is placed the fear of God, as being their common antithesis, that our author, by pointing to the sovereignty of God, did not mean to undermine morality. He that feareth God cometh forth of the offspring of a sensual character, and, the later German to moral scepticism, it would be impossible for him to teach retribution, which he inculcates in numerous passages, and which are not contradicted by others, in which he says that the retribution in individual circumstances is frequently obscure and enigmatical. Where is that sentence that I have not found in the secret of a true blessedness, in the midst of all the distractions and sorrows of the world, as consisting in a tranquil, calm enjoyment of the good that comes from God (Ps. 37).’

The variety of these opinions indicates sufficiently that the book is as far as possible from the character of a formal treatise. It is simply what it professes to be—the confession of a man of wide experience looking back upon his past life, and looking out...
upon the disorders and calamities which surround him. Such a man does not set forth his premises and conclusions with a logical completeness. While it may be true that the absence of a formal arrangement is characteristic of the life mind in all stages of its development (Lewth, De Sci. Polit. Heb., Poel. xxix.), or that it was the special mark of the declining literature of the period that followed the captivity (Ewald, Poet. Bcck. iv. 177), it is also true that it belongs generally to all writings that are addressed to the spiritual rather than the intellectual element in man's nature, and that it is found accordingly in many of the greatest works that have influenced the spiritual life of mankind. In proportion as a man has passed out of the region of traditional, easily-systematized knowledge, and has been under the influence of great personal thoughts—possessed by them, yet hardly mastering them so as to bring them under a scientific classification—are we likely to find this apparent want of method. The true utterances of such a man are the records of his struggles after truth, of his occasional glimpses of it, the wisdom born in all stages of life. The treatises De In imitatione Christi, the Pensées of Pascal, Augustine's Confessions, widely as they differ in other points, have this feature in common. If the writer consciously reproduces the stages through which he has passed, the form he adopts may either be essentially dramatic, or he may make a statement of the changes which have brought him to his present state, or it may repeat and renew the oscillations from one extreme to another which had marked that earlier experience. The writer of Ecclesiastes has adopted and interwoven both the latter methods, and hence, in part, the obscurity which has made it so prosaically in the struggling-block of commentators. He is not a didactic moralist writing a homily on virtue. He is not a prophet delivering a message from the Lord of Hosts to a sinful people. He is a man who has sinned in giving way to vanity and lust, and so has written out the consequences which/file him the penalty of that sin in satiety and weariness of life; in whom the mood of spirit, over-reflective, indisposed to action, of which Shakspeare has given us in Hamlet, Jaques, Richard II, three distinct examples, has become dominant in his darkest form, but who has through all this been under the discipline of a divine education, and has learnt from it the lesson which God meant to teach him. What that lesson was will be seen from an examination of the book itself. Leaving it an open question whether it is possible to arrange the contents of this book (as Köster and Van der Loos have done) in a continuous series of strophes and antiphons, it is tolerably clear that the recurring burden of "Vanity of vanities" and the teaching which recommends a life of calm enjoyment, mark, whenever they occur, a kind of halting-place in the succession of thoughts. It is the summing up of one cycle of experience; the sentence passed upon one phase of life. Taking this, accordingly, as our guide, we may look upon the whole book as falling into four divisions, each, to a certain extent, running parallel with the others in its order and results, and closing with that in which its position no less than its substance is "the conclusion of the whole matter." (L.) Ch. i. and ii. This portion of the book, more than any other, has the character of a personal confession. The preacher starts with reproducing the phenomena and the weariness into which his experience had led him (i. 2, 3). To the man who is thus satiated with life, the order and regularity of nature are oppressive (4, 7-); nor is he led, as in the 90th Psalm, from the things that are transitory to the thought of One whose years are from eternity. In the midst of the ever-recurring changes he finds no process. That which seems to be new is but the renewal of the old (1. 8-11). Then, having laid bare the depth to which he had fallen, he retraces the path by which he had travelled thitherward. First he had sought after wisdom as to that which God seemed to call him (i. 18), but the pursuit of it was a sore travail, and there was no satisfaction in its possession. It could not remedy the blows of the deceitful, evil spirit that he had taken advantage of (i. 15). The first experiment in the search after happiness had failed, and he tried another. It was one to which men of great intellectual gifts and high fortunes are continually tempted—"to surround himself with all the appliances of sensual enjoyment, and yet in thought to hold himself above it" (ii. 1). Nevertheless, he finds in the voluptuous part of the experience which was to enlarge his store of wisdom. This—which one may perhaps call the Goethean idea of life—was what now possessed him. But this also failed to give him peace (ii. 16). "The day in which I exalted all human experience and found it profitless?" (ii. 12). If for a moment he found comfort in the thought that wisdom excelleth folly, and that he was wise (ii. 12, 14), it was soon darkened again by the thought of death (ii. 15). The wise man dies as the fool (ii. 16). This is enough to make the man wise who, without labour and sin, had ascended into the outer darkness of despair (ii. 20). Yet this very despair leads to the remedy. The first section closes with that which, in different forms, is the main lesson of the book—to make the best of what is actual about the world (ii. 24)—to substitute for the reckless, feverish, and immeasurable passion of life, a calm and steady nature. Men may yet find both for the senses and the intellect. This, so far as it goes, is the secret of a true life; this is from the hand of God. On everything there is written, as before, the sentence that it is vanity and vexation of spirits. (L.) Ch. iii. 1-9. The order of thought in this section has a different starting-point. One who looked out upon the infinitely varied phenomena of man's life might yet discern, in the midst of that variety, traces of an order. There are times, and seasons for each of them (iii. 1-6). The age ('age') includes also the various contexts of the world of nature (iii. 1-8). The heart of man, with its changes, is the mirror of the universe (iii. 11), and is, like that, ineradicable. And from this there comes the same conclusion as from the personal experience. Calmly to accept the changes and chances of life, entrusting, as it were, the balance between joy and sorrow to the hand, is the same as to accept the order of nature, this is the way of peace (iii. 13). The thought of the ever-recurring cycle of nature, which before had been irritating and disturbing, now whispers the same lesson. If we suffer, others have suffered before us (iii. 15). God is seeking out the just man, who, in the midst of persecution and oppression, God also in the appointed season repeats his judgments (iii. 16, 17). It is true that this thought has a dark as well as a bright side, and this cannot be ignored. If men come and pass away, subject to laws and changes like those of the natural world, then, it would seem, man has no pre-existing voice above the beast (iii. 19). One end happens to all. All are of the dust and return to dust again (iii. 20). There is no immediate denial of this conclusion. It was to this that the preacher's experience and reflection had led him. Yet even then the thought that the personal being of man terminates with his death, he has still the same counsel to give. Admit that all is darkness beyond the grave, and still there is nothing better on this side of it than the tempo of a tranquil enjoyment (iii. 22). The transition from this result to the opening thoughts of ch. iv seems at first somewhat abrupt, but the preacher is retracing the paths by which he had been actually led to a higher truth than that in which he had then rested, and he will not, for the sake of a formal continuity, smooth over its ruggedness. The new track on which he turns may at first have seemed less promising than the old. Instead of the self-centred search after happiness he looks out upon the miseries and disorders of the world, and learns to
sympathize with suffering (iv, 1). At first this does not multiply his perplexities. The world is out of joint. Men are so full of misery that death is better than life (iv, 4). Indolence leads to poverty (iv, 5). Here, too, he who steers clear of both extremes has the best portion (iv, 6). The man who heaps up riches stands alone without kindred to share or inherit them, and loses all the blessings and advantages of human fellow-feeling (iv, 12). Successful in his survey of life on earth on a large scale, as in that of a personal experience, there is a cycle which is ever repeated. The old and foolish king yields to the young, poor and wise, who steps from his prison to a throne (iv, 15, 14). But he too has his day, and will join all generations in the final judgment (v, 13, 14). All human greatness is swallowed up in the great stream of time.

The opening thought of ch. v again presents the appearance of abruptness, but it is because the survey of human life takes the form of new avenues. The eye of the Preacher passes from the dwellers in palaces to the worshippers in the Temple, the devout and religious men. Have they found out the secret of life, the path to wisdom and happiness? The answer to that question is that there is blindness and folly in mankind through the fashion of this life while the resurrection of the dead is not yet manifest. The unseemly prayers, idle dreams, broken vows, God's messenger, the Priest mocked with excuses—that was what the religion which the Preacher witnessed presented to him (v, 1–6). The command "Fear thou God," means that a man was to take no part in a religion such as this. But the Lord's command also suggested the solution of another problem, that of prevalence of injustice and oppression which had for a long time reduced the spirit of the inquirer. Above all tyranny of petty governors, above the might of the king himself, there was the power of the highest (v, 8); and his judgment was manifest even upon earth. Was there, after all, so great an inequality? Was God's purpose, that the earth should be for all, really counteracted? (v, 9). Was the rich man with his cares and fears happier than the laboring man whose sleep was sweet without anxiety? (v, 10–12). Was there anything permanent in that wealth of his? Did he not leave the world naked as he entered it? And if so, did not all this bring the inquirer round to the same conclusion as before? Moderation, self-control, freedom from all disturbing passions, these are the conditions of the maximum of happiness which is possible in this life. Let this be received as from God. Not the outward means only, but the very capacity of enjoyment is his gift (v, 18, 19). Short as life may be, if a man thus enjoys, he makes the most of it. God approves and answers his cheerfulness. Is not this better than the riches or length of days on which men set their hearts? (vi, 1–5). All are equal in death; all are nearly equal in life (vi, 6). To feed the eyes with what is actually before them is better than the ceaseless wanderings of the spirit (vi, 9).

(III.) Chap. vii, 10–viii, 15. So far the lines of thought all seemed to converge to one result. The ethical teaching that grew out of the wise man's experience had in it something akin to the higher forms of Epicureanism. But the seeker could not rest in this, and found himself beset with thoughts at once more terrible and more easily to be resisted. In the spirit of man looks backwards and before, and the uncertainties of the future vex it (vii, 12). A good name is better, as being more permanent, than riches (vii, 1); death is better than life, the house of mourning than the house of feasting (vii, 2). Self-command and the spirit of calm endurance are a better safeguard against vain speculations than any form of enjoyment (vii, 8, 10). This wisdom is not only a defence, but a test as to whether their measure or may be, but it gives life too them that have it (vii, 12). So far there are signs of a clearer insight into the end of life. Then comes an oscillation which carries him back to the old problems (vii, 15). Wisdom suggests a half-solution of them (vii, 16), and then the question of how the old man is to deal with them (vii, 22); but this is again followed by a relapse into the bitterness of the sated pleasure-seeker. The search after wisdom, as such as it has been in his experience, had led only to the discovery that, though men were wicked, women were more wicked (vii, 26–29). But the report of the life of the universe appears as if perhaps the natural consequence of such an oscillation, and accordingly in ch. vii will we find the sinner moving in the same round as before.

There are the old reflections on the misery of man (vii, 6), the vanity of life (vii, 8), and the conditions of the moral order of the universe (vii, 10, 11), the old conclusion that enjoyment (such enjoyment as is compatible with the fear of God) is the only wisdom (vii, 15).

(IV.) Chap. viii, 16–xii, 8. After the pause implied in his again arriving at the lesson of v, 15, the Preacher retracts the many of his earlier teachings. This time the thought with which he starts is a profound conviction of the inability of man to unravel the mysteries by which he is surrounded (viii, 17), of the nothingness of man when death is thought of as ending all things (ix, 3–9), of the wisdom of enjoying the present (ix, 7–10) and the folly of grasping at the fragments of the generations or individual man (ix, 11, 12). The wide experience of the Preacher suggests sharp and pointed sayings as to these evils (x, 1–20), each true and weighty in itself, but not leading him on to any firm standing-ground or clearer solution of the problems which oppresses him. It is here that the traces of plan and method in the book seem most to fail us. Consciously or unconsciously the writer teaches us how clear an insight into the follies and sins of mankind may coexist with doubt and uncertainty as to theistic and ethical truth. The man who is not a thing of the night after truth. In ch. xi, however, the progress is more rapid. The tone of the Preacher becomes more that of direct exhortation, and he speaks in clearer and higher notes. The conclusions of previous trains of thought are not contradicted, but are placed under a new law and brought into a more harmonious course. The end of man's life is not to seek enjoyment for himself only, but to do good to others, regardless of the uncertainties or disappointments that may attend his efforts (xi, 1–4). His wisdom is to remember that there are things which he cannot know, problems which he cannot solve (xi, 9), and that is the true greatness of his youth, whatever blessings God bestowed on him (xi, 9). But beyond all these there lie the days of darkness, of falling powers and incapacity for enjoyment; and the joy of youth, though it is not to be crushed, is yet to be tempered by the thought that it cannot last forever, and that it too is subject to God's law of retribution (xi, 9, 10). The secret of a true life is that a man should consecrate the vigor of his youth to God (xii, 1). It is well to do this before the night comes, before the slow decay of age benumbs all the faculties of sense (xii, 2, 3); before the spirit returns to God who gave it. The thought of that end rings out once more the knell of the nothingness of all things earthly (xii, 8); but it leads also to "the conclusion of the whole matter," to which to that all trains of thought and all the experiences of life had been leading the several trains of thought, the spirit of the "righteous judgment of God would in the end fulfill itself and set right all the seeming disorders of the world (xii, 13, 14)." (See two articles on the plan and structure of the book of Ecclesiastes in the Method. Quart. Rev. for April and July, 1849, written by Dr. M'Clinotchick from Vahinger, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. for July, 1848; also an article by Gurlitt in the Stud. u. Krit. for 1864, ii.

If one were to indulge conjecture, there would per-
happ be some plausibility in the hypothesis that xii, 8 had been the original conclusion, and that the epilogue of xii, 9-11 had been added, either by another writer, or by the same writer on a subsequent occasion. These verses (9-12) have the character of a panegyric designed to give weight to the authority of the teacher. The two that now stand as the conclusion may naturally have originated in the desire to furnish a clue to the perplexities of the book, by stating in a broad instance of the form, not easy to be mistaken, the truth which had before been latent.

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

V. Commentators.—The following is a full list of separate references to each of our ecclesiastical writers (the most important as indicated by an asterisk) and also the names of some of the more important writers on the subject.

Galante, "Εκκλησιαστάς (4to, Safet, 1570; Frckt. 1681)"; Sidonius, Commentarius (in Germ., Mogunt. 1571, fol.); De Pomis, Discourse (Ven. 1572, 4to); Mercer, Commentarius (Gen. 1575, fol.); Taitzak, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Ven. 1576, 4to); Jaisch, "Εκκλησιαστάς (et constpl. 1578, fol.); id., Commentarius (antw. 1588, 4to); Jansen, Paraphrasis (Leyd. 1578, fol.); Galicho, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Ven. 1578, 4to); Corranus, Paraphrasis (Lond. 1572, 1586, 8vo); ed. Scultet, Francf. 1617, Heidelberg, 1618, 8vo); Senellin, Commentarius (Gen. 1590, 8vo); in English, Stocknick, Lond. 1586, 8vo, Explicatio (Flor. 1580, 8vo; Colon. 1590, 12mo); Lavater, Commentarius (Tigr. 1584, 8vo); Beza, Paraphrasis (Gen. 1588, 1598, 8vo); in German, ib. 1599, 8vo); Gifford, Commentarius (Lond. 1589, 8vo); Strack, Predigten (4to, Casell. 1590; Frckt. 1618; Goth. 1683); Slangendorp, Commentarius (Hafn. 1590, 8vo); Greenham, Brief Sam in (Works, p. 628); Areop, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Constpl. 1591, 4to); Avrilo, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Salonica, 1597, 4to); Baruch ben-Baruch, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Ven. 1599, fol.); Aleseich, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Ven. 1601, 4to); Luchchter, Erklärung (Frkft. 1603, 1611, 4to); Broughton, Commentarius (Lond. 1603, 4to); Lininus, Commentarius (Lugd. 1606, 4to); Bardin, with various titles (in French, Par. 1609, 12mo, 1622, 8vo; in Germ., Guelf. 1602, 8vo); Fay, Commentarius (Gen. 1607, 8vo); V_paid, Commentarius (Lugd. 1610, 4to); Remon, Notae (in the Crit. Sacri, 1618); Sanchez, Commentarius (Bardin. 1619, 4to); "De ipnea, Commentarius (Antw. 1620, fol.); Ferdinand, Commentarius (Rom. 1621, fol.); Granger, Commentarius (Lond. 1621, 4to); Egard, Expositio (Ham. 1622, 4to); Pemble, Exposition (Lond. 1608, 4to); Dietrich, Predigten (fol. Ulm, 1632, 1656; Nurnb. 1665); Drusius, Annotationes (Amst. 1635, 4to); Guillebert, Paraphrasis (Paris, 1655, 1642, 8vo); à Lapide, In Eccles. (Antw. 1638, fol.); Jermin, Commentary (Lond. 1638, fol.); Cartwright, Metaphrasis (4to, Amsterd. 1647, 4th edit. ib. 1683); Trapp, Commentary (Lond. 1650, 4to); Geier, Commentarius (4to, Lpz. 1658; 5th edit. 1730); Mercado, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Amst. 1653, 4to); Cotton, exposition (Lond. 1654, 8vo); Gorse, Explication (in French, Par. 1655, 3 vols. 12mo); Lusitanio, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Ven. 1656, 4to); Leigh, Commentarius (Lond. 1657, fol.); Varenius, Gemma Salomonis (Rost. 1659, 4to); Werenfers, Homile (Basle, 1666, 4to); *Reynolds, Annotations (Lond. 1669, 8vo); *In Assembly's Annot. Works, in (ed. by Washill, Lond. 1670, fol.); de Sayy, I: Ecclesiastics, 2: Sainte Bible, xiv.; Anon. Exposition (Lond. 1689, 4to); Bosseu, Libri Salomonis (Par. 1685, 8vo); Nislet, exposition (Edinb. 1694, 4to); Smith, Explicatio (Anstl. 2 vols. 1699, 1794); Leenhoff, Vertictures (te Wolle, 1700, 8vo); Yeard, Paraphrasis (Lond. 1701, 8vo); Martainay, Commentary (Par. 1705, 12mo); Seebach, Erklärung (Hal. 1705, 8vo); Tietmazz, Erklärun (Nurnb. 1705, 4to); David ben-Ahron, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Prague. 1706, 4to); *Schmid, Commentarius (Strasb. 1709, 4to); Mel, Predigten (Frkft. 1711, 4to); Zierold, Bedeutung, etc. (Lpz. 1715, 4to); Rambach, Adnotationes (Hal. 1720, 8vo); Wachter, Uebers. m. Anm. (Amst. 1729, 4to); France, Commentary (Braband. 1724, 4to); Wolfe, Anmung (Lpz. 1729, 8vo); Hardoun, Paraphrasis (Par. 1729, 12mo); Bauer, Erklärung (Lpz. 1782, 4to); Hansen, Betrachtungen (Lub. 1737, 1744, 4to); Lampe, Adnotationes (in his Medit. Exeg. Gronig. 1741, 4to); Michelis, Commentarius (Lpz. 1757, 4to); Gotti, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Amst. 1753, 4to); Anon. Uebers. m. Anm. (Halle, 1760, 8vo); Peters, Append. zu Crit. Dia. (Lpz. 1769, 8vo); *Des Vaux, Esay, Analytical Paraphrasis, etc. (Lond. 1760, 4to); in (Germ., Halle, 1764, 4to); Carmeli, Speigungens (Ven. 1765, 8vo); *Judetein, "Εκκλησιαστάς (Amst. 1765, 4to); Anon. Codeth, a Podem (Lond. 1768, 4to); *Mendele
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Ecclesiastic, Ecclesiastical, of or belonging to the Church (ecclesia). In later times the word ecclesiastic is generally treated as a noun, and ecclesiastics often used in the singular number, improperly, to the affairs of the clergy. In the early Church, Christians in general are spoken of by this title, in opposition to Jews, infidels, and heretics. The word means men of the Church, and was applied to Christians as being neither of Jewish synagogues, nor heretics, but of the heathen temples, nor heretics, but of the Church, not members of the Church of Christ; e.g. ἀντιπόλεμοι ἐκκλησιαστεῖοι, Eusebius, iv. 7, cited by Bingham, Orig. Eccles., bk. i, ch. i, § 8.

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

I. Idea and Scope of Ecclesiastical History.—The title Ecclesiastical History (Historia Ecclesiastica) was used by all the early writers on this branch of history, both before and after the invention of the term by L. Sozomenus. German writers began the use, in its stead, of the title Church History (Kirchengeschichte), which has of late been adopted also by most English writers. Its ideas and limits depend on the idea which is formed of the Church (ecclesia). See Church.

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

2. If (as it generally is) for convenience, on the other hand, the term Church be restricted to the Christian Church, then the field of Church history is limited to the development of the kingdom of God among men through and by means of the Christian Church. Its proper starting-point is the incarnation of the eternal Word, who, amenable among us and revealed his glory, the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and next to this the miracle of the first Pentecost, when the Church took her place as a Christian institution, filled with the spirit of the glorified Redeemer, and entrusted with the continuing of his kingdom. The God-man and Saviour of the world, is the author of the new creation, the soul and the head of the Church, which is his body and his bride. In his person and work lies all the fulness of the Godhead and of renewed humanity, the whole plan of redemption, and the key of all history from the creation of the image of God to the resurrection of the body unto everlasting life” (Schaff, Church Hist., vol. i, § 1). Modern writers generally adopt this second view, not only for its practical convenience, but also because the theological ground that the sources of the O. and N. T. history are inspired, that the Church history, since it is a history of the church, are human. The former is therefore called Sacred History, constituting a department by itself. The relations of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism are generally treated by modern writers in an Introduction or in separate chapters, as the Preparation for Christianity; the History of the World: The life of Jesus is so treated by some writers; by most others it is relegated to a separate work. Neander makes one work of “The life of Christ” as the ground of the existence of the Christian Church; another work of the apostolic Church; another of “The Training of Christianity by the Apostles;” while his great Church History continues the development after the apostolic age. Nevertheless, in treating of “Church Discipline and Constitution,” he
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is compelled to go back to the apostolic age. Dr. Schaff makes "the Church under the Apostles" the first division of his History of the Christian Church, and gives the relations of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism in chap. i., as "Preparations for Christianity." Hinds (History of the Christian Church, 1st Division, Encycl. Metropolitana) treats in an introduction of the relation of Jews and Greeks to Christianity, and thinks the fact makes part i. the Ministry of Christ; part ii. the Apostolic Age; part iii. Age of the Apostolic Fathers.

3. As to the relations to church history to general history, dear Stanley remarks: "To a great extent the two are inseparable; they cannot be divided without some loss to both. It is indeed true, in common parlance, ecclesiastical history is often confounded within limits so restricted as to render such a distinction only too easy. Gibbon’s Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire is, in great part, however reluctantly or unconsciously, the history of the 'rise and progress of the Christian Church.' Never let us think that we can understand the history of the Church apart from the history of the world, any more than we can separate the interests of the clergy from the interests of the laity, which are the interests of the orthodox, and the other branches of society.

Hence the relations of the two spheres to each other is almost as indefinable in a history as it is in practice and in philosophy. In no age are they precisely the same" (Eastern Church, Introduction). A book written from this point of view, however, would be rather a history of the Church, than of the topics discussed and development of man than a history of the Church. So Milman’s Latin Christianity is, to great extent, a general history of the times rather than of the Christian Church, while, at the same time, the Church is the prominent feature of it. It is well that such a book should be written, and the work has been well done by dear Milman.

II. Method of Church History.—The order and arrangement of the material have varied greatly at different periods. The earliest writers (e.g. Eusebius) wrote generally without scientific method, and their arrangement was arbitrary and fortuitous. In the Church of the Middle Ages history was little studied, and what little was written was put in the form of simple chronicles. The first application of method was really made in the Magdeburg Centuries, projected by printer Neumann, and published in 1674. See also Dr. Scharff, Geschichte der Kirchen zum Verhüten der Geschichtskenntniss (1816). The history is divided into centuries, with a topical arrangement under each century of sixteen heads as rubrics, viz.: 1. General view; 2. Extent of the Church; 3. Its external condition; 4. Doctrines; 5. Heresies; 6. Blas; 7. Polity; 8. Churches; 9. Councils; 10. Bishops and doctor; 11. Haiters; 12. Martyrs; 13. Miracles; 14. Jews; 15. Other religions; 16. Political changes affecting the condition of the Church. This centennial arrangement (combined with the rubrical subdivision) maintained its ground for two centuries; the last great work which follows it is Mosheim’s Institutes of Ecclesiastical History. Mosheim divides the material under each century into external and internal history, and these again as follows: External events into prosperous and adverse; internal history into, 1. State of literature and science; 2. State of the Church; 3. Theology; 4. Rites and ceremonies; 5. Heresies and schisms. The latter historians divide the whole history into periods, determined by great events, and then arrange the material under each period by topics or rubrics. Each writer, of course, frames his periods according to his own views of the great epochal events of history, but most of them make three great periods—ancient, medi-
aval, and modern, the first beginning with the day of Pentecost; the second with Gregory the Great, A.D. 590 (acc. to others, with Constantine, 306 or 311, or the fall of the West Roman empire, 476, or Charle-
ugame, 800); the third with the Reformation, 1517.

Perhaps the best modern division is that of Schaff, who proposes nine periods, viz., three ancient, three medieval, three modern, viz.: I. The Apostolic Church, A.D. 1-100. II. The Church persecuted as a sect, to Constantine, the first Christian emperor, A.D. 100-311. III. The Church in union with the Graeco-Roman empire, and amid the storms of the great migration, to the pope Gregory I, A.D. 511-600, and the Church divided among the Germanic nations, to Hildebrand, A.D. 590-1049. V. The Church under the papal hierarchy and the scholastic theology, to Boniface VIII, A.D. 1049-1294. VI. The decay of mediæval Catholicism, and the rise of the free churches of the Reformation, A.D. 1294-1517. VII. The evangelical reformation and the Roman Catholic reaction, A.D. 1517-1600. VIII. The age of polemic orthodoxy and exclusive confession-
alisum, A.D. 1600-1750. IX. The spread of infidelity and the revival of Christianity in Europe and Ameri-
cas, from 1750 to the present time (Hist. I, 14). Dr. J. A. Alexander (Op. cit. p. 214 sq.) objects to the minutes and fixed rubrical arrangement on various grounds, and proposes to set it aside altogether as a framework running through the history and determining its whole form, and to substitute a natural arrangement of the topics discussed by way of a guide to the student, working with a due regard to the mutual relative importance of the topics themselves, so that what is prominent at one time may be wholly in the background at another, instead of giving all an equal prominence at all times, by applying the same scheme or formula to all alike. This method has been adopted by Dr. Schaff. He divides the whole into every artificial or conventional arrangement, far from being new, is recommended by the practice and example of the best historians in every language and in every age, affording a presumptive, if not a conclusive, proof of the practical efficiency and usefulness, and, at the same time, a convenient means of keeping this and other parts of universal history in mutual connection and agreement with each other." See also Bur, Epochen d. Kirch-
lichen Geschichtschreibung (Tübingen, 1832).

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

IV. Sources of Church History.—For the history of the Jewish Church and of the Apostolic Church, we find in the O. and N. Testament books for the history of the Church and of the O. and N. Testament. For the history since the closing of the Canon, the sources are given by Kurtz as follows: "They are partly primary (original), such as monuments and original documents; partly secondary (derived), among which we reckon traditions, and reported researches of original sources which have been found. Monuments, such as ecclesiastical buildings, pictures, and inscriptions, are commonly only of very subordinate use in Church history. But archives, preserved and handed down, are of the very greatest importance. To this class also belong the acts and decrees of ecclesiastical councils; the decrees and official decrees of the popes (decretales, briefs) and of bishops (pastoral letters); the laws and regesta issuing from imperial chancel-

laries, so far as these refer to ecclesiastical affairs; the rules of monastic orders, liturgies, confessions of faith, letters of personages influential in Church or State; reports of eye-witnesses; sermons and doctrinal
treatises of acknowledged theologians, etc. If the documents in existence are found insufficient, we must have recourse to the original history from the fathers and to the historical investigations of those who had access to original documents which are now no longer extant" (Text-book of Church History, vol. 1, § 8). "The private writings of personal actors in the history, the works of the Church fathers for the first six centuries, of the Mohammedan and Jewish schools of the Middle Ages, and of the Reformers and their opponents for the 16th century, are the richest mines for the historian. They give history in its birth and actual movement; but they must be carefully sifted and weighed, especially the controversial writings, where fact is generally confused with Arrogance and with the benefit of orthodoxy" (Schaff, Church History, vol. 1, § 8).

V. Literature. (1.) Apostolic Church. The Acts of the Apostles may be regarded as the first Church history, for they describe the planting of the Church among Jews and Gentiles from Jerusalem to Rome. (Irenaeus in his Historia in parte, St. Ignatius in his Epistles and kisses, etc.) (2.) Greek Church. Eusebius (q. v.) won by his Church history ( Εκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία, up to A.D. 324) the title of the Father of Church history, though he was able to make use of the work of a predecesor, Hegesippus. Eusebius (q. v.) is the most moderate, and truth-loving, and made use of many sources of information which are now lost. As a work of art his is inferior to the classic historians. It was continued on the same plan and in a similar spirit by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret in the fifth, and by the Theodoretus Theodoretus in the sixth centuries. Among the later Greek Church historians Nicephorus Callistus (about 888) deserves mention. A Church history in the modern Greek Church was begun in 1866 by Konst. Kontogonola (Εκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία συμβολὰ τῶν Σιάτων συντάσσων τῆς ἱστορίας μίας τῶν Εἰσαγγελίας τῆς Ἱεράς Εὐαγγελίας) in Athens (1866). (3.) The Latin Church before the Reformation. The Latin Church before the Reformation was long content with translations and extracts from Eusebius and his continuators, and but one work of consequence was produced during the Middle Ages. (4.) The Roman Church after the Reformation. At the head of Roman writers of Church history stand of Dr. Scal Tfl., (Rutinis) (-1197), whose Annales Ecclesiastici (Rome, 1588 sq., 12 vols. fol.) come down to the year 1188. They were continued, though with less ability, by Raynaldus, Siscontinus, and very recently, from the year 1549, by J. B. M. Mayer, who for the first time, the church in the sixteenth century was designed as a refutation of the Magdeburg Centuries (see Centuries), and were refuted in part not only by several Protestant writers, but also by Roman scholars, e. g. by Pagli. The work of Natalie Alexander (1724), Historia Ecclesiastica V. et N. T. (Par. 1599 sq., 8 vols. fol.; Bingg, 1785-1791, 21 vols.), is Gallican, learned, and, on the whole, a very valuable work. Fleury (Histoire Ecclesiastique, Par. 1691-1720, 20 vols. 4to) commends himself by mildness of spirit, fluency of style, and copiousness of material. Bossuet (1704) wrote in a very elegant style a history of the world: Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle depuis le commencement du monde jusqu'à l'Empire de Charlemagne (Paris, 1816). Tillemont (1688) compiled, almost entirely in the words of the original authorities, his Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles (Paris, 1689 sq., 4to), which is the most thorough, learned, and accurate history of the six first centuries. The first comprehensive work in Roman Catholic Germany was commenced by count Stolberg, Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi (Hamburg, 1806-1818, 8vo). The 15 vols. which he completed bring the history down to the year 1850. It is very copious and written with the enthusiasm of a poet, but is not critical. The continuation, by Kerz (vols. 16-28, 8vo, Mentz, 1824-54, to A.D. 1800) and Brisch (v. 38 sq., 8vo), are still inferior. The work of Katerkamp (Kirchengeschichte) (1783-30 to 1783, 4 parts, 8vo) is by far more thorough.

Rohrbacher's Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise (Par. 1842-49, vol. 29, 8vo; a continuation containing the Church History from A.D. 1856, by J. C. Schwitter-Dr. Rohrbacher) is written from an ultramontane standpoint, and has not made sufficient use of the recent investigations. The best Roman Catholic manuals of Church history are those of Döllinger (Gesch. d. christl. Kirche, vol. i parts 1 and 2, Landsbut, 1858-86; Lehrbuch der Kirchen- geschichte, vol. 1, Aachen, 1859 sq. to 24 ed. 1843; Kirchen- geschichte, vol. i, part 1, Heidetum und Judäum, Ratibson, 1857, part 2, Christenthum u. Kirche in der Zeit ihrer Grundle- gung, 1860, Eitter (Handbuch d. Kirchengesch. Bonn, 1826-85, 8 vols.; 6th ed. 1866, 2 vols.), and especial- ly Schickele's (Handbuch d. Kirchengesch. 8 vols.; 3d ed. 1843, Mainz, 1843, 8vo; 4th ed. 2 vols. 1867-68). Post- humid lectures on Church history by Dr. Möhler (died 1868), the greatest Roman Catholic theologian of Germany in the 19th century, were published thirty years after his death by Dr. Gams (Kirchengeschichte, 3 vols. Ratibson, 1878-80), a moderate and impartial Lutheran. The first comprehensive Church history from the Protestant standpoint was compiled by Mathias Flacius (1575), surnamed Illyricus (Ecclesiastica Historia No- stri Testamenti, usually called Centuries Magdeburgenses, Basel, 1556 sq.), and with great care and soundness. It followed the centennial arrangement, and treated of 18 centuries in as many folio volumes. It remained long the standard work of the Lutheran Church, though it is to a certain extent partial and often uncritical (see Centuries). Hottinger (1667) published a similar work, and the standpoint of the 17th century (formed Church), Historia Ecclesiastica N. Testamenti (Zurich, 1655-67, 9 vols.) extending to the 16th century, but it is inferior to that of Flacius. A thorough refutation of Barisonius was furnished by Spanheim (Summa Historiae Ecclesiasticae, Lugd. Bat. 1689, 4to). An attempt to re-write the Church history in a modern spirit (see Centuries) was made by J. G. Arnold (in his Un- partischiere Kirch- und Ketzerhistorie, 1698-1700, 4 vols., to 1698), which, however, was often unjust towards the predominant churches through partiality towards the sects. Objective Church history was greatly advanced by Mohelius's Historia ecclesiastica (1719, a moderate and impartial Lutheran. His Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae et recentioriae (Heilbronn, 1755, 4to) is, in the English translation of Murdock (N. Y., 1841, 3 vols., 8yo ed.) and McIlhiney, a favorite text-book in England and America to the present day, and is excellent in general and far the best. The work of Schröck, Christliche Kirch- geschichte (45 vols., to the end of the 18th century, Leipzig, 1768-1812; the last 2 vols. are by Tschirnner), though leaning towards Rationalism, is very valuable for reference. The principal representative of Rationalism among Church historians is Henke, Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Kirche (Braunschweig, 1788-1828, 9 vols. 8vo, continued by Vater). The work of Gieseler (1854), Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Bonn, 1824-1857) gives the history as much as possible in the very words of the sources. It is profoundly learned and impartial, but cold and dry. The best English translation of it is by Prof. H. B. Smith (New York, 1857 sq.). Neander (1850) is generally considered as the father of modern Church history. His aim was to represent Church history as a continuous proof of the divine power of Christianity, and it is therefore prominently the history of church and state. His Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religions und Kirche (Hamburg, 1825-52, 11 vols. 8vo, extending to the council of Basle) has been translated into English by Torrey (Boston, 1847-51, 2 vols. 8vo). Besides these larger works, Germany has produced a great number of excellent manuals. The most important of these are those of Niederer (1846, new ed. 1866), distinguished for fulness and thought: of Hase (9th ed. 1867, translated by Blumenfeld and Wilt, New York, 1855.
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8vo), distinguished for copiousness combined with conciseness; and Guericke (9th ed. 1867, translated by Shedd, vol. i, 1857), who wrote the best historical work from the old Lutheran standpoint. More a sketch than a manual of Church history is the Kirchengeschichte of Schleiermacher, published after his death by his J. G. J.). The first half of Engelhardt, of Erlangen (Handb. d. Kirchengeschichte, Erlangen, 1832-34, 4 vols.), is an unpretending but valuable arrangement of the subject, as derived from the sources. The manual of Friske, left incomplete (Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Leipzig, 1850, 1 vol.), learned but stiff, is printed in its best, revised form by Judowitsch in Stuttgart, 1841-46 to 1895, Christianity is treated as the natural product of the time in which it originated. Clerical selfishness, political calculations and intrigues, appear the sole principles of ecclesiastical movements which this author appreciates or discovers. Still, the work is of importance; and those volumes especially which detail the history of the Middle Ages give evidence of original study, and contain much fresh information. The manual of Jacobi (Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 5th ed. 1860, 4 vols.), originally delivered to an educated audience, are somewhat diffuse, but clear and attractive. They breathe throughout a warm Christian spirit, nor is the judgment of the lecturer warped by narrow sectarian prejudices. The works by J. A. Kurtz (Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Leipzig, 1849, 5th ed. 1863; Engl. trans., in 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1869; Handbuch der allgemein. Kirchengesch., vol. i in 3 parts, Mitau, 1853-54, vol. ii, part 1, 1856) belong among the best productions of the Lutheran school. To the same school belong the manuals of W. B. Lindner (Lehrbuch der Kircht. Kirchengesch., Leipzig, 1874-54) and H. Schmid (Lehr. der Kirchengeschichte, Nördlingen, 1851). The manual of Ehrard (Handbuch der christl. K.-u. Dogmengesch. Erlangen, 1865-66, 4 vols.) is written from the standpoint of the United Evangelical Church, as also the work of Neunh. A. Hasse, Kirchengeschichte, Leipzig, 1861-65, 3 vols., published after the author's death by A. Köhler. The works published by F. C. Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school on the Church history of the first six centuries (Das Christenthum u. d. christl. K. der dritter Jahrh. Tübingen, 1853, 3d ed. 1863, and Das christl. K. der vierten Jahrh. Tübingen, 1853, 2d ed. 1863) were after his death completed, so as to form a continuous and complete Church history, by the publication of three volumes, treating several of the Church history of the Middle Ages, of the time from the Reformation to the end of the 16th century, and of the 19th century. The five volumes appeared together under the title Geschichte d. christl. Kirche (Tübingen, 1863-64, 5 vols.). A Church history in biographies was published by F. Böhringer (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, Zürich, 1842-48). Among the English works we mention Milner (1797), History of the Ch. of Christ to the 16th century (revised ed. by Grantham, Lond. 1847, 4 vols. 8vo). It has been continued by Dr. Stebbing, The Hist. of the Church of Christ from 1689 to the Eighteenth Century (London, 1839 sq., 3 vols., and a further continuation (Edinb., 1896); Waddington, History of the Church from the earliest Ages to the Reformation (Lond. 2d edit. 3 vols. 8vo, and Hist. of the Reform. on the Continent (Lond. 1841, 3 vols. 8vo), is neither accurate nor profound; Foulkes, Manual of Ecclesiastical Hist. (1861, to the 12th cent.); Robertson, Hist. of the Church (Lond. 2 vols. 1854-56, 8vo) to 1122; Milman, Hist. of Christianity (Lond. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo, reprinted in New York), and Hist. of Latin Christ. (Lond. 1854 sq. 6 vols. to Nicholas V.; 4th ed. in 9 vols. 1867, reprinted in New York), an elaborate and at the same time brilliant work; Hardwick, Hist. of the Christ. Church, vol. i Middle Age, vol ii Reform. (Cambridge, 1853 and 1868, 8vo), an admirable work. The collection of the author: Hinds, Jeremie, and others, Church History, in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana, and in a separate edition (Lond. 1850-58, 4 vols. 8vo); Killen, The Ancient Church (Belfast and New York, 1859, 8vo), an able work from the Presbyterian standpoint. The best works on Church history in America are 1831 by Prof. Schaff (Hist. of the Apostolic Age, New York, 1838, 8vo, and Hist. of the Christian Ch. vol. i to A.D. 311, New York, 1859, 8vos. ii and iii to Gregory the Great, New York, 1867. They have also appeared in a German edition, Geschichte der christl. Kirche, vol. i, Merseburg, 1851, and Leipzig, 1854; vol. ii and iii, Leipzig, 1867). They are distinguished by copiousness of material, philosophical arrangement, and attractive style. A brief work on the history of the Christian Church has been published by Dr. C. M. Butler (Philadelphia, 1869). In Protestant history, a numerous literature on special periods. The works treating of the primitive Church have been given in the article on the APOSTOLIC AGE. An able work on the history of the first three centuries has been published by Ed. de Pressensé (Histoire des trois premiers siecles, Paris, 1854, 8vo), and of modern Church history, by Dr. Nippold (Elberfeld, 1867) and Hagenbach (1865). For the ample literature on the period of the Reformation, see the article REFORMATION. The literature on branches of ecclesiastical history, such as history of heresies, councils, particular religious denominations, popes, saints, countries, monasticism, crusades, etc., and that on prominent men of Church history, is given in the special articles treating of those subjects. Tables of Church history, presenting in parallel columns the various church histories of the world, are to be found in Germany by Vater (Halle, 6th ed. 1838), Danz (Jena, 1838), Lange (Jena, 1841), Dousay (Leipzig, 1841), Uhlemann (to the Reformation, 2d edit. Berlin, 1865); in England, by Riddle (Ecclesiastical Chronology, London, 1840); in America, by H. B. Smith (Hist. of the Ch. of Christ, Philadelphia, 1864, 8vo), ed. 1863). This work has considerably improved the plan of all its predecessors, and, in fact, is the most thorough and complete work of the kind extant. Special dictionaries of Church history were compiled by W. D. Fuhrmann (Handbucher der christl. Religionus-a. Kirchengesch. Halle, 1826-29, 3 vols.) and Neudecker (Allgem. Lex. der Religionus-a. christl. Kirchengesch. Weimar, 1834-37, 5 vols.). Periodicals specially devoted to ecclesiastical history have been published by Staudin, Tschircher, and Vater (Magazin für Religionus-a. Kirchengesch., by Staudin, 4 vols. Hanover, 1835-53; Archiv für alte u. neue Kirchengesch., by Staudin u. Tschircher, 4 vols. 1818-22, 5 vols.; Kirchenrat. Archiv, by Staudin, Tschircher, u Vater, 4 vols. Halle, 1823-26; by Illgen, Niederr. and Kahnis (Zeitschrift für hristl. Theologie, Leipzig, 1832-1858; established by Illgen; since 1845, by Niederr.; since 1867, by Kahnis); by Kist and Roysdaels (Archiv voor Kunst, Techeelsg. en Christel. Letterk., 1828-29). See Herzog, Real-Encykl. v. 722, Hagenbach, Thes. Encyklop. p. 312 sq., Wetzer u. Weis, Kirchen-Lex. v. 130, Christian Remembrancer, xiiii, 62, Jortin, Remarks on Ecclesiastical History; Princeton Rev. xxvi, 200, xxxii, 660; Stanley, Ecclesiastical History (Introduction on the Study of Church History); Dowling,
ECClesiASTICAL POLITY

to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History attempted in an Account of the Progress, and a short Notice of the Sources, of the History of the Church (Lond. 1838, 8vo).

Ecclesiastical Polity denotes the principles and laws of Church government. Personal religion is a matter to the individual man and his Maker. But religion necessarily involves social relations; that is to say, it involves society; and no society of men can exist without government. True, there can be no compulsion in religion; but government is not inconsistent with freedom; nay, it is necessary to all true existence of any society, whether of two or of many. The "two conditions essential to a good religious government are, first, a good system for the formation and organization of authority; and, second, a good system of security for liberty" (Guizot, History of Civilization, N. Y. 1840, p. 121).

So Richard Watson: "The Church of Christ being visible and permanent, bound to observe certain rites and to obey certain rules, the existence of government in it is necessarily supposed."

Is any form of Church polity divinely ordained? from the original position in which Christ placed the Church. We gather some elements of polity from the practices of the apostles as recorded in their acts and writings. This polity is not presented as legislative enactments, but simply as facts, showing how the apostles acted in given cases. In the first account we find the Church composed of the apostles and other disciples, and then of the apostles and the multitude of them that believed." Hence it appears that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole body, which arose from their apostleship. It is this original position of the Church, which is based on the authority of Christ, that is represented, in the New Testament, as the pattern of the Church of Christ (Acts, vii, 53; 1 Tim. ii, 5; Titus, i, 6), and this forms the basis of the Lutheran theory of Church polity, in which the rights of the laity are fairly regarded. "Properly, all Christians have a right to teach—every father his own family; and even to administer the sacraments, as even Tertullian truly observed, and he therefore, in most of his works as diversely, as Grotius, Salmiasius, Böhme, and Spener have maintained. Even among the Jews the teachers of the people were not priests, but laymen; and any one who had proper qualifications might teach in the synagogue or in the temple. Among the ancient Israelites the priests were the leaders of the priesthood, but, for the most part, from other tribes, classes, and orders of the people" (Knapp, Lectures on Christian Theology, Wood's translation, Phila., 1853, 8vo, p. 478). Calvin (Institutes, book iv) sets out the principles of Church polity, as they were divinely commanded. He finds a certain "mode of government delivered to us by the pure word of God" (iv, 1, and traces this form of government in the early Church until its "subversion by the papal tyranny" (ch. v). In substance Calvin asserted the following principles: 1. The First Church of Christ was under the direct government and direction of Christ (1 Cor. xii, 28; Gal. iii, 28). He is the Head of the Church. 2. The Church of Christ should be the city of God. It is a theocracy and of divine institutions as such, and as such is to be regarded with reverence. Its members have a positive obligation to be organized, if possible, as a visible society, and to be organized in all things, so far as possible.—its office-bearers, ordinances, worship, and general administration and arrangements—according to what is prescribed or indicated upon these points in the New Testament. 3. That the fundamental principles, or leading features of what is usually called Presbyterian Church government, are indicated with sufficient clearness in the New Testament, as permanently binding upon the Church. 4. That the Church should be the city of God, independent of civil control, and should conduct its own distinct and independent government by preachers and synods, while the civil power is called upon to afford it protection and support. 5. That human laws, whether about civil or ecclesiastical things, and whether promulgated by civil or religious power, do not, per se, i.e. irrespective of their being sanctioned by the authority of God—impose an obligation upon the conscience. Calvin professed to find all these principles more or less clearly taught in Scripture (B. and F. Ec. Rev. April, 1860, p. 164). On this principle Tullioch remarks (Leaders of the Reformation, p. 179 sq.) that Calvin went too far in asserting that Presbyterianism "is the form of the divine kingdom presented in Scripture." "Presbyterianism became the peculiar Church order of a free Protestantism. It was first, on the contrary, on a principle, therefore, of the Church, that it never could have attained this historical success. But it did not merely assert itself to be wise and conformable to Scripture, and therefore divine, but it claimed the direct impress of a divine right for all its details and applications. This gave it strength and influence over the whole ecclesiastical age, in a rule and order, which was the first element of corruption. The great conception which it embodied was impaired at the root by being fixed in a stagnant and inflexible system, which became identified with the conception as not only equally but specially divine" (p. 181).

Are these elements, some of which are called 'sacramental,' to be found in the Bible? Did not Calvin establish his Church polity and Church discipline upon Scripture? and is not this a warranta-
ble course? Assuredly not, in the spirit in which he did it. The fundamental source of the mistake is here. The Christian Scriptures are a revelation of divine truth, and not a revelation of Church polity. They not only do not lay down the outline of such a polity, but they do not even give the adequate and conclusive hints needed for the determination of all the requirements, that it would have been entirely contrary to the spirit of Christianity to have done so; and because, in point of fact, the conditions of human progress do not admit of the imposition of any unvarying system of government on civil society. The Scriptures inculcate a spirit of self to the life, everywhere expands with it, or narrows with it, but is nowhere in any particular form the absolute condition of life. A definite outline of Church polity, therefore, or a definite code of social ethics, is nowhere given in the New Testament, and the spirit of it is entirely things that it untried. There may be differences of opinion among Presbyterians as to the extent to which a divine right should be claimed for the subordinate features of the system, and some, no doubt, have gone to an extreme in the extent of their claims; but no Presbyterians of eminence in the Church can, in any just sense, claim a divine right for all the details and applications of their system. They have claimed a divine right, or Scripture sanction, only for its fundamental principles, its leading features. It is these only which they allege are indicated by the Lord's example; such a doctrine would bind the Church in all ages. And it is just the same ground that is taken by all the more intelligent and judicious among the reformed prelates and Congregationalists' (Brut. and For. Ev. Review, April, 1860).

Moreover, Calvin did not approve ecclesiastical bodies which he did not choose to adopt the Presbyterian regimen. He introduced his scheme where he had influence to do so; and he employed all the vigor of his talents in pressing upon distant churches the propriety of regulating, in conformity with his sentiments, their ecclesiastical government. But, at the same time, he did not wish to be regarded as the mouthpiece of the Gospel as heard with reverence, and the sacraments are not neglected, there at that time there is a church. Scripture, of faithful pastors, he describes them to be "those who by the doctrine of Christ lead men to true piety, who properly administer the sacred mysteries, and discharge the other spiritual duties." The Reformation and greatest writers of the Church of England held that no form of Church polity is enjoined in Scripture. Cranmer explicitly declared that bishops and priests were of the same order at the commencement of Christianity; and this was the opinion of several of his distinguished contemporaries. Holding this maxim, their support of episcopacy must have proceeded from views of expediency, or, in some instances, from a conviction which prevailed very generally at this early period, that it belonged to the superintendence of the civil to regulate the spiritual as much as the political government; an idea involving in it that no one form of ecclesiastical polity is of divine institution. At a later period, during the reign of queen Elizabeth, we find the same conviction, that it was no violation of Christianity to choose different modes of administering the Church. Archbishop Whitgift, who distinguished himself by the zeal with which he supported the English hierarchy, frequently maintains that the form of discipline is not particularly, and by name, set down in Scripture; and he also plainly assigns a reason for the government laid down by the Scriptures prescribed or commanded to the Church of God" (Watson, s. v.). Hooker maintains this principle with great vigor in his Ecclesiastical Polity (book iii), where the following principles are laid down: 1. The Scripture, though the only standard and law of doctrine, is not a rule for discipline. 2. The practice of the apostles, as they acted according to circumstances, and without that, the Church. 3. Many things are left indifferent, and may be done without sin, although not expressly directed in Scripture. 4. The Church, like other societies, may make laws for her own government, provided they interfere not with Scripture. 5. Human authority may intervene with the Church. In case of a dispute between the Church and the Scriptures, the Church may appoint ceremonies within the limits of the Scriptures. Stillingfleet indicates the same view at large in his Irenicum: "Those things may be said to be jure divino which are not determined one way or other by any positive law of God, but are left wholly between them in a way agreeable to natural right and the general rules of the Word of God." His conclusion is that the reason or ground of Church government, the ratio regimini ecclesiasticae, is of divine right, but that the special mode or system of it is left to human discretion. It is by no means equally indisputable what the form of government must be. The necessity of having of necessity it is not as equally in doubt in the case of civil government. "Though the end of all be the same, yet monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy are in themselves lawful means for attaining the same common end. . . . So the same reason of Church government may be advanced, that God may be a king in the persons acting as governors of the Church in one place which may call for superiority and subordination in another" (Irenicum, p. 40 sq., Phila. 1840).

In the modern Church the Romanists and High Episcopalians claim divine right for their system of government. The Roman Catholic doctrine is thus stated (The Catechism of the Council of Trent, published by command of pope Inno's translation, Baltimore, n. d., 8vo): "Sitting in that chair in which Peter the prince of the apostles sat to the close of life, the Catholic Church recognises in his person the most absolute and universal power, the right of universality—a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on synodal or other human constitutions, but emanating from the authority of God himself. As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate representative of Peter, he therefore possesses, as universal Church, the father and governor of all the faithful, of bishops also, and of all other prelates, be their station, rank, or power what they may" (p. 222). And (p. 82), speaking of the power of the keys, "it is a power not given to all, but to bishops and priests only." The following extracts from bishop Forbes's Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles (London and New York, 1867—8, 2 vols. 8vo) present a High-Church Episcopalian view of this subject: "Thus one department of the Church is to be called the Ecclesia docens. To the hierarchy, as distinguished from the great body of Christians, is committed the duty of interpreting and communicating these truths" (Art. xix, p. 268 of vol. i). . . . "It having been shown in the preceding article that the Ecclesia docens hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and hath authority in controversies of faith, we come to consider one great channel of authority in this episcopalian council. Given that the Church has this power, by whom or how is it to be exercised? By whom but by the apostolical ministry, who are appointed for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ? They who are committed the power of the keys, who had, among other duties connected with admission to communion,
to test the orthodoxy of applicants; by those whose important office it was to hand on the form of sound words which they had received to their successors” (Art. xxi, p. 286-9 of vol. i). . . . "Our Lord is the immediate founder of the hierarchy, because it was he who ordained the apostles bishops and assigned to them. ‘As my Father sent me, send I you; receive the Holy Ghost: go ye into all the world and make disciples of every creature; whatsoever ye shall bind or loose on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven.’ These words denote a power without limit; its measure is not given; its efficacy, its all-sufficiency, extend over the whole world. At the beginning of the Church there was one general episcopate” (Art. xxxvi, p. 699 of vol. ii). . . . "It is needless to add that the discipline as well as the doctrine of the Church was a purely internal matter, in which the state had no interest nor control. . . . They . . . do not mean to prejudice the matter of all Church discipline, for it relegated the sanction of the visible Church into the unseen world. If salvation depended, clave non errante, upon Church membership, and Church membership, under certain laws, was in the hands of the hierarchy, it placed the control of the Church absolutely in the hierarchy” (Art. xxxvii, p. 728-9 of vol. ii). The moderate Episcopalians (including Methodists and Moravians) generally hold that episcopacy is in harmony with Scripture, but is not divinely ordained as essential. For a temperate argument in favour of Church history and episcopacy, see Archbishop Whately’s (The Kingdom of Christ, 2d ed. N. Y. 1845, 12mo) says (p. 59): “Thus a further and important advantage of the Anglican church is furnished by the view that the form of episcopacy has been taken, viz., that it was the plan of the sacred writers to lay down clearly the principles on which Christian churches were to be formed and governed, leaving the mode of application of those principles undetermined and discretionary.” And again (p. 215): “In the English Episcopal Church the province of judicatory (the General Conference) is as yet (1860) an exclusively clerical body. But that body has itself admitted the rights of the laity to the fullest extent by submitting to a popular vote (held in June, 1860) the fundamental question whether lay delegation shall be practically incorporated into the ecclesiastical system or not. The vote is by a very large majority in favor of lay delegation, and now (July, 1861) only the concurrence in the proposed changes of the Restrictive Rules of three fourths of all the members of the Annual Conferences, present and voting thereon, is required for the admission of lay delegates to the next General Conference in 1872. In the Methodist Episcopal Church South, this change in its polity was, by the General Conference held in 1866, likewise submitted to the Annual Conferences, and, having received the requisite approval, has been adopted by the several Conferences, and incorporated in its economy. This subject of controversy in the Methodist Episcopal churches of the United States seems, therefore, now on the eve of settlement. For other points related to ecclesiastical polity, see Church; Church and State; Discipline; Episcopacy; Laymen. Literature.—Hooker, Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (Works, vol. i); Potter, Discourse of Church Government (Works, vol. ii); Stilllingfleet, Irenicum (Philad. 1842, 8vo); Watson, Institutes, pt. iv; Litton, Church of Christ (Lond. 1853, 8vo); Barrett, Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Storck, Principles of Church Polity (N. Y. 1859, 12mo); Coleman, Primitive Church Polity, 88-50; Wilson, On Church Government; Davidson (Congregational), Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Morris (Bishop), On Church Polity (18mo); Fillmore Ecclesiastical Polity, its Forms and Functions, by Ripley (Congregational), Church Polity (Boston, 1865, 18mo); Garrett, Inquiry into the Scriptural View of the Constitution of a Christian Church (Lond. 1848): New Englander, August, 1860, art. vi (Congregational); Leicester A. Sawyer, Organic Christianity, or An Address of Church of God, with its Officers and Government, with its Eves, and Variations, both in ancient, medieval, and modern Times (Boston, 1855, 12mo; Congregational).
ECCLESIASTICUS

Ecclesiasticus, one of the most important of the apocryphal books of the O. T. (see Apocrypha), being of the class ranked in the second canon. See DEUTERO-CANONICAL.

1. Title.—The original Hebrew title of this book, according to the authority of the Jewish writings and St. Jerome (Pref. in Libro Sol. i, 1242), was הֶבְרָאָדֶרֶת, Proverba, or, more fully, בֵּרָאָדֶרֶת יְשִׁירָה אֲנָשָׁה, the Proverbs of Jesus, son of Siria, which was abbreviated, according to a very common practice, into ישִׁירָה אֲנָשָׁה, Ben-Sira; יְשִׁירָה, Shiruk, which we find in a few later writers, evidently originated from a desire to imitate the Greek Σερια, Hence all the quotations made from this book in the Talmud and Midrashim are under these titles. (Comp. Mishna, Tadrim, iii, 15; Chagigga, p. 15; Midrash Rabbi, p. 6, 8.; Tanachuma, p. 69, a, etc.) The Greek MSS., and fathers, however, as well as the prologue to this book, and the printed editions of the Sept., designate it שִׁירָה יְשִׁירָה יְשִׁירָה יְשִׁירָה וְרָאָדֶרֶת (v. r. ישִׁירָה וְרָאָדֶרֶת, and even ישִׁירָה וְרָאָדֶרֶת), The wisdom of Jesus, the son of Siria, or, by way of abbreviation, ישִׁירָה, The wisdom of Sirach, or simply Sirach; also 조산 ኧጎስ, የጎስ እውነት የጎስ, እውነት የጎስ, የጎስ እውነት የጎስ. The wisdom of Sirach, or of all virtues, because of the excellency and diversity of the wisdom it propounds (Jerome, l. c.; comp. Routh, Rel. Sacr. i, 274). In the Syriac version the title is The book of Jesus, the son of Simon Asiro (i. e. the bound); and the same book is called the wisdom of the sages of the Jews. Among the authors it is simply styled Wisdom (Orig. in Matt. xiii, 4); compare Clem. Al. Pol. i, 8, § 69, 72, etc., and Jesus Sirach (August. ad Simplic. 1, 20). The name Ecclesiastus, by which it has been called in the Latin Church ever since the second half of the fourth century (Rufinus, Hieron.; Orig. In Num. xviii, 3), and which has been retained in many versions of the Reformers (e. g. the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and [together with the other title] the Auth. Version) is derived from the old Latin version, adopted by Jerome (the Græce), and is explained by no less than four words—church reading-book. Calmet, however, is of opinion (Preface) that this name was given to it because of its resemblance to Ecclesiastes. But as this explanation of the title is very vague, it is rightly rejected by Luther, and almost all modern critics. The word, like many other Greek names of authors, is derived from a word adopted in the African dialect (e. g. Tertull. De pudic. c. 22, p. 438), and thus it may have been applied naturally in the Vetus Latina to a church reading-book; and when that translation was adopted by Jerome (Pref. in Libro Sol. ii, 299; x. 404, ed. Migone), the local title became the prevailing one throughout the West, where the book was most used. The right explanation of the word is given by Rufinus, who remarks that "it does not designate the author of the book, but the character of the writing," as publicly used in the services of the Church (Comm. in Salm. § 80). The biblical application by Rufinus of the general name of the class (ecclesiasticus as opposed to canonici) to the single book may be explained by its wide popularity. Athanasius, for instance, mentions the book (Ep. Fest. s. f.) as one of those "framed by the fathers to be read by those who wish to be instructed (carnis, κατανοηθηναι) in the word of godliness."

11. Design and Method.—The object of this book is to propound the true nature of wisdom, and to set forth the religious and social duties which she teaches us to follow through all the varied stages and vicissitudes of this life, thus exhibiting the practical end of man's existence by reviewing life in all its different bearings and aspects. Wisdom is represented here, as in Proverbs, as the source of human happiness, and the same views of human life, founded on the belief of a recompense, pervade the instructions of this book also, wherein, however, a more matured reflection is perceptible (De Wette's Einleitung). It is, in fact, the composition of a philosopher who had deeply studied the fortunes and misfortunes of mankind, and who does not hesitate to avow himself of the philosophy of older moralists: xii, 8—xiii, 23; xv, 11—20; xvi, 26—xvii, 20; xix, 6—17; xxii, 16—27; xxvi, 1—18; xxx, 1—13; xxxvii, 27; xxxviii, 15, 24—xxxix, 11, etc. (Ib.). It abound in grace, wisdom, and spirit, although sometimes objects more gentle principles of politeness than that of virtue (Cellerier, introd. à la Lecture des Liv. Saints). It is not frequently marked by considerable beauty and elegance of expression, occasionally rising to the sublime heights of human eloquence, (vol. vii). It has been observed of it by Addison (see Horne's Intro. vol. iv) that "it would be regarded by our modern wits as one of the most shining tracts of morality that are extant if it appeared under the name of a Confucius, or of any celebrated Greerian philosopher."

In addition the fact that no Palestinian production, whether inspired or uninspired, can be reduced to a logically developed treatise according to Aristotelian rules, there are difficulties in tracing the plan of this book, arising from the peculiar circumstances of the author, as well as from the work itself. Ben-Sira brings to this task the plan of his work, the experience of a studious and practical life, and in his great anxiety not to omit any useful lesson which he has gathered, he passes on, after the manner of an Eastern logician, from the nature of heavenly wisdom to her godly functions, to their teaching in life, and to the duties of men. He discloses before the eyes of his readers the inward workings of the heart and mind, he depicts all passions and aspirations, all the virtues and vices, all the duties towards God and man, in proverbs and apothegms, in sayings which have been the property of the nation for ages, and in his own creation, with a rapidity and suddenness of transition which even an Eastern mind finds it at times difficult to follow. Add to this that the original Hebrew is lost, that the Greek translation is very obscure, that it has been mutilated for dogmatic purposes, and that some sections are transposed beyond the limits of adjustment, and the difficulty of displaying satisfactorily the method or plan of this book will at once be apparent, and the differences of opinion respecting it will be no matter of surprise. The book (see Fritzsche’s proleg. in his Commentator) is divisible into several parts or sections, the most obvious being chap. iv, which treats of the nature of wisdom, gives encouragements to submit to it, as well as directions for conducting ourselves in harmony with its teachings; 5, xvi, 22—xviii, 17, shows God in the creation, the position man occupies with regard to it, the giving of the law, and gives directions how he is to conduct himself under different circumstances, and how to avoid sin; 3, xxiv, 1—xxxvii, 24; xxxix, 12—xxvii, 16; xxxvii, 25—27, describes wisdom and the law, and the writer’s position as to the former, gives proverbs, maxims, and admonitions about the conduct of men in a social, wise of view: 4, xxxvi—xxviii, 11; xxxvi, 16—22, describes the wise and just conduct of men, the Lord and his people; 5, xxxvi, 23—xxxvii, 11, instructions and admonitions about social matters; 6, xxxix, 12—xiii, 4, God’s creation, and the position man occupies with regard to it; 7, xiii, 11—16, the praise of the Lord and his people, and extended himself in the domain of nature, and in the celebrated ancestors of the Jewish people. Thereupon follows an epilogue, ch. 1, 27—29, in which the author gives his name, and declares those happy who will ponder over the contents of this book, and act according to its teaching as well as an instance of doing so, 1—30, praising the Lord for deliverance from danger, describing how the writer has successfully followed the paths of wisdom from his very youth, and calling upon the uneducated to get the precious treasures of wisdom. See WISDOM PERSONIFIED.

11. Its Unity.—The peculiar difficulties connected
both with the plan of the book and the present de-
arranged condition of its text will have prepared the
reader for accepting the unity and consistency of
this book. We may therefore say that there is no unity
at all in the composition of this book, and
that it is, in fact, a compilation of divers national say-
gings, from various sources, belonging to different ages
(vertexed, in Horne's Introd. ii, 1018 sq.). En-
couragement is sought for these assertions from the
statement respecting the unity of works of this kind: "
môn to τίτημα τῶν πράγματων, αὐτός ἀυτοῦ ἀξίης ἀγαθοστιγματά συναγαγεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτός ἤθε τίνα ἀφεθήκτο, as well as from the remark of St. Jerome:
"Quorum priorum [παντίκευτο ζευιλιφιρά iurirum] 
Helenorum recepti, non Ecclesiae, sed Pauli
pernaeumotum, cui juncti erant Ecclesiastia-
etes et Canticum Canticorum, ut simultinem Salomo-
nis non solium librum numero, sed etiam materia-
rum genere conquireat" [Pref. in Libr. Solom.,]
which seems to imply that the book of Ben-Sira was intended
to answer to all the three reputed works of Proverbs.
So also Luther. Eichhorn can see in it three different
books: the first book consists of chaps. i-xxiiii,
comprising deutschastic remarks upon life and morals,
and is divisible into two sections, viz. (a) i-ix, and (b) x-
xxiiii; the second book comprises xxvii-xlix, 14, begins
with some vivid description of wisdom's works from
which follow some remarks and maxims without any order; and the third
book, comprising xlii, 15-1, 24, is the only portion of
Siraich carefully worked out, and contains praise of
God and the noble ancestors of the Hebrews (Einle-
tung in d. Ap. p. 50, etc.). Ewald, again, assigns
that work to the first experience of the people in the
basis of his book, so that his merit chiefly consists in
arranging those works and supplementing them.
The first of these two books originated in the fourth
century before Christ, extends from ch. i to xvi, 21, and
covers the sphere of the Wisdom, which of all the
canonical books is the most ancient. The second book
originated in the third century before Christ, extends from xvi, 22, to xxi,
22, and displays the excitement of passions as well as
some penetrating observations, and has been greatly
misplaced in its parts, which Ewald rearranges. The
third book, which is the genuine work of Ben-Sira, ex-
ceeds from xvi, 23 to li, 30, with the exception of the
song of praise contained in xxxxi, 12-35, which
belongs to the author of the second work (Geschichte
of V. Jer. iv, 300, etc.; Jahrb. iii, 131, etc.). These
must suffice as specimen of the opinions entertained by
the authors of the book. When perusing the text of this
book, however, it must be urged—1. That the difference
in form and contents of some of the constituent parts
by no means precludes the unity of the whole, seeing
that the writer brought to the illustration of his design
the experience of a long life, spent both in study and
travelling. 2. That this is evidently the work of the
author's life, and was written by him at different pe-
riods. 3. That the same design and spirit pervaded the
whole, as shown in the foregoing section; and, 4. That
the abruptness of some portions of it is to be traced to
the Eastern style of composition, and more especially
to the present deranged state of the Greek translation.

IV. Author and Date.—This is the only apocryphal
book the author of which is known. The writer tells us
himself that his name is Jesus [i.e. Jesus, the son of Siraich, and that he is of Jerusa-
lem (1, 27). Here, therefore, we have the production of
a Palestinian Jew. The conjectures which have been
made to fill up this short note are not warranted
(e. g. that he was a physician, from xxxxi, 1-15)
or absolutely improbable. There is no evidence to
show that he was of priestly descent; and the simili-
arity of names is scarcely a plausible excuse for confun-
ding him with the Hellenizing high-priest Jason
(2 Macc. iv, 11; George Sync. Chron. p. 276). In
the Talmud, the name of Ben-Sira is יִבְנֵשָׂרָא, or which
יהוָאָרָא is a late error, Josh, Geach. d. Judench. p. 311),
occurs in several places as the author of proverbial
sayings which in part are parallel to sentences in
Ecclesiasticus, but nothing is said as to his date or per-
sion, and the tradition which ascribes the authorship of
the book to Elizezer (B.C. 260) is without any adequate
foundation (Jost, iv.; yet see note 1). The Palestinian
origin of the author is, however, substantiated by in-
ternal evidence, e. g. xxiv, 10. For the various
speculations advanced about the person, character,
acquisitions, and position of the author, we must re-
fer to the article Jesus, son of Sirach. That
the book should have been ascribed by the Latin Church
to Solomon, notwithstanding this plain declaration of
the book itself, is due to the credulity of the Latins. If
Siraich is spoken of, the reference to Solomon's success-
ors, to prophets and other great men who lived before
and after the Babylonish captivity, the mention of the
twelve minor prophets (xix, 10), the citation from the
prophet Malachi (comp. xviii, 10, with Mal. iv, 6), and
the description of the high-priest Simoon (chap. 1), only
shows what the fathers can do.

The age of the book has been, and still is, a subject
of great controversy. The life-like description of
the high-priest Simon, contained in chap. i, seems to indi-
cate that the writer had seen this high functionary of
the Temple in action. But the description of the
same name, viz. Simon, son of Onias, named
the Just, or the Pious, who lived B.C. 370-300,
and Simon II, son of Onias, who lived in the reign
of Ptolemy Philopator, B.C. 217-195 (8 Macc. i, 2). See
noted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. iv, 17). The
explanation that Simon I is described by Ben-Sira, whilst
others think that Simon II is intended. The lives and acts
of these two pontiffs, however, as well as the esteem
in which they were respectively held by the people,
as recorded in their national literature, must show to
the reader what of these two high-priests the Ben-Sira
is applicable. 1. The encomiums show beyond
doubt that one of Israel's most renowned high-priests is
described, whereas Simon II was so little distinguish-
ed that Josephus cannot relate a single good thing
about him. 2. Ben-Sira characterizes him as the de-
header of all the people from destruction; whereas in
the time of Simon II no deliverance of either the people
or the Temple was necessary. 3. In the time of Simon
II, Hellenism, the great enemy of Judaism, which was
represented by the sons of Tobias, had made great
progress; and if Ben-Sira had written about Simon II,
we should have expected some comments from this pious poet of
these thoughtless and godless innovations, whereas
there is no allusion to these throughout the whole
of this book. This appears the more strange when it
is borne in mind that Simon II himself sided with
the sons of Tobias, and therefore, that the Ben-Sira
life-like description refers to Simon I. Now Simon
I died B.C. 300, Ben-Sira must have written his
work not earlier than 290-280, as chap. I implies
that this high-priest was dead. (See also infra, sec. vi.)
V. The original Language of the book.—The trans-
lator of this work into Greek most distinctly declares
in his preface that it was written in Hebrew, and St.
Jerome assures us that he had seen the Hebrew original
(cvide supra, sec. iii.). That by the term Ἐφασωρι is
meant Hebrew, and not Aramaic, is evident from
the numerous quotations made from this book both in the Talmud and the Midrashim. Compare

B. Strack, "Talmud and Midrashim," Chap. iii, 20, 20, Chap. I, 18; Bereshith Rab. 10, 10.

vi, 10, 10. Sanhed. 10, 100; Yebamoth, 83, b; Erubin, 65, a.

vii, 54, a. Derek Erets, 19, c, 4.

ix, 6, 9. Sanhed. 100, b; Yebamoth, 83, a.

xii, 8, 10. "Ezekiel, XXIV, 16; "Ezekiel, XXIV, 24; comp. Linde, ap. Eichhorn, p. 41, 42," is scarcely

xi, 1, 1. Jer. Beresch. 28, a; Nazir, 15, a; Beresh. Rab. 78, 3.

xii, 27. Sanhed. 100.

xiii, 15. Baba Kama, 92, b.

xiv, 29. Bereshith Rabba, 92, b.

xvi, 31. Bereshith Rabba, 94, b.


xv, 8, 9. Pesachim, 66; Kebubin, 55, a.

xvii, 35. Tanhumoth Yavnik, 41, b.

xviii, 1. Pesachim, 113.


xxv, 1. Sanhedrin 100; Yebamoth, 83, b.

xxvi, 20. Nida, 70.

xxvii, 8. Baba Kama, 92, b.

xxviii, 14. Yavnik Rab. 150, b.

xxix, 21. Sanhedrin 100, b.

xxx, 26. Yebamoth, 63, b.

xxxii, 1. Sanhedrin 41; Taanith, 9, a; Shemoth R. 106, b.

xxxv, 6. 9. Baba Kama, 92, b.

xxxvi, 4, 8. Beresh. Rab. 8, 8; Yalkut Job, 148.

xxxviii, 10, 1. p. 43, 12; Mekh. Eron, 27.

xli, 28. Betzah, 23, b; Yalkut Job, 149.

xli, 9, 10. Sanhedrin, 106, b.

By some writers, however, it is thought that the Sentences of Ben-Sira were written in genuine Hebrew. Besides, some of the historians, the Greek can only be accounted for from the fact that the original was Hebrew. Thus, for example, in xxiv, 26 we read, "He made him knowledge to come forth as light, as Gihon in the days of vintage, where the parallelism Γνως photoshop (Gen. ii, 18), whereby the Νως is designated in later times, which the Sept. also understands by Γνως (Jer. ii, 18), shows that we φως in the first hemistic originated from the translator's mistaking the Hebrew "וגנ" like a stream, for γνως, like light. Comp. also xlix, 9, 3, which is most unintelligible in the Greek through the translator's mistaking the Hebrew בוש for בוש. Bishop Lowth, indeed, went so far as to assert that the translator "seems to have numbered the words, and exactly to have preserved their order, so that, were it literally and accurately to be retranslated, I have very little doubt that, for the most part, the original diction would be recovered." The learned prelate has actually rettranslated this chapter into Hebrew (Beur. Poet. Lect. xxiv, Oxford ed. 1821, p. 324). This rettranslation is also printed by Fritzsche, who has added some corrections of his own, and who also gives a translation of chap. I.

VI. The Greek and other Translations of this Book.—The English translation incorporated in the Sept. was made by the grandson of the author (δ' ως, μου, μου, 1ηρος), who tells us that he came from Palestine into Egypt in his thirty-eight year, "in the reign of Euergetes (1v ῥυ αγων και ῥασιντ αν ἑν τοι ηερο γους Βασιλειας). But there were two kings who have been supposed by scholars to be the personages thus mentioned, Ptolemy II. Philadephus, B.C. 247-222, and Euergetes II. I. e. Ptolemy VII, known by the nickname Physcon, the brother of Ptolemy VI, B.C. 146-116, and the question is, which of these two is meant? Now, if Ben-Sira wrote B.C. cir. 220-200, when an old man, and if we take δ' ως μου, μου, to mean great-grandfather, a sense which it frequently has, and that the translation of Euergetes is the second the death of this illustrious ancestor, his arrival in Egypt in his thirty-eighth year would be B.C. cir. 230, i. e. in the reign of Euergetes I. On the other hand, the manner in which the translator speaks of the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament, and the familiarity which he shows with it, e. g. xlix, 16, "Eve, Ezek. xxiv, 24; comp. Linde, ap. Eichhorn, p. 41, 42," is scarcely consistent with a date so early as the middle of the third century. Winer (De utr. Synec. etat. Erliang. 1832) maintains that Simon the Just is the person referred to, but that it is not necessary to conclude that the author wrote in the latter's time. He thinks that, although the grammatical construction rather requires ἐν τοι ἐν τοι ἔκτυρον to refer to the age of the monarch's reign, Euergetes the Second was the king in whose reign the translation was made, and that the council could not have been yet closed under the reign of the first Euergetes, as implied in the phrase—"the law, the prophets, and the other books." As there appears to be no special reason for the translator's reference to his own age, the date has been taken to allude to that of the reigning Ptolemy by many critics since, e. g. by Bruch, Palmer, of York, Schenkel, Edwald, Fritzsche, etc. The "thirty-eighth year of his reign," although not applicable to the first Euergetes, may refer to the second, if his regency be included. According to this, which De Wette conceives the most probable hypothesis, the translator would have lived B.C. 130-110. The Second Ptolemy B.C. 180-160, and the Jewish historians, tinterpreters, the chronological datum in question refers to the translator's own age, then the grandson of the author was already past middle-age when he came to Egypt; and if his visit took place early in the reign of Ptolemy Physcon, it is quite possible that the book itself was written while the name was still fresh in his memory, at last, of the "men of the great synagogue" was still familiar to his countrymen. Even if the date of the book he brought somewhat lower than the times of Simon the Just, the importance of the position which that functionary occupied in the history of the Jews would be a sufficient explanation of the distinctness of his portraiture; and the political and social troubles to which the book alludes (ii, 6, 12; xxxix, xii) seek to point to the disorders which marked the transition of Jewish allegiance from Egypt to Syria rather than to the condition of the prosperous times in which the translation was enjoyed during the supremacy of the earlier Ptolemies. On the whole, therefore, we may conclude that the book was probably written B.C. cir. 200, and translated B.C. cir. 140.

The present state of this translation, however, is very debatable; the text as well as the MSS. are greatly disfigured by numerous interpolations, omissions, and transpositions. The Old Latin version, which Jerome adopted in the Vulgate without correcting it, was made from this Greek translation, and, besides being barbarous in style, is also greatly mutilated, and in many instances cannot be harmonized with its original. Even in the first two chapters the following words occur which are found in no other part of the Vulgate: "de functo" (i, 15), "reliquiis" (i, 17, 18, 26), "compartiri" (i, 24), "inuerumallo" (i, 26), "obsolcto" (i, 2; v, 1, 10), "reiusmamma" (i, 14). The Syrian text, on the other hand, is the direct text of the Hebrew, and contains a quotation made by Jose ben-Jochanan about 150 B.C. (comp. Aboth, i, 5 with Ben-Sira ix, 12), which the secondary versions have not, because it was dropped from the Greek. Notwithstanding the ill treatment and the changes which this version has been subjected to, it is still one of the best auxiliaries for the restoration of the old text. The Arabic seems to have been made from the Syrian; whilst the old English version of Coverdale, as usual, follows the Zurich Bible and the Vulgate, the Bishops' Bible again copies Coverdale; the Genevan version, as is often the case, departs from the other
English version for the better. The present A. V. chiefly follows the Complutensian edition of the Greek as the Latin Vulgate. The arrangement, however, of chaps. xxx, xxxv—xxxvi, 17 in the Vatican and Complutensian editions is very different. The English version here follows the latter, which is supported by the Latin and Syriac versions against the authority of the Uncial MSS. The extent of the variation may be seen in the following:

Compl., Lat., Syr. A. V. | Fust., MSS. "A, B, C, "
---|---
xxx, 20 | xxxii, 13, λαμπρος καιρος, κ. τ.
xxxii, 20 | xxxiv, xxxv.
xxxii, 16, 17, ληποτωθεσα, κ. τ. | xxxii, 1—16.
xxxii, 10, μεταλαμπαινον | xxxiv, xxxv.
xxxii, 12, μεταλαμπαινον | xxxiv, xxxv.
xxxii, 11—11, φανελαν λαμακος | xxxii, 1—13.
xxxii, 12, και κατεληπτον | xxxvi, 17, ιο.

The most important interpellations are: i, 5, 7; 180; ii, 25; iv, 225; v, 225, 20; xii, 25; xiii, 25; xiv, 25, 22; xv, 5, 10, 17, 18, 21, 21; 225, 225; xvii, 23, 227, 227; xix, 56, 126, 147, 170; xv, 25; 225, 225; xx, 14, 22; xxi, 9, 10, 23c; xxii, 5, 4c, 5b, 19, 26, 225; xxiv, 19, 24; xxi, 19, 25; xxi, 19—27, 1, 29.

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

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

VII. Canonicity.—Though this book has been quoted in the Jewish Church as early as B.C. 150 and 100, by Joseph ben-Jochanan (Aboth, i, 5), and Simon ben-Shetach (Yanir, v, 3), and references to it are dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim (vide supra, sec. v), yet these latter declare most distinctly that it is not canonical. Thus Yalkut, c. ii, says the book of Ben-Sira, and all the books written from its time and afterwards, are not canonical. We also learn from this remark that Ben-Sira is the oldest of all apocryphal books, thus confirming the date assigned to it in section iv. A. 11, by Dr. Reay, that he who studies uncanonical books will have no portion in the world to come (Mishna, Shaked, x, 1), is explained by the Jev. Talmud to mean the books of Ben-Sira and Ben-Lazana (comp. the Midrash on Cohesheth xii, 12), it was not, however, named by the Jews as the canonical Scriptures; for though it is quoted in the Talmud, and at times like the Kethubim, yet the study of it was forbidden, and it was classed among "the other books (nı̂sbe, ¸é, lzn), that is, probably, those which were not admitted into the Canon (Dukes, Rabb. Blumenleer, p. 24 sq.)."

Allusions to this book have been supposed to be not unfrequently discernible in the New Testament (comp. especially, Ecclus. xxx, xiii; Rom. ix, 21; xi, 19; Luke xii, 19, 20; v, 11; James i, 19, etc.; xxiv, 17, 18; Matt. xi, 29, 29; John iv, 18, 14; vi, 35, etc.). The earliest clear coincidence with the contents of the book occurs in the epistle of Barnabas (c. xix Ecclus. iv, 31; compare Const. Apost. vii, 11), but in this case the parallelism consists in the thought and not in the words, and there is no mark of quotation. There is no sign of the use of the book in Justin Martyr, which is the more remarkable, as it offers several thought-provoking parallels in style. The first distinct quotations occur in Clement of Alexandria; but from the end of the second century the book was much used and cited with respect, and in the same terms as the canonical Scriptures; and its authorship was often assigned to Solomon, from the similarity which it presented to his writings (August, De Croa pro Mort. 18), Clement speaks of it continually as Scripture (Pied. i, 62; iii, 44; iv, 80, 82), and as the word of Solomon (Strom. ii, 5, § 54), and as the voice of the great Master (taulawuyow, Plo. ii, 10, § 98). Origl cites passages with the same formula as the canonical books (γραμταν, in Johann. xxx, 14; in Matt. xvi, 8, § 8), as Scripture (Comm. in Matt. 44; in Ep. ad Rom. i, 23, 24; and as the utterance of the divine word (c. Cels. viii, 50). The other writers of the Alexandrian school follow the same practice. Dionsius calls its words "divine oraclels (Frag. de Nat. iii, p. 1268, ed. Migne), and Peter Martyr quotes it as the work of "the Preacher" (Frag. § 5, p. 515, ed. Migne). The passage quoted from the Tertullian treatise, Lib. de M. N., 14, 29, is in the form of an argument that even in controversy (c. Jul. Peleq, v, 30); but he expressly notices that it was not in the Hebrew Canon (De Croa pro Mort. 18), "though the Church, especially of the West, had received it into authority" (De Giesi. xvi, 20; compare Speculum, iii, 1127, ed. Paris). Jerome, in a like manner, in Speculum, ii, 20, represents the book with "the canonical Scriptures" as "doubtful," while they are "sure," and in another place (Prol. Guliel.), he says that it "is not in the Canon," and again (Prol. in Libr. Sol.), that it should be read "for the instruction of the people (gelpis), not to support the doctrine of ecclesiastical discipline. The book is cited by Hippolytus (Opp. p. 192) and by Eusebius (Opp. iv, 21, etc.), but is not quoted by Irenaeus; and it is not contained in the Canon of Melito, Origen, Cyril, Laodicea, Hilary, or Rufinus. See Canon.

While the book is destitute of the highest canonical authority, it is of the most important monument of the religious state of the Jews at the period of its composition. As an expression of Palestinian theology it stands alone; for there is no sufficient reason for assuming Alexandrian interpolations, or direct Alexandrian influence (Gneuss, Philo, Philo. ii, 129 sq.). The conception of God as Creator, Preserver, and Governor is strictly conformable to the old Mosaic type; but, at the same time, his mercy is extended to all mankind (xviii, 11-13). Little stress is laid upon the spirit-world, either good (xlvii, 21; xlv, 2; xxxxii, 28) or evil (xxvi, 27), and the doctrine of a resurrection fades away (xlv, 14; xlvii, 24, 28; xlv, 14, 15). Yet comp. xlviii, 11). In addition to the general hope of restoration (xxvii, 1 etc.), one trait only of a Messianic faith is preserved, in which the writer contemplates the future work of Elias (xlviii, 10). The ethical precepts are addressed to the middle class (Eichhorn, Einl. p. 44 sq.). The praise of agriculture (vii, 15) and medicine (xxxviii, 1 sq.), and the constant reference to cheerfulfulness and cheerfulness at the thought of a time when men's thoughts were turned inwards with feelings of despondency and perhaps (Dukes, u. a. p. 27 sq.) of fatalism. At least the book marks the growth of that anxious idealism which was conspicuous in the sayings of the later doctors. Life is already impressed in rules; religion is degenerating into ritualism. knowledge has taken refuge in schools (compare Ewald, Gesch. d. Vold. Israel. 4. 298 sq.)—Kitto, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

VIII. Commentaries, etc.—Special exegetical works which have appeared on the whole of this book are the
ECCLESIOLOGY

of the pulpit; of the hour-glass stand, by which the preacher was warned not to weary the audience; of the flocks; of the reading pew; of the benches, pews, and galleries; of the aisles; of the shrines, fount, or reliquary; of the benediction, or holy-water stoup; of the corbels, with special reference to the head-dress figured on them; of the pavement; of the belfry; of the baptismal font, with its accessories: of the steps, the kneeling-stone, the chasismory, the cover, and the desk; of the tower, with its lantern, parapet, pinnacles, louvres, windows, buttresses, and bells; of the porch and doors, with their niches and seats; of the parvise, or priest's chamber, above the porch; of the monastic cloisters; of the monastic hedges; of the grottoes, or rain-spouts; of the church-yard or village cross; of the church-yard pew; of the lych-gate, or corse-gate, where the corpse was met by the priest; of the crypt; of the confession; of the hagiooscope, or opening in the chancel arch through which the elevation of the host might be seen; of the lych-envelopes, or low window in the side wall of the chancel, the use of which is uncertain; of the chest for alms; of the table of the ten commandments; of the church plate; of the fauld-stool, or lityn stove; of the embroidered vestments; of the work of the image-makers, etc.; of the sepulchral monuments and brasses, with their inscriptions; of the chapels or sacristies; of the vestry; of the dedication crosses. Ecclesiology has a literature of its own, including a monthly journal, called The Ecclesiologist. There are societies for promoting its study, one of which, the Ecclesiological, late Cambridge Camden Society, has published A Hand-book of English Ecclesiology (Lond. 1847).

Ecdippa. See ACHUBE.

Echard, Jacques, a learned Dominican, was born at Rouen September 22, 1644, and died at Paris March 15, 1724. He published S. Thomas Summa suo autori minullo, et in fine F. Vincenti, Bollandonis scripta dissertation, in qua quid de speculo morali sententiam operatur (1708, 8vo). He has contributed to illustrate his order by the "Library of Dominican Writers" (Scriptores ordinis Recitatorum recens, notisque illustrati, incomplit. J. Quinti, et J. Echard, Facs. 1719-21, 2 vols. fol.). He held a high position among all bibliographers.—Hoefner, Novum. Diogr. Ger. v. 623.

Echard, Lawrence, A.M., archdeacon of Stowe, was born in Suffolk about 1671, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge. He was presented to the livings of Welton and Elkington, Lincolnshire, and was made archdeacon of Lincoln and prebendary of Stowe in 1712. He died Aug. 16, 1730. In his History of England, written on High-Church principles, he relates facts with perspicuity; and the work is rendered entertaining by short characterizations of the most eminent literary men in the different periods of history. At present, his writings are little valued. His chief works are, (1) A general Ecclesiastical History, from the Nativity of our Saviour to the first Establishment of Christianity by human Laws under Constantine (Lond. 1727, 2 vols. 8vo, 6th edit.); (2) The Roman History, from the building of the City to the Removal of the Holy Seat by Constantine the Great (Lond. 1707, 4 vols. 8vo, 1st edit.); (3) The History of England to the end of the Revolution (Lond. 1707-18, 3 vol. fol.).—Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i. 540; Kripps, Biographia Britannica, v. 592.

Eck or Eckius, Johannes (Johann Mayer von Eck), one of the most capable and violent of Luther's opponents, was born in Swabia, Nov. 14, 1486, the son of a peasant. He was educated at Heidelberg and Tubingen, and in 1516 was made professor and vice-chancellor at Ingolstadt. His intense ambition for literary fame stimulated him to unwearied activity and industry. In 1512 he was made vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. In 1514 he published Cen-
from his promise, and he so declared to the elector Frederick on the 13th of March. He wrote at once a reply to Eck, so unanswerable in all its points, and so full of severity, that Eck could no longer remain in doubt as to the fate which awaited him at Leipzig. Eck's aim was undoubtedly not so much to gain the mastery over Carlstadt as over Luther. He published his "Fidei Defensio" (February 1518), in which he accused Luther of being willing to defend against Luther. They referred chiefly to the doctrine of penitence and absolution, and the thirteenth especially sought to provoke an answer from Luther which should make him liable to the Inquisition for heresy. It read: "Romane Ecelest omnes ecclesias ante temporis Sibyllarum, negeamus. Sed eum, qui sedem beataissimi Petri habuit et fidem, successorum Petri et Vicariam Christi generalium semper auguriamus." Eck here really gained his object. Luther accepted the challenge, and answered it by the following: "Romane Ecclesiae omnibus suis sacerdotiis, precedentur et frigidissimis Roman. Pontificum decreta, intra quarumregiones annos nous. Contra qua sunt historiae approbatae et centum annorum, testis scripturae divinae et decretae Niceni Concilii omnium sacra- sissimae." Eck, eager to bring Luther into a still more acute and inextricable conflict, as he was always anxious, on 14, 1519, the following: "Excusatio aderens criminationes Fr. M. Lutheri, ordinis Eremitarum," with the accusation that Luther was a coward, and that he only endeavored to advance Carlstadt in order that he might himself safely retire. To this Luther replied in another "Excommunicationis et Defensionis Dr. J. Ecki," and with the assertion "Ich suche mich weder vor dem Pöbel und des Pöbelns Namen noch vor Pilschen und Puppen" (I am neither afraid of the pope or the pope's name, nor of popings or puppets). But in his letters to Zwingli, which he addressed on this subject, he charged Zwingli with having had the task to quiet Spalatinus, who had grown very doubtful as to the final result of the dispute. But Luther was already decided not to spare the Roman see. The Roman Church he calls (De Weete, Luther's Briefe, i, 260) "Babylon," the power of the Roman pontiff which counts among worldly powers (ib. i, 261). Meanwhile many causes delayed disputation. At last the personal interference of Duke George, who asked of the bishop "not to defend the lazy priests, but to oblige them to meet the battle manfully, unless the pope should interfere," had driven all other details into the background. The session opened at Leipsic June 27, 1519, and from that date to July 8 Eck and Carlstadt were the disputants. Eck admitted that the Scriptures were the ultimate rule of doctrine, and maintained a syncretistic doctrine as to grace and free-will. Carlstadt supported the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and that good works are from grace alone. The controversy led to no result. "On Monday, the 4th of July, at seven in the morning, Luther arose; the antagonist whom Eck most ardently desired to meet, and whose rising fame he hoped to crush by a brilliant victory. He stood in the prime of manhood, and in the fullness of his strength: he was in his thirty-sixth year; his voice was melodious and clear; he was perfectly versed in the Bible, and its aptest sentences presented themselves unbidden to his mind; above all, he inspired an irresistible vitality of argument which struck the truth. The battle immediately commenced on the question of the authority of the papacy, which, at once intelligible and important, riveted universal attention. It was immediately obvious that Luther could not maintain his assertion that the pope's primacy dated only from the last four centuries: he soon found himself forced from this position by ancient documents; and the rather, that no criticism had as yet shaken the authenticity of the false decreals. But his attack on the doctrine that the primacy of the pope (whom he still persisted in regarding as the ecclesiastical bishop) was founded on Scripture and by divine right, was far
more formidable. Christ's words, 'Thou art Peter; feed my sheep,' which have always been cited in this controversy, belong, however, to a later exposition. Nicolaus Lyra's also, of which Luther made the most use, there occurs this explanation, differing from that of the curia, of the passage in Matthew, chap. xvi: 'Quia tu es Petrus, i.e. confessor vere petra qui est Christus fusta; et super hanc petrum, quam conc formavi, edificabo ecclesiam meam.' Luther labored to support the already well-known explanation of them, at variance with that of the curia, by other passages which record similar commissions given to the apostles. Eck quoted passages from the fathers in support of his opinions, to which Luther opposed passages from the same authorities. On this point he would not go into these more recondite regions, Luther's superiority became incontestable. One of his main arguments was that the Greeks had never acknowledged the pope, and yet had not been pronounced heretics; the Greek Church had stood, was standing, and would stand without the papacy. The Gregorian was as the Roman. Eck did not hesitate at once to declare that the Christian and the Roman Church were one; that the churches of Greece and Asia had fallen away, not only from the pope, but from the Christian faith—that they were, so to say, heretical. The whole circuit of the Turkish empire, for instance, was there not one soul that could be saved, with the exception of the few who adhered to the pope of Rome. 'How?' said Luther; 'would you pronounce damnation on the whole Greek Church, which has produced the most eminent fathers, and which has stood against the whole circuit of the Turk? How, then, could it be maintained that no council could be subject to error? Reverend father,' replied Eck, 'if you believe that a council regularly convoked can err, you are to me as a heathen and a publican.' (Disputatio Ecclesiasticae de Anno Domini, 1509.) Such were the results of this discussion. It was continued for a time, and opinions more or less conflicting on purgatory, indulgences, and penance were uttered. Eck renewed the interrupted contest with Carstadt; and although, in the end, the reports of the identity of Christ and his Church, and the doctrine of the two universities; but all these measures could lead to nothing further. The main result of the meeting was, that Luther no longer acknowledged the authority of the Roman Church in matters of faith. At first he had only attacked the instructions given to the preachers and indulgent souls, and the young schoolmen, but he had expressly restrained the decretales of the pope; then he had rejected these, but with appeal to the decision of a council: he now emancipated himself from this last remaining human authority also; and the Confession of the Philistia, and History of Reformation, Austin's translation, bk. ii. ch. iii. After the dispute, in which Eck's pride of intellect had been grievously wounded, he wrote (July 23) a letter to the elector of Saxony exhorting him to discourage the pernicious doctrines of his professor, and to cause his books to be burned. Farel replied with some delay and great moderation, and Carlstadt with bitterness. A bitter controversy followed, in which Melanchton took part, and Eck got the worst of it. In February, 1520, Eck also completed a treatise on the supremacy, in which he promises triumphant victory and clearly to contest Luther's assertion that "it is not of divine right." "Observe, reader," says he, "and thou shalt see that I keep my word." Nor is his work by any means devoid of learning and talent. After obtaining a condemnation of Luther from the university of Louvain and Cologne, Eck went to Rome (1520) to present his book to the pope, and to stir up feeling against Luther. His exhortations animated the enemies of Luther, and they at length prevailed upon the pope to summon a congregation, which was passed sentence of condemnation upon Luther. Leo X. in fact, openly appointed Eck as his nuncio for the promulgation of his bull in Germany. Elated by vanity, Eck set out with puerile exultation to inflict, as he thought, a fatal blow on his devoted adversary. In September he caused the bull to be fixed up in public places in Meijs-
ECKART 49

ECCLESIASTICS. (1.) a sect of ancient philosophers, who professed to select (Selekt) from all systems of philosophy what they deemed to be true. The Ecclesiasts were chiefly Neo-Platonists (q.v.), and the philosophers chiefly selected from were Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. "This union of the Aristotelian and Platonic philosophies was first by Posthumus Pan- drois, whose principles were taken up and maintained by Ammonius Saccas. It may be doubted, however, if the title of ecleci:is can be properly given to Potamo- or Ammonius, the former of whom was in fact merely a Neo-Platonist, and the latter rather jumbled together the different systems of Greek philosophy (with the exception of that of Epicurus) than selected the consistent parts of all of them. The most eminent of the followers of Ammonius were Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblicus, Proclus, and the ancient Eclecticism became at last little more than an attempt to reconcile Platonism with Christianity." (Penny Cyclop. ix, 260.) See Ammonius.

Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. I, 228) said: "By philosophy I mean neither the Stoic, nor the Platonic, nor the Epicurean, nor the Aristotelian, but whatever things have been properly said by each of these, and the knowledge—this whole selection I call philosophy." "The sense in which this term is used by Clemens" (of Alexandria), says Mr. Maurice (Mor. and Metaphs. Phil., ii, 33), "is obvious enough. He did not care for Plato, Aristotle, Pythago- rae, as such; far less did he care for the opinions and conflicts of the schools which bore their names; he found in each hints of precious truths of which he de- sired to avail himself; he would gather the flowers without asking in what garden they grew, the prickles he would leave for those who had a fancy for them. Eclecticism, in his sense, seemed only another like another name for catholic wisdom. A man, conscious that every- thing in nature and art was given for his learning, had a right to suck honey wherever it was to be found; he would find sweetness in it if it was hanging wild on trees and shrubs; he could admire the elaborate architec- ture of the cellars in which it was stored. The Au- thor of all good to man had scattered the gifts, had imparted the skill; to receive them thankfully was an act of homage to him. But once lose the feeling of devotion and gratitude, which belonged so remarkably to Clemens—once let it be fancied that the philosopher was not a mere receiver of gifts which had been provided for him, but an ingenious chemist and compounder of various naturally unusable ingredients, and the ecclesiastical doctrine would lead to more self-con-
ECLIPSE

be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood,” we
can hardly avoid discerning an acquaintance with the
appearance of those luminaries while under eclipse.
The interruption of the sun’s light causes him to ap-
pear black; and the moon, during a total eclipse, ex-
hibits a copper color, or what Scripture intends by a
bloody moon. The Biblical narrative is not in par-
nature inspired by an eclipse in the minds of those
who are unacquainted with the cause of it rendered it
a token of impending judgment in the prophetic
books. See EARTHQUAKE.

The plague of darkness in Egypt has been ascribed
by some to the natural phenomena of other countries non-miraculous
agency, but no sufficient account of its intense degree,
long duration, and limited area, as proceeding from
any physical cause, has been given. See PLAGUE OF EGYPT.

Josephus mentions (Ant. xvii, 6, 4 s. f.) an eclipse of
the moon as occurring on the night when Herod
deprived Matthias of the priesthood, and burnt alive
the seditious Matthias and his accomplices. This is
of great importance in the chronology of Herod’s reign,
as it immediately preceded his own death. It has
been connected with the reappearance March 13, B.C. 4. See
HEROD (THE GREAT).

The darkness is in the giv yv of Matt. xxvii, 45, attending the crucifixion has been similarly attributed
to an eclipse. See CRUCIFIXION (OF CHRIST).

Phlegon of Tralles, indeed, mentions an eclipse of
intense darkness, which, he says, in Bithynia, with an
earthquake, which, in the uncertain state of our chronology (see Clinton’s Fusi Romani, Olympia, 202), more or less nearly synchronizes
with the event. Nor was the account without re-
ception in the early Church. See the testimonies to
that effect contained in the History of Phlegon
vindicated, London, 1732). Origen, however, ad loc.
(Latin commentary on Matthew), denies the possibility
of such a cause, arguing that by the fixed Pashcal
reckoning the moon must have been about full, and
denying that Luke xxiii, 45, by the words idoneopho o
παρασκευή, to indicate that fact as the cause. The
genuineness of this commentary has been impeached,
nor is its tenor consistent with Origen adev. Cels. p. 80;
but the argument, unless on such an assumption as
mentioned below, seems decisive, and has ever
since been accounted for to the judgment of Judea. Dean Alford (ad loc.), though without stating
his reason, prefers the wider interpretation of all
the earth’s surface on which it would naturally have
been day. That Phlegon’s darkness, perceived so intense
in Tralles and Bithynia, was felt in Judea, is highly
probable. All the other phenomena of coincidence
darkness and earthquake, taken in connection with the near agreement of time,
gives a probability to the supposition that the former
speaks of the same circumstances as the latter. Wies-
leart (Chron. Synop. p. 880), however, and De Wette (Com-
ment. on Matt.) consider the year of Phlegon’s eclipse
an impossible one for the crucifixion, and reject that
explanation of the darkness. The argument from
the duration (three hours) is also of great force, for an
eclipse seldom lasts in great intensity more than six
minutes. The darkness was instantly dispersed, moreover,
cannot with reason be attributed to the eclipse. If the
moon was at the full at the time of the Passover (q. v.).

On the other hand, Seyfarth (Chronol. Sacr. p. 58, 9) maintains that the Jewish calendar, owing to
their following the sun, had become so far out that the
moon might possibly have been new, and thus,
emitting the year as a possible epoch, revives the argu-
ment for the eclipse as the cause. He, however, views
this rather as a natural basis than as a full account of
the darkness, which in its degree at Jerusalem was
still preternatural (ib. p. 138). The pamphlet of Whis-
ton above quoted, and two by Dr. Sykes, Dissertation
on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, and Defense of the
ECONOMY

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

Ecclesia, a proclamation or formula of faith, in the form of an edict, written by Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, published A.D. 690 by the emperor Heraclius, to put an end to the troubles occasioned by the Pseudo-Martyr cassia. It professes to answer the question, Whether in Christ there were one or two orations? though in the same edict the doctrine of one will was plainly inculcated. A considerable number of the Eastern bishops declared their assent to this law, which was also submissively received by Pseudo-Martyr cassia. A patriarch of Constantinople in the East, and in the West the case was quite different. The Roman pontiff, John I, assembled a council at Rome, A.D. 629, in which the ecclesia was rejected, and the Monothelites were condemned (Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. N. Y. ed. i. 435). A copy of it is given in Herodotus, Conclav. iii. 70. It also occurs in Gieseler, Church History, i. 126; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, iii, 184 sq. See Euchelians.

Ecuador (the Spanish term for Equator), a republic in South America. In lat. it extends from 1° 28' N. to 4° 45' S., while in long. it stretches from 79° to 81° 20'. It measures, therefore, from north to south fully 400 miles, and from east to west nearly 850, presenting an area of about 100,000 square miles. It is bounded by the United States of Colombia, Brazil, Peru, and the Pacific. The population in 1888 was given at 1,004,651, in which the savage and heathen Indians of the eastern province were included, although estimated at 160,000. Six cities have a population of more than 10,000. The majority of the population is of the aboriginal race, speaking the Quichua or some cognate language. Ecuador, until the beginning of the present century, belonged to the Spanish vicereignty of New Granada. After the establishment of the independence of the Spanish colonies, Ecuador formed part, until 1830, of the federal republic of Colombia. Since 1830 it has been an independent republic. The chief cities are Quito, the capital, and Guayaquil, the emporium of foreign trade. The government appears to have been constituted on the model of the United States of North America, having a president and vice-president, with a Senate and a House of Representatives. All the inhabitants belong to the Roman Catholic Church, which contains the following dioceses: 1. The archbishopric of Quito, established as an episcopal see in 1580, and since 1562. 2. The bishopric of Guayaquil, established in 1838; 3. the bishopric of Nueva Cuenca. The public exercise of no other religion is allowed by the Constitution of the state. There were, in 1855, 277 parochial and 106 vice-archdiocesan churches, 554 secular priests, 262 monks in 36 and 202 nuns in 11 convents. The University of Quito, established in 1866 by the Jesuits, has 4 colleges and several seminaries. There were 11 high schools, called colleges or seminaries, and 290 primary schools, of which 30 were for girls. Nearly all the scholars were the children of the whites and mulattoes; the Indian population grows up almost without education. — Algemeine Real-Encyk. iv. 1019; Villavicencio, Cronología de la República del Ecuador (N. Y. 1858). (A. J. S.)

Ed, i. e. "witness" (for Heb. id. ה), supplied (apparently on the authority of a few MSS, and also of the Syr. and the Arab. versions) in the A. V. as the name of the altar erected by the three tribes east of Jordan in commemoration of their adhesion to the other (Josh. xxii. 40). The commonly received Heb. text is literally as follows: "And the sons of Reuben, and the sons of Gad called the altar [יַעֲבֹדָה יִבְרָעֵל, Sept. yahweha yivrael, Vulg. vocaverunt]; for a witness is this [ןַעֲבֹדָה יִבְרָעֵל, Sept. yahweha yivrael, Vulg. testimonium], etc., or as it may be rendered (ץַעֲבֹדָה יִבְרָעֵל being sometimes used absolutely thus), "gave a name to the altar, [saying]," etc. The gloss is unnecessary (see Maurer, Comment, in loc.), for the latter clause furnishes both the name and the explanation (Keil, Comment, in loc.), i. e. they named the altar (as follows), 'This is a witness," etc. See Oakey.

E'dar (Heb. 'Edar, אֶדֶּר, flock, as often rendered), the name of a tower (אֶדֶר), beyond (ἐνδρόμω) which Jacob first built between Bethelhem and Hebron (Gen. xxxv. 21, Sept. Θεσπ. Vat. omits, Vulg. Eder). In Mic. iv. 8 (Sept., Vulg., and A. V. translate παροιμίαν, greez, "flock") it is put for the neighboring village Bethelhem itself, and hence tropically for the royal line of David as sprung thence. It perhaps derived its name from the fact of having been erected as a guard [see Migdal-] flocks, or else from some individual of the name of Eder (q. v.). Jerome (who calls it turris Ader) says it lay 1000 paces from Bethlehem (Onomast. s. v. Bethlehem), and intimates that it contained a prophetic anticipation (comp. Targum of Pseudo-Jonah in loc.) of the birth of the Messiah on the same spot (Luke ii. 7, 8). (See Albert, De turri Ederi, Lips. 1689.) See Bethlehem.

Edayoth. See Talmad.

Eddy, John Reynolds, a Methodist Episcopal minister, son of Rev. Augustus Eddy, was born in Xenia, Ohio, Oct. 10, 1829, obtained a liberal English education, and made some proficiency in the classics. He commenced a study of law, but determined to devote himself to the ministry, and was admitted on trial in the North-west Indiana Conference in 1856. After filling various appointments acceptably, he accepted in 1862 the chaplaincy of the 72d Indiana Regiment. He immediately joined his regiment at Camp Atalissa, freeholders, and commenced his labors among the soldiers. Sunday, June 11, he preached from Prov. xvi. 32; Wednesday, June 24, during a fight between colonel Wilder's cavalry brigade and a rebel force he was instantly killed by a shell.—Min. of Conferences, 1868.

Edelmann, Johann Christian, an infidel German writer, was born at Weissenfels in 1668, and studied theology at Jena. From his youth he evinced an unsteadiness of mind, which afterwards led him, after oscillating between the different Christian denominations, to forsake them all and become an opponent of all orthodoxy. He rejected the Christian revelation as a part of the essence of God, in no way different from him. For some years he abstained from all animal food, in order, as he expressed it, not to eat a part of divinity. He had previously taken part in the translation of the Bible, published at Berlin (q. v.). His principal work is Unschuldige Wahrheiten, in which he attempts to prove that no religion is of any importance: — Moes mit aufgedecktem Angesicht (1740, 8vo); — Christ und Babel (1741, 8vo); — die Gottlichkeit d. Vernunft (1742, 8vo).

He finally went to Berlin, where Friedrich II tolerated
his presence on the plea that he had to put up with many other fools. Edelmann died in Berlin Feb. 15, 1750. See Praetoria, Nachtrichten (1831). He is more just towards heathenism than towards Judaism, and more just towards Judaism than towards Chris-
tianity. Everything positive in religion is, as such, superstitition. Christ was a mere man, whose chief merit consists in the struggle against superstition. What he taught and what he was anxious for, no one, however, may attempt to learn from the New Testa-
ment writings, inasmuch as these were forged as late as the time of Constantine. All which the Church teaches of his divinity, of his merits, of the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, is absurd. There is no rule of true but reason, and it manifests its truths di-
rectly by a peculiar sense. Whatever this sense says is true. It is this sense which perceives the world. The reality of everything which exists is God. In the sense in which the world admires the reality of the world admires also the reality of God. God is not a

person, least of all are there three persons in God. If God be the substance in all the phenomena, then it follows of itself that God cannot be thought of without the world, and hence that the world has no more

an original in it than has an end. Omnipotence cannot mean the world the body of God, the shadow of God, the son of God. The spirit of God is in all that exists. It is ridiculous to ascribe inspiration to special persons only; every one ought to be a Christ, a prophet, an inspired man. The human spirit, being a breath of God, does not perish; our spirit, separated from its body by death, enters into a connection with some oth-
er body. Thus Edelmann taught a kind of metempsy-
chosis. What he taught had been thoroughly and in-

igeniously said in France and England; but from a

German theologian, and that with such eloquent coarse-

ess, with such a mastery in expatiating in blasphemy, such things were unheard of. But as yet the faith of the Church was a power in Germany!' (Kahnis, German Protestantism, bk. 1, chap. ii. § 2). An autograph-

ography of Edelmann was published by Klose (Berlin, 1836). See also, in the

Kleine, II stor, vol. iii, 242, 243; vol. iv, 168, 169. Major Wil-

ford and professor Wilson find its elements in the

Sanskrit. The Greek ἔθνος is next to identical with it in both sound and sense. It occurs in three places (Isa. xxxvii, 12; Ezek. xxxvii, 23; Amos i, 5) as the name of some eminently pleasant districts, but not the Eden of this article. Of them we have no certain knowledge, except that the latter instance points to the neighborhood of Damascus. In these cases it is pointed, in the Hebrew text, with both syllables short (772); but when it is applied to the primitive seat of man, the first syllable is long. The passages in which it occurs in the latter sense are, in addition to Gen. ii, iii, iv, 10, the few following, of which we transcribe the

chief, because they cast light upon the primordial value:

"He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her des-

tert like the garden of Jehovah." "This is that has been in

Eden, the garden of God." "All the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him." "This land which was desolate is become like the garden of Eden" (Isa. i, 8; Ezek. xxix, 13; xxxi, 9, 16, 18, xxxvi, 85; Joel ii, 8). All this evidence goes to show that Eden is rendered "Paradisus," a proper name in three pas-
sages only, Gen. ii, 8, 10; iv, 16, where it is represent-
ed by ἔδαφος. In all others, with the exception of Isa.

ii, 8, it is translated ἐδαφεῖς. In the Vulgate it never occurs as a proper name, but is rendered "culpitas," "locus culpatis," or "deliciar." The Turyn of On-

kelos gives it uniformly ἔδαφος, and in the Peshito Syr-

iac it is the same, with a slight variation in two pas-
sages only.

II. Biblical Description.—The following is a simple translation of the Mosai account of the situation of the Adamic Paradise (Gen. ii, 8-17). See GENEISIS.

Now Jehovah God had planted a garden in Eden eastward, and he placed there the man whom he formed out of the soil. And Jehovah God caused to spring from the ground every tree pleasant for sight or good for food; also the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was in the midst of the garden. Now a river issued from Eden to water the garden, and thence it was parted, and became four head-streams: the name of the first is Pishon, which supplies the one that passes through the land of the Chavilah, where is [the metal] gold (the gold too of that land [is] good); there also [is] the substance called Hiddekel, which supplies a river called the Tigris; and the name of the second river is Gihon; thia [is] the one that supplies all the land of Asshur; and the name of the third river is Têkakô; thia [is] the one that supplies the Euphrates; and the name of the fourth river, that is Perih, supplies the garden of Eden, to tile it, and to keep it. Then Jehovah God took the man, and settled him in the garden of Eden, to till it and to keep it. Then Jehovah God enjoined upon the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; except of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—then shall not eat of it; in the day of thy eating of it thou shalt surely die." The garden of Paradise is here said to be to the east, i. e. in the eastern part of the tract of Eden (see Cense-

nius, Heb. Iez. s. v.). The river which flowed through Eden watered the garden, and thence branched off into four distinct streams. The first problem to be solved, then, is this: To find a river which, at some stage of its course, is divided into four streams, two of which supply the garden and are called the Euphrates; and these rivers with the Hiddekel and Perath has never been disputed, and no hypothesis which omits them is worthy of consideration. Setting aside minor differences of detail, the theories which have been framed with regard to the explanation of the above description of the terrestrial part of the garden, can naturally divide themselves into two classes. The first class includes all those which place the main river of the garden of Eden be-

low the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris, and in-

terpret the names Pison and Gihon of certain portions of these rivers; the second, those which place the Euphrates in the high table-land of Armenia, the fruitful parent of many noble streams. These theories have been sup-

ported by most learned men of all nations, of all ages, and repre

senting every shade of theological belief; but there is scarcely one which is not based in some degree upon a misinterpretation of a part of the narrative. Those who contend that the united stream of the Euphrates and Tigris is the "river" which "goeth forth from Eden to water the garden," have commit-

ted a fatal error in neglecting the true meaning of ἔδαφος, which is only used of the course of a river from its source downerida (comp. Ezek. xlvii, 1). Following the guidance which this word supplies, the de-
scription in ver. 10 must be explained in this manner: the river which takes its rise in Eden, flows into the garden, and from there is divided into four rivers; the separation taking place either in the garden or after leaving it. If this be the case, the Tigris and Euphrates before junction cannot, in this position of the garden, be two of the four branches in question. But, though the Tigris and Euphrates are the third and fourth second class have generally been driven into another but little less destructive. Looking for the true site of Eden in the highlands of Armenia, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, and applying the names Pison and Gibon to some one or other of the rivers which spring from the same region, they have been compelled to give to the meaning of וָּרִיבָּה, a sense which is scarcely supported by a single passage. In no instance is וָּרִיבָּה (lit. "head") applied to the source of a river. On several occasions (comp. Judg. v. 16; Job i. 17, etc.) it is used of the detachments into which the main body of an army is divided, and analogy therefore leads to the conclusion that וָּרִיבָּה denotes the "branches" of the parent stream. There are other difficulties in the details of the several theories which may be obstacles to their entire reception, but it is manifest that no theory which fails to explain above-men menoned cannot be allowed to take its place among things that are probable. What, then, is the river which goes forth from Eden to water the garden? It is a question which has often been asked, and still waits for a fully satisfactory answer. That the ocean stream which surrounded the earth was the source from which the four rivers flowed was the opinion of Josephus (Ant. i. 1, 3; and Johannes Damascenus (De Orthod. Fid. ii. 9). It was the Skat el-Arab, according to those who place the garden of Eden below the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, and their conjecture would deserve consid- eration were it not that this stream is, so far as any degree of propriety, said to rise in Eden. By those who refer the position of Eden to the highlands of Armenia, the "river" from which the four streams diverge is conceived to mean "a collection of springs," or a well-watered district. It is scarcely necessary to say that this signification of וָּרִיבָּה (nākār) is without a parallel, and even if it could, under certain circumstances, be made to adopt it, such a signification is, in the present instance, precluded by the fact that, whatever meaning we may assign to the word in ver. 10, it must be essentially the same as that which it has in the following verses, in which it is sufficiently definite. Sickler (Augusti, THEOL. MOSAIC, i, 1), supposing that the whole valley to be a myth, solved the difficulty by attributing to its author a large measure of ignorance. The "river" was the Caspian Sea, which in his apprehension was an immense stream from the east. Bertheau, applying the geographical knowledge of the ancients as a test of that of the He- brews, arrived at the same conclusion, on the ground that all the people south of the Armenian and Persian highlands place the dwelling of the gods in the extreme north, and the regions of the Caspian were the northern limit of the horizon of the Israelites (Knobel, Genesis). But he allows the four rivers of Eden to have been real rivers, and not, as Sickler imagined, oceans which bounded the earth east and west of the Nile. The modern Lake Van, or perhaps the ancient stream of which this is now the representative, appears to be the only body of water in this vicinity answer- ing this description. Sickler describes it as follows: "It is to suppose that in former ages great changes had taken place, which have so disguised the rivers in question that their course, connection, and identity are not now traceable; for two of the rivers, at least, remain to this day essentially the same as in all historic times, and the whole narrative of Moses is evidently adapted to the geography as it existed in his own day, being constantly couched in the present tense, and in terms of well-known localities and landmarks." See above.

Some, ever ready to use the knife, have hesitatingly pronounced the whole narrative to be a spurious interpolation of a later age (Granville Penn, MIN. DE DON GED. p. 164). But, even admitting this, the words are not such as a second or third writer would have used. Ewald (Gesch. i. 331, note) affirms, and we have only his word for it, that the tradition originated in the far East, and that in the course of its wanderings the original names of two of the rivers at least were changed to others with which the Hebrews were better acquainted. Hartmann regards the latter as a result of the Babylonian or Persian period. Luther, rejecting the forced interpretations on which the theories of his time were based, gave it as his opinion that the garden remained under the guardianship of angels till the time of the Deluge, and that its site was known to the descendants of Adam; but that by the flood all traces of it were obliterated. But, as before remarked, the narrative is so worded as to convey the idea that the countries and rivers spoken of were still existing in the time of the historian. It has been sug- gested that the description of the garden of Eden is part of a generalized antiquarian document written by the historian, Rosenmüller's GEOGR., 192). The conjecture is beyond criticism; it is equally incapable of proof or disproof, and has not much probability to recommend it. The effects of the flood in changing the face of countries, and altering the relations of land and water, are too little known at present to allow any inferences to be drawn from them. (See below.)

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

III. IDENTIFICATIONS OF THE SITES. It would be difficult, in the whole history of opinion, to find any subject which has so invited, and at the same time so completely baffled conjecture, as the garden of Eden. The three continents of the Old World have been subjected to the most rigorous search; from China to the Canary Islands, from the Mountains of the Moon to the coasts of the Baltic, without any locality which in the least approximated to the description of the first abode of the human race has been left unexamined. The great rivers of Europe, Asia, and Africa have in turn done service as the Pison and Gibon of Scripture, and there remains not one of which the New World wherein the first adventurous theorist may bewilder himself in the mazes of this most difficult question. Upon the question of the exact geographical position of Eden dis- cussions innumerable have been written. Many au- thors have given descriptive lists of them, with argu- ments for and against each. The most convenient presentation of their respective outlines has been re- duced to a tabulatated form, with ample illustrations, by the REV. N. Morren (annexed to his translation of the younger Rosenmüller's Biblical Geography of Central Asia, p. 91-98, Edinb. 1856). He reduces them to nine principal and four additional, as follows: (See the following table; comp. Kalisch, Genesis, p. 100 sq.)

1. The opinion which fixes Eden in Armenia we have placed first, because it is that which has obtained most general support, and seems nearest the truth. (See No. vi.) For if we may suppose that, in former ages, moved to the East (Gen. iv. 16), the city of the Seth remained in the neighborhood of the primval seat of mankind, and that Noah's ark rested not very far from the place of his former abode, then Mount Ararat in Armenia becomes a connecting point between the ante- diluvian and post-diluvian worlds (Gen. viii. 4), and...
the names of the Phrat, Hiddekel, etc., would readily be given to rivers, which, after the great deluge, seemed to flow in channels somewhat corresponding to the Paradisaical streams. The opinion in question was first systematically propounded by Reland, and is held by Calmet, and by his American editor, Prof. Robinson, who, however, understands by Cush, Chasutian, Prof. Stuart takes the Phison for the Kur, and Cush for the Indus, while in the northwestern region of the region between the Caspian Lake and the Persian Gulf (Hab. Chrest: on Gen. i, 10 14). The Cossar, whom Reland finds in Cush, lived near Media, in the tract now called Dilm, south-west of the Caspian Sea. Link takes the Gihon for the river of Cyrus or Cusur, and refers for the Cosar to the river Cydnus. Verbruggen coincides with Reland, except that he takes the Gihon to be the Glynde, which flowed between Armenia and Matiana.

ii. This opinion was most elaborately defended by Huet, bishop of Avranches; but it is also maintained by Calvin, Boehm, Wells, Step, Fores, etc. Fores was of this sentiment in the first edition of his Chronology, but in the second he follows the opinion of Reland. The Shat el-Abab is the name of the united streams of the Euphrates and Tigris. Ainaworks says, "It is probable that the united rivers emptied themselves into a gulf at this period (in ancient times) by several distinct mouths, of which the first or greatest was at Tereon, the Ostium Tigris Occidentale of Pтолей, and the mouth of the Euphrates, according to Aeaecus; the second was the Pastiglris of Pliny, probably the Shat el-Abab, and the Ostium Tigris Oriental of the Alexandrian geographer." Cush he compares with the Cutha of 2 Kings, xxvi, 24; and Havi- lah with the Chalalta of the Eriothenes in Strabo, xvi, 767. Grotius thinks the Phison is the Pastiglris, and the Gihon the Nahr Malikah, or the Chaboras. Huet points out the source of Grotius as to the Phison, but takes the Gihon for the Nahr Surah. Hoppkinson makes the Phison and Gihon to be the two canals of the Euphrates, the Nahr Malikah, and the Nahr Sarees or Sura.

iii. The celebrated Göttingen professor, J. D. Michaelis, originated this hypothesis, though he is doubtful as to some of the points. Gatterer, in the main, agrees with him, only he understands the Hiddekel to be the Indus, and takes the Phison for the Phaxis. Cush is found by Michaelis in the name of the city Cath or Ceth, the ancient capital of Corowrasia, on the Oxus or Jihon, near the site of Balkh. He refers to Quint. Curtius as speaking of the Cossar as Cushian being in Bactria upon the Oxus. Wahl sees Cush in the Khouist of Moses of Chorene, meaning the large province between the Caspian and Persian Seas, as far as the Indus and Oxus. The land of Havihail Michaelis connects with the tribe of Chwialski or Chwalesse, from whom the Russians call the Caspian Sea the Chwalinisko More.

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

v. That Paradise was in Syria was the opinion of the voluminous Le Clerc, in his valuable Commentary, Havihil is the tract mentioned in 1 Sam. xv, 7. Cush is Casiestis or Mount Casuis, near Betania in Syria. This opinion is shared by Lakemacher, who, however, takes the Phison to be the Jordan. Heiddegser thinks the Jordan was the great river of Paradise, an idea adopted by the paradoxical Hardouin, in his Excursus to Plato's Nat. Hist. lib. vi. Others, who place Eden in Arabia Felix, refer it either to the land of the Persian Gulf, and the Gihon into the Red Sea.

vi. This is perhaps the most ancient opinion of any, being found in Josephus (Ant. i, 1, 3), and in several of the fathers, e.g. Theophilus Autol., lii, 24; Ephraim. (Epp. lii, 60); Philostorgus in Nicephor. Hist. Ecc. ix, 13, though the latter takes the Phison for the river Hypasia. The editor of Calmet observes that "the inhabitants of the kingdom of Goiam call the Nile the Gihon." Cush is naturally taken for Ethiopia. This view is embraced by the celebrated Gesenius, with the exception that he maintains the Phison to be the Indus; in this he is followed in the main by Prof. Bush, who likewise observes: "This view of the subject, it is admitted, represents the ancient Eden as a very widely extended territory, reaching from the Indus on the east to the Nile and the Mediterranean on the west, and including the intermediate countries. If the view above given of the topography of Eden be correct, it will be seen that it embraced the fairest portion of Asia, besides a part of Africa, comprising the countries at present known as Cabul, Persia, Armenia, Kurdistan, Syria, Arabia, Abyssinia, and Egypt. The garden was on that side which they termed the "eastward in Eden," was probably situated somewhere in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, perhaps not far from the site of Babylon, a region near its eastern than its western limits; but the exact position is sufficiently vague to attempt to determine." Among the most modern scholars, the context seems now to lie mainly between this view and that of No. 1.

vii. Captain Wilford, well known for his profound acquaintance with Hindu antiquities, advanced the present view, as being founded upon the Indian Puranas (Asiatic Researches, vi, 455, Lond. edit.). It was partly adopted by a late ingenious but fanciful writer, Mr. C. Taylor, editor of Coleret's Dictionary, who, however, makes the Phison the Nehil; the Gihon, the western branch of the Oxus; the Hiddekel, the eastern; and the Phrat, the Hirond. It is, however, the following are given as specimens of the views of the modern German school of neology, which regards the whole narrative as a myth, similar to the Greek tradition of the Hesperides, the Islands of the Blessed, etc. Philip Buttman is the author of the hyposethesis under the present number. The Phison he compares with the Beyong, which is mentioned by Ptolemey as the most considerable river of India east of the Ganges. Ava was early known as a region of gold; and an anonymous geographer, in Hudson's collection, vol. iii, speaks of the Eville or Evilee as being near the Seues or Chinese.

viii. Another neological theory—the author, A. T.
Hartmann, who looks upon the description as a product of the Babylonish or Persian period. The idea of Eden being the far-famed vale of Cushmehr had been anticipated by Herder in his work on the History of Mankind. Appropriate accounts of Cushmehr may be found in the travels of Burns and Jamieson. Many of the names thought by Parrot to be Parthian were in the island of Serendib or Ceylon; while the Greeks place it at Beth-Eden, on Lebanon.

These, indeed, are but a few of the opinions that have been propounded; yet, though many more might be added, we observe that most of them have been much in common, and differ only in some of the details. To enumerate the vagaries of German and other writers on this subject would be endless. (See Kitt's Scripture Lands, p. 1-8.) The fact is that not one of them answers to all the conditions of the problem. It has been remarked that this difficulty might have been expected, and is obviously probable, from the geological changes that may have taken place, and especially in connection with the Deluge. This remark would not be applicable, to the extent that is necessary for the argument, except upon the supposition that the earth in the beginning was not in the form as it is at present. The book of Genesis consists of primeval documents, even antediluvian, and that this is one of them. There is reason to think, however, that since the Deluge the face of the country cannot have undergone any change approaching to that hypothesized by the ancient authors. The famous bed of the river of Eden is 25° to 30° N. and 30° to 35° E.; and the sea which lay to the south, or an elevation of the bed of that sea. See DELUGE.

As nearly as we can gather from the Scriptural description, Eden was a tract of country, the finest imaginable, lying in the latitude of 36° N., and the 40th degree of E. longitude, of such moderate elevation, and so adjusted, with respect to mountain ranges, and watersheds, and forests, as to preserve the most agreeable and salubrious conditions of temperature and all atmospheric changes. Its surface must therefore have been covered by an unbroken plain of hill and plain. In the north part of this land of Eden, the Creator had formed an enclosure, probably by rocks, and forests, and rivers, and had filled it with every product of nature conducive to use and happiness. Due moisture, of both the ground and the water, and the right temperature, the soil from the nearest hills, and the rivulets from the more distant; and such streamlets and rivulets, collected according to the levels of the surrounding country ("it proceeded from Eden") flowed off afterwards in four larger stream, each of which thus became the source of a great river.

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

That the Hiddekel (this name is said to be still in use among the tribes who live upon its banks—Col. Chesney, Exp. to Tigris and Euphrates, i, 13) is the Tigris, and the Phrathe the Euphrates, has never been denied, except by those who assume that the whole narrative is a myth which originated elsewhere, and which has been transferred to the Hebrews from their own geographical notions. As the former is the name of the great river by which Daniel sat (Dan. x, 4), and the latter is the term uniformly applied to the Euphrates in the Old Testament, there seems reason to suppose that the appellations in Gen. ii, 14 are to be understood in any other than the ordinary sense. One circumstance in the description is worthy of observation. Of the four rivers, one, the Euphrates, is mentioned by name only, as if that were sufficient to identify it. The other three are defined according to their geographical positions, and it is fair to conclude that they were therefore rivers with which the Hebrews were less intimately acquainted. If this be the case, it is scarcely possible to imagine that Yidden, or, as some say, the Pison, is the Nile, for that river must have been even more familiar to the Israelites than the Euphrates, and have stood as little in need of a definition.

But the stringent difficulty is to find any two rivers that will reasonably answer to the predicates of the Pison and the Gihon; any rivers, which can be collocated as Havilah and Cush. The latter name, indeed, was given by the Hebrews and other Orientals to several extensive countries, and those very distant both from Armenia and from each other. As for Havilah, we have the name again in the account of the dispersion of the sons of Noah. The scholars argue, but whether that was the same as this Havilah, and in what part of Asia it was, we despair of ascertaining. Reland and others, the best writers upon this question, have felt themselves compelled to give to these names a comprehension which destroys all preciseness. So, likewise, the meaning of the two divinest products of the olive can be little more than matter of conjecture—the bedeloch and the stone skoham. The former word occurs only here and in Num. xi, 7. The Septuagint, our oldest and best authority with regard to terms of commerce, renders it the heathen word τόμας, meaning probably the ruby, or possibly the topaz; and in Numbers by κρύσταλλον, which the Greeks applied not merely to rock-cystal, but to any finely transparent mineral. Any of the several kinds of odoriferous gum, which many ancient and modern authorities have maintained, is not likely, for it could not be in value comparable to gold. The pearl is possible, but not quite probable, for it is an animal product, and the connection seems rather to confine us to minerals; and pearls, though transparent, are not transparent as good crystal is. Would not the diamond be an admirable substitute of N? The skoham occurs in ten other places, chiefly in the book of Exodus, and in all those instances our version says onyx; but the Septuagint varies, taking onyx, sardius, sardonix, byzil, prase-stone, sapphire, and amaragdas, which is a green-tinted rock-crystal. The preponderance of the former is in favor of onyx, one of the varieties of banded agate; but the idea of value leads us to think that the emerald is the most probable. There are two remarkable inventories of precious stones in Exod. xxxii, 10-18, and Ezek. xxvii, 18, which include the names of some of the Septuagint with the Hebrew. See Havilah. For attempted identifications of the Pison and Gihon, see those names respectively.

IV. For the Literature of the subject, see PARADISE. 2. (729, Sept. Ezib, but omits Isa. xxxvi, 12, and Ezek. xxvii, 28; Vulg. Eden,) one of the marts which supplied the luxury of Tyre with richly embroidered stuffs. It is associated with Haran, Sheba, and Ashbeha; and in most, 5, Beth-Eden, replacing the name of Eden, is rendered in the Sept. by Charras (Xhab-āb.) In 2 Kings xix, 12, and Isa. xxxvi, 12, "the sons of Eden" are mentioned with Gozan, Haran, and Rezeph, as victims of the Assyrian greed of conquest. Tellasser appears to have been the chief city of the tribe; and Knobel's (Comm. on Isaiah) etymology of this name would point to the highlands of Assyria as their whereabouts. But this has no sound foundation, although the view which it supports receives confirmation from the version of Jonathan, who gives כחנוב (Chanan) as the equivalent of Eden. Bochart proved (Codex. pt. i, p. 274) that this term was applied by the Hymnic writers of the ancient Assyrians to the mountain district of Assyria, which bordered on Media, and was known as Akkadene. But if Gozan be Gausanitis in Mesopotamia, 24 as its equivalent of Eden. Bochart proved (Codex. pt. i, p. 274) that this term was applied by the Hymnic writers of the ancient Assyrians to the mountain district of Assyria, which bordered on Media, and was known as Akkadene. But if Gozan be Gausanitis in Mesopotamia, 24
potamia, and Haran be Carrahe, it seems more natural to look for Eden somewhere in the same locality. Keil (Com. and C. Int., i. 97) thinks it may be Vdum, which Assemin (Bibl. Or. ii, 224) places in Mesopotamia, in the modern province of Dierbark. Bochart, considering the Eden of Genesis and Isaiiah as identical, argues that Gozan, Haran, Rezeph, and Eden are mentioned in order of geographical position, from north to south; and, identifying Gozan with Gausanita, Haran with Carrhe, a little below Gausanita on the Chabur, and Rezeph with Resipha, it gives to Eden a still more southerly situation at the confluence of the Eufrates and Tigris, or even lower. According to him, it may be Addos or Addana, which geographers place on the Euphrates near the present town Eljune, and succeeded in its importance by the town Eljune, which was founded in 1144, when all the Christian churches were converted into mosques. After many vicissitudes, in the course of which Edessa fell successively into the hands of the Sultans of Egypt, the Byzantines, the Mongols, Turks, and Persians, the city was finally conquered by the Turks, and has since formed a portion of the Turkish dominions. The population is variously estimated at from 25,000 to 50,000, of whom 2000 are Armenian Christians. The Jacobites, in the last century, had 150 houses and a church. The rest are Turks, Arameans, Kurds, and Jews. Edessa is regarded by the Eastern ortho-do xians, because it is said to have been the residence of Abraham" (Chambers, Encyclopaedia, s. v.). It is still the seat of a Greek archbishop and an Armenian bishop. A dialect of the Aramaic is still spoken at Edessa (comp. Etheridge on the Aramaic Language, p. 30).

The report of the introduction of Christianity by king Abgar (q. v.), a contemporary of Christ, is probably an unfounded legend; but it is certain that Christianity became firmly rooted in Edessa at a very early period. The twenty-sixth Osrhoenean king (152-167) was a Christian himself, a patriot, and a zealous promoter of Christianity, and the Gnostic Bardasanes is said to have been highly esteemed by him. Edessa was an early episcopal see, and in the 4th century became the chief see of Syrian ecclesiastical learning. The emperor Julian threatened to distribute the large treasure of the churches of Edessa among his soldi, but the knowledge of his death saved the churches from the execution of this threat. In 688, Ephrem (q. v.), the Syrian, came from Nisibis to Edessa, and by his preaching, teaching, and prolific writings, greatly distinguished himself in the defence of the orthodox doctrines of the Church. After the death of Ephrem, the Arians took possession of all the churches of Edessa, but after five years the ascendancy of the orthodox school was restored. Different from the Edessene school established by Ephrem was the Persian school at Edessa, which was intended to be a seminary for the Christian subjects of the Persian king. It attained its highest prosperity in the time of Ephrem, became subsequently a stronghold of Nestorianism, and was on that account dissolved in 488-498. Herzog, Real-Encik., ii, 645; Wetzet und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 301; Chronicon Edessenum, in Assemani, Biblioth. Oriental., i, 367-428; Cureton, Ancient Syriac Documents relative to Edessa, etc. (Lond. 1866); Etheridge, The Syrian Churches (Lond. 1846), p. 35 sq. See Nestorians.

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

**Edgar, John Todd, D.D.**, a Presbyterian minister of North Carolina, was born at Scarsmore, April 13, 1792. With the proverbial love for knowledge of the Scotch-Irish, his parents gave him the best education that could be obtained in Kentucky, to which state they removed soon after his birth. He graduated at Princeton in 1816, and was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery. In 1817 he was ordained pastor of the church at Flemingsburg, Ky. He was thene called to Maysville, where he labored unremittingly. In 1829 he was induced to accept a call from the church at Frankfort, Ky, where his eloquence soon gathered around him the leading men of the state. Henry Clay said of him, "If you want to hear eloquence, listen to John T. Edgar." In 1833 he became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Nashville, Tenn., and continued to discharge the duties of that office with great fidelity and success up to the year 1853, when an association was appointed to aid him. He was distinguished for power in the pulpit, and for a degree of liberality of feeling and public spirit which caused him to be regarded as belonging rather to the whole community than to his particular church. Mr. Edgar wrote little, though at one time he was editor of the *American Presbyterian*, published at Nashville. He died suddenly of apoplexy Nov. 13, 1860.

**Edge**, with reference to the sword, is the rendering of πᾶς, pehus (like *eirix*), Luke xxii, 44, Heb. xi, 34, or from ἐκποιιν, ἐκποιιν, *nomin*, *nomin*, *meces* (Eccles, x, 10); poet. *πελεχ, *a rock, hence *sharpness* (Psa. lxxxvi, 49); elsewhere, in the sense of *brink or margin,* it corresponds to *παφαλ*, *phantas*; and to ἢπα, *kebes*, ἢπα, *katan*, or ἢπα, *katan*, *katan*, *extremity* (Exod. xxxvi, 7; xxxvii, 5; xxii, 26; xxvi, 5; xxxvi, 12; Num. xxxiii, 6; Josh. xiii, 27; Psa. lxxxiv, 4). To put *set on edge* is an inaccurate rendering (Jer. xxxi, 29, 30; Ezek. xviii, 2) of ἢπα, *kukh*, *to be bent* (as Eccles, x, 10). See *Sword,* *Sword,* *Sword,* *Sword,* *Sword,*

**Eidias, or Eddias** (11Eis, Alex. MS. 11Eis, Vulg. Eddeias), the second named of the "sons of Phoros," who took foreign wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 26); the *Jewish* (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Exra x, 25).

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

**Edict of Nantes.** See *Nantes,* France, Reformed Church of.

**Edicts, Imperial.** See *Persecutions.*

**Edification,** "the process by which believers are built up, that is, progressively advanced in knowledge and holiness." (1) The sacred writers perpetually employ this figure as their favorite illustration of the condition of Christians, as forming collectively the temple, and form, in an individual sense, the literal one (2 Cor. iii. 17). It is the temple in which the Lord dwells by his holy Spirit; and as being, individually, "living stones, built up into an habitation for the Lord." 'The words "edify" and "edification" have so completely lost their literal signification in our tongue, that it would be an imposition on the public conscience to use them in speaking of the building of a literal edifice, and thus the reader loses the force and significance of the language of the sacred writers." The word *edify,* especially when applied to individual Christians, has often the meaning of training, though in the strict sense of the *Order of Confirmation* in the English Prayer-book. 'To the end . . . . . . to the more edifying,' the word is probably used in the sense already explained, not in the especial sense of 'instruct' (Eden).

(2) "To perceive the full force and propriety of the term as used by the apostles, it is quite necessary to keep in mind the similitudes by which they generally describe a Christian church. All those spiritual gifts, which were bestowed on the Christians were for the building and edifying of the members of the church. The apostolic power in Church censures was for edification (Ephes. iv. 2). The church itself is the body not to pull down; that is, to preserve the unity of the Church entire, and its communion pure. And we may observe that this edification is primarily applied to the Church: that the Church may receive edifying; that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church; for the edifying of the body of Christ (1 Cor. xiv. 5, 12, 14, 25, iv, 12). And it is very observable wherein the apostle places the edification of the body of Christ, viz. in unity and love: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of Christ (Ephes. iv. 12, 18). Till we are united by one faith unto one body, and perfect man. And speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body is fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, make increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love (Ephes. iv, 15, 16). This is an admirable description of the unity of the Church, in which all the parts are closely united and compacted together, as stones and timber are to make one house; and this growth to make increase and in mutual love and charity, which is the very building and edification of the Church, which is edified and built up in love, as the apostle adds, that knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth (1 Cor. viii. 1). This builds up the Church of Christ; and that not such a building as charity as we have for all mankind, but such a love and sympathy as is peculiar to the members of the same body, and which none but members can have for each other" (Hook, *Ch. Des. s. v.*).

(3) "Many professors, and even teachers of religion, not greatly liking such union and communion, consequently, yet finding much said in the New Testament of the attainments and comforts of the first Christians have studied to devise means of enjoying these com
forts separately. Instead of the objects that chiefly drew the attention of the first believers, they have endeavored to fix the attention of Christians on a multitude of rules respecting the particular conduct of each in his devout exercises, his attendance on ordinances, and the frame of his heart therein. But this is a scheme of religion which is a mere device. Not only are we plainer from the whole tenor of the Acts of the Apostles, and their epistles to the churches, than that it is the will of Christ his disciples should unite together, holding fellowship in the institutions of the Gospel; and also that, as he in infinite wisdom and grace has furnished provision for their comfort, establishment, and edification, so these blessings can only be effectually enjoyed in proportion as they obey his will in this respect.

Edifice. See Architecture; House; Temple; Church.

Edithryda or Etheldrida, St., daughter of the Anglo-Saxon queen Anne. She made a vow of chastity in her youth, but was afterwards compelled to marry Earl Tondibert, who, at her request, respected her vow. After his death she desired to retire to the island of Ely, but was eventually obliged to marry Egfrid, son of the king of Northumbria. This marriage was dissolved, and in 671 she retired to the convent of Coldingham, and afterwards to the island of Ely, on which she founded a monastery. She was afterwards canonized, and is called Wilfrid named her abbess. Here she led a life of asceticism until her death in 679. —Herzog, Real-Encyk. iii, 618; Butler, Lives of the Saints, June 23.

Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, and seat of a bishop of the Scotch Episcopal Church. The diocese of Edinburgh had in 1867 24 churches, 2 missions, 83 clergy, and 29 schools. The population of the city was, in 1861, 168,098. Edinburgh is also the seat of a Roman Catholic vicar apostolic, whose district had in 1860 about 60 parishes and 70,000 Roman Catholics. See Churchman's Calendar for 1868; Neber, Kirchl. Geogr. i, 103. (A. J. S.)


Edmund I of England, king and martyr, succeeded in 855, when but fifteen years of age, to his father Offa, king of the East Angles. Edmund reigned in meekness, and his whole life was a preparation for martyrdom. About 870 the heathen Danes invaded the kingdom, after violating the nuns, killing the priests, and laying waste the country, made him a prisoner. Unwilling to offend God by submitting to the terms of his captors, he was tortured, and finally beheaded (870). In 1129 his anniversary was placed among the English holidays, and the kings of England took him for patron. See his Life by Abbo, and another by John Lydgate. —Herzog, Real-Encyklopd. iii, 648.

Edmund, St. EDMUND RICH, archbishop of Canterbury in the thirteenth century, studied at Paris, where he became doctor of theology. Returning to England, he preached for the Crusades with such success as to command the approval of the Pope. He was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury April 2, 1234. It fell to his lot as prelate to resist the will of the Pope, and also that of the king of England, and he did resist manfully. He died at the monastery of Soisay, in France, Nov. 18, 1242. The English people, who admired and loved him, demanded his canonization; the papal court at first refused, but finally yielded, and he was canonized by pope Innocent IV in 1249. His Speculum Ecclesiae is published in the Bibliotheca Patrum. —Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xv, 660; Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury (1855, vol. iii); Wright, Biographia Literaria (Anglo-Norman period).

Edna (Edna, i. c. 757, plebeian; Vulg. Ama), the wife of Ragnell and mother of Sara, the bride of Tobias (Tob. vii, 2, 8, 14, 16; x, 12; xii, 1).

Edom (Heb. Edom, 'Edam or 'Edom, so called from his red hair, Gen. xxv, 25, or from the red pottage for which he was bought by Esau, xvi, 26). In the later name of Isaac's son, elder twin-brother of Jacob; more frequently called Esau (q. v.). See also Obed-Edom.

Edom (Sept. 'Idouyaia) stands also collectively for the Edomites, the posterity of Edom or Esau; and likewise for their country. See Edomite.

Edomite (Heb. 'Adom, 'Adom, Sept. 'Idouyaiai, fem. plur. 'Idouyaia; 1 Kings xi, 1, Sept. 'Idouyaia; but usually 'Edom, Edom, put collectively for the Edomites). The name Edom (fully written 'Edom, red; see Genesis, Heb. Theseus, i, 26) was originally the secondary name of Esau (Gen. xxv, 30, comp. ver. 25; xxxvi, 8), but is used ethnographically in the O. T., his descendants ("children of Edom," 'Edom 'Edam) being the race who had settled in the south of Palestine, and who at a later period came into conflict with the kindred nation of the Israelites (Deut. xxxii, 7; Num. xxx, 14). Comparatively seldom are the appellations children of Edom (Deut. ii, 4, 6; i Macce, iv, 8), house of Edom (Obad. 18), connected with another race of Edomites, or simply Edom (Jer. xxxi, 8; Obad. 6), used in Scripture for the Edomites or Idumeans; the people and country are often called merely Edom (Num. xxiv, 18; Josh. xv, 1; 2 Sam. vii, 14; 1 Kings xi, 14; and especially by the prophets), hence, more fully, land of Edom (Gen. xxxvi, 16, 21; Num. xxxii, 37), or field of Edom (Gen. xxii, 3; Judg. v, 4). The territory of the Edomites was mountainous (Obad. 8, 9, 19, 21), situated at the southern (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7), i. e. south-eastern border of Palestine (Num. xxxiv, 9), or more particularly of the tribe of Judah (Josh. xvi, 1, 21), in the neighborhood of the Moabites (Judg. xi, 18; Isa. xi, 14; 2 Kings iii, 8), and was properly called the land or mountain of Seir (anan. Gen. xxvi, 20; xxxii, 4; Josh. xxiv, 2; Ezek. xxxv, 3, 7, 15; comp. Deut. ii, 4, 29). See Shem. Lofty and intersected by chasms in the rocks, it formed a natural fastness (Jer. xxxii, 14; Obad. 3 sq.), but it was no means unfruitful (Gen. xxxvii, 39). It contained, among other cities, the famous rock-hewn Sela (2 Kings xiv, 7), and extended from the Edomite Gulf to the Red Sea (1 Kings ix, 20; 2 Chron. viii, 17). It hence admits of no doubt that the cleft and craggy region traversed by fruitful, and now called el-Shere, rises from the spongy and waterless plains of the Edomites from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea to the eastern arm of the Red Sea, and is separated on the west by the long sandy plain el-Ghor from the desert el-Tib (Seetzen, xviii, 350, 354; Burckhardt, Trav. ii, 668), and bounded on the north by the wady el-Ahas, which separates it from the land of Moab, near Kerak, in the district of Jebel, is the ancient land of Edom, as Saadias has long ago perceived, for he renders Seir in Gen. xxxvi, 8 by the same Arabic name Shera (comp. Baumer in Berghaus's Anmii. d. Erd. u. Volkerkunde, i, 562 sq.). See Sela; Teman; Uz; Bozrah. According to the division in Greek authors, the territory of Edom, Idumaea (Idouyaia, a name evidently derived from the Heb.), was reckoned as a part of Arabia Petraea (see Anthon's Class. Dict. s. v.). The early inhabitants of Mount Seir, who were called Horites, were destroyed by the Edomites (Deut. xii, 22), or rather supplanted and absorbed by them. See Horite. Already, in the time of Moses, the Edomites showed a hostile feeling towards the Israelites by forbidding them to pass through their territories, and thus subjecting them to the hardship of journeying around it (Num. xxx, 15-21; comp. Judges xi, 17; 1 Sam. xiv, 17; 1 Kings ii, 12; 1 Chron. xvi, 28); an act which Saul successfully
avenged (1 Sam. xiv. 47), while David subjugated them (2 Sam. vili. 14; comp. 1 Kings xi. 13 sq.; Psa. ix. 2, 10), and his successor Solomon fitted out a merchant fleet in the Edomite harbors (1 Kings ix. 26), although under his reign a partially successful revolt took place (1 Kings xi. 14 sq.). In the division of the Hebrew commonwealth the Edomites consisted under the name of the Edom (probably by means of viceroyas, 2 Kings iii. 9, 12, 26; but compare 1 Kings xxii. 48; 2 Kings viii. 20), so that their ports were at the disposal of Jewish commerce to the time of Jerom (1 Kings vii. 49), under whose reign (B.C. 885) they threw off all dependence of Syria (2 Kings viii. 20) and retained their independence by force of arms against several succeeding princes of the weak kingdom of Judah (2 Kings viii. 21). Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 7; 2 Chron. xxv. 11, in B.C. cir. 856, and also Uzziah (2 Kings xiv. 22; 2 Chron. xxv. 11), in B.C. cir. 802, again reduced the Edomites to subjection; and under Ahaz (B.C. cir. 738) they invaded Judaea (2 Chron. xxvii. 17), while, at the same time, the harbor of Elath was wrested from the Jewish dominions by the Syrians (2 Kings xvi. 6). From this time forward, the Edomites, favored by the increasingly formidable attitude of Asshur, the chief confidant of Damascus, and by the political severance of the kingdom of the Chaldeans connected with the kingdom of Judah, enjoying real independence, until they too at last were forced to succumb to the Chaldaean power (Jer. xxvii. 3, 6). The early prophets, nearly contemporary with these events, had already announced Judah's future triumph over the Edomites and the subjects and enemies of Israel (Isa. xi. 14; Joel iii. 19; Amos i. 11), but, after they had made common cause with the foes of Israel at the capture of Jerusalem (Ezek. xxx. 15; xxxvi. 5; Obad. 10, 15 sq.), the denunciations of the prophets became more severe (Ezek. xxi. 20, Lxx. 13, 21 sq.; Ezek. xxxvi. 12 sq.—compare 38; Obad. pass.; Psa. cxxxvii. 7; comp. Isa. xxxiv. 5 sq.; Zeph. i. 1 sq.). The Edomites, it is true, likewise felt the ravages of the Chaldaean march (Mal. i. 3 sq.), but they were left in their own land (in opposition to the view of Eichhorn, De Ezech. Proph. ii. 614, 634; Bezae, Ezech. xiv. 1440, 1625, who maintain that the Idumeans were politically annihilated by Nebuchadnezzar; see Gesenius, Comm. on Isa. i. 906; nor are the predictions of the utter desolation of Edom (e.g. Jer. xiii. 17, sq.) to be pressed to their extreme fulfilment; see Heinrich, De Idumaea et Loci Edomitis, Lpz. 1829, as a purely fortuitous event rent away a portion of southern Palestine (comp. Ezek. xxxv. 10), including the town of Helbon (1 Macc. v. 65). During the Syrian rule they continued to evince their old ill will against the Jews (1 Macc. v. 3, 6); 2 Macc. x. 4 sq. (B.C. 164) until the complete subjection and holy subjection by John Hyrcanus (B.C. cir. 129), and, by a compulsory circumcision, were merged in the Jewish state (Josephus, Ant. xiii. 9, 11; xv. 7, 5; comp. War. iv, 5, 5; yet they were invidiously termed half-Jews, Anti. xiv. 15, 2). From that time Idumea continued under a Jewish prefect (Jerome, Joseph. Ant. xiv. 1, 5). One of these, Antipater, managed so to ingratiate himself with the Jewish court, and, during the disputes concerning the Maccabean succession, wielded the procuratorship of all Judea, with which the friendship of the emperor had invested him, with such efficiency (C. C. G., 47), that he actually succumbed to supreme power in this new capacity or instead of Hyrcanus II (Joseph. Anti. xiv. 8, 5). His son Herod became the acknowledged king of the Jews, and founded an Idumean dynasty in Palestine. Idumea formed a province of his dominions, and was under the administration of a special governor (Jerome, Joseph. Ant. xv. 7, 9). Concerning the further history of this people, we can here only remark that the Idumeans in the last Jewish contest acted the same ruinous part with the Jews themselves (Joseph. War. iv, 4, 1 and 5; vili. 8, 11). The name of Edom or Edomite is to this day hateful to the Jews (Orto, Lex. vulg. p. 169; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 689). From the time of the overthrow of the Jewish nation, the name of Idumea no longer occurs, but passes away in the wider denomination Arabia (comp. Steph. Byz. p. 834, 841; Strabo xvi. 760, 749); since already for a long period the southern part of the ancient land of the Edomites was reckoned, together with its metropolitan Petra, to the Arab countries (comp. the city of Petra under the name of (E) Edom (Joseph. Anti. xiv. 1, 8; xvii. 8, 2; War. i. 18, 8): so that Idumea, while on the north it included in addition a Jewish district (comp. the term Idumæan for Jew, especially among the Roman poets, Celsi. Hierbd. ii. 469 sq.), at the same time was contracted in its southern part (though in the works of Plutarch, v. 15, 10, v. 17; Strabo, xvi. 760; Jerome in Obs. 1); but this does not affect Biblical geography, and it would be difficult to reduce the point to full historical and topographical clearness (see Ebalad, Palest. p. 89 sq.). See Arabia; Petra. The form of government among the Edomitic people was, like that of surrounding nations, tribal (comp. Gen. xxvi. 15 sq.), yet they originally (or at least earlier than the Israelites) had kings (Gen. xxxvi. 32 sq.; Num. xx. 14; see Tach on Gen. xxxvi. 9 sq.; Bertheau, Isra. Gesch. p. 207), who appear to have been freely elected, and who were merely stately kings of the people (Gen. xxxvi. 40; Ezek. xxxii. 29; comp. Isa. xxxiv. 12, and Gesenius, in loc.; Bengstenberg, Pent. ii. 299 sq.), until (in the time of Solomon) a hereditary dynasty had established itself (1 Kings xi. 14 sq.). While the country remained under a monarchy, the name of Edom was near to disappear (1 Kings xxii. 48); although under Jehoshaphat mention is made (2 Kings iii. 9, 26) of a king (viceroy) of the Edomites (in alliance with him), and from this time they seem to have had an uninterrupted line of kings (Amos ii. 1; Jer. xxvii. 9, Ezk. xxxii. 29). The principal mode of livelihood and employment of the Edomites were commerce by trade by means of caravans (Heeren, Ideen, i. 1, p. 107; Lengerke, Kem. i. 298; compare Ezek. xxviii. 16, where, however, the true reading is Aram; see Haverinck in loc.), probably to Elath and Exon-guber, on the Red Sea; the raising of cattle, agriculture, and the cultivation of vines (Num. xxi. 17; Ezek. xxx. 13); according to Jerome (Osom. s. v. Fenon), also mining (see C. G. Plade, De re metall. Miliarum, Edomiti, et Phemic., Lpz. n. d.). Respecting their religion the Old Test. is entirely silent, except that they lead such a holy existence (Jer. xxxii. 20): Josephus (Ant. xx. 7, 9) mentions one of their gods by the name of Cose (Közi, 7 קז़, the destroyer or ender; see Sitztg. Philos. p. 265; and comp. Epiphan. Har. 55; Lengerke, Kem. i. 298). From the earliest times the wisdom of the Edomites, namely, of the Tameanite branch, was celebrated (Obad. 8; Jer. xii. 7). See Ux. (On the subject generally, see Van Iperen, Hist. crit. Edomorum, et Amalek. Leonard. 1768; Hoffmann, in the Halle. Encyclop. ii. xv. 146). See Idumea.

**Edrei** (Heb. Edre'ı, אֶדְרֵי, mighty; Sept. Ἐδραίος and Ἐδραῖον), the name of two cities.

1. One of the metropolitan towns (Ashhtaroth being the other) of the kingdom of Bashan, beyond the Jordan (Josh. xii. 4, 5; xii. 12; Deut. iii. 10 sq.). It was here that On the final defeat of the Edomites, and lost his kingdom (Num. xxi. 33–35; Deut. i. 4; iii. 1–5). Edrei afterwards belonged to eastern Manasseh (Josh. xiii. 31; Num. xxxii. 35). It is probable that Edrei did not remain long in possession of the Canaanites. May it not be that they abandoned it in consequence of its position within the borders of a wild region infected by numerous robber bands? The Leah is the ancient Argoth, and appears to have been the stronghold of the Geshurites; and they perhaps subsequently occupied Edrei (Josh. xii. 4, 5). It was the seat of a bishop in the early age of Christianity (Reland, Palest. p. 547), and a bishop of
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Adrai sat in the Council of Seleucia (A.D. 381) and of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). In A.D. 1142 the Crusaders under Baldwin his nephew, came near, or Atradum, then popularly called also Vieniae Bernardi de Stampilis, but they encountered such obstacles in the difficult nature of the ground, the scarcity of water, and the valor of the inhabitants, that they were compelled to retire (Will. Tyr. p. 895, 896, 1082). Abulfeda calls it Adra (Tabk. Pers., ii. p. 210).

There are two ancient towns in Bashan which now claim the honor of being the representatives of Edrei. The one is called Edra, and is situated on the south-west angle of the rocky district of Lejah, the Argob of the Book of Deuteronomy, the Trachonitis of the Greeks. The ruins of Edra are among the most extensive in Hauran. The site is a strange one. It is a rocky promontory projecting from the Lejah [see Trachonitis], having an elevation of some thirty feet above the plain, which spreads out beyond it smooth as a sea, and of unrivaled fertility. The ruins are nearly three miles in circuit, and have a strange, wild look, rising up in black shattered masses from the midst of black rocks. A number of the ancient houses still remain, though half buried beneath heaps of more modern ruins. Their walls, roofs, and doors are all of stone; their very faces are grooved and chiselled, and tell of a great age. The site is a notable city of Arabia, twenty-four miles from Bostra (Onomast. s. v. 'Eroptai, Edra). In another place they give the distance at twenty-five miles from Bosra and six from Ashtaroth (66. s. v. 'Atrapos, Astara, Ader, which in question is called Alpia, Ader). Edra is laid down in the Robinsoner Tables as here indicated (Reland, Palaest., p. 547; comp. Ptol. v. 17, 7). There can be no doubt that the city thus referred to is the modern Dera; and the statement of Eusebius is too explicit to be set aside on the supposition that he has confounded the two cities in dispute. Moreover, it is improbable that the boundaries of Manasseh East extended so far as the locality of Edra. Most modern geographers have therefore concluded that Dera marks the real site of Edrei (Reland, Palaest., p. 547; Ritter, Palaest. and Syr. ii. 584; Burchhardt, Travels in Syria, ii. p. 241; Buckingham, Arab. Tribes, p. 168; Schwarz, however, declares for the other position, Palaest. p. 222).

2. A fortified town of northern Palestine, allotted to the tribe of Naphtali, and situated near Kadesh and Hazor (Josh. xix, 57). About two miles south of Ke- desh is a small village called Edrei. A large church stands at the northern end of the town. A Greek inscription over the door informs us that it was originally a heathen temple, was converted into a church, and dedicated to St. George in A.D. 516. There are the walls of an ancient St. Elias church, and near the centre of the town a cloistered quadrangle, which appears to have been at first attached to a forum, and afterwards to a cathedral. On the public buildings and private houses are many Greek inscriptions. Some were copied by Burchhardt, and some by Rev. J. L. Porter. The total number amounted to about fifty families, of which some eight or ten were Christian, and the rest Mohammedan. A full account of the history and antiquities of Edrei is given in Porter's Five Years in Damascus, ii. 250 sq., and Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 559 sq.; also in Burchhardt's Syria, p. 57 sq.; Sch hệ, Dersch's Travel in Syria, p. 57 sq.; Buckingham's Travels among the Arab Tribes, p. 374.

The other place with which Edrei has been identified is called Dera, and stands in a shallow wady in the open plain of Hauran, about fourteen miles south of Edra. The following reasons have been assigned in favor of the other site. 1. The name Edrei, which signifies "strength," and the fact that it was the capital of an ancient and warlike nation, naturally lead to the belief that it was a very strong city. Ancient cities were always, when possible, built on the tops of hills, or in rocky fastnesses, so as to be easily defended. Edra stands on a ridge of jagged rocks, and is so encompassed with cliffs and defiles as to be almost inaccessible. Dera, on the contrary, is, in the open plain, and has no traces of old fortifications (St. Robin- son, ii. 160). 2. The ruins of Edra are more ancient, more important, and much more extensive than those of Dera. The dwellings of Edrei possess all the character-istics of remote antiquity—massive walls, stone roofs, stone doors. The monuments now existing seem to show that it must have been an important town from the time the Romans took possession of Bashan; and that it, and not Dera, was the episcopal see of Adram. 3. Edrai, as it is written in the Babylonian Tablets, is a noted city of Arabia, twenty-four miles from Bostra (Onomast. s. v. 'Eroptai, Edra). In another place they give the distance at twenty-five miles from Bosra and six from Ashtaroth (66. s. v. 'Atrapos, Astara, Ader, which in question is called Alpia, Ader). Edra is laid down in the Robinsoner Tables as here indicated (Reland, Palaest., p. 547; comp. Ptol. v. 17, 7). There can be no doubt that the city thus referred to is the modern Dera; and the statement of Eusebius is too explicit to be set aside on the supposition that he has confounded the two cities in dispute. Moreover, it is improbable that the boundaries of Manasseh East extended so far as the locality of Edra. Most modern geographers have therefore concluded that Dera marks the real site of Edrei (Reland, Palaest., p. 547; Ritter, Palaest. and Syr. ii. 584; Burchhardt, Travels in Syria, ii. p. 241; Buckingham, Arab. Tribes, p. 168; Schwarz, however, declares for the other position, Palaest. p. 222).

EDUCATION.

Education, Hebrew. Although nothing is more carefully incalculated in the Law than the duties of parents to teach their children its precepts and principles (Exod. xii. 26; xiii. 8, 14; Deut. iv. 5, 9, 10; vi. 7, 20; xi. 19, 21; Acts xxii. 3; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Susanna, 8; Josephus, Ap. ii, 16, 17, 25), yet there is little trace among the Hebrews in earlier times of education in any other than a rudimentary sort. The word "school," in the strict construction, of which so much is said in the book of Proverbs, is to be understood chiefly of moral and religious discipline, imparted, according to the direction of the Law, by the teaching and under the example of parents (Prov. i. 2, 6; ii. 20; iv. 1, 7, 20; viii. 1; ix. 1, 10; xi. 1; xvi. 22; xvii. 24; xxxii). Implicit expec-

ations to this statement may perhaps be found in the instances of Moses himself, who was brought up in all Egyptian learning (Acts vii. 22); of the writer of the book of Job, who was evidently well versed in natural history and in the astronomy of the day (Job xxi. 31; xxxiv. xi. 31); of Daniel and his companions in captivity (Dan. i. 4, 17); and, above all, in the intellec-
tual gifts and acquirements of Solomon, which were even more renowned than his political greatness (1 Kings iv. 29, 94; x. 1-9; 2 Chron. ix. 1-8), and the memory of which is kept with singular reverence, not only by monarchs, as Jehoshaphat or Josiah, or by prophets, as Elijah or Isaiah, to enforce, or at least to inculcate reform in the moral condition of the people on the basis of that standard (2 Kings xvii. 15; xxiii. 8-20; 2 Chron. xvii. 7, 9; I Kings xix. 14; Isa. i. 9).
In later times the prophecies, and comments on them as well as on the earlier Scriptures, together with the traditions of the Jews, went into the hands of the rabbis (see Euclet, xxxviii, 24; 26; xxxix, 1-11). St. Jerome adds that Jewish children were taught to say by heart the genealogies (Jerome on Titus, iii, 9; Calmet, Dict. s. v. Génaudie). Parents were required to teach their children some trade, and he who failed to do so was said to be virtually teaching his child to steal (Mishna, Kiddushin, ii, 2, vol. iii, p. 413, Surenhus.; Lightfoot, Chron. Temp. on Acts xviii, vol. ii, p. 79).

The sect of the Essenes, though themselves abhorring marriage, were anxious to undertake, and careful in carrying out the education of children, but confined itself to the temple, and to moral law (Josephus, War, ii, 8, 12; Philo, Quod omnis probus liber, ii, 458, ed. Mangey; § 12, Tauchn.).

Previous to the captivity, the chief deportees of learning were the schools or colleges, from which, in most cases (see Amos vii, 14), proceeded that succession of public teachers who, at various times, endeavored to reform the moral and religious conduct of both rulers and people. (See Werkmeister, De primis scholarum ap. Hebr. originis, Jenalt, 1735; Hegewis, Ob chen dem Alten öffentl. Erziehun g war, Altona, 1811.) In these schools the Law was probably the chief subject of instruction. The study of languages was followed by any Jews till after the Captivity, but from that time the number of Jews residing in foreign countries must have made the knowledge of foreign languages more common than before (see Acts xxii, 37). From the time of the outbreak of the last war with the Romans, parents were forbidden to instruct their children in Greek literature (Mishna, Sotah, c. ix, 15, vol. iii, p. 307, 308, Surenhus.). Nor had it ever been generally pursued by the Jews (Origen, contra Celsum, ii, 34).

Besides the prophetic schools, instruction was given by the priests in the Temple and elsewhere, but their subjects were doubtless exclusively concerned with religion and worship (Lev. x, 11; Ezek. xlii, 23, 24; 1 Chron. xxxv, 7, 8; Mal. ii, 12). Those sovereigns who exhibited any anxiety for the maintenance of the religious element in the Jewish polity were conspicuous in enforcing the religious education of the people (2 Chron. vii, 7, 8; xiv, 6, 11; 2 Kings xiii, 22).

From the time of the settlement in Canaan there must have been among the Jews persons skilled in writing and in accounts. Perhaps the neighborhood of the tribe of Zebulun to the commercial district of Phoenicia may have been the occasion of their reputation for the art of writing. The written language of the tribe are represented (Judg. v, 14) by the same word, "םֹסֵר, sofer," used in that passage of the levying of an army, or, perhaps, of a military officer (Gesenius, s. v.) as is applied to Ezra in reference to the Law (Ezra vii, 6); to Seraiah, David's scribe or secretary (2 Sam. viii, 17); to Shebna, scribe to Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 37); to Shemaiah (1 Chron. viii, 6); Baruch, scribe to Jeremiah (Jer. xxvi, 32), and others filling like offices at various times. The municipal officers of the kingdom, especially in the time of Solomon, must have required a staff of well-educated persons in their various departments under the recorder, "שֶׁמֶור, mosher," or historiographer, whose business was to compile memorials of the reign (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 24; 2 Kings xviii, 16; 2 Chron. xxxii, 8). Learning, in the tribe above mentioned, was at all times highly esteemed, and educated persons were treated with great respect, and, according to Rabbinical tradition, were called "sons of the noble," and allowed to take precedence of others at table (Lightfoot, Chr. Temp. Acts xviii, vol. ii, 79, 61; Hor. Heb, Luke xiv, 8-24; ii, 540). The same authority depletes the degeneracy of later times in this respect (Mishna, Sotah, ix, 15, vol. iii, 308, Surenhus.).

The schools of the prophets succeeded, after the Captivity, the synagogues, which were either them-
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Edumia, a place thus described by Eusebius and Jerome (in the Onomasticon, s. v. Eoumyia, Edumia) :

"of the tribe of Benjamin; and there is still a village Eduma, Eoumyia, in Acrobatia, about twelve miles east of Neposia. From this language, Leclerc (noti- cing that Aquam in Edumia is Aquarb in this last place) considers that this place was settled by the Phœnicians, who colonized a similar name farther south.

Van de Velde finds the locality in the modern village Daumen, S. E. of Nabilous (Narrat. ii, 306); a coincidence first pointed out by Robinson (Researches, iii, 108), as lying in the prescribed position, although not within the tribe of Benjamin (apparently a conjecture of Euseb.). It is situated on the tableland overlooking the Jordan valley, and contains a fountain and ancient sepulchres in the outskirt (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 292, 293).

E'duth (עֶדָּת, eduth, precept, as it is often rendered; Sept. and Vulg. translate accordingly) stands (besides being translated elsewhere in its ordinary acception) as a part (in connection with "Shushan") ethnically, as being related to instruction and religious ceremonial, as the contents of the whole were of a revealed or sacred character (title of Ps. 1, lx). See SHOSHANIM.

Edward III, Confessor, king of the Anglo-Saxons, was born in Oxfordshire in 1004, and died Jan. 5, 1066. He was canonized by Pope Alexander III, and styled "Confessor" in the bull of canonization. The only ground for this was the fact that when, in 1044, he married Editha, daughter of earl Godwin, he informed her that he would make her his queen, but that she should not share his bed. He kept this unnatural vow, and for it, in spite of a licentious life, he was anointed by the Pope within the tribe of Benjamin (apparently a conjecture of Euseb.). It is situated on the tableland overlooking the Jordan valley, and contains a fountain and ancient sepulchres in the outskirt (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 292, 293).

Edwards, John, D.D., one of the strongest Calvinistic divines of his age. He was born at Hartford Feb. 26, 1637, and was educated at Merchant-Taylor's School, London. In 1658 he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, where he became scholar and fellow. He was minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge, from 1664 to about 1676, when he was made rector of St. Peter's, Colchester. He returned to Cambridge in 1679, and there wrote industriously on controversial theology. He died April 16, 1716. "It may be questioned whether, since the days of Calvin himself, there has existed a more decided Calvinist than Dr. Edwards. He has better understood the Paul, the Apostles, the Westminster, the Beatitude, the Calvin of his age. Such was his abhorrence of Arminianism that he contended, with the old Puritans, that there is a close connection between it and popery." His principal writings are, Theologia reformata, or the Body and Substance of Christian Religion in Distinct Discourses or Treaties upon the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments (Lond. 1713-16, 3 vols. fol.):—A complete History or Survey of all the Diapensations or Methods of Religion (London, 1659, 2 vols. 8vo):—The Arminian Doctrines condemned by the Scripture (Lond. 1711, 8vo):—Authority of the O. and N. T. (Lond. 1693, 3 vols. 8vo):—Exercitions, critical, theological, etc., on important places in the O. and N. T. (Lond. 1702, 8vo):—Socianism unmask'd (Lond. 1697, 8vo):—The Doctrine of Faith and Justification (Lond. 1708, 8vo):—Jones, Christ. Biography, s. v.; Kipps, Biographia Britannica, s. v.

Edwarda, Jonathan, was born at East Windsor, Conn., on the 5th of October, 1708. His great-grandfather on the paternal side was the Rev. Richard Edwards, a clergyman in London in the time of queen Elizabeth. His great-grandfather, William Edwards, was born in England, came to America about the year 1640, and was an honorable trader in Hartford, Conn. His grandfather, Richard Edwards, was born at Hartford, and spent his life there as a respectable and wealthy merchant. His father, Rev. Timothy Edwards, was born in Hartford May 14, 1669. He entered Harvard College in 1687, and received the
two degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts on the same day, July 4, 1691, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon, 'an uncommon mark of respect paid to his extraordinary proficiency in learning.'

He was ordained pastor of the church at East Windsor in May, 1694. In 1711 he was appointed, by the Legislature of Connecticut, chaplain of the troops sent on an important expedition to Canada. He was distin-
guished for his scholarship, devoutness, and general weight of character. He generally preached extem-
pore, and until he had passed his seventieth year he did not often write the heads of his discourses. He lived to enjoy the fame of his son, and died January 27, 1738. On his memorial side, the great-grandfather of Presi-
dent Edwards was Anthony Stoddard, Esq., who emi-
grated from the west of England to Boston, and was a member of the General Court from 1655 to 1684. The grandfather of Edwards was the Rev. Solomon Stodd-
dard, of Northampton, Mass., one of the most erudite and powerful clergymen of New England. Edwards' mother was Esther, the second child of the Northam-
pton pastor, a lady of excellent education and rare strength of character.

The history of President Edwards cannot be fully made out without considering that both on the pa-
ternal and maternal side he was allied with families belonging to the ecclesiastical aristocracy of New England. He was an only son, and had ten sisters, some of whom became the wives of eminent men. He was trained by his father and his four eldest sisters (all of whom were in very much af-
fected for many months, and concerned about the things of religion and my soul's salvation, and was abundant in religious duties. I used to pray five times a day in secret, and to spend much time in rel-
gious conversation with other boys, and used to meet with them to pray together. I experienced I know not what kind of delight in religion. I, with some of my schoolmates, joined together and built a booth in a swamp, in a very retired spot, for a place of prayer; and, besides, I had particular secret places of my own in the woods where I used to retire by myself, and was from time to time much affected. My affections seemed to be lively and easily moved, and I seemed to be in my element when engaged in religious duties.'

Reflecting on these fervid emotions, Edwards after-
ward regarded them as so signs of genuine piety. He was keen in his analysis of character, and was wont to encourage, not only in others, but also in himself, the habit of severe self-examination, and of jeal-
ous watchfulness against the influence of self-love. Although from his earliest childhood he had been duti-
ful, docile, and exemplary in his outward demeanor, yet he writes concerning his boyhood and youth: 'I was at times very uneasy, especially towards the lat-
ter part of my time at college, when it pleased God to seize me with a pleurisy, in which he brought me nigh to the grave, and shook me over the pit of hell. And yet it was not long after my recovery before I fell again into my old ways of sin. But God would not suffer me to go on with any quietness. I had great fear and vio-

ence of heart against wicked inclinations, repeated resolutions, and bonds that I laid myself under by a kind of vows to God, I was brought wholly to break off all former wicked ways, and all ways of known outward sin, and to apply my soul to the care of God, and to seek to accomplish religious duties, but without that kind of affection and delight which I had formerly experienced.' With his characteristic fidelity in scrutinizing his motives, he looked with distrust on his seeking the Lord after this 'miserable manner, which,' he says, 'has made sometimes in question whether whether such miserable seeking ever succeeded.' At length, however, but precisely at what period he does not state, he began to entertain an abiding confidence in his hav-
ing been regenerated by the Holy Ghost. In the po-
etic and rhetorical style which often characterizes his writings, he says: 'I began to have a new kind of apprehensions and ideas of Christ, and the work of re-
demption, and the glorious way of salvation by him. This I know not how to express otherwise than by a calm, sweet abstraction of soul from all the concerns of this world and the flesh, and a more vital or fixed ideas and imaginations of being alone in the mountains or some solitary wilderness, far from all mankind, sweetly conversing with Christ, and rapt and swallow-
ed up in God. One on occasion 'I walked abroad alone in a solitary Corner, and gave myself over to con-
templation. As I was walking there, and looking upon the sky and clouds, there came into my mind so sweet a sense of the glorious majesty and grace of God as I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction, majesty and meekness joined together; it was a sweet, and gentle, and holy majes-
ty, and also a majestic meekness, an awful sweetness, a high, and great, and holy gentleness. After this my sense of divine things gradually increased, and be-
came more and more lively, and had more of that in-
ward sweetness. The appearance of every thing was altered to me, and that which before had no signif-
cast or appearance of divine glory in almost every thing. God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity, and love, seemed to appear in every thing—in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the waves and sea—"which used greatly to fix my mind. I often used to sit and view the moon for a long time, and in the day spent much of my time in viewing the clouds and sky, to behold the sweet glory of God in these things, in the mean time singing forth with a low voice my con-
templations in the spirit of the Creator and Redeemer, and scarce anything in all the works of nature was so sweet to me as thunder and lightning; formerly nothing had been so terrible to me. Before, I used to be uncommonly terrired with thunder, and to be struck with terror when I saw a thunder-storm rising; but now, on the contrary, it rejoiced me to hear it. I used to speak, at the first appearance of a thunder-storm, and used to take the opportunity at such times to fix my-
self in order to view the clouds, and see the lightnings play, and hear the majestic and awful voice of God's thunder, which oftentimes was exceedingly entertain-
ing, leading me to sweet contemplations of my great

The sharpness of his intellect, the activity of his imagination, the liveliness of his sensibilities, and the
EDWARDS

Edwards's piety, were regarded as signs of his being called of God to the ministry of the Gospel. Having been a resident scholar at Yale College for nearly two years after his graduate, and having pursued his theological studies during that period, he was "approved" as a preacher in June or July, 1722, two months before he was nineteen years of age. From August, 1722, until April, 1725, he preached in a small Presbyterian church in Yonkers, New York. His eloquence fascinated his hearers, but he felt compelled to decline their urgent invitations to become their pastor. In his solitary walks along the silent banks of the Hudson he: learned more and more of "the bottomless depths of seclusion" that lie below the college, his heart, and of the beauty and amissibleness of true holiness.

"Holiness, as I then wrote down some of my contemplations on it, appeared to me to be of a sweet, pleasant, charming, serene, calm nature, which brought an inexpressible purity, brightness, peacefulness, and ravishment to the soul. In other words, that it made the soul like a field or garden of God, with all manner of pleasant flowers, enjoying a sweet calm, and the gentle, vivifying beams of the sun. The soul of a true Christian, as I then wrote my meditations, appeared like such a little white flower as we see in the spring of the year, growing up from a green bed in the bosom to receive the pleasant beams of the sun's glory; rejoicing, as it were, in a calm rapture; diffusing around a sweet fragrance; standing peacefully and lovingly in the midst of other flowers round about, all in like manner opening their blossoms to drink in the light of the sun. In his sermons and writings in New York that he wrote the thirty-fourth of his well-known "Resolutions" for the government of his life.

In September, 1725, he was called to a tutorship in Yale College. Having passed the preceding winter and spring in severe study at the college, he entered on his tutorship in June, 1726, and left it in September, 1726. After having declined various invitations to take the oversight of churches, he was ordained February 15, 1727, as pastor of the church in Northampton, a colleague with his celebrated grandfather, Solomon Stoddard. He rose at once into eminence as a preacher, especially as a preacher of the divine law, of the divine sovereignty, of man's entire sinfulness by nature, of justification by faith, and of eternal punishment. He often spoke extempore; he seldom made a gesture; his voice was not commanding; his power was in his mind. Dr. Trumbull says that when Mr. Edwards was preaching at Enfield, Conn., "there was such a breathing of distress and weeping that the preacher was obliged to speak to the people and desire silence that he might be heard. A gentleman remarked to President Dwight that when, in his youth, he heard Mr. Edwards describe the day of judgment, he fully supposed that immediately at the close of the sermon "the Judge would descend, and the final separation take place." During the delivery of one of his most overwhelming discourses in the pulpit of a minister unused to such power, this minister is said to have forgotten himself so far as to pull the preacher by the coat, and try to stay the torrent of such appalling eloquence by the question, "Mr. Edwards! Mr. Edwards! is not God a merciful Being?"

In February, 1729, in consequence of the death of Mr. Stoddard, the entire charge of the congregation at Northampton was devolved on Mr. Edwards. In 1728 and 1730 occurred a remarkable "awakening" of religious feeling in his parish; another occurred in 1740, at which period he became a bosom friend of George Whitefield. During both these developments of religious activity he preached with a force which overawed his hearers. While his parochial labors were "skillful and earnest, he studied the phenomena of the revival with the keenness of a philosopher, and they prompted him to write some of his most acute disquisitions. Indeed, nearly all the works which he published during his ministry at Northampton indicate the degree in which he labored for the unloosing the regulation of those religious "awakenings" for which his ministry was distinguished. Some of these works are merely sermons, others are larger treatises. They bear the following titles: God glorified in Man's Dependence (1731): A divine and supernatural Light imparted to the Spirit of God (1731); Sermons on the Holy Ghost (1741); one of his most terrific sermons); Sorrows of the bereaved spread before Jesus (1741); Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the true Spirit (1741); Thoughts on the Revival in New England, etc. (1745): The Watchman's Duty and Account (1745); The true Excellency of a Gospel Minister (1744); A Treatise concerning religious Affections (1746); one of his most spiritual and analytical works); An humble Attempt to promote explicit Agreement and visible Union among God's People in extraordinary Prayer (1746); True Senses, when they are taken from the Balance (1747); God's awful Judgment in breaking the strong Rods of the Community (1748); Life and Diary of the Rev. David Brainerd (1749); a volume which exerted a decisive influence on Henry Martyn, and has affected the missionary spirit of the English as well as American churches. In New York he published a book of 484 pages in 1749; Qualifications for full Communion in the visible Church (1749; a treatise of historical as well as theological importance); Farewell Sermon to the People of Northampton (1750); called "the best farewell sermon ever written."

The last two publications suggest the most sorrowful event of President Edwards's life. He was dismissed from his Northampton pastorate on the 22d of June, 1750. As early as 1744 he had offended many, and among them some of the most influential families in his congregation, by certainregulations he adopted in regard to alleged immoralities prevalent at Northampton. The whole parish was shaken by his resolute and uncompromising reproofs, and was predisposed to resist any subsequent innovation which he might make. His grandfather, Mr. Stoddard, had written the memorial, which many persons who are not immoral have a right to partake of the Lord's Supper. The authoritative influence of Mr. Stoddard had induced not only the Northampton Church, but also many other churches, to adopt that principle. Mr. Edwards, after prolonged deliberation, opposed it. The entire community was aroused by his boldness in controverting the teachings of a man like Solomon Stoddard, "whose word was law." After a prolonged and earnest controversy, he was ejected from the office which he had adorned for more than twenty-three years. He never saw occasion to change the opinions which were so obnoxious to his people; and two years after his dismissal he published a work entitled Misrepresentation corrected and Truth vindicated in a Reply to Mr. Solomon Williams's Book on Qualifications for Communion; to which is added a letter from Mr. Edwards to his late Fleece. In June (1759). After his death, and after a disastrous controversy through the land, his principles prevailed among the evangelical churches.

At the present day, when the dismissal of pastors is so frequent, we cannot easily imagine the mortification and injury which Edwards suffered in consequence of his difficulties with his parish. He was in his forty-seventh year, and had accumulated no property for the support of his large and expensive family. He was compelled to receive pecuniary aid from his friends in remote parts of this country and in Great
Brittain. His wife was a descendant from the earls of Kersington, and was a lady of rare accomplishments. The description which he wrote of her in her girlhood was pronounced by Dr. Chalmers to be one of the most beautiful compositions in the language. He was married to her on the 27th of July, 1727, and at the time of his disinmission, his eldest son, afterwards judge Tim-

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

During his virtual banishment to the Stockbridge wilderness he wrote another of his more noted works, entitled The great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin defended, etc. The work was finished May 26, 1757, but was not published until 1758, several months after his death. Perhaps the distinctive feature in this treatise is his defence of the doctrine that there was a constituted oneness or identity of Adam and his poster-

in the seventeenth year; and, his daughter, afterwards the mother of president Timothy Dwight, was in her sixteenth year; another daughter, afterwards, the mother of President Dwight, died three years before his dismissal. She was betrothed to David Brainerd, who had been a cherished inmate of her fa-

In July, 1751, about a year after his dismissal, Edwards was installed pastor of the small Congregational church in Stockbridge, Mass., and missionary of the Housatonic tribe of Indians at that place. He preached to the religious services in the Indian language, and was an inter-

preter. In this uncultivated wilderness he was sadly afflicted with the fever and ague, and other disorders incident to the new settlements. He published a characteristic sermon in 1752, entitled True Grace dis-

tinguished from the Experience of Devils. In 1754 he published a dissertation on the subject of his Essay on the Freedom of the Will. Of this essay there are conflicting interpretations. One school of interpreters contend that he believed in a literal inability of the soul to act otherwise than it does act; another school contend that he did not believe in an inability which is absolute and literal, but only a two years of age; his second son, afterwards Dr. Jonathan Edwards, was about five years of age; and his youngest son, afterwards judge Pierpoint Edwards, was an infant of two or three months; his third daughter, afterwards the mother of Aaron Burr, was in her eleventh year; and his fourth daughter, afterwards the mother of President Dwight, died in her sixteenth year. He had a family of three sons and seven daughters—another daughter, Jerusha, having died three years before his dismissal. She was betrothed to David Brainerd, who had been a cherished inmate of her fa-

ther's family.

God's time, when a century old, is one plant with the little sprout from which it sprang; the soul, which is the body, and the body, which is the soul, is one with the infant body from which it grew—"as the body and soul are one with each other, so there is a divine "constitution" according to which Adam and his posterity are "looked upon as one, and dealt with accordingly;" that in his descendants "the first sin" was "the consequence and essential part of his fall, and as sin belonging to them, distinct from their participation in Adam's first sin;" that "the guilt a man has upon his soul at his first existence is one and simple, viz. the guilt of the original apostasy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled against God. This, and the guilt of sinning from the first moment of the depraved disposition of the heart, are not to be looked upon as two things distinctly imputed and charged upon men in the sight of God," but are one and the same thing, according to an arbitrary constitution, like that which excludes the freedom of the will, which is constantly flowing, or of an animal body which is constantly fluctuating. "When I call this an arbitrary constitution, I mean that it is a constitution which depends on nothing but the divine will, which divine will depends on nothing but the divine wisdom, the will of God. If he could possibly enter into the heart of any man to conceive," (Letter to a Scotch theologian). One school regard Edwards as agreeing with those Calvinists who suppose that "man, in his state of innocency, had freedom and power to do that which is good and well-pleasing to God, but yet mutable so that it might fail from it;" and that "man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation;" another school regard Edwards as denying this proposition in its literal, and affirming it only in its figurative sense, and believing that since the Fall man has all the freedom or liberty which he ever had, or can be imagined to have. One class of critics suppose him to believe that motives are the efficient or the necessitating causes of volitions; another class suppose him to believe that the volition is the effect of motive as an occasion, rather than the necessary effect of motive as a cause. The latter class interpret his whole theory of the will in the light of the following remark of Edwards to the Scotch divine: "On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which takes place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of necessity improperly, and that all such terms as must, cannot, impossible, unable, irresistible, unavoidable, inescapable, etc., when applied here, are not applied in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or in a sense quite diverse from their original and proper meaning, and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called certainty than necessity, it being no other than the certain connection between the subject and predicate of the proposition which affirms their existence." It is asserted by many that Edwards makes a distinction between the will and the sensibilities; it is thought by some that he does make a distinction; the acts of the will being acts of moral choice, the processes of the sensibilities being what he elsewhere terms "natural or animal feelings or affections."
an inferior above a superior good, appeal to Edwards's Dissertation on Virtue as having given a marked impulse with facetious colloquiality, in which he speaks of, such as the new, or the New England, or the Hopkinstian divinity. The two last-named dissertations were not published until 1788, thirty years after his death. In 1704 eighteen of Edwards's sermons were published in a volume, to which was prefixed his memoir by Dr. Samuel Sibly. After the death of his father and the publication of the History of Redemption, in 1788 a new volume of his sermons, in 1789 another new volume of his sermons, in 1793 his Miscellaneous Observations on Important Theological Subjects, in 1796 his Remarks on Important Theological Controversies, were all published at Edinburgh, Scotland. His published works were collected and arranged in eight volumes at Worcester, Mass., under the editorship of Dr. Samuel Austin, in 1809, and have been re-published repeatedly in England and America. A larger edition of his writings, in ten volumes, including a new memoir, and much new material, especially his Notes on the Bible, was published at New York in 1829, under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. Sereno Edwards Dwight. Parts of this edition have been re-published in England. In 1852, his work entitled Charity and its Fruits was published for the first time, and more recently in England and America. It has been re-published in England, which has never been reprinted in America.

One of the most interesting aspects in which president Edwards may be viewed is that of his influence over Whitefield, Brainerd, and two of his theological pupils, Bellamy and Hopkins. Another is that of his influence over Whitefield's converts and various of his treatises were published in Great Britain before they were published in America, and the estimate formed of him by Dr. Erskine, Dr. Chalmers, Robert Hald, Dugald Stewart, Sir Henry Moncrief, Sir James Mackintosh, Dr. Priestley, Dr. George Hillo, Isaac Taylor, and others, was of the highest order. It is true that many men of the same relative position in this country. It is a remarkable fact that, while living in a kind of exile as a missionary among the Indians at Stockbridge, he was invited to the presidency of the college at Prince- ton, New Jersey. He was elected to the office on the 26th of September, 1757. In his first response to the trustees he expressed his great surprise at their appointment, and, among other reasons for declining it, he said, with his characteristic simplicity, "I have a constitution in many respects peculiarly unhappy, attacking me from many quarters. I feel constant weakness and wretchedness of body, presence, and demeanor, with a disagreeable dulness and stiffness much unfitting me for conversation, but more especially for the government of a college." He was dismissed from his Stockbridge pastorate January 4, 1758, after having labored in it six years and a half. He spent a part of January and all of February at Princeton, performing some duties at the college, but was not inaugurated until the 16th of February, 1758. He was inculcated for the small-pox on the 25th of the same month; and after the ordinary effects of the in- culation had nearly subsided, a secondary fever sur- prised, and he died on the 22d of March, 1758. He had then resided at Princeton about nine weeks, and had been the inaugurated president of the college just five weeks. Only nine months, 6 months, 5 days, and 17 days. His father died in his 86th year, only two months before him; his son-in-law, president Burr, died in his 42d year, only six months before him; his daughter, Mrs. President Burr, died in her 27th year, only sixteen days after him; his wife died in her 46th year, only six months and ten days after him. The three last named are interred in the same burial- ground at Princeton. (E. A. P.)

Edwards, Jonathan, D.D., the second son and ninth child of the President whose history has been sketched in the preceding article, was born at North- ampton, Mass., May 26th, 1745. Although each was the president of a college, yet, as the father was not a doctor of divinity, he is but his honorary title, and the son is distinguished from him as the Doctor. In his early childhood young Edwards was afflicted with an ocular disease, and therefore did not learn to read at so early an age as his powers and in- stincts would have inclined him. In consequence also of the physical and mental conditions of his father's religious talent, he was deprived of some important facilities for his education. "When I was but six years of age," he writes in 1788, "my father removed with his family to Stockbridge, where at that time was inhabited by Indians almost solely, as there were but two town or villages, twelve families of white men, and perhaps one hundred and fifty families of Indians. The Indians being the nearest neighbors, I constantly associated with them; their boys were my daily schoolmates and playfellows. Out of my father's house I seldom heard any language but the Indian. By these means I acquired the knowledge of that lan- guage, and a great facility in speaking it. It became more familiar to me than my mother-tongue. I knew the names of some things in Indian that I did not know in English. Even all my thoughts ran in In- dian; and, in fact, the true Indian language is extremely difficult to all but themselves, they acknowledged that I had acquired it perfectly, which, as they said, had never been done before by any Ang- lo-American. On account of my skill in their lan- guage in general, I received from them many compli- ments applauding my superior wisdom. This skill in their language I have in a good measure retained to this day."

Although the pastor at Stockbridge was nominally the teacher of the Housatonmucks, yet, in fact, he often gave instruction to families of the Mowawks, Oneidas, and Tuscaroras, who had come to Stockbridge in the sake of its educational advantages. He was a patron and also an intimate companion of Gideon Hawley, a man highly revered as a preacher to the Indian tribes. The elder Edwards desired that his son Jonathan should be trained for a missionary among the Indians and he therefore sent the boy, not then eleven years old, to a settlement of the Oneida Indians on the banks of the Susquehanna. The faithful friend, Gideon Haw- ley, travelled with the boy, and took the charge of him, but, in consequence of the French and Indian war, was obliged to leave the country. In about six months among the Oneidas. Young Ed- wards endeared himself to the Oneida tribe, and on one occasion, when they expected an attack from the French, the Indians took the boy upon their shoulders, and bore him many miles through the wilderness in place of safety. At that early age he exhibited the traits which afterwards distinguished him—courage, fortitude, and perseverance. While travelling through the wilderness in the depths of winter he was sometimes compelled to sleep on the ground in the open air, and he endured the hardness as a good soldier. He spent the two years 1756, 1757, under the parental roof in Stockbridge, but in January, 1758, his father removed to Princeton, and in October, 1758, both his father and mother were removed from the world, and thus, in his fourteenth year, he was left an orphan. He had no pecuniary means of support, but, being educated, he was supported by the Indians; but, having received promises of aid from the friends of his parents, he entered the Grammar School at Princeton in February, 1760, was admitted to Prince- ton College in September, 1761, and was graduated there in September, 1765. During the presidency and under the preaching of Dr. Finley, he became, as he thought, a true servant of Christ, and in September, 1763, he became a member of the Church. After hav- ing studied theology with Dr. Joseph Bellamy, he was appointed as a preacher in October, 1766, by the Litchfield County Association. In 1767 he was ap-
pointed to the office of tutor at Nassau Hall, and was continued in the office two years. He was also, with great reluctance, at the professorship of languages and logic in the same institution. He had distinguished himself as a linguist and as a logician at Nassau Hall, and at a later day he received the doctorate of divinity from that college. Thus in his earlier years he was honored by his alma mater and by his master. He was now in a situation of uncommon promise, and in his mature years as a man of uncommon attainments. His contemporaries speak of him as indefatigably diligent while at college, and as ever afterwards an eager aspirant for knowledge in its various branches.

Dr. Edwards was also an itinerant and sometimes an eloquent preacher. Accordingly, he was invited to the pastorship of an important church in New Haven, Conn., and was ordained there Jan. 5, 1769. It is stated in his memoir, that the ordaining council were so intensely interested in his preparatory examination that they continued it for their own pleasure and profit several hours after the time which had been previously appointed for the public exercises of the ordination. Several members of his church were advocates of the "half-way covenant;" he, like his father, was decidedly hostile to it. This divergence of views occasioned a considerable trouble to him in his ministerial duties, and extravagances which had been connected with the "great awakening" in 1740-2 were followed by a disastrous reaction among the New England churches, and the ministry of Dr. Edwards was made in some degree insecure. Having removed his family and himself to Savannah, Georgia, his health was greatly disturbed by the demoralizing influences of the Revolutionary war. That war introduced a flood of errors among the people. Dangerous heresies were adopted by some members of his parish. The result of all these untoward events was that he was dismissed from his office May 19, 1780, after having labored in it more than twenty-six years. The *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine* stated that the principal cause "of his dismissal was the departure of some of his parishioners from their former faith, but the ostensible cause assigned by the society was their inability to support a minister of his calibre."

He had already acquired a great reputation as a philosopher and as a philanthropist. He was well known and much beloved by divines in Great Britain, with some of whom he maintained an active correspondence as well as some, who could not, however, cut out some official relations. In January, 1796, he was installed pastor of the church in Colebrook, Conn. Here, in the bosom of an intelligent, affectionate, and confiding parish, he persevered in his rigorous system of study, and prepared himself for works which he did not undertake for a second time. Having enjoyed his present health a little more than three years, he was surprised by being called in May, 1799, to the presidency of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. After a prolonged examination of his duties, he applied to an ecclesiastical council for their advice, and in accordance with their counsel he accepted the new office. He entered on its duties in the summer of 1799, and was welcomed with unusual demonstrations of joy. Rev. Dr. Andrew Yates, who was associated with Dr. Edwards in the government of the college, says of him: "His disciples were mild and affectionately parental, and his requirements reasonable. Such a change in the government in president Edwards was unexpected to some who professed to know his disposition, and had formed their opinions of him in this respect. It was therefore the more noticed. There was an apparent austerity in the manner in which he laid aside the retirement of study and from habits of close thought, and would leave such an impression after a slight acquaintance; but in his domestic intercourse, and with his intimate friends, while conscientiously strict and prompt in his duties, and while he acted with decision, he was mild and affectionate. The same spirit characterized his government of the college. It was a government also attended with greater mildness and affection than would have been expected, had not the prevailing expectations of some intimated the danger of his erring on the side of severity. His pupils, like a well-regulated family under faithful discipline, were respectfully attached to him."

On April 15, 1799, about a fortnight before his death, he died, at the age of fifty-six years, two months, and six days. "The blood of Christ is my only ground of hope" were among his last words. A highly eulogistic sermon was preached at his funeral in the Reformed Dutch Church at Schenectady by his friend, Rev. Reuben Hawley, of Savannah, who had been greatly affected by the loss of his first wife, who, in June, 1782, was drowned. He had also been reared of one child; but three of his children survived him.

The influence of Dr. Edwards in the pulpit, although not equal to that of his father, was yet greater than might have been expected from his analytic habits. His eye was piercing, his whole manner was impressive, his thoughts were clear and weighty, and his general character was itself a sermon. He was known to be honest, and a hearty lover of the Saviour in Jesus. The world always talked, in the superficial meaning of that phrase, yet he was powerful in conversation with men of letters, and was a prince among disputants; therefore his influence over his theological pupils was perhaps as important as his power in the pulpit. In about the same period, he instructed many young men for the Christian ministry, and his influence is yet apparent in the writings of some of them. One of these pupils was his nephew, president Dwight, of Yale College, who was wont to speak of him with filial reverence; another was Dr. Griffin, president of Williams College, who afforded frequent testimony to the power of his teacher. A large part of Dr. Edwards's influence arose from his interpretations of his father's writings. He often said that he had spent his life on those writings, although, in fact, he had a more various learning than belonged to his father. He studied the published and the unpublished works of the elder president with peculiar care. He was an early and confidential friend of Dr. Bellamy, one of the most intimate associates of the elder president, and he learned from Bellamy the exact shadings of his father's meaning without a long foreknowledge of Dr. Samuel Hopkins, another of president Edwards's bosom companions, and he obtained from Hopkins many nice discriminations in regard to the president's theories as expounded in his conversations. He was thus well fitted to be an editor of his father's works, and he did honor for the present of the *History of the Work of Redemption*, two volumes of sermons, and two volumes of Miscellaneous Observations on Important Theological Subjects. He was also well fitted to write a commentary on his father's doctrinal system, as that system was originally published by the President, or afterwards modified by Hopkins, Bellamy, Smalley, and others. In this aspect there is great value belonging to Dr. Edwards's treatise entitled *Improvements in Theology made by President Edwards and those who have followed his Course of Thought*. In 1797, while he was at Colebuck, he published a *Discourse on the State of the Son of God according to the Rev. Dr. Samuel West*. This volume may be regarded as perhaps the fairest exponent of the elder president's theory of the will. It led Dr. Emmons to say that, of the two, the father had more reason than the son, yet the son was a better reasoner than the father. It is accordingly in his published works that the influence of Dr. Edwards has been most conspicuous. He printed numerous articles in the *New York Theological Magazine*; various sermons, one in 1783, at the ordination of Rev. Timothy Dwight, at Greenfield, Conn.; one in 1791, on the Injustice and Impolicy of
the Slave-trade; one in 1791, on Human Depravity; one in 1792, at the ordination of Rev. Dan Bradley, at Hamden; one in 1792, at the ordination of Rev. William Brown, at Glastonbury; one in 1792, the Concil ad Clerum, preached in the chapel of Yale College on the marriage of a deceased wife's sister; one in 1798, on the death of a prominent minister; one in 1794; in 1797, a sermon on the Future State of Existence and the Immortality of the Soul; in 1799, a Farewell Sermon to the people of Cobrook. The most celebrated of his discourses are the three On the Necessity of the Atonement and its Consistency with Free Grace; and the three On the Atonement, its Necessity, and its Accidents. To these was added his address as his excellency the governor and a large number of both houses of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, during their session at New Haven, in October, 1785, and published by request. They have been fruitfully studied, and are now thoroughly familiar with the thought, that he has sometimes called the "Edwardsian" theory, and is now commonly adopted by what is termed the "New England school of divines." These discourses have great historical as well as theological importance, and they serve to illustrate the fact that some of the most profound treatises in the science of divinity have been originally preached in sermons. One ultimate design of his volume on the Atonement was to refute the argument which some were deriving from that doctrine in favor of universal salvation. Intimately connected with this volume is another larger work, widely published in 1789, but frequently republished, and entitled, The Salvation of All Men, strictly examined, and the endless Punishment of those who, being conjured and defended against the Reasonings of Dr. Chauncey in his book entitled The Salvation of all Men. This work alone would have established the fame of Dr. Edwards as a divine of singular acuteness, deep penetration, accuracy and precision of thought and style. At the present day it is more suggestive of the true and decisive modes of reasoning on this subject than all the other extant tracts on the subject. The preceding works illustrate the metaphysical acumen and the profound judgment of Dr. Edwards; he published one essay which indicates his tact as a philologist, and which elicited the enthusiastic praises of Humboldt. This is his Observations on the Language of the Muhhekanese, in which the extent of its grammatical and other forms is shown, its genius grammatically traced, and some of its pecularities, and some instances of analogy between that and the Hebrew are pointed out. These observations were "communicated to the Connecticut Society of Arts and Sciences, and published as the report of the society." The best accomplished of American linguists, Hon. John Pickering, who edited one edition of this paper, says of it: "The work has been for some time well known in Europe, where it has undoubtedly contributed to the diffusion of more just ideas than once prevailed respecting the structure of the Indian languages, and has served to correct some of the errors into which learned men had been led by placing too implicit confidence in the accounts of hasty travellers and blundering interpreters. In the Micmacs, that immortal monument of philological research, professor Vater refers to it for the information he has given upon the Mohican language, and he has published large extracts from it. To a perfect familiarity with the Muhhekanese dialect, Dr. Edwards united a stock of grammatical and other learning which well qualified him for the task of reducing to written language the rules of grammar. Nearly all of Dr. Edwards's published writings were collected and reprinted in two octavo volumes, each of above 500 pages, in 1842. They were edited, and a memoir was prefixed to them, by his grandson, Rev. Tryon Edwards. Although the two Edwardses were in various particulars dissimilar, yet in many respects there was a striking resemblance between them. Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, says "the son greatly resembled his venerable father in metaphysical acuteness, in ardent piety, and in the purest exemplification of Christian deportment." The son, like the father, was a tutor in the college where he had been a student; was for a time a professor of divinity; was born where his paternal grandfather had been the pastor; was dismissed on account of his doctrinal opinions; was afterwards the minister of a retired parish; was then president of a college, and died soon after his inauguration. His memoir states that both the father and the son died on the first Sabbath of the January preceding their death from the text, "This year thou shalt die." (E. A. F.)

Edwards, Justin, D.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Westhampton, Mass., April 25, 1787. He graduated at Williams College 1810; entered the Theological Seminary in Andover March, 1811, and was installed pastor of the South Church in the same place December 2, 1812. In 1825 he was one of the sixteen who founded the "American Society for the Promotion of Temperance." He was installed pastor of the Salem-Sfleet Church, Boston, January 1, 1826, but resigned August 20, 1829, and entered the service of the American Temperance Society and the Abolition Society. His zeal, wisdom, and activity contributed, perhaps more than any other agency, to diffuse the principles of the Temperance reform in the United States. He was elected Professor of Theology in the Seminary in New York in 1835, and President of the Seminary at Andover, 1837. He accepted the latter appointment. In 1842 he was chosen secretary of the newly-formed American and Foreign Sabbath Union, and in this service he spent several laborious and eminently useful years. He died July 24, 1853. He published An Address on the Rhetorical Society of the Theological Seminary at Andover (1824).—An Address at the laying of the corner-stone of the new meeting-house in Andover (1826).—A Letter to the friends of Temperance in Mass. (1836).—Permanent Temperance Documents, a series of papers (1850-56).—Permanent Documents, a series of papers on the Sabbath and various tracts for the American Tract Society, and a compendious Commentary (N. T. and part of O. T.; Amer. Tract Society). His life was full of varied but always consecrated labor, and few men have contributed more largely to promote Christian ethics in America by laying their lives on the line in true reform. His "Life of Dr. Justin Edwards, Life of Justin Edwards (Amer. Tract Society); and Sprague, Annals, ii. 572.

Edwards, Morgan, a Baptist minister, was born in Trevethin parish, Wales, May 9, 1722. He commenced preaching in 1738, supplied for seven years a small congregation in Boston, Lincolnshire, and thence removed to Cork, Ireland, where he was pastor for nine years. After spending one year more at Rye, in Sussex, he emigrated to America, and in May, 1761, became pastor of the Baptist Church in Philadelphia. In 1772 he removed to Newark, Del., and preached to several vacant places until the commencement of the Revolution. After the war he delivered lectures on divinity in Philadelphia and other parts of Pennsylvania, as well as in New Jersey, Delaware, and New England. He died January 28, 1796. Besides various manuscripts, he left behind him forty-two volumes of sermons. He published a number of sermons, addresses, pamphlets, etc. —Sprague, Annals, vii. 82.

Edwards, Thomas, on English divinity, was born about 1575, passed A.B. at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1606, and A.M. in 1609. He did not become a Nonconformist, but yet was always a Puritan in theology. "I never," says he, "had a canonical coat, declined authority for fifty years before the Parliament, though I practiced the old conformity; much less did bow to the altar and at the name of Jesus,
EDWARDS

etc. He was lecturer at Hertford, and afterwards in London. When the Long Parliament declared against
Charles I he sided with them, but when the Independents came into power he opposed them with great vir-
tulence both in writing and acting. He published
Books against the Independency, and a particular
Conferences (1641, 4to:—Antapologia, or a full
answer to the apologetical Narration of Mr. Goodwyn,
Mr. Nye, Mr. Symonds, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge,
Members of the Assembly of Divines, wherein are
handled many of the Controversies of those Times (1644, 4to)
The chief design of this work we learn from himself,
in the preface to it: "This Antapologia," says he, "I
here recommend to you for a true glass to behold the
faces of Presbytery and Independency in, with
the beauty, order, and strength of the one, and the deform-
ity, disorder, and weakness of the other";—Gangra-
ena, or a Catalogue and discovery of many of the
Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and pernicious Practices of the
Sectaries of this Time (1645, 4to):—Gangrena, part ii
(1646, 4to):—Gangrena, part iii:—The casting down
of the last and strongest hold of Satan, or a Treatise
against Toleration (part i, 1647):—Of the particular
Visibleness of the Church: — A Treatise of the Civil Power
in Ecclesiastics, and of Suspension from the Lord's
Supper. He died Aug. 24, 1647. He professed him-
self "a plain, open-hearted man, who hated tricks,
repelled by a zeal for the true worship of God: an
Assembly of Divines, the Directory, the use of the Lord's
Prayer, singing of psalms, etc., and so earnest for
what he took to be the truth that he was usually
called in Cambridge young Luther." — Kippis, Biog.
Brui. vol. vi.

Edwards, Thomas, D.D., a learned Arminian
divine, born at Coventry, England, in 1729; entered
Clare Hall, Cambridge (of which he became fellow),
in 1747; master of the Free School, and rector of St.
John the Baptist, Coventry, in 1758; vicar of Nune-
ston, Warwickshire, in 1770; and died in 1785. His
principal writings are, (1.) The Doctrine of irreversable
Grace proved to have no Foundation in the Writings of the
New Testament (Camb. 1759, 8vo);—(2.) Prolego-
mena in libros veteris Testamenti poeticos (Can.
1762, 8vo).

Edwards, Timothy, a Congregational minister,
born May 14, 1669, at Hartford, Conn. He grad-
uated at Harvard College July 4, 1681, and was or-
dained May, 1684, in New Hampshire, which, with
the relation he sustained until his death, Jan. 27, 1758.
Mr. Edwards was father of the distinguished Jonathan
Edwards. He published but one sermon (Election
Sermon, 1730).—Sprague, Annals, i, 280.

Edwy, surnamed the Fair, eldest son of king Ed-
ward the Confessor, was created king of England
in 955, while his brother Edgar became vice-roy of
Mercia. Edwy had married Alfricga, the daughter
of a noble matron, and was affectionately attached
to his young wife. The monks, at the head of whom
were Dunstan and archbishop Odo, had, during the
reign of Older, so great an influence at the court,
that the young king rejected their counsels, and this
appears to have made them jealous of Alfricga, believ-
ing her to be the cause of this change; and when, on
the occasion of his coronation, the king left his court
for a time, Dunstan, who had watched for an opportu-
nity to revenge himself on the queen, rushed to her
chamber, tore the king from her arms, and brought
him back to his courtiers. In revenge for this indig-
ity, Edwy not only banished Dunstan (956), but ex-
 tended his hatred to the monks generally. Odo
declined the murder, desiring lawful, carried the queen a pris-
oner to Ireland, and ordered her face to be branded
with a red-hot iron. Her wounds soon healed, she
recovered her former beauty, and returned to Glou-
cester. Here she was discovered by Odo's emissaries,
and was treated with such cruelty as to cause her
death. When Edwy attempted to resist this violence
of the monks, Odo formed a conspiracy against him
with Edgar, supported by the Mercians and Northum-
brians, and he was deprived of the larger part of his
kingdom—all England north of the Thames. He sur-
deed his triumph for a time, but was brought to
death before the end of the year 959. While the
monks represent king Edwy as licentious and a mal-
administrator, Huntingdon, who was no party in
the quarrel, gives him a handsome character, reports
that the country flourished under his administration, and
that Odo and Dunstan became his enemies because
he was unwilling to submit to the severity of monastic
rulers.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Génér. xv, 692; Mackin-
tosh, History of England, i, 55 sq.; Wright, Biographe
Brui. Lat. (A. S. F.) 430 sq.; Collier, Eccles. History, i,
430 sq.; Edinb. Rev. xxv and xlix.

Edzardi, Eara, a great Hebrew scholar, was born
at Hamburg June 28, 1629. He pursued his studies
at Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Tübingen, and, in order
to become still more proficient, visited many of the
larger cities, as Zwickau, where he studied under
Daun; Bazel, where he enjoyed the instruction of
Buxtorf (q. v.); Strasbourg, Giessen, Göttingen, and
also Rostock, where he was made a licentiate. On
his return to Hamburg he gave instruction in Hebrew,
and became famous not only for his learning in the
Oriental tongues, his thorough acquaintance with Tal-
udic literature, and Hebrew antiquities, but also for
his zeal in the conversion of Jews and Romanists. He
died January 1, 1708. Most of the works of Edzardi
remain in MS. form. The only book mentioned by
Gräše is Consenans Antiqui. Judicioris ex explicat. christi-
ianorum super Jerem. xvi, 5, 6, Heb. 37. (Kämb.
1760, fol.).—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Génér. xv, 694;
Gräše, Aligem. Literärgeschichte, vi, 866. (J. H. W.)

Edzardi, Ezra Heinrich, a theologian and his-
torian, son of Sebastian Edzardi, was born at Hambur-
Jan. 30, 1708. Although his life was very short (he
died Feb. 4, 1738), he left a number of works, of which
the principal are, Sächsische Kirchengeschichte (Alto-
n. 1729, 8vo);—Ordinanz der seih gelehre Luthers
Catechismo (Hamburg, 1721, 8vo);—Disputatio de Cyrc
ante mortuis non contra clement (Wittenbr. 1722, 4to):
—Wohre Lehre von der Graden wohlf (Hamburg, 1721, 4to).

Edzardi, Georg Eilesen, son of Ezra Edzardi,
known as Georg, is a great scholar, was born at
Hamburg January 22, 1661. He studied at the
universities of Giessen, Frankfort on the Oder, and
Heidelberg, and resided for some time at Worms,
where he held many disputations with the Rabins.
After a journey through Germany, he was appointed
professor of Hebrew and history at the gymnasium in
Hamburg. In 1717 he was appointed professor of
Hebrew, and in this department became the worthy suc-
cessor of his father, and, like him, was zealous in the
conversion of the Jews. He died July 23, 1727.
Besides theses on the Talmud, we have from him Ex-
cerpta Generis Biblici (1709);—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog.
Génér. xv, 698; Gräše, Literärgeschichte, vi, 866. (J. H. W.)

Edzardi, Johann Eara, a German historian,
brother of the distinguished Hebraist Georg Eilezer,
was born at Hamburg June 23, 1662. He studied at
his own native place, at Giessen, and at the leading
universities of Germany and Sweden. Edzardi was
for a time an instructor at Rostock, and on his return
to Hamburg was called to London to preside as pastor
over the evangelical Church of the Holy Trinity. He
died Nov. 15, 1713. Besides a Funeral Oration to Queen
Mary, he has also written History of the Church of England.

Edzardi, Sebastian, youngest son of Eara, was
born at Hamburg August 1, 1673. When only eight-
early years old he went to Holland and England, and
soon after entered the University of Wittenberg.
where he received his M.A. degree in 1695. He then entered upon the study of theology, but in 1696 was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics at the Hamburg Gymnasium. As a bishop he was a man of learning, but his zeal for the Lutherans and his hatred of the Reformed, whom he believed insincere in their professions, engaged him in long and violent controversies. The king of Prussia, Friedrich I (in 1706), ordered five of Edzard's dissertations written against the Reformed to be burned as a hate of the sheriff (Walch, Ketter-Historie, i, 512 sq.; iii, 1087 sq.). But this punishment was no avail with Edzard. He even went so far as to impeach the character of the University of Halle, which he called Holle (Tartarus). After the burning of his books he devoted all his strength and faculties in his efforts for the conversion of the Jews. He died June 10, 1736. A complete catalogue of his numerous polemical writings may be found in Thiessen, Vernach. e. Gebüth. Gesch. von Hamburg, Th. 1, 139-154, and in Moller's Cimbría Literari, i, 147-151. His leading dissertations against a union with the Reformed were, Dissert. de unioni cum Reformatis hodiernis fugiendi (Hamb. 1703, 4to); — De circ. eni. coiusm. a Calvinisiiu quaestis (Hamb. 1704, 4to); — Pelagianismus Calvinianorum commutatus (Hamb. [Vitba. 1705, 4to]); — Monarcaeius Calvinianorum. commutatus. una cum calvinum esse erunt (Acad. C. Mart. 1706, 4to); — Hoofer, Nouv. Biogr. Gén. xv, 694; Fuhrmann, Handschrift. d. Kirchengesch. i, 672; Aschbach, Al Gygen. Kirchen-Lexicon, ii, 496; Schröck, Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reform. vili, 231, 392; Grasse, Algygen. Literarischgeschichte, vi, 868. (J. H. W.)

Effectual Calling. See CALL.

Effectual Prayer is the rendering of an expression which occurs James v, 16: "The effectual prayer of a righteous man availeth much." The verb inygein (the root of the English energy), thus translated, signifies to work in, produce, effect (intrinsically, Matt. xiv, 2; Mark vi, 15; or transitively, 1 Cor. xii, 6; Gal. iii, 5; Ephes. i, 11; Phil. ii, 13; or in the "middle voice," Rom. vii, 5; 2 Cor. i, 6; iv, 12; Gal. v, 6; Ephes. iii, 20; Col. i, 29; 1 Thess. ii, 13; 2 Thess. ii, 7). The participle here, if regarded as used in a neuter sense, adjectively, would signify operativus, effectivus, and such is the interpretation of most commentators (see Wolflri Curia, locc.; for the etymology and derivation of the word, see Hammer, Hammond, Whitby, Macknight, Dodridge, and Clarke, to regard it as passive, in its literal sense, invidiosus, implying both earnest earnest and d'vine influence, not full inspiration (although the example of Elijah ad- deduced in the following verse would almost warrant that, but such an allusion as accompanies the supplications of the believing supplicant. See PRAYER.

Efficacious Grace. See Grace; Jansenism.

Effronite, an obscure Transylvanian sect of the sixteenth century, who not only denied the Holy Ghost, but, among other fooleeries, cut their foreheads and anointed them with oil as a mode of initiation. Hence their name "esforna" — out of the bow (Echal, Eccl. Cypcor. v).

Effusion of the Holy Spirit. See Pentecost.

Egbert or Echbert, archbishop of York, was a brother of the Saxon king. After his visit to Rome and his ordination he had for a time the care of the youth of York, and a pupil, and later a friend, of Beda. As teacher at the cathedral school of York, he became celebrated for ex- tensive knowledge and for his Christian character. Among those who were educated at this school were Alcuin and Aelbert. He became bishop of York in 781, and soon after, in 785, York was made an arch- bishopric, with metropolitan power over all bishops north of the river Humber. Even as bishop and arch- bishop, Echbert was a man of learning, but his zeal for the Lutherans and his hatred of the Reformed, whom he believed insincere in their professions, engaged him in long and violent controversies. The king of Prussia, Friedrich I (in 1706), ordered five of Edzard's dissertations written against the Reformed to be burned as a hate of the sheriff (Walch, Ketter-Historie, i, 512 sq.; iii, 1087 sq.). But this punishment was no avail with Edzard. He even went so far as to impeach the character of the University of Halle, which he called Holle (Tartarus). After the burning of his books he devoted all his strength and faculties in his efforts for the conversion of the Jews. He died June 10, 1736. A complete catalogue of his numerous polemical writings may be found in Thiessen, Vernach. e. Gebüth. Gesch. von Hamburg, Th. 1, 139-154, and in Moller's Cimbría Literari, i, 147-151. His leading dissertations against a union with the Reformed were, Dissert. de unioni cum Reformatis hodiernis fugiendi (Hamb. 1703, 4to); — De circ. eni. coiusm. a Calvinisiiu quaestis (Hamb. 1704, 4to); — Pelagianismus Calvinianorum commutatus (Hamb. [Vitba. 1705, 4to]); — Monarcaeius Calvinianorum. commutatus. una cum calvinum esse erunt (Acad. C. Mart. 1706, 4to); — Hoofer, Nouv. Biogr. Gén. xv, 694; Fuhrmann, Handschrift. d. Kirchengesch. i, 672; Aschbach, Al Gygen. Kirchen-Lexicon, ii, 496; Schröck, Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reform. vili, 231, 392; Grasse, Algygen. Literarischgeschichte, vi, 868. (J. H. W.)

Egbert, Saint, was born in the 7th century. He was a monk in the convent of Rathmelsing, and in 614, when seized with the plague, he made a vow that, in case of recovery, he would leave his country and preach the Gospel among the pagans. He accordingly set out as a missionary for Germany, but was by a tempest compelled to return. He then took up his abode among the monks of the island of Hy, from where he sent as missionaries to Friesland, first, the learned monk, Egbert, and, when this was unsuccessful, after two years of fruitless labor, twelve Anglo-Saxon. Egbert had a prominent share in kindling that remarkable missionary zeal which distinguished the Anglo-Saxons in the 8th century. He introduced, in 716, into the monastery of Hy the Roman manner of celebrating Easter, and the Roman calendar. He died in 729. — Beda, Hist. Eccl. Anglii, iii, 27; v, 10, 11, 23; Herzog, Real-Encycl. iii, 658. (A. J. S.)

Egede, Hans, an eminent Danish missionary, called the "apostle of Greenland," was born at Har- stad, Norway (which at that time belonged to Den- mark), Jan. 51, 1686, and became pastor at Drontheim in 1707. Here he conceived the project of a mission to Greenland, having derived from a history of Nor- way the impression that formerly there had been Chris- tians in Greenland, where now there were only hea- thens. "Egede, after receiving some suggestions to this effect from a friend in Bergen, became so enthusi- astic on the subject that he wrote to the king of Bergen and Drontheim in 1710, proposing an expedi- tion to convert the Greenlanders; and on its striking him that such a recommendation would come with an ill grace from one who did not offer to undertake it himself, he made the offer, supposing, however, as he himself tells us, that as it was war-time, and the expedi- tion would require some money, the proposal would not be accepted. He received in reply a strange let- ter from the bishop of Drontheim, Krog, in which the prelate suggested that 'Greenland was undoubtedly a part of America, and could not be very far from Cuba and Hispaniola, where there was found such abun- dance of gold;' concluding that it was very likely that those who went to Greenland would bring home 'in- credible riches.' Egede had made this offer, very oddly, without acquainting his wife; and as soon as she became aware of it, by the receipt of a letter, she, with her mother and his mother, assailed Egede with such strong remonstrances, that, he says in his own account, he was quite conquered, and re- pulsed his folly with a promise to remain in the land which 'God had placed him in.' (Eng. Cypcor.). Soon after he went, however, gave his consent. In 1717 he threw up his benefice at Vaagen, and went with his family to Bergen, endeavoring to find a company to trade with Greenland. The merchants did not re- ceive this project favorably, and Egede determined to lay his plans before the king at Copenhagen. "Fred-
Egede IV of Denmark, who had already, in 1714, founded a college for the propagation of the Gospel, sent Egede back to Bergen with his approbation; a company was formed, to which Egede put down his name for the first subscription of 800 dollars, and finally, on May 8, 1721, a ship called 'Isabel', or 'The Hope', set sail for Greenland, with six souls on board, including Egede and his family. On the 8d of July, after a dangerous voyage, they set foot on shore at Haalservier, on the western coast, and were, on the whole, hospitably received by the natives. The very appearance of the Greenlanders at once put a negative on the superior officer, with only two or three women, men, and their language, which it was now the missionary's business to learn, was found to be entirely of a different kind, being, in fact, nearly related to that spoken by the Esquimaux of Labrador. The climate and the soil were both hard, and harder than the Norwegians had expected, and the only circumstance that was in their favor was the character of the inhabitants, which, though at first excessively phlegmatic, so as to give the idea that their feelings had been frozen, was neither cruel, nor, as was found by further experience, that they received religious impressions. For some years the mission had a hard battle for life. The settlers, unable to obtain sufficient food by fishing and the chase, were entirely dependent on the supply of provisions sent them by annual store-ships from Denmark, and when this supply was delayed, were reduced to live on store-ships from the coast from Greenland. On one occasion even Egede's courage gave way, and he had made up his mind to abandon the mission and return to Europe unless the provisions arrived within fourteen days. His wife alone opposed the resolution, and refused to pack up, persisting in predicting that the store-ship would arrive in six weeks; and, when the time had elapsed, the ships, which had missed the coast, found their way, and brought tidings that, rather than give up the attempt to Christianize Greenland, the king had ordered a lottery in favor of it, and, on the lottery's failing, had imposed a special tax on Denmark and Norway under the name of the Greenland Assessment. In 1727 the Bergen company for trading with Greenland was dissolved, from the losses it had sustained, and the Danish government then resolved on founding a colony in Greenland, and sent in 1738 a ship of war, with a body of soldiers under the command of a Major Paars. The soldiers grew mutinous when they saw to what a country they had been sent, and Egede found his life in more danger from his countrymen than it had ever been from the natives. The death of king Frederick IV, in 1732, occasioned a change in the court of Greenland. The new king, Christian VI., did his utmost to break up the colony and recall all his subjects from Greenland, with the exception of such as chose to remain of their own free-will, to whom he gave directions that provisions were to be allowed for one year, but that they were to be led to expect no further supply. Egede had then been ten years in Greenland, and his labors were beginning to bear fruit. His eldest son Paul, who was a boy of twelve when they landed, had been of much assistance in learning the language and in other ways; his wife and the younger children had greatly in projecting a favorable effect on the natives, who had seen no Europeans before except the crews of the Dutch trading-vessels. The angekoks, or conjurers, who might almost be called the priests of the native religion, had been saved, some into respect and others into silence, by the theological and benevolent influence of the Angekok; the natives had seen with wonder the interest he took in their welfare, and, if they refused to believe the new doctrines themselves, had not forbidden them to their children, of whom Egede had a hundred and fifty baptized. The elder Greenlanders, when Egede told them of the efficacy of prayer, asked him to pray that there should be no winter; and when he spoke of the torment of fire, said they should prefer it to frost. Egede, confirmed by his wife, resolved to remain, and this resolution greatly increased his influence over the Greenlanders, who knew that it could only proceed from zeal in their behalf. The king of Denmark, unable to resist his constancy, sent another ship the following year, and the number went by boat; and, finally, in 1738, announced that he had changed his mind, and determined to devote a yearly sum to the Greenland mission. A dreadful trial was approaching. The Greenland children, of whom some had occasionally been sent to Denmark, almost all died of the small-pox. Two or three of them were taken home from Copenhagen in the vessel which came in 1738; one of them died on the voyage, the other brought the disorder to Greenland, and the mortality was dreadful. From September, 1738, to June, 1739, the contagion spread over the whole country, and Egede went to the Green- land. When the trading-agents afterwards went over the country, they found every dwelling-house empty for thirty leagues to the north of the Danish colony, and the same devastation was said to have extended still farther south: the number of the dead was computed at 2000. That was the beginning of a combination of horrors which could seldom be equalled, but they were met with admirable constancy by Egede and his indefatigable wife. The same ship that brought the small-pox had brought the assistance of some Moravian missionaries. In the year 1736 his son Paul had been sent from the colony to Christiania; and in 1738 he had been sent to study, and the elder Egede, finding his health begin to fail, applied for leave to return home. The permission reached him in 1735, but his return was delayed from the illness of his wife, who longed to see her native land again, but was dead upon her arrival, and the death of her husband, death, and the next year, he appeared, dying finally in Greenland on the 21st of December, 1735, at the age of 62. Egede carried her coffin with him to Denmark, and she was buried in Copenha- gen, where she was followed to the grave by the whole of the clergy of the city. A seminary for the Green- land mission was established there in 1740, and Egede was appointed superintendent, with the title of bishop. In the same year he preferred a memorial for an expendi- tion to be sent out to discover the lost 'eastern col- ony' of the old Norwegians, and offered to accompany it in person, but the proposal was not adopted. In 1747 Egede was sent to Copenhagen, and spent most of the remainder of his life at the house of his daughter Christine, who was married to a clergy- man of the island of Falster. While he was at Copen- hagen he had married a second wife, who accom- panied him to Falster, but before his last illness he expressed a wish that he should be buried in the churchyard of his first wife at Copenhagen, and said that if they would not promise to carry this wish into effect, he would go to Copenhagen to die there. He died at Falster on the 5th of November, 1766 (Eng. Cyclop.). He wrote two books on the history of his life's labors. The first was, Relation anguaadende den Grønlandke Mis- sions Begyndelse og forstætinge (Copen. 1788; German, Hamb. 1748). It is rich in materials, but dry in style. Its chief recommendation is its sincerity. The reader is disposed to give entire confidence to the missionary, who not only tells him that on one occasion he was so eagerly in his vocation, but that on another he occu- pied himself for days in the study of alchemy; who not only speaks of the ardor of his faith at times, but tells us that at others he was seized with a hatred of his task and of religion altogether. The second was, Des gamle Grøn- landers Kunde og ændrede benevolences til forskudd; the work was benevolent work, and was transla- ted into French (1768), and into English in 1745, under the title of A Description of Greenland. The transla- tion was reprinted in 1818. It comprises his observa- tions on the geography and natural history of Green- land, and the manners of its inhabitants.
Egged, Paul, son of Hans, was born at Waagen, Norway; went to Greenland in 1729, in his twelfth year; afterwards studied at Copenhagen; returned to Greenland in 1734; finally left it in 1740, and was, in reward for his labors, appointed chaplain at the hospital of the Bishop of the See, member of the College of Missions, director of the Hospital of Orphans, and finally (1786) bishop of Greenland. Having retired to the house of his son-in-law, pastor Saabye, he did not cease to urge the Danish government to send new expeditions to that colony, and made up his mind to seeing it finally complied with. He died June 8, 1789. He wrote and published a Greenland grammar (Grammatica Greenlandica - Lat. - Dan., Copenhagen, 1760) and dictionary (Dictionarium Greenlandicum Danico-Latino, Copenhagen, 1754), which have since been improved by Fabricius; translated the New Testament into the language, and was the author of a work, Etterretning om Grønland (Information on Greenland, Copenhagen, 1789), which is one of the most interesting in Danish literature. It gives a history of the mission from 1729 to 1786 in a more interesting style than his father was master of. - Hoefier, Nouv. Biogr. Génér. xv, 705.

Egged. See Heiffer.

EGG (777,720, bapto), so called from its whiteness, so-called, in the plur., of eggs deserted (Isa. x, 14), of the eggs of a bird (Deut. xxii, 6), of the ostrich (Job xxxix, 14), or the cockatrice (Isa. lix, 5). See FOWL; OSTRICH; COCKATRICE. It is apparently in this last sense that an egg is contrasted with a scorpion in Luke xi, 12, as a desirable article of food. The body of the scorpion is said to resemble an egg. The head can scarcely be distinguished, as it appears to be joined and continued to the breast. Bochart adduces authorities to prove that scorpions in Judea were about the size of an egg (Job xxxix, 14; Isa. x, 14; lix, 5). The passage in Job xxxii, 6, humanely prohibits the taking away of a brooding bird from a nest, and is similar in its nature to the provision respecting other animals and their young (Lev. xxv, 28).

Eggs are usually considered a great delicacy in the East, and are served up with fish and honey at their entertainments. Among the ancient Egyptians poultry was kept in abundance, and the most remarkable thing connected with it is the manner in which the eggs were hatched by artificial means, and which, from the monuments, we have reason to infer, was known and practised there at a very early period. At present times there are as many as four hundred and fifty of these establishments, which, being heavily taxed, produce a large revenue to the government. The proprietors of these egg-ovens make the round of the villages in their vicinity, and collect eggs from the peasants, which are given in charge to the reapers, who, without any previous examination, place all they receive on mats strewn with bran, in a room eleven feet square, with a flat roof, and about four feet high, over which is a chamber of the same size, but with a vaulted roof, about nine feet high; a small aperture in the centre of the vaulted roof admitted the oven during the warm weather, and another of larger diameter immediately below, communicating with the oven, through whose ceiling it is pierced. By this the man descends to observe the eggs; but in the cold season both openings are closed, and a lamp is kept burning instead, or an extension of the front part of the oven being then used for the same purpose, and shut immediately on its quitting it. In the upper room, the fire is disposed along the length of two troughs, based with earthen slabs, reaching from one side to the other against the front and back walls. In the oven the eggs are placed in a line, corresponding to and immediately below the fire, where they remain half a day. They are then removed to a warmer place, and replaced by others, and so on, till all have taken their share of the warmest positions, to which each set returns, again and again, in regular succession, till the expiration of six days. They are then held up one by one towards a strong light, and if the egg appears round and of a uniform colour, it is evident it has not succeeded; but if it shows an opaque substance within, or the appearance of different shades, the chicken is already formed; and these last are all returned to the oven for four days more, their positions being changed as before. At the expiration of the fourth day they are reserved to another oven, over which, however, there are no fires, where they remain for five days in one heap, the aperture in the roof being closed with tow to exclude air; after which they are placed separately about one, two, or three inches apart, over the fire (Wilkinson's Ant. Egyptians, ii, 170, Am. ed.; Lane's Mod. Egyptians, ii, 5).

The word דַּבָּר (challamuth), in Job vi, 6, which our translators have rendered "the white of an egg," is so rendered by the Hebrew interpreters, and the Targum, or rather, "the slime of the yolk of an egg." The Syriac interpretation gives "a tasteless herb," which is there proverbially used for something unsavoury or insipid. - See Parislain.

Egidio Antonini, surnamed of Viterbo, Latin patriarch of Constantinople, was born at Viterbo in the second half of the 15th century. He was received into the order of the hermits of St. Augustine at the early age of ten years; was professor of philosophy and theology in several towns of Italy, and became one of the most eloquent preachers of his epoch. Having become general of his order in 1507, he was appointed patriarch of Constantinople, and bishop of Viterbo, Nepi, Castro, and Sutri. In 1512 he opened, by order of pope Julius II, the Council of Lateran, and on this occasion severely censured the corruption prevailing in the church. In 1517, and, in particular, on the 27th February of that year. In 1517 pope Leo X sent him to Germany, and appointed him cardinal; in the following year he was sent as papal legate to Spain. Egidio was well versed in the Oriental languages, and a good Latin poet. He wrote a commentary to the first three chapters of Genesis, and to several psalms, Latin dialogues, epistles, and poems, and a treatise De ecclesiae incremento. Some of these works are given in Martene et Durand, Amplissima Collectio veterum monumentorum, tom. iii. - Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génér. xv, 718.

Egidius. See Egidius.

Egidius. See Gil J.uan.
magne, was born about 770. The place of his birth is entirely unknown. At an early age he repaired to the court of Charlemagne, and became a pupil of Alcuin. Eginhard gained the favor of the emperor to a high degree, and an intimate friendship sprang up between him and the emperor's children, especially the emperor's oldest son and successor, Louis le Débonnaire. The emperor appointed him his private secretary, and superintendent of public buildings at Aix-la-Chapelle. Eginhard accompanied the emperor in all his marches and journeys, never separating from him except on one occasion (900), when he was dispatched by Charlemagne on a mission to pope Leo, in order to obtain the signature of the pope for the document which divided the empire among the sons of Charlemagne. The emperor departed in his case, as in that of Alcuin, Angilbert, and some other friends, from his habit not to esteem ecclesiastical benefices in one hand, and gave to him the abbey of St. Bavo and Blandenberg in Ghent, St. Leonius in Maestricht, Fritzlar in Germany, St. Wandregisil in France, and others. On the death of Charlemagne, he was appointed Dean of St. Denis, and Dean of the Abbey of St. Denis, the latter presented him with a large tract of land in the Odenwald, the centre of which was Michelstadt. Here Eginhard spent the last years of his life in retirement. He was in 826 ordained presbyter, and in 827 assumed as abbot the direction of a monastery that he had established, which he afterwards sold on his estates. As his wife Emma was still alive at this time, he appears to have agreed with her to consider her only as a sister. The report that his wife was a daughter of Charlemagne is probably untrue. The year of his death is unknown. He was still alive in 844. He probably had no children, and the claim of the counts of Erbach, who trace their descent from him, and in whose castle the coffins of Eginhard and his wife are still shown, is probably unfounded. The reputation of Eginhard rests chiefly upon his life of Charlemagne (Vita et Concessoria Gloriosissimi Imperatoris Caroli Regis Magni, completed about 890), which is generally regarded as the most important historical work of a biographical nature that has come down to us from the Middle Ages. It frequently served as a model for other biographies, and was extensively used as a school-book. The best edition is that of Pertz (1829), in vol. ii of the monumenta Germaniae Historiae; another edition, with valuable notes and documents, was published by Ideler, Leben u. Wandl. Karl's des Grossen (Gotha, 1839, 2 vols.). Another work, the annales Regni Francorum, Pippini, Caroli Magni, emendavit, compiled upon the period from 741 to 829 (published in Pertz, Monumenta, vol. i). The first part (741-788) is based on the Annals of Lorash; the second part is original. He also wrote an account of the transfer of the relics of St. Marcellinus and St. Peter from Rome to his monastery in Seligenstadt (Historia translationis S. Marcellini et Petri, in Acta Sanctorum, June 2). His Epistolae, 62 in number, are also of considerable value in a historical point of view. They are published in Weikens, Eginhardus v. sanctus (Franck, 1714). Another work, Libellus de partibus liberum in the theological faculty of this university, of which he was president, and of which he rector (qv), in 1607, the title of D.D. Subsequently Moritz also appointed him court preacher at Marburg. He died May 20, 1622. Egininus was one of the first Reformers in Hesse where landgrave Moritz and his successors endeavored to supplant Lutheranism by the Reformed religion. He wrote in defense of the Church a number of short tracts, the most important of which relate to the doctrine of predestination. He is one of those writers in whom the German reformed theology became more scholastic in its character, and was able to express in the stricter Calvinistic form. In 1618 Egin competed in the controversy of the Rosicrucians of which association he had become an active member. He also wrote several books on alchemy and on the-
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Eglion (Heb. Eglon', Ἐγλών, place of kefsra, q. d. κηφησαί), the name of a man, and also of two places.

(1. Sept. Ἐγλών, Josephus Ἐγλών, Vulgate Eglon.) An early king of the Moabites (Judg. iii, 12 sq.), who, aided by the Ammonites and the Amalekites, crossed the Jordan and took the cities of Sihon, king of Jericho (Josephus). B.C. 1527. Here he built himself a palace (Josephus, Ant. v, 4, 1 sq.), and continued for eighteen years to oppress the children of Israel, who paid him tribute (Josephus). Whether he resided at Jericho permanently, or only during the summer months (Judg. iii, 9; Josephus), he seems to have formed a familiar intimacy (συμφίλος, Josephus, not Judg.) with Ehud, a young Israelite (marias, Josephus) who lived in Jericho (Josephus, not Judg.), and who, by means of repeated presents, became a favourite courtier of the monarch. Eglon subdued the Israelites beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side the river, and made Jericho the seat, or one of the seats, of his government. This submission to a power always present must have been more galling to the Israelites than any they had previously suffered. At length (B.C. 1509) they were put to flight through the instrument of Ehud, who slew the Moabish king (Judg. iii, 12-33). See EHUD.

(2. Sept. Ἐγλών v. τ. Ἁλαβ, but in Josh. x, Ὀδόλαιον, Vulgate Eglon, Eglom.) A city in the maritime plain of Judah, near Lachish (Josh. xv, 39), formerly one of the royal cities of the Canaanites (Josh. x. 39). Its Amoritish king Debir (q. v.) formed a confederacy with the neighbouring princes to assist Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, in attacking Gibeah, because that city had made peace with Joshua and the Israelites (Josh. x., 3, 4). Joshua met the confederated kings near Gibeah and routed them (Josh. x, 11). Eglon was soon after visited by Joshua and destroyed (x, 34, 35). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Ἐγλών, Eglon) erroneously identify it with Oodium or Adullam (q. v.), and say it was still "a large village," ten E. miles (Jerome, twelve) east of Eleutheropolis, being near the southern limit of the territory of the tribe of Judah. See above. On the road from Eleutheropolis to Gaza, nine miles from the former and twelve from the latter, are the ruins of Ajjun, which mark the site of the ancient Eglon (Robinson, Researches, ii, 382). The site is now completely desolate. The ruins are mere shapeless heaps of rubbish, strewn over a large mound (Porter, Handb. for Syria, p. 262). The absence of more imposing remains is easily accounted for. The private houses, like those of Damascus, were built of sun-dried bricks; and the temples and fortifications of the soft calcareous stone of the district, which soon crumbles away. A large mound of rubbish, strewn with stones and pieces of pottery, is all we can now expect to mark the site of an ancient city in this plain (Van de Velde, Narrativa, i. 188; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 386). 3. Another important place of this name (ἴγλων) according to Schwartz (Palest. p. 235), is mentioned in Talmudical authorities as situated within the bounds of Gad. He identifies it with the present village Ajjun, one mile east of Kulat er-Rubud, or Wady Rejih, which runs parallel with Jebel Ajjun on the south (see Robinson's Map, and comp. Researches, ii, 121). The village is situated on both sides of the new river, which is broad and contains nothing remarkable except a few ancient tombs (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 266).

Ecgolam. See SELACHIN.

Egypt (or, more strictly, Egypt, since the word is but Anglicized from the Gr. and Lat. Αἰγύπτιον, Ἐγγύπτος), a region important from the earliest times, and more clearly identified with Bible incidents than any other, except the Holy Land itself. For a vindication of the harmony between Scripture history and the latest results of Egyptological research (Brugsch, Au dem Orient, Berl. 1864), see Volck in the DOP, 1867, ii, art. 2.

1. Names and common name of Egypt in the Heb. Book of Psalms, Ἐγγύπτιον, Ἐγγύπτας (in, or, more fully, "the land of Egypt"). In form Misraim is a dual, and accordingly it is generally joined with a plural verb. When, therefore, in Gen. x, 6, Misraim is mentioned as a son of Ham, some conclude that nothing more is meant than that Egypt was colonized by descendants of Ham. See MISRAIM. The dual number doubtless indicates the natural division of the country into an upper and a lower region, the plain of the Delta and the narrow valley above, as it has been commonly divided at all times. The singular Misr, Μισρ, Mater, also occurs (2 Kings xii, 24; Isa. xxxvii, 25; perhaps as a proper name in Isa. xix, 6; Zech, vii, 2; A. V. always as an appellative, "the land, city," etc.), and some suppose that it indicates Lower Egypt, the dual only properly meaning the whole country; but there is no sure ground for this assertion. See MAZORS. The mention of Misraim and Pathros together (Isa. xi, 1; Jer. xlv, 1, 15), even if we adopt the explanation which supposes Misraim to be in these places by a late usage put for Misr, by no means proves that, since Pathros is a part of Egypt, Misraim, or rather Mazeor, is here a part also. The mention of a part of a country by the same term as the whole is very usual in Hebrew phraseology. This designation, at all events, is sometimes used for Egypt indiscriminately, and was by the later Arabs extended to the entire country. Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 2) says that all those who inhabit the country call it Misr (Misrâp), and the Egyptians Misrâpum (Μισραῖοι). The natives of Modern Egypt invariably designate it by the name Misr, evidently cognate with its ancient Heb. appellation (Hackett's Illustra. of Scripture, p. 120).

Egypt is also called in the Bible דֶּלֶת, דל, "the land of Ham" (Psa. cxviii, 27; comp. XXVIII, 51), referring to the son of Noah. See HAM. Occasionally (Psa. lxx, 20; xlviii, 15, 16; Jer. ii, 5, 23) it is apparently styled רֶדֶב֫וֹ, רֶדֶב֫וֹ, אֲשֶׁר, i.e., "the proud" or "insolent." See RAMAB. The common ancient Egyptian name of the country is written in hieroglyphics קומ, which was probably pronounced Chom; the detomatic form is KEM (Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften, i, 73, No. 382) and the Coptic forms are Chems or Chem (Memphitic), Kems or Kemi (Sahidic), and Kemi (Bashmuri). This name signifies, alike in the ancient language and in Coptic, "black," and may be supposed to have been given to the land on account of the blackness of its alluvial soil (comp. Plutarch, De Is. et Osir. c. 33). It would seem, however, to be rather a representative of the original Heb. name Ham (i.e., Cham), which likewise in the Semitic languages denotes un-burnt, as a characteristic of African tribes. The other hieroglyphic names of Egypt appear to be of a poetical character.

The Greek and European name (ἡ Αἰγύπτιος, Αἰγύπτος), Egypt, is of uncertain origin and signification (Champion, loc. cit. 77). It is possible, however, to have some etymological connection with the modern name Copt, and is perhaps nothing more than "the land of the Copts" (the prefix ai- being perhaps for ain = yai or γά), from where the Nile is sometimes (Odys. iv, 351, 355; xiv, 237, 238) called Egypt (Αἰγύπτιος). KEM, which was probably pronounced Chem; the detomatic form is KEMI (Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften, i, 73, No. 382) and the Coptic forms are Chems or Chemi (Memphitic), Kemi or Kemi (Sahidic), and Kemi (Bashmuri). This name signifies, alike in the ancient language and in Coptic, "black," and may be supposed to have been given to the land on account of the blackness of its alluvial soil (comp. Plutarch, De Is. et Osir. c. 33). It would seem, however, to be rather a representative of the original Heb. name Ham (i.e., Cham), which likewise in the Semitic languages denotes un-burnt, as a characteristic of African tribes. The other hieroglyphic names of Egypt appear to be of a poetical character.

The Greek and European name (ἡ Αἰγύπτιος, Αἰγύπτος), Egypt, is of uncertain origin and signification (Champion, loc. cit. 77). It is possible, however, to have some etymological connection with the modern name Copt, and is perhaps nothing more than "the land of the Copts" (the prefix ai- being perhaps for ain = yai or γά), from where the Nile is sometimes (Odys. iv, 351, 355; xiv, 237, 238) called Egypt (Αἰγύπτιος).
II. Extent and Population.—Egypt occupies the north-eastern angle of Africa, between N. lat. 31° 37' and 24° 1', and E. long. 27° 13' and 34° 12'. On the E. it is bounded by Palestine, Idumea, Arabia Petraea, and the Arabian Gulf. On the W., the moving sands of the wide Libyan desert obliterate the traces of all political or physical limits. Inhabited Egypt, however, is restricted to the valley of the Nile, which, having a breadth of from two to three miles, is enclosed on both sides by a range of hills: the chain on the eastern side disappears at Mokattam, that on the west extends to the sea. Its limits appear to have always been very nearly the same. In Ezekiel (xxix, 10; xxx, 6), according to the obviously correct rendering
(see Migdol), the whole country is spoken of as extending from Migdol to Syene, which indicates the same limits to the east and the south as at present. Egypt seems, however, to have always been held, except by the modern geographers, to include no more than the tract irrigated by the Nile lying within the limits we have specified. The deserts were at all times wholly different from the valley, and their tribes more or less independent of the rulers of Egypt. Syene, now Aswan, is also assigned by Greek and Arabian writers as the southern limit of Egypt. Here the Nile issues from the granite rocks of the cataracts, and enters Egypt proper. The length of the country, therefore, in a direct line, is 456 geographical miles. The breadth of the valley between Aswan and the Delta is very unequal; in some places the inundations of the river extend to the foot of the mountains; in other parts there remains a strip of a mile or two in breadth, which the water never covers, and which is therefore always dry and barren. Originally the name Egypt designated only this valley and the Delta; but at a later period it came to include also the region between this and the Red Sea from Berenice to Suez, a strong and mountainous tract, with only a few spots fit for tillage, but better adapted to pasturage. It included also, at this time, the adjacent desert on the west, as far as to the oases, those fertile and inhabited islands in the ocean of sand. The name Delta, also, was extended so as to cover the districts between Pelusium and the border of Palestine, and Arabia Petraea; and on the west it included the adjacent tract as far as to the great deserts of Libya and Barca, a region of sand of three days' journey east and west, and as many north and south.

Egypt, in the extensive sense, contains 115,200 square geographical miles, yet it has only a superfi- cies of about 2696 square geographical miles of soil, which the Nile either does or can water and fertilize. This computation includes the river and lakes as well as sandy tracts which can be inundated, and the whole space either cultivated or fit for cultivation is no more than about 5628 square miles. Anciently 3746 square
miles more may have been cultivated, and now it would be possible at once to reclaim about 1259 square miles. These computations are those of Colonel Jacotin and M. Estève, given in the Memoir of the former in the great French work (Description de l'Egypte), 2d ed. xviii. pt. ii. p. 101 sq.). They must be very nearly correct, for the actual state of Egypt at this time. Mr. Lane calculated the extent of the cultivated land in A.D. 1375-6 to be 6500 square geographical miles, from a list of the cultivated lands of towns and villages appended to De Sacy's Abd-Allatf. He thinks this list may be underrated. M. Mengin made a much larger estimate, which began in 1824 but since that time much waste territory has been reclaimed (Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt, i. 85). The chief differences in the character of the surface in the times before the Christian era were that the long valley through which flowed the canals from the Red Sea was then cultivated, and that the Gulf of Suez perhaps extended further north than at present.

As to the number of its inhabitants, nothing very definite is known. Its fertility would doubtless give birth to and support a teeming population. In very remote times, many as 8,000,000 are said to have lived on its soil. In the days of Diocletian and Constantius the population was estimated at 3,000,000. Volney made the number 2,300,000. A later government estimate is 3,200,000, which seems to have been somewhat below the fact (Bowring's Report on Egypt and Ceylon, p. 4). According to the census of 1895, taken immediately after the occupation, the population is numbered 8,617,765 in Egypt proper. The Copts are estimated at 800,000, the Bedouins being the most in number. Seven eighths of the entire population are native Mohammedans. In Alexandria, at the close of the last century, scarcely 40,000 inhabitants were counted, whereas at present the city contains 800,000, about half of whom are Arabs and half Europeans. The nationality of the latter has been ascertained to be as follows (the figures represent thousands): Greeks, 25; Italians, 18; French, 16; Anglo-Maltese, 13; Syrians and natives of the Levant, 12; Germans and Swiss, 10; various, 6. Cairo, the capital, contains upwards of 400,000 inhabitants; within its walls are 140 schools, more than 400 mosques, 1166 cafés, 65 public baths, and 11 bazaars. The other towns of importance, from their population, are, in Lower Egypt, Alexandria, 45,000; Rosetta, 20,000; and in Upper Egypt, Luxor, on the left bank of the Nile, numbering 20,000 souls.

III. Geographical Divisions. Under the Pharaohs Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower, "the two regions..." The Western or "the Southern Region..." and Hilt. There were different crowns for the two regions, that of Upper Egypt being white, and that of Lower Egypt red, the two together composing the pharaoh. The sovereign had a special title as ruler of each region: of Upper Egypt he was Suten, "king," and of Lower Egypt Suteb, "bee," the two combined forming the common title Suten-Suteb. The initial sign of the former name is a bent reed, which illustrates what seems to have been a proverbial expression in Palestine as to the danger of trusting to the Pharaohs. (Kings xxix, 6; Ezek. xxix, 6): the latter name may throw light upon the comparison of the king of Egypt to a fly, and the king of Assyria to a bee (Isa. vii, 18). It must be remarked that Upper Egypt is always mentioned before Lower Egypt, and that the crown of the former is mentioned in that of the latter. In some of the times the same division continued. Manetho speaks of it (ap. Josephus, c. apion. 1, 14), and under the Ptolemies it still prevailed. In the time of the Greeks and Romans, Upper Egypt was divided into the Heptanomia and the Thesibis, making altogether three provinces, but the division of the whole country into two was even then the most usual. The Thesibis extended from the first cataract at Philae to Hermopolis, the Heptanomia from Hermopolis to the point where the Delta begins to form itself. About A.D. 400 Egypt was divided into four provinces, Augustamnica Prima and Secunda, and Egyptian Prima and Secunda. The Heptanomia was called Arcadian, from the emperor Arcadius, and Upper Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower Thesibis.

From a remote period Egypt was subdivided into nomes (Hespé, sing. Hespé), each one of which had its special objects of worship. The monuments show that this division was as old as the earlier part of the New Kingdom, which began in 1550 B.C. It is stated that they are said to have been first 36 in number (Diod. Sic., i, 54; Strabo, xvii, 1). Ptolemy enumerates 44, and Pliny 46; afterwards they were further increased.

There is no distinct reference to them in the Bible. In the Sept. version, indeed, ἡ πέντε (Isa. xix. 2) is rendered by νομον, but we have no warrant for translating it otherwise than "kingdom." It is probable that at that time there were two, if not three kingdoms in the country. Two provinces or districts of Egypt are mentioned in the Bible, Pathros (q. v.) and Caphtor (q. v.); the former appears to have been part of Upper Egypt; the latter was evidently so, and must be represented by the Coptic nome, although no doubt of greater extent. The division into nomes was more or less modified till the invasion of the Theran Greeks. Egypt is now composed of 24 departments, which, according to the French system of geographical arrangement, are subdivided into arrondissements and cantons (Bowring's Report).

IV. Surface, Climate, etc. The general appearance of the country cannot have greatly changed since the days of Moses. The Delta was always a vast level plain, although of old more perfectly watered than now by the branches of the Nile and numerous canals, while the narrow valley of Upper Egypt must have suffered still less alteration. Anciently, however, the rushes must have been abundant; whereas now they have almost disappeared, except in the lakes. The whole country is remarkable for its extreme fertility, which especially strikes the beholder when the rich green of the fields is contrasted with the utterly-bare yellow mountains or the sand-strewn rocky desert on the plains. The plains some of the houses on the borders of the villages were destroyed, was, we read, "well watered everywhere...even" like a garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt" (Gen. xiii. 10). The aspect of Egypt is remarkably uniform. The Delta is a richly-cultivated plain, varied only by the mounds of ancient cemeteries, the ruins of ancient temples, and the few villages seldom met with. The valley in Upper Egypt is also richly cultivated. It is, however, very narrow, and shut in by low hills, rarely higher than 800 feet, which have the appearance of cliffs from the river, and are not often steep. They, in fact, form the border of the desert on either side, and the valley seems to have been, as it were, cut out of a table-land of rock. The valley is rarely more than twelve miles across. The bright green of the fields, the reddish-brown or dull green color of the great river, the tints of the bare yellow rocks, and the deep blue of the sky all combine to form a pleasant view, and often one of great beauty. The soil consists of the mud of the river, resting upon desert sands; hence this country owes its existence, fertility, and beauty to the Nile, whose annual overflow is indispensable for the purposes of agriculture. The country north and south of the cataracts is highly picturesque; the other parts of Egypt, and especially the Delta, are exceedingly uniform and monotonous. The prospect, however, is extremely different, according to the season of the year. From the middle of the spring season, when the harvest is over, one sees nothing but a gray and dusty soil, so full of cracks and chasms that he can hardly pass along. At the time
of the autumnal equinox, the whole country presents nothing but an immeasurable surface of reddish or yellowish water, out of which rise date-trees, villages, and narrow canals, which serve well as means of communication.

After the waters have retreated, which usually remain only a short time at this height, you see, till the end of autumn, only a black and slimy mud. But in winter nature puts on all her splendor. In this season, the freshness and power of the new vegetation, the variety and abundance of vegetable productions, exceed everything that is known in the most celebrated parts of the European continent; and Egypt is then, from one end of the country to the other, nothing but a beautiful garden, a verdant meadow, a field sowen with flowers, or a waving ocean of grain in the car.

The climate is very equable, and, to those who can bear great heat, also healthy; indeed, in the opinion of some, the climate of Egypt is one of the finest in the world. There are, however, unwholesome tracts of salt marsh which extend here and there. Rain seldom falls except on the coast of the Mediterranean. At Thebes a storm will occur, perhaps, not oftener than once in four years. Cultivation nowhere depends upon rain or showers. This absence of rain is mentioned in Deut. (xvi. 10, 11) as rendering artificial irrigation necessary. In the case of Eqypt, and in Zech. (xiv. 18) as peculiar to the country. The atmosphere is clear and shining; a shade is not easily found.

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

Egypt has been visited at all ages by severe pestilences, but it cannot be determined that any of those of ancient times were of the character of the modern plague. The plague with which the Egyptians are threatened in Zech. (l. c.) is described by a word, תְּנָכָה, which is not specially applicable to a pestilence of their country (see ver. 12). See Bortch. Cutaneous disorders, which have always been very prevalent in Egypt, are distinctly mentioned as peculiar to the country (Deut. vii. 15; xxviii. 27, 35, 60, and perhaps Exod. xx. 20, although the reference may be to the plague of boils), and as punishments to the Israelites in case of disobedience, whereas if they obeyed they were to be preserved from them. The Egyptian calumny that made the Israelites a body of lepers and unclean (Joseph. c. Apion.) is thus refuted, and the traditional tale as to the Exodus given by Manetho shown to be altogether wrong in its main facts, which depend upon the truth of this assertion. Famines are frequent, and one in the Middle Ages, in the time of the Fatimite caliphate El-Mustansir-billah, seems to have been even more severe than that of Joseph. Mosquitoes, locusts, frogs, together with the small-pox and the dengue, are the main plagues which are inflicted by Ophithalmia is also very prevalent. See Disease.

V. The Nile.—Egypt is the land of the Nile, the country through which that river flows from the island of Philae, situated just above the Cataracts of Syene, in lat. 24° 1' 56"; to Damietta, in 31° 35' N., where its principal stream pours itself into the Mediterranean Sea. In lat. 30° 15' the Nile divides into two principal streams, which, in conjunction with a third that springs somewhat higher up, forms the great delta, so called from its resemblance to the Greek letter Δ. At Khartum, 160 miles north of Sennār, the Nile forks into two rivers, called Bahr el-Abiad and Bahr el-Azzak, or the white and blue river, the former flowing from the west, the latter from the east. The blue river is the smaller of these, but it possesses the same fame for its kills as the Nile, and is of the same color. The sources of this river were discovered by Bruce; those of the white river were, until quite recently, undiscovered. They are now known to flow from lakes situated among the mountains south of the Nile. (Sources of the Nile, London, 1860.) Most ancient writers mention seven mouths of the Nile, beginning from the east: 1: Pelusiac or Bubastis; 2: Sais or Tanis; 3: Mendesian; 4: Bucolic or Pharaonic (now of Damietta); 5: Sennōnian; 6: Bubitine (now of Rosetta); 7: Canopic or Heracleotic.

The Nile is called in the Bible שֶׁכֶר, מֶשְׁכֶר, or "the black (river)"; also "כָּרָם, מֶשְׁכֶד, "the river." As to the phrases פִּזְיוֹן, פִּיזְיוֹנָה, "the river of Egypt," and פִּזְיוֹנָא, פִּזְיוֹנָא, "the brook of Egypt," it seems unlikely that the Nile should be so specified; and פִּזְיוֹן or פִּזְיוֹנָה here more probably denotes a mountain stream, usually dry, on the borders of Egypt and Palestine, near the modern El-Arish (Num. xxxiv. 5; Josh. xii. 3, etc.). See EGYPT, RIVER OF. Some have thought that פִּזְיוֹן is the origin of the name Nile; others have been anxious to find it in the Sanscrit Nīlau, which means dark blue. The Indus is called Nil-ah, or "the blue river;" the Stulej also is known as the blue river." It is to be observed that the Low Nil was painted blue by the ancient Egyptians. The river is turbid and reddish throughout the year, and turns green about the time when the signs of rising commence, but not long after becomes red and very turbid. The Copitc word is som, "sea," which corresponds to the Arab name for it, kāh, properly sea; thus Nahum iii. 8, "Populous No (Thebes), whose rampart was the sea." In Egyptian the Nile bore the sacred appellation HAPI, or HAPI-MU, "the abyss," or "the abyss of waters." As Egypt was divided into two regions, we find two Niles, HAPI-MES, or Upper Nile, and NAPI-MER, or Lower Nile; HAPI-MES, or the Northern Nile, the former name being given to the river in Upper Egypt and in Nubia. The common appellation is ATUR, or AUR, "the river," which may be compared with the Heb. Fōr.

The inundation, HAPI-UR, "great Nile," or "high Nile," fertilizes and sustains the country, and makes the river its chief blessing, a very low inundation or failure of rising being the cause of famine. The Nile was on this account anciently worshipped, and the plague in which its waters were turned into blood, while injurious to the river itself and its fish (Exod. vii. 19; Ps. cv. 35) was a reproach to the superstition of the Egyptians. The rise begins in Egypt about the summer solstice, and the inundation commences about two months later. The greatest height is attained about or somewhat after the autumnal equinox. The inundation reaches its height in the month of Akhet, or, according to this time, and especially when near the highest, the river rapidly pours along its red turbid waters, and spreads through openings in its banks over the whole valley and plain. The prophet Amos, speaking of the ruin of Israel, metaphorically says that "the land . . . shall be smitten with the sword as [by] the river of Egypt." (viii. 8; ix. 5). Owing to the yearly deposit of alluvial matter, both the bed of the Nile and the land of Egypt are gradually raised. The river proceeds in its current uniformly and quietly at the rate of two and a half or three miles an hour, always deep enough for
navigation. Its water is usually blue, but it becomes of a deep brick-red during the period of its overflow. It is salubrious for bathing, and the Zululand inhabitants which it has so abundantly received. On the river the land is wholly dependent. If the Nile does not rise a sufficient height, sterility and death, if not famine, ensue. An elevation of sixteen cubits is essential to secure the prosperity of the country. Such, however, is the variety of nature, that much the faithfulness of God, that for thousands of years, with but few and partial exceptions, these inundations have in essential particulars been the same. The waters of the stream are conveyed over the surface of the country by canals when natural channels fail. During the months of August and September, and the first quarter of October, it becomes like the Hebrews, a sea with the appearance of a sea dotted with islands. Wherever the waters reach abundance springs forth. The cultivator has scarcely more to do than to scatter the seed. No wonder that a river whose waters are so grateful, salubrious, and beneficial should in days of ignorance have been regarded as an object of worship, and that it is still revered and beloved. See NILE.

VI. Geology. The fertile plain of the Delta and the valley of Upper Egypt are bounded by rocky deserts covered or strewn with sand. On either side of the plain the rocks overlie or form, as it were, the base, about which they rise so steeply as from the river to present the aspect of cliffs. The formation is limestone as far as a little above Thebes, where sandstone begins. The First Cataract, the southern limit of Egypt, is caused by granite and other primitive rocks, which rise through the strata and obstruct the river's bed. In Upper Egypt the mountains near the Nile rarely exceed 300 feet in height, but far in the eastern desert they often attain a much greater elevation. The highest is Jebel Gharib, which rises about 6000 feet above the sea. Limestone, sandstone, and granite, were obtained from quarries near the river; basalt, breccia, and porphyry from others in the eastern desert between the Thebais and the Red Sea. A geological change has, it is thought, in the course of centuries raised the country near the head of the Gulf of Suez, and depressed that on the northern side of the isthmus. The Delta is of a triangular form, its eastern and western limits being nearly marked by the courses of the ancient Pelusiac and Canopic branches of the Nile: Upper Egypt is a narrow winding valley, varying in breadth, but seldom more than twelve miles across, and generally interrupted on the western side. The anciently there was a fertile valley on the course of the Canal of the Red Sea, the Land of Goshen (q. v.), now called Wady Tumelait: this is covered with the sands of the desert. To the south, on the opposite side, is the oasis now called the Fayyum, the old Abarim, connected with the valley by a neck of cultivated land.

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

Egypt is naturally an agricultural country. As far back as the days of Abraham, we find that when the produce failed in Palestine, Egypt was the natural resource. In the time of Joseph it was evidently the granary—at least during famines—of the nations around (Gen. xlvii. 18; Sir. 10; comp. Gen. xxi. 27; Am. xv. 9, 10). The inundation, as taking the place of rain, has always rendered the system of agriculture peculiar; and the artificial irrigation during the time of low Nile is necessarily on the same principle. We read of the Land of Promise that it is "not as the land of Egypt, where the king came out, where he soweds thy seed, and watered it with his foot, as a garden of herbs: but the land whither thou goest in to possess it, [is] a land of hills and valleys, [and] drinketh water of the rain of heaven" (Deut. xi. 10, 11). Watering with the foot may refer to some mode of irrigation by machine, but we are not to think that it is an idiomatic expression implying a laborious work. The monuments do not afford a representation of the supposed machine. That now called the shaft, which is a pole having a weight at one end and a bucket at the other, so hung that the labourer is aided by the weight in raising the full bucket, is depicted, and seems to have been the common means of artificial irrigation (q. v.). There are detailed pictures of breaking up the earth, or ploughing, sowing, harvesting, threshing, and storing the wheat in granaries. See AGRICULTURE. The use of the sleigh, or sled, drawn by oxen or crows, unmuzzled (comp. Deut. xxxv. 4). The processes of agriculture began as soon as the water of the inundation had sunk into the soil, about a month after the autumnal equinox (Exod. ix. 31, 32). Vines were extensively cultivated, and there were several different kinds of vine, one of which, the smaerotic, was famous among the Romans. Of other fruit-trees, the date-palm was the most common and valuable. The gardens resembled the fields, being watered in the same manner by irrigation. See GARDEN. VINEYARD. On the tenure of land much light is thrown by the story of Joseph. The farms or small holdings, or vineyards, were sacrificed by the rich to the landings of the poor; the rich family having few farms, the poor family having many lands. The Ramesseum, seen from the Colossi of Memnon, is a large and magnificent building, perhaps the tomb of the king. The remains are grand, and, as they have been used for other purposes, the building is in a state of decay. The materials of which it is constructed are well preserved. The building was erected during the reign of the last king of the 18th dynasty, and was used as a quarry for the materials. The materials of which it is constructed are well preserved. The building was erected during the reign of the last king of the 18th dynasty, and was used as a quarry for the materials. The materials of which it is constructed are well preserved. The building was erected during the reign of the last king of the 18th dynasty, and was used as a quarry for the materials. The materials of which it is constructed are well preserved. The building was erected during the reign of the last king of the 18th dynasty, and was used as a quarry for the materials.
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celebrated, was an artificial lake between Beni-Suef and Medinet el-Fayum. It was of use to irrigate the neighboring country, and its fisheries yielded a great revenue. It is now dried up. The canals are now far less numerous than of old, and many of them are choked and comparatively useless. The Bahri Yûrûf, or "river of Joseph"—not the patriarch, but the famous sultan Yusuf Salah-ed-din, who repaired it—is a long series of canals, near the desert on the west side of the river, extending northward from Farshut for about 350 miles to a little below Memphis. This was probably a work of very ancient times. There can be no doubt of the high antiquity of the canal of the Red Sea, upon which the Land and Coast was mainly depended for its fertility. It does not follow, however, that it originally connected the Nile and the Red Sea.

VIII. Botany.—The cultivable land of Egypt consists almost wholly of fields, in which are very few trees. There are no forests and few groves, except of date-palms, and in Lower Egypt a few of orange and lemon trees. There are some acacias, mulberry trees, and acacias, either planted on the sides of roads or standing singly in the fields. The Thelban palm grows in the Thebais, generally in clumps. All these, except, perhaps, the mulberry-tree, were anciently common in the country. The two kinds of palm are represented by the chief, and that by the acacia-wood are the materials of various objects made by the ancient inhabitants. The chief fruits are the date, grape, fig, sycamore-fig, pomegranate, banana, many kinds of melons, and the olive; and there are many others of little or no importance. There were also of old produced in the country. Anciently grapes seem to have received great attention, to have been elaborately drained, and well filled with trees and shrubs. Now horticulture is neglected, although the modern inhabitants are as fond of flowers as were their predecessors. The vegetables are of many kinds and excellent, and form the chief food of the common people. Anciently cattle seem to have been more numerous, and their meat, therefore, more usually eaten, but never as much as in colder climates. The Israelites in the desert, though they looked back to the time when they "ate the flesh of birds" (Exod. xvi, 3), seem as much to have regretted the vegetables and fruits, as the flesh and fish of Egypt. "Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely, the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic" (Num. xi, 4, 5). The European vegetables now cultivated, and ails, of which an excellent thick potage is made (Gen. xxxiv, 34), leeks, onions, garlic, radishes, carrots, cabbages, gourds, cucumbers, the tomato, and the eggfruit. There are many besides these. The most important field-produce in ancient times was wheat; after it must be placed barley, millet, flax, and, among the vegetables, lentils, peas, and beans. At the present day the same is the case; but maize, rice, oats, clover, the sugar-cane, roses, the tobacco-plant, hemp, and cotton, must be added, some of which are not indigenous. Anciently fruits and four kinds of field-produce are mentioned—flax, barley, wheat, and "papyrus" (Exod. ix, 31, 32), which is variously rendered in the A. V. "ryo" (1 c.), "apellite" (Isa. xxxvii, 25), and "fitches" (Isa. xxxviii, 27). It is doubtless whether the last be a cereal or a leguminous product: we incline to the former opinion. See RYE.

It is clear from the evidence of the monuments and of ancient writers that, of old, reeds were far more common in Egypt than now. The byblis or papyrus is almost or quite unknown. Anciently it was a common and most important plant: boats were made of its stalks, and of their thin leaves the famous papyrus paper was manufactured. It appears to have been mentioned under two names in the Bible, neither of which, however, can be proved to be a peculiar designation for it. (1) The mother of Moses made נ' פראס "an ark" or "skiff" of papyrus," in which to put her child (Exod. ii, 3), and Isaiah tells of messengers sent apparently from farthest Ethiopia in נ"פראס, "vessels of papyrus" (xviii, 2), in both of which cases נ'פראס must mean papyrus, although it would seem in other places to signify "reed" generally. (2) Isaiah prophesies, "The papyrus-reeds (יארוני) in the river, and every thing growing [lit. sown] in the river shall be dried up, driven away [by the wind], and [shall] not be" (xix, 7). Gesenius renders יאַרוני a naked or bare place, here grassy places on the banks of the Nile. Apart from the fact that little grass grows on the banks of the Nile, in Egypt, and that little only during the cooler part of the year, instead of those sloping meadows that must have been in the European scholar's mind, this word must mean some product of the river which with the other water-plants should be dried up, and blown away, and utterly disappear. Like the fisheries and the flux mentioned with it, it ought to hold an important place in the commerce of ancient Egypt. In can therefore scarcely be reasonably held to intend anything but the papyrus. See PAPER REED.

The marine and fluvial product י.food, from which the Red Sea was called י.food, will be noticed under RED SEA. The lotus was anciently the favorite flower, and at feasts it took the place of the rose among the Greek and Romans; it is now very rare.

IX. Zoology. Anciently Egypt was more a pastoral country than at present. The cattle are still more excellent, but lean kine are more common among them than they seem to have been in the days of Joseph's Pharaoh (Gen. xii, 19). Sheep and goats have always been numerous. Anciently swine were kept, but not in great numbers; now there are none, or scarcely any, except a few in the houses of Copts and Francs. The Egyptian oxen were celebrated in the ancient world (Aristot. Hist. Anim. viii, 28),—Horses abounded (1 Kings x, 29); hence the use of war-chariots in battle (Isa. xxxi, 1; 11 Dods. Soc. x, 45), and the celebrity of Egyptian charioteers (Jer. xvi, 4; Ezek. xvii, 15). Under the Pharaohs the horses of the country were in repute among the neighboring nations, who purchased them as well as chariots out of Egypt. Thus it is commanded respecting a king of Isreal: He shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, I will henceforth return no more that way" (Deut. xvi, 16), which shows that the trade in horses was with Egypt, and would necessitate a close alliance. "Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn: the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price. And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for six hundred shekels of silver, and a horse for a hundred and fifty: and so for all the king's horses of the Hittites and for the kings of Syria did they bring [them] out by their hand" (1 Kings x, 29). The number of horses kept by this king for chariots and cavalry was large (iv, 26; x, 26; 2 Chron. i, 14; ix, 25). Some of these horses came as yearly tribute from his vassals (1 Kings x, 25). In later times the people removed the people from the sea to be in the help of Egypt, and relying on the aid of her horses and chariots and horsemen, that is, probably, men in chariots, as we shall show in speaking of the Egyptian armies. The kings of the Hittites, mentioned in the passage quoted above, and in the account of the close of the siege of Samaria by Bethel, are referred to as "The Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, [even] the noise of a great host: and they said one to another, Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings
of the Hittites and the kings of the Egyptians to come upon us" (2 Kings vii, 6)—these kings ruled the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, who were called by the Egyptians SHETA or KHETA. The Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties waged fierce wars with these Hittites, who were then ruled by a great king and many chiefs, and whose principal arm was a force of chariots, resembling those of the Egyptian arm. Asenath, the anciently numerous: the breed as the present time is excellent. Buffalo are common, and not wild. Dogs were formerly more prized than now; for, being held by most of the Moslems to be extremely unclean, they are only used to watch the herds of camels and cattle. Cattle are numerous, but less favored. The camel has nowhere been found mentioned in the inscriptions of Egypt, or represented on the monuments. In the Bible Abraham is spoken of as having camels when in Egypt, apparently as a gift from Pharaoh (Gen. xii, 6), and before the Exodus the camels of Pharaoh or his subjects were to be smitten by the murrain (Exod. ix, 3; comp. 6). Both these Pharaohs may have been shepherds. The Ishmaelites or Midianites who took Joseph into Egypt carried their merchandise on camels (Gen. xxxvii, 25, 28, 36), and the land traffic of the Arabs must have been a branch of the trade by caravans. It is probable that camels were not kept in Egypt, but only on the frontier. On the black obelisk from Nimrud, now in the British Museum, which is of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, contemporary with Jehu and Hazael, c. 840-835 B.C., comes a representation presented as tribute by Egypt. They are of the two-humped sort, which, though perhaps then common in Assyria, has never, so far as is known, been kept in Egypt. The deserts have always abounded in wild animals, especially of the canine and antelope kinds. The wolf, fox, jackal, hyena, wild cat, weasel, ichneumon, jerboa, and hare, are also met with. Anciently the hippopotamus was found in the Egyptian Nile, and hunted. This is a fact of importance for those who suppose it to be the behemoth (q. v.) of the book of Job, especially as that book shows evidence of a knowledge of Egypt. Now this animal is rarely seen even in Lower Nubia. The elephant may have been, in the remotest historical period, an inhabitant of Egypt, and, as a land animal, have been driven further south than his brother pachyderm, for the name of the island of Elephantine, just below the Fish Gate, Cataract, in hieroglyphics, AB, "Elephant-land," seems to show that the animal was found there. Bats abound in the temples and tombs, filling the dark and desecrated chambers and passages with the unearthly whirr of their wings. Such description is represented by Isaiah when he says that a multitude of idols "is to the mountains and to the bats" (xi, 20). See each animal in its place.

The birds of Egypt are not remarkable for beauty of plumage: in so open a country this is natural. The Rupacas are numerous, but the most common are scavengers, as vultures and the kite. Eagles and falcons also are plentiful. Quails migrate to Egypt in great numbers. The Giraffes and Antelopes are found on the islands and sand-banks of the river, and in the sides of the mountains which approach or touch the stream. Among the reptiles, the crocodile (q. v.) must be especially mentioned. In the Bible it is usually called דָּרוֹן, דְּרוֹן, "dragon," a generic word of almost as wide a signification as "reptile," and is used as a symbol of the king of Egypt. Thus, in Ezekiel, "Be hold, against thee, Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the great dragon that is in the midst of the rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself. But I will put hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause the fish of thy rivers to stick unto thy scales, and I will bring thee up out of the midst of thy rivers, and all the fish of thy rivers shall stick unto thy scales. And I will leave thee [thrown] into the wilderness, thee and all the fish of thy rivers. . . . I have given thee for meat to the beasts of the field and to the fowls of the heaven" (xxix, 3, 4, 5). Here there seems to be a retrospect of the Exodus (which is thus described in Isa. i, 9, 10, and 15), and with a more close resemblance in Psa. lxxxiv, 13, 14, "Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the dragons ([ן], [ן]) in pieces, [and] guest [thou] to meat to the dwellers in the wilderness [in the wilderness, i.e. to the wild beasts; comp. Isa. xiii, 21). The last passage is important as indicating that whereas דָּרוֹן is the Hebrew generic name of reptiles, and therefore used for the greatest of them, the crocodile, דָּרוֹן is the special name of that animal. The description of leviathan in Job (xii) fully bears out this opinion, and it is doubtful if any passage can be adduced in which a wider signification of the latter word is required. In Job (xxvi, 12) also there is an apparent allusion to the Exodus in words similar to those in the 15th and 17th, and then a mention of the dragon. In this case the division of the sea and the smiting of Rahab, דָּרוֹן, the proud or insolent, are mentioned in connection with the wonders of creation (ver. 7-11, 13); so, too, in Isaiah (ver. 18, 15). The crossing of the Red Sea could be thus spoken of as a signal exercise of the divine power.—Frogs are very numerous in Egypt, and there is a constant croaking in the autumn in "the streams," מָצַּר, "the rivers," מַצָּר, "the ponds" or "marshes," מַצָּר (Exod. viii, i, A. V. V, 5), makes it difficult to picture the Plague of Frogs.—Serpents and snakes are also common, including the deadly crotalus and the cobra di capello; but the more venomous have their home in the desert (comp. Deut. viii, 15). The Nile and lakes have an abundance of fishes; and although the fisheries of Egypt have very greatly fallen away, their produce is still a common article of food. Among the insects the locusts must be mentioned, which sometimes come upon the cultivated land in a cloud, and, as in the plague, eat every herb, and fruit, and leaf where they alight; but they never, as then, overspread the whole land (Exod. x, 8-6, 12, 19). They disappear as suddenly as they come, and are carried away by the wind (ver. 19). As to the lice and flies, they are now plagues of Egypt, but it is not certain that the words מַצָּר and מַצָּר designate them (Exod. viii, 16-18). The danger arising from "crickets" is frequently met with. Beetles of various kinds are found, including the sacred scarabaeus. Bees and silk-worms are kept, but the honey is not very good, and the silk is inferior to that of Syria. X. Ancient Inhabitants. — The old inhabitants of Egypt appear from their monuments and the testimony of ancient writers to have occupied in race a place between the Negroes and the Caucasians. The constant immigrations of Arab settlers have greatly diminished the Negro characteristics in the generality of the modern Egyptians. The most recent inquiries have shown that the extreme limit at Philae was only of a political nature, for the natives of the country below it were of the same race as those who lived above that spot—a tribe which passed down into the fertile valley of the Nile from its original abode in the south. These Egyptian and the Ethiopians were considered as the same people, differing only in color. Their frame was slender, but of great strength. Their faces appear to have been oval in shape, and narrower in the man than in the women. The forehead was well-shaped, but small and retiring; the eyes were almond-shaped and mostly black; the hair was long, crisp, and generally black; the skin of the men
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chap. vi. As early as the age of the 6th dynasty, a vulgar dialect was expressed in the demotic or enochri
dial writing. This dialect forms the link connecting the old language with the Coptic or Christian Egyptian,
the latest phase. The Coptic does not very great
ly differ from the monumental language, distinguished in the time of the 6th demotic, as the sacred dialect,
cept in the presence of many Greek words. See Coptic

Language.
The language of the ancient Egyptians was entirely
unknown until the discoveries made by Dr. Young
from the celebrated Rosetta stone, now preserved in
the British Museum. This stone is a slab of black
marble, which was found by the French in August,
1799, among the ruins of Port St. Julien, on the west-
ern bank, and near the mouth of the Rosetta branch
of the Nile. It contains a decree in three different
kinds of writing, referring to the coronation of Ptole-
my V (Ephiphanes), and is supposed to have been sculp-
tured B.C. cir. 195. As part of the inscription is in
Greek, it was easily deciphered, and was found to state
that the decree was ordered to be written in sacred,
enocharial, and Greek characters. Thence, by care-
fully comparing the three inscriptions, a key was
obained to the interpretation of the mysterious hieroglyphs.
The language which they express closely resembles
that which was afterwards called Coptic when the
people had become Christians. It is monosyllabic
in its roots, and abounds in vowels. There were at
least two distinct kinds of it, spoken equally in Upper
and Lower Egypt. See Rosetta Stone.

"The wisdom of Egypt" was a phrase which, at
an early period, passed into a proverb, so high was the
opinion entertained by antiquity of the knowledge and
skill of the ancient Egyptians (1 Kings iv, 80; Herod.
ii, 160; Josephus, Ant. v, 13); Acts vii, 22). But as
the sequel of this article will show, were there want-
ing substantial reasons for the current estimate. If,
however, antiquity did not on this point exceed the
bounds of moderation, very certain is it that men of
later ages are chargeable with the utmost extravag-
ance in the terms which they employed when speaking
on the subject. It was long thought that the hie-
roglyphical inscriptions on the monumental remains of
Egypt contained treasures of wisdom no less bound-
less than hidden; and, indeed, hieroglyphics were, in
the opinion of many, invented by the gods for the
people of the land, if not expressly to conceal their knowledge from
the profane vulgar, yet as a safe receptacle and con-
venient storehouse for their mysterious but invaluable
doctrines. Great, consequently, was the expectation
of the public when it was announced that a key had
been discovered which opened the portal to these long
concealed treasures. The result has not been altogether
more correspondent, especially with regard to the pre-
sumed secrets of ancient lore. Men of profound learn-
ing, great acuteness of mind, and distinguished reputa-
tion have engaged and persevered in the inquiry: it
is impossible to study without advantage the writings
of such persons as Zoege, Akerlaid, Young, Champol-
io, Spohn, Seyfthart, Rosegarten, Ruhle; and equal-
ly ungrateful would it be to affirm that no progress has been
made in the undertaking; but, after all, the
diverse and novel conclusions to which the disput
has been divided, and set forth are only in a few cases (comparatively)
finite and unimpeachable (Heeren, Iden, ii, 2; 4;
Quatremer, Recherches sur la langue et la litterature de l'Egypte). See Hieroglyphics. The results in point of
history and archaeology, as detailed by Lepsius,
Brugsch, and other late Egyptologists, are far more
important than in a purely scientific view. See below.

XII. Religion.—The basis of the religion was Nigeri-
tian fetishism, the lowest kind of nature-worship, dif-
fering in different parts of the country, and hence
obviously indigenous. Upon this was erected, first,

cosmic worship, mixed up with traces of primeval re-
velation, as in Babylonia; and then a system of per-
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sonifications of moral and intellectual abstractions. The incongruous character of the religion necessitates the supposition, and the case with which it admitted
extraneous additions in the historical period confirms it. There were, according to Herodotus, three orders of gods—the eight great gods, who were the most antient,
the twelve lesser, and the Osirian group. They were represented in human forms, sometimes having the sacred animals sacred to them, or bearing on
their heads cosmic or other objects of worship. The fetischism included, besides the worship of animals, that of
trees, rivers, and hills. Each of these creatures or objects was appropriated to a divinity. There was no
prominent hero-worship, although deceased kings and
other illustrious persons received divine honors—in one
case, that of Osiraen II, of the 12th dynasty, the old
Sesostris, of a very special character. The great
doctrines of the immortality of the soul, man's responsi-
bility, and future rewards and punishments, were
taught. Among the rest, circumcision is the most re-
markable; it is old as the age of the 4th dynasty.

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

I. FIRST ORDER.

1. Amen, or Amun-the king of all the gods."

2. Man, or Mut (Sanchoan. mod. the material principle,
sometimes as Buto (Latona))

3. Neph, or Nef, or Knefeh=Mercury.

4. Sithi=Juno.

5. Pibah, or Pibah, the creative power (a function assigned by
Seth to Knefeh)=Valcne.


7. Khen, the generative principle (phallicus).

8. Pash=Janna.

II. SECOND ORDER.

1. Ra, or Pibah, the Sun, father of many deities, often
seen with those of the other.

2. Seb, the Earth=Saturn, father of the infernal gods.

3. Neph, wife of Seb, the Sky, mother of gods=Neith.

4. Bubastis and Mani, the Moon=Hermes.

5. Anuro (Priest)=Vesta.

6. Atma (for Mat), Darkness, or Twilight.

7. Mut, or Shu, son of Re, Light (phallicus).

8. Taoureh (Daphne), or Tafnet, a lion-headed goddess.

9. Thoth, the Willless=Hermes and the Moon.

10. Sanak, or Sebak.

11. Athiata=Lucina.

12. Mandai, or Mumum=

III. THIRD ORDER.

1. Osiris, son and daughter of Seb and Neph.

2. Isis, also.

3. Anou, the elder Horus, son of Neph.

4. Seth, or Typhon, the destructive principle (Death).

5. Neph, or Nebank (Nebekh), lady of the house of the Horu.

6. Horus the younger, god of victory.

7. Harpoocrates, son of Osiris and Isis, emblem of Youth.

8. Anoua, son of Osiris.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS.

1. Themet, or Ma (Bruyi), goddess of Truth and Justice, head-
less.

2. Athor (at-Hor)=Venus, another daughter of Ra.

3. Nepthe-Athéa, perhaps a variation of Amoun above.

4. Hor-Ha, a winged globe, as (;ytoh).

5. Haktet, a lion-headed goddess.


7. Tert, a god connected with Pash.

8. Diam, perhaps a female Amun.

9. The, "the heavens." 

10. Hapi, or the god of Nile.

11. Rano, an ass-headed goddess, as (;ytoh).

12. Hermes Triumphant, a form of Thoth.

13. Apoplos, Neith, or Imoep, "son of Pash.

14. Sopf, the goddess of Speech.

Together with about 50 more, some of them local divin-
taxes and personifications of cities, besides deified an-
mals, etc.

Num, Nu, or Knefeh, was one of the most important
of the gods, corresponding to the "soul" or one of the
to whom was ascribed the creation of gods, men, and
animals, the world. He is represented as a man with a
head of a ram and curved horns. The chief
god of Thebes was Amen, or Amen-Ra, or Amen-Ra
Knefeh, also worshipped in the great oasis, and some-
times portrayed under the form of Knefeh. He was the
Jupiter Ammon of the classics. The goddess Mut,
or the "mother," is the companion of Amen, and is
represented as a female wearing the crowns of Upper
and Lower Egypt, and the vulture head-dress of a
typhon. Amen was the god by whom the productiv-
ity of nature was symbolized. His name reminds
us of the patriarch Ham. The Greeks identified him
with Pan, and called Chemnис, a city in the Thebais,
where he was worshipped, Panopolis. He is accom-
panied by a tree or a flower on the sculptures, which
may have been supposed to be caused by the sacred
or sacred grove spoken of in the Bible. Pibah was
the god of Memphis, and worshipped there under the form
of a pigmy or child; but, as his temples have been
destroyed, little is known of his worship. The goddess
Nef or Neith is often associated with Pibah. She was
wife of Seth, and mother of the god of Sais, the first
received divine honors—in one case, that of Osiraen II, of the 12th dynasty, the old
Sesostris, of a very special character. The great
doctrines of the immortality of the soul, man's responsi-
bility, and future rewards and punishments, were
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He was questioned by forty-two assessors as to
whether he had committed forty-two sins about which
they inquired. If guiltless, he took the form of Osiris,
apparently long after series of transformations and
many ordeals, and entangled into his dwelling among
the gods in perpetual day on the banks of the celestial
Nile. If guilty he was often changed into the form
of some base animal, and consigned to a fiery place
of punishment and perpetual night. From this abstract
it may be seen that the Egyptian religion is to be re-
ferred to various sources. There is a trace of some primeval revelation in it; also a strong Semitic element. (See a full discussion of the subject, with figures of the leading deities, in Kitto's "Biblical Dictionary," note on Deut. iv, 16.) A more favorable view of the ancient Egyptian theology is taken by Wilkinson in his "Ancient Egyptians" (see his summary in the abridged ed. of "The Manners and Customs of the Hebrews," p. 379). The author himself is the first to admit the connection of this religious system with the polytheism of the Greeks and Romans likewise, that the more learned and philosophical classes were able to spiritualize to some extent a religion which could have been to the populace nothing but a great mystery.

The Israelites in Egypt appear, during the oppression, to have adopted to some extent the Egyptian idolatry (Josh. xxiv, 14; Ezek. xx, 7, 8). The golden calf, or rather steer, בּáveis, was probably taken from the bull Apis, certainly from one of the sacred bulls. Rehemph and Chian were foreign divinities adopted into the Egyptian Pantheon, and called in the hieroglyphics REmpHU (probably pronounced Rempha) and REN. It can hardly be doubted that they were worshiped as the sun-bears; but there is no conclusive evidence that there was any separate foreign system of idolatry. See REMPHA. Ashtoreth was worshipped at Memphis, as is shown by a tablet of Amemoph II, B.C. cir. 1415, at the quarries of Turis, opposite that city (Voss's "Pyramid Inscriptions," iii, "Touarq tablet" 2), which is represented as the Egyptian goddess. The temple of the "Foreign Venus," in "the Tyrian camp" in Memphis (Hered. ii, 112), must have been sacred to her. Doubtless this worship was introduced by the Phoenician shepherds.

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

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

XIV. Government. — The rule was monarchical, but not of an absolute character. The sovereign was superior to the laws, and the priests had the power to check the undue exercise of his authority. The kings under whom the Israelites lived seem to have been absolute, but even Joseph's Pharaoh did not venture to touch the independence of the priests. Nomes and districts were governed by officers whom the Greeks called nomarchs and toparchs. There seems to have been no hereditary aristocracy, except perhaps at the earliest period, for indications of something of the kind occur in the inscriptions of the 4th and 12th dynasties. XV. Foreign Policy. — This must be largely related to the admission of foreigners into Egypt and to the treatment of tributary and allied nations. In the former aspect it was characterized by an exclusive spirit which sprang from a national hatred of the yellow and white races, and was maintained by the wisdom of foreign relations and the institutions of the country. The influence of the pirates of the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, and the robbers of the deserts. Hence the jealous exclusion of the Greeks from the northern ports until Naukratis was opened to them, and hence, too, the restriction of Semitic settlers in earlier times by the kings of Goshen, toward the south as part of Egypt. It may be remarked as a proof of the strictness of this policy that during the whole of the sojourn of the Israelites they appear to have been kept in Goshen. The key to the policy towards foreign nations, after making allowance for the hatred of the yellow and white races balanced by the regard for the red and black, is found in the position of the great Oriental rivals of Egypt. The supremacy or influence of the Pharaohs over the nations lying between the Nile and the Euphrates depended as much on wisdom in policy as on the arms. The Pharaohs of the 4th, 6th, and 15th dynasties appear to have uninter ruptedly held the peninsula of Sinai, where tablets record their conquest of Asiatic nomads. But with the 18th dynasty commences the period of Egyptian supremacy. Very soon after the accession of this powerful line most of the countries between the Red Sea and the Euphrates, and even Babylonia, were reduced to the condition of tributaries. The empire seems to have lasted for nearly three centuries, from about B.C. 1500 to about 1200. The chief opponents of the Egyptians were the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, with whom the Pharaohs waged long and fierce wars. After this time the influence of Egypt declined; and until the reign of Shishak (B.C. cir. 990-967), it appears to have been confined to the western borders of Palestine. No doubt the rising greatness of Assyria caused the decline. The Hittite war, and above all the conquest of the Pharaoh Necho there was a constant struggle for the tractis lying between Egypt, and Assyria, and Babylonia, until the disastrous battle at Carchemish finally destroyed the supremacy of the Pharaohs. It is probable that during the period of the empire an Assyrian or Babylonian king generally supported the opponents of the native rulers of Egypt. Great aid from a powerful ally can indeed alone explain the strong resistance offered by the Hittites. The general policy of the Egyptians towards their eastern tributaries seems to have been marked by great moderation. The Pharaohs intermarried with them, and neither forced upon them
EGYPTIAN garrisons, except in some important positions, nor attempted those deportations that so marked a feature of Asiatic policy. In the case of those nations which never attacked them they do not appear to have even exacted tribute. So long as their general powers remained unimpaired they could not be unwise enough to make favorable or neutral powers their enemies. Of their relation to the Israelites we have for the earlier part of this period no direct information. The explicit account of the later part is fully consistent with what we have said of the general policy of the Pharaohs. If Solomon's rule were, as we believe, a kingdom of Egypt or a command of Egyptian forces, are the only exceptions in a series of friendly kings, and they were almost certainly of Assyrian or Babylonian extraction. One Pharaoh gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon, another appears to have been the ally of Jehoram, king of Israel (2 Kings vii. 6). So made a treaty with Hosea, Tirhakah aided Hezekiah, Pharaoh Necho fought Josiah against his will, and did not treat Judah with the severity of the Oriental kings, and his second success ruled by a treaty, the pact of allied Egypt, notwithstanding this break, as firmly as before, and, although filled in his endeavor to save Jerusalem from the Chaldeans, received the fugitives of Judah, who, like the fugitives of Israel at the capture of Samaria, took refuge in Egypt. It is probable that during the earlier part of the period of the friendly relations both parties were consulted. The Hebrew records of that time afford no distinct indication of hostility with Egypt, nor have the Egyptian lists of conquered nations and towns of the same age been found to contain any Israelitish name, whereas in Shishak's list the kingdom of Judah and some of its towns occur. The route of the earlier Pharaohs to the east seems always to have been along the Palestinian coast, then mainly held by the Phcenitins and Phenicians, both of whom they subdued, and across Syria northward of the territories occupied by the Hebrews. With respect to the African nations a different policy appears to have been pursued. The Rebu (Lebu) or Lubim, to the west of Egypt, on the north coast, were reduced to subjection, and probably employed, like the Sharytana or Cherethim, as mercenaries. Ethiopia was made a purely Egyptian province, ruled by a viceroy, the prince of all Cush (Cush), and the assimilation was so complete that Ethiopian sovereigns seem to have been received by the Egyptians as native rulers. Farther south the negroes were subject to predatory attacks like the slave-hunts of modern times, conducted not so much from motives of hostility as to obtain a supply of ivory. In the Bible we find African peoples, Lubim, Phut, Sukkilm, Cush, as mercenaries or supporters of Egypt, but not a single name that can be positively placed to the eastward of that country.

XVI. Army.—There are some notices of the Egyptian army in the O.T. They show, like the monuments, that its most important branch was the chariot-force. The Pharaoh of the Exodus led 600 chosen chariots, besides his whole chariot-force, in pursuit of the Israelites. The warriors fighting in chariots are praised as the "horse" mentioned in the relation of this event and elsewhere, for in Egypt they are called the "horse" or "cavalry." We have no subsequent indication in the Bible of the constitution of an Egyptian army until the time of the 22nd dynasty, when we find that Shishak's invading force was partly composed of tents, whether drawn by horses or asses cannot as yet be positively determined, although the monuments make it most probable that they were of the former character. The army of Necho, defeated at Carchemish, seems to have been similarly composed, although it probably contained Greek mercenaries, who soon afterwards became the most important foreign element in the Egyptian forces.

XVII. Customs, Science, and Art.—The sculptures and paintings of the tombs give us a very full insight into the domestic life of the ancient Egyptians, as may be seen in Sir G. Wilkinson's work. What most strikes us in their manners is the high position occupied by women, and the entire absence of the harem system. It is important to remark how rarely, if ever, the house." Marriage appears to have been universal, at least with the richer class; and if polygamy was tolerated it was rarely practised. Of marriage ceremonies no distinct account has been discovered, but there is evidence that something of the kind was usual in Egypt, as in the case of a priestess to whom they occasionally gave the name of Stile Egyptian, p. 53, 54). Consecration was allowed, the concubines taking the place of inferior wives. There were no castes, although great classes were very distinct, especially the priests, soldiers, artisans, and herdsmen, with laborers. A man of the upper classes, both hold a command in the army and be a priest; and therefore the caste-system cannot have strictly applied in the case of the subordinates. The general manner of life does not much illustrate that of the Israelites from its great essential of Egyptians. The Egyptians from the days of Abraham were a settled people, occupying a land which they held for centuries without question, except through the aggression of foreign invaders. The occupations of the higher class were the superintendence of their fields and gardens, their diversions, the chases, the pursuit of the pheasant, and the fishing. The tending of cattle was left to the most despised of the lower class. The Israelites, on the contrary, were from the very first a pastoral people: in time of war they lived within walls; when there was peace they "dwell in their tents" (2 Kings xii. 5). The case of feasts, and the dances, music and feasts which accompanied them for the diversion of the guests, as well as the common games, were probably introduced among the Hebrews in the most luxurious days of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. The account of the nocturnal dinner of Joseph (Gen. xlix. 14, 31. 33) shows the influence of Egyptian festivals, and the table was sometimes covered with a cloth; and in great entertainments among the rich, each guest was furnished with a napkin. They sat on a carpet or mat upon the ground, or else on stools or chairs round the table, and did not recline at most like the Greeks and Romans. They were particularly fond of music and dancing. The most austere and scrupulous priest could not give a feast without a good band of musicians and dancers, as well as plenty of wine, costly perfumes and ointments, and a profusion of choice meats. But to the Egyptians, various persons skilled in feats of agility, were hired for the occasion, and the guests played at games of chance, at mora, and the game of latrunculi, resembling draughts. The latter was the favorite game of all ranks, and Ramessus III. is more than once represented among the players. The number of pieces for playing the game is not exactly known. They were of different colors on the opposite sides of the board, and were not flat as with us, but about an inch and a half or two inches high, and were moved like chessmen, with the thumb and finger.

The religious festivals were numerously kept and some of them were, in the days of Herodotus, kept with great merrymaking and license. His description of
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of the goddess Bastabtes, kept at the city of Bastabtes, in the eastern part of the Delta, would well apply to some of the greatest Egyptian tombs now held in the country (ii, 59, 60). The feast which the Israelites celebrated when Aaron had made the golden calf seemed to have been very much of the same character: first offerings were presented, and then the people ate, and danced, and sang (Exod. xxxii., 5, 6, 17, 18, 19), and even, it seems, fasted themselves. This seems to have been more unusual at the popular ancient Egyptian festivals.

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

The Egyptians, for the most part, were accustomed to shave their heads; indeed, except among the soldiers, the practice was probably almost universal. They generally wore skull-caps. Otherwise they wore their own hair, or wigs falling to the shoulders in numerous styles and forms, and the costumes of the priests and pharaohs also showed their faces; kings, however, and other great personages had beards about three inches long and one inch broad, which were plaited. The crown of Upper Egypt was a short cap, with a tall point behind, which was worn over the other. The king often had the figure of an animal on it, such as the cobra just above his forehead. The common royal dress was a kilt which reached to the ankles; over it was a shirt, coming down to the knees, with wide sleeves as far as the elbows: both these were generally white, while the loincloth was sometimes worn around the neck, and on the person, armlets, bracelets, and necklaces. The upper and middle classes usually went barefoot; in other respects their dress was much the same as that of the king's, but of course inferior in costliness. The priests sometimes wore a leopard's skin, and even the shoulders, or like a shirt, with the fore legs for the sleeves. The queen had a particular head-dress, which was in the form of a vulture with expanded wings. The beak projected over the forehead, the wings fell on either side, and the tail hung down behind. She sometimes wore the ureaus or sash. The Egyptians were noted for the length of their hair, which was either curled or plaited, reaching about half way from the shoulders to the waist.

The Egyptians were a very literary people, and time has preserved to us, besides the inscriptions on their tombs and temples, many papyri of a religious or historical character, and one tale. They bear no resemblance to the books of the O.T., except such as arise from their sometimes enforcing moral truths in a manner not wholly different from that of the book of Proverbs. The moral and religious system is, however, essentially different in its principles and their application. Some have imagined a great similarity between the O.T. and Egyptian literature, and have given a show of reason to their idea by dressing up Egyptian documents in a garb of Hebrew phraseology, in which the same ideas are worded in, to wit, no one who had not prejudged the question could for a moment be deceived. We find frequent reference in the Bible to the magicians of Egypt. The Pharaoh of Joseph laid his dream before the magicians, who could not interpret it (Gen. xii, 8); the Pharaoh of the Exodus used them as opponents of Moses and Aaron, when, after what appears to have been a seeming success, they failed as before (Exod. vii, 11, 12, 22; viii, 18, 19; ix, 11; 2 Tim. iii, 8, 9). The monuments do not recognize any such art, and we must conclude that magic was secretly practised, not because it was thought to be unlawful, but in order to give it importance. See Magic; Jambres; Jannes.

In science, the Egyptian influence is discernible, and the country was distinctly traced in the Pentateuch. Moses was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts vii, 22), and probably derived from them the astronomical knowledge which was necessary for the calendar. His acquaintance with chemistry is shown in the manner of the destruction of the Red Sea (Exod. xv). The Egyptians were versed in the sciences of geometry and mechanics; the earlier books of the Bible, however, throw no light upon the degree in which Moses may have made use of this part of his knowledge. In medicine and surgery, the high proficiency of the Egyptians was probably of but little use to the Hebrews after the Exodus; anatomy, by the formers from the earliest ages, was repugnant to the feelings of Semites, and the simples of Egypt and of Palestine would be as different as the ordinary diseases of the country. In the arts of sculpture, architecture, and painting, the form of which was the chief, there seems to have been but a very slight and material influence. This was natural, for with the Egyptians architecture was a religious art, embodying in its principles their highest religious convictions, and mainly devoted to the service of religion. Durability was also an essential and prominent feature of the art, though soberly of character, they characterize their temples and tombs, the abodes of gods, and "homes" of men. To adopt such an architecture would have been to adopt the religion of Egypt, and the pastoral Israelites had no need of buildings. When they came into the Promised Land they found their art in a state of decay, and it was not until the days of Solomon that a temple took the place of the tent, which was the sanctuary of the pastoral people. Details of ornament were of course borrowed from Egypt; but, separated from the temple system, they lost all their material significance, and became harmless until modern scholars made them prominent in support of a theory which no mind capable of broad views can for a moment tolerate.

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

Sacred music was much used in Egypt, and the sharp, lyre, flute, tambourine, cymbals, etc., were admitted in divers religious services, of which music constituted an important element. Sacred dancing was also common in religious ceremonies, as it seems to have been among the Jews (Psa. cxli, 8). Moses found the children of Israel dancing before the golden calf (Exod. xxxxi, 19), in imitation probably of rites they had witnessed in Egypt. Sacred dancing also held an important place in the occupations of the Egyptians. The women in fine drapery and the weavers of white linen are mentioned in a manner that shows they were among the chief contributors to the riches of the country (Isa. xix, 9). The fine linen of Egypt found its way to Palestine (Prov. vii, 16). That its celebrity was not without cause is proved by a piece found near Memphis, and by the paintings (comp. Gen. xii, 42; 2 Chron. i, 16, etc.). The looms of Egypt were also famed for their fine cotton and woolen fabrics, and many of these were adopted by the Babylonians, who became noted for their needle-work. Sir G. Wilkinson states that the secret of dyeing cloths of various colors by means of mordants was known to the Egyptians, as proved by the manner in which Pliny described the process, though he does not seem to have understood it. They were equally fond of variety of patterns on the walls and ceilings of their houses and tombs, and some of the oldest ceilings show that the chevron, the scroll, and the guilloche, though ascribed to the Greeks, were adopted in Egypt more than 2000 years before our era.

A gradual progress may be observed in their choice of fancy ornament. Beginning with simple imitations of real objects, as the lotus and other flowers, they adopted, by degrees, conventional representations of them, or purely imaginary devices; and it is remarkable that the oldest Greek and Etruscan vases have a similarly close imitation of the lotus and other real objects. The same patterns common on Greek vases had then been introduced on those in Egypt; whole ceilings and walls covered with these, and the vases themselves had often the same elegant forms we admire in the cixli and others afterwards made in Greece. They were of gold and silver, engraved and embossed; those made of porcelain were rich in color, and some of the former were inlaid or studded with precious stones, or enamelled in brilliant colors. Their knowledge of glass-blowing is shown by a glass bead inscribed with the name of a queen of the 18th dynasty, which proves it to be as old as 3200 years ago. Among their most beautiful achievements in this art were the colored-bottles and vases with lining wares, and their small inlaid mosaics. In these last the fineness of the work is so great that it must have required a strong magnifying power to put the parts together, especially the minute details, such as feathers, the hair, etc. "They were composed," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "of the finest or best glass (attenuated by drawing them when heated to a great length), which, having been selected according to their color, were placed upright side by side, as in an ordinary mosaic, in sufficient number to form a picture if the object intended. Others were then added until the whole had been composed; and when they had all been cemented together by a proper heat, the work was completed. Slices were then sawn off transversely, as in our Tunbridge ware, and each section presented the same picture on its upper and under side."

The more wealthy Egyptians had their large town-houses and spacious villas, in which the flower-garden and fruit-trees and vines and small ponds were to Joseph's consent features. Avenues of trees shaded the walks, and a great abundance of violets, roses, and other flowers was always to be had, even in winter, owing to the nature of their climate and the climate of their gardeners. A part also was assigned to vines and fruit-trees; the trellis-work, the vine, and the fruit-trees were so well trained, the leaves furnished standards. It is a curious fact that they were in the habit of employing monkeys, trained for the purpose, to climb the upper branches of the sycamore-trees, and to gather the figs from them. The houses generally consisted of two stories, and the second story was more than a storey high. They were often placed round an open court, in the centre of which was a fountain or small garden. Large houses had sometimes a porch with a flight of steps before the street door, over which latter was painted the name of the owner. The wealthy landed proprietors were grandees of the priestly and military classes (Mr. Birch and M. Ampère may be said to have proved the non-existence of castes, in the Indian sense, in Egypt); but those who tended cattle were looked down upon by the rest of the community. This contempt is often shown in the paintings and representations of the culture of the land, and those who dressed in the same covering of mats that were thrown over the beasts they tended. None would intermarry with swineherds. It was the custom for the men to milk, as it is still among some Arab tribes, who think it disgraceful for a woman to milk any animal.

Pottery was very numerous, and the wheel, the baking of cups, and the other processes of their art were prominent on the monuments. It is singular, as affording illustration of Scripture language, that the same idea of fashioning the clay was also applied to man's formation, and the best Psalms and Num., the creative agencies, are represented sitting at the potter's wheel turning the clay for the human creation. Pottery appears to have furnished employment to the Hebrews during the bondage (Psa. lxxx, 6; lxviii, 13; comp. Exod. i, 14). The Egyptians were familiar with the use of iron from a very remote period, and their skill in the manufacture of bronze was celebrated. They were acquainted also with the use of the forceps, the blow-pipe, the bellows, the syringe, and the siphon. Gold mines were wrought in Upper Egypt (Diod. Sic. iii, 12).

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

As illustrating Scripture, it may be mentioned that the gods are sometimes represented in the tombs holding the Tau or sign of life (ץ), which was adopted by some of the early Christians in lieu of the cross, and is mentioned by Ezek. ix, 4, 6, as the 'mark (Ταυ) set upon the eyes of the living' or on the 'face and on the head of the preserved alive. Christian inscriptions at the great oasis are headed by this symbol; it has been found on Christian monuments at Rome.

Egyptian edicts seem to have been issued in the form of a formis or written order; and from the word used by Pharaoh in general, and when according to thy word shall all people be ruled: Hebrew אַהֲרֹן, Gen. xlii, 40, alluding evidently to the
custom of kissing a female), we may infer that the people who received that order adopted the usual Eastern mode of acknowledging their obedience to the sovereign. Besides the custom of kissing the signature attached to these documents, the people were doubtless expected to "bow the knee" (Gen. xii. 43) in the presence of the monarch and chiefs of the nation, or even to prostrate themselves before them. The statues represented them thus bowing with the hand stretched out towards the knee.

The account of brick-making in Exod. v. 7-19 is illustrated in a remarkable degree by a painting in a tomb at Thebes, in which the hardness of the work, the tale of bricks, their measurement and the numbers set over foreign workmen, are vividly portrayed. The making of bricks was a monopoly of the crown, which accounts for the Jews and other captives being employed in such numbers to make bricks for the Pharaoh. See Brick.

Certain injunctions of the Mosaic law appear to be framed with particular reference to Egyptian practices, e.g. the fact of false witness being forbidden by a distinct and separate commandment, becomes the more significant when we bear in mind the number of witnesses the Egyptian law required for the execution of the most trifling contract. As many as sixteen names are appended to one for the sale of a part of certain properties, amounting only to 400 pieces of brass. It appears that bulls only, and not heifers, were killed by the Egyptians in sacrifice. Compare with this custom the Egyptian custom of commanding them to "bring a red heifer, without spot, wherein was no blemish." It was on this account that Moses proposed to go "three days' journey into the desert," lest the Egyptians should be enraged at seeing a heifer (Exod. viii. 20); and by this very opposition of a custom they were made unequivocally to denounce and separate themselves from the rites of Egypt. The Egyptian common name for Heliopolis was An, from which was derived the Hebrew On or Aon, pointed in Ezek. xxx. 17, 18, and translated by Bethsheanah (Jer. xiii. 19). So also the Pi-beseth of the same place in Ezekiel is from the Egyptian article Pi, prefixed to Baast, the name of the goddess there worshipped, and is equivalent to Bubastis, a city named after her, supposed to correspond to the Grecian Artemis. The Ta'panih of the Scripture (Jer. xxii. 8; Ezek. xxx. 18) was perhaps a place called Daphne, sixteen miles from Palmsium.

XVIII. Comparison with the Manners of the Modern Inhabitants. — The mode of life of the Egyptians has in all ages necessarily been more or less influenced by their trade, and at all times their commerce has been an important branch of industry. As far as the coast, as well as those who dwell on the marshy flat country in the Delta, have become shepherds, as their land does not admit of cultivation. The people who live along the Nile become fishermen and sailors. The cultivated part of the nation who live on the plains and over the surface of the country diligently and most successfully practise all the arts of life, and in former ages have left ever-during memorials of their proficiency and skill.

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

The peculiarities of the ancient Egyptians of the lower castes, to have had their characteristics represented, at least in some particulars, by the Fellahs of the present day. These Fellahs discharge all the duties of tillage the country and gathering its rich abundance. They are a quiet, contented, and submissive race, always living, through an unjust government, on the edge of starvation, yet always happy, with no thought for the morrow, no care for, no interest in, political changes. "Of the Fellahs it may be said, as was said by Amorus of the ancient Egyptians, "they are bees always toiling, always toiling for others, not those of their own country and his Nile is an all-absorbing love. Remove him, and he perishes. He cannot live a year away from his village; his grave must be where his cradle was. But he is of all men most submissive; he will rather die than revolt; resignation is his primary virtue; it is the secret of his endurance." This latter fact is more especially true of the Egyptian, his nationology is blended into Egyptian, and they are most intense. Upon this race, the race of bright eyes and beautiful forms, it is impossible to look without deep interest: of all the gay, the gayest; of all the beings made for happiness, the most excitable. If day of peace and prosperity could be theirs, what songs, what music, what joys!" (Browne's Report, p. 7.)

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

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

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

There appear to have been at least three years in use with the Egyptians before the Roman domination, the first called the Royal Year, the second called the Tropical Year, and the third called the Sothic Year; but it is not probable that more than two of these were employed at the same time. The Vague Year contained 365 days without any additional fraction, and therefore passed through all the seasons in about 1560 years. It was used both for civil and for religious purposes. Probably the Israelites adopted this year during the sojourn in Egypt, and that instituted at the Exodus appears to have been the current Vague Year fixed by the adoption of a method of intercalation. See Year. The Vague Year was divided into twelve months, each of thirty days, with five epagomenal, or intercalary, days, after the last month. One month was assigned to three seasons, each comprising four months, called respectively the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th of those seasons. The names by which the Egyptian months are commonly known, Thoth, Paophi, and Djed, refer to the divinities of the month with whom they were sacred. The seasons are called, according to our rendering, those of Vegetation, Manifestation, and the Waters, or the Inundation: the exact meaning of their names has, however, been much disputed. They evidently refer to the phenomena of a tropical year, and by the intercalation we infer that the Egyptians had, at least, in a remote period of their history.

If, as we believe, the third season represents the period of the inundation, its beginning must be dated about one month before the summer solstice, which would place the beginning of the year at the winter solstice, an especially fitting time in Egypt for the commencement of a tropical year. The Sothic Year was a supposed sidereal year of 365 1/4 days, commencing with the so-called heliacal rising of Sothis. The Vague Year, having no intercalation, constantly retreated through the Sothic Year, until a period of 1461 years of the former kind, and 1460 of the latter had elapsed from one occurrence of commencements to another.

The Egyptians are known to have used two great cycles, the Sothic Cycle and the Tropical Cycle. The former was a cycle of the coincidence of the Sothic and Tropical cycles, and the latter a cycle of the coincidence of the former kind. This cycle is mentioned by ancient writers, and two of its commencements recorded, the one, called the Era of Menophres, July 20, B.C. 1322, and the other on the same day, A.D. 139. Menophres is supposed to be the name of an Egyptian king, and this is most probable. The nearest name is Mem-phth, or Menophth, which is part of that of Sethi Memphth, a title that seems to have been in one form or another common to several of the first kings of the 12th dynasty. Chronological indications seem to be conclusive in favor of Sethi I. The Tropical Cycle is a cycle of the coincidence of the Tropical and Vague years. We do not know the exact length of the former year with the Egyptians, nor, indeed, that it was used in the monumental age; but from the mention of a period of 500 years, the third of the cycle, and the time during which the Vague Year would retrograde through one season, we cannot doubt that there was such a cycle, not to speak of its analogy with the Sothic Cycle. It has been supposed by M. Biot to have had a duration of 1565 years; but the length of 1560 Vague Years is preferable, since it contains a number of complete lunations, besides that the Egyptians could scarcely have been more exact, and that the period of 500 years is a subdivision of 1500. Ancient writers do not fix any commencements of this cycle. If the characteristics of the Tropical Years are what we suppose, the cycle would have begun B.C. 2005 and 507; two hieroglyphic inscriptions are thought to record the former of these epochs (Poole, "An Egypt. p. 12 sq., pl. I, Nos. 5, 6). The return of the Pharaoh was undoubtedly a chronological meaning. It has been supposed to refer to the period last mentioned, but Poole is of opinion that the Phoenix Cycle was of exactly the same character, and therefore length, as the Sothic, its commencement being marked by the rising of a star of the constellation BENNU HESAR, "the Phoenix of Osi- ris," which is placed in the astronomical ceiling of the Ramesium of El-Kurneh six months distant from Sothis. The monuments make mention of Panegyric Months, which can only, it is supposed, be periods of thirty years each, and divisions of a year of the same kind. Poole has computed the following as dates of commencements of these Panegyric Years, in accordance with which he has adjusted his chronology: 1st, B.C. 2717, 1st dynasty, era of Menees (not on monuments); 2d, B.C. 2355, 4th dynasty, Sophie I and II; 3rd, B.C. 1993, 5th dynasty, Menees; (monuments); the last-mentioned date being also, according to him, the beginning of a Phoenix Cycle, which he thinks comprised four of these Panegyric Years. The other important dates of the system of panegyric months occur three times which must be one of the years, in his scheme: B.C. 1462, 18th dynasty, queen Amen-em-nebt; and B.C. 1412, 18th dynasty, Thothmes III.

Certain phenomena recorded on the monuments have been calculated by M. Biot, who has obtained the following dates: Rising of Sothis in reign of Thothmes III, 18th dynasty, B.C. 1445; supposed vernal equinox, Thothmes III, B.C. circa 1441; rising of Sothis, Ramses II, 19th dynasty, B.C. 1301; star-rising, Rameses VI and IX (? Menees I and II), 20th dynasty, B.C. circa 1241. Some causes of uncertainty affect the exactness of these dates, and that of Rameses II is irreconcilable with the two of Thothmes III, unless we hold the calendar in which the inscription supposed to record it occurs to be a Sothic one, in which case no date could be obtained.

Egyptian technical chronology gives us no direct evidence in favor of the high antiquity which some assign to the beginning of the first kingdom, but the earliest record which all Egyptologists are agreed to regard as affording a date is of the fifteenth century B.C., and no one has alleged any such record to be of an earlier time than the twenty-fourth century B.C. The Egyptians accepted the year 1460 even at the beginning of the 1st dynasty in the twenty-eighth century B.C., but for determining this epoch there is no direct monumental evidence, and a comparison with Scripture does not favor quite so early a date. See CHRONOLOGY.

**XX. Historical Chronology.**—The materials for this are the monuments and the remains of the historical work of Manetho. Since the interpretation of hieroglyphics has been discovered the evidence of the monuments has been brought to bear on this subject, but as yet it has not been sufficiently full and explicit to enable us to form a definite conclusion. It is, however, the task of this chapter to state the evidence as far as it goes, and to point out the local elsewhere for a general framework, the details of which the monuments may fill up. The remains of Manetho are now generally held to supply this want. A comparison with the monuments has shown that he drew his information from original sources, the general authenticity of which is vindicated by minute points of agreement. The information Manetho gives us, in the present form of his work, is, however, by no means explicit, and it is only by a theoretical arrangement of the materials that they take a definite form. The remains of Manetho's historical work consist of a list of the Egyptian dynasties and two considerable frag-
The monuments do not justify any great extension of the period assigned in the table to the first seventeen dynasties. The last date, that of the commencement of the 18th dynasty, cannot be changed more than a few years. Some Egyptologists indeed place it much earlier (Bunsen, B.C. 1625; Böckh, 1555; Lepsius, 1684; Brugsch, 1706), but they do so in opposition to monumental evidence. The date of the beginning of the 1st dynasty, which Poole is disposed to place a little before B.C. 2700, is more doubtful, but a concurrence of ethnological evidence points to the twenty-fifth century. The interval between the two dates cannot therefore be greatly more or less than nine hundred years, and in accordance with the lengths of the dynasties according to the better text, if the arrangement here given be correct. Some have supposed a much greater antiquity for the commencement of Egyptian history (Bunsen, B.C. 3625; Lepsius, 3892; Brugsch, 4450; Böckh, 5670). Their system is based upon a passage in the astronomical work of Syncellus, which assigns a duration of 3555 years to the thirty dynasties (Chron., p. 51 n.). It is by no means certain that this number is given on the authority of Manetho, but apart from this, the whole statement is unmistakably not from the true Manetho, but from some one of the fabricators of chronology, among whom pseudo-Manetho held a prominent place (Encyc. Brit., 8th ed. passim; Egypt, p. 452; Quarterly Review, No. 210, p. 393-5). If this number be discarded as doubtful or spurious, there is nothing definite to support the extended system so confidently put forth by those who adopt it.

The importance of this ancient list of Egyptian kings—it being, in fact, the only completely connected line extant—requires a fuller exhibit than we usually give, and especially a somewhat minute examination of the monument and comparison of the names and dates with the latest archeological documents. The dates given by us are essentially those assigned by Wilkinson in Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. ii, chap. viii. The identifications are in part made by Kenrick (Egypt under the Pharaohs, vol. ii). The names of Manetho exhibit many striking coincidences with the elementary records of the late discoveries and discoveries, especially Mariette's "Apis list" on the tablet of Sakkara, Dümichen's "Sethos list" on that of Abydos, and the "Turin papyrus," as these are given in detail by Unger (Chronologie des Mammeluk, Berlin, 1867), although we have not been able to adopt all the conclusions of this author, whose work is the most elaborate on the subject. The fact that the names in all these lists are in continuous order does not prove an unbroken succession of reigns, for such is the case in Manetho's list, although he expressly states that the several dynasties were of different localities. That the dynasties of the monumental lists likewise are not all consecutive is further proved by at least two conclusive circumstances: 1. The sum of the years of those 74 reigns, to which an explicit length is assigned in the Turin roll, is 1060; now if to this we add a corresponding number for the other 160 reigns whose duration is not specified in the same document, and also for the 10 subsequent names in the parallel lists down to Seth I (B.C. 1392), we obtain a total of 3464 years for the first eighteen dynasties, or a date for Menes of B.C. 4806; but this would be 2144 years before the Flood, even according to the latest reconstrual of the Biblical text. See Ages of the World.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>VARIOUS READINGS, and other Authors.</th>
<th>On the ANCIENT MONUMENTS.</th>
<th>Other Inscriptions.</th>
<th>Designation by most Writers.</th>
<th>ACCESSION R.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Menes</td>
<td>Minos, etc. 60, 20</td>
<td>1, Menes</td>
<td>Menes</td>
<td>Menes</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Athribis</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2, Attilo</td>
<td>2, Attilo</td>
<td>3, Attilo</td>
<td>2913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Menophis</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3, Menophis</td>
<td>3, Menophis</td>
<td>Menophis</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Amonophis</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4, Amonophis</td>
<td>4, Amonophis</td>
<td>Amonophis</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Ascalon</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5, Ascalon</td>
<td>Ascalon</td>
<td>Ascalon</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Menes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6, Menes</td>
<td>Menes</td>
<td>Menes</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Amones</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7, Amones</td>
<td>Amones</td>
<td>Amones</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Amones</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8, Amones</td>
<td>Amones</td>
<td>Amones</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Ascalon</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9, Ascalon</td>
<td>Ascalon</td>
<td>Ascalon</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE OF THE EGYPTIAN REIGNS.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
<th>Various Readings, and other Authors</th>
<th>On the Ancient Monuments</th>
<th>Other Inscriptions</th>
<th>Designation by most Writers</th>
<th>Accession R.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>19 kugs</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>16 kugs</td>
<td>43 Murtuia 27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>17. Amenemhesun 16 Nekht-en-ra</td>
<td>46 Ptolethrius 35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2. Amenemhesun 38 Thothos</td>
<td>46 Gabessi, etc. 24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>5. Amenemhesun 48 Sesostris 35</td>
<td>46 Sesostris, etc. 17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>6. Amenemhesun 6 Smeth 38</td>
<td>46 Amenemhesun 33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>7. Amenemhesun 8 Amenemhesun 38</td>
<td>46 Amenemhesun 33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>9. Amenemhesun 30 Amenemhesun 38</td>
<td>46 Amenemhesun 33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>10. Amenemhesun 40 Amenemhesun 38</td>
<td>46 Amenemhesun 33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The table continues with similar entries for each dynasty, including information on reigns, years, and various readings and authors.
- Each dynasty's reigns are listed with corresponding years, and additional notes include references to specific authors and monuments.
- The table concludes with a mention of accession dates and other historical details.
TABLE OF THE EGYPTIAN REIGNS.—(Continued.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sethos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sethos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Re-nephth-bau</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ap Hayes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ap Hayes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aphesis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aphesis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sethos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sethos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ap Hayes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ap Hayes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aphesis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aphesis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ramses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Amenemhat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Achebes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-naphet</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with additional monarchs and their reign details, but the above snippet is an excerpt for brevity.
TABLE OF THE EGYPTIAN REIGNS.—(Continued.)

XXI. 1. Memnetes 35 36 Memnetes
2. Epefrannes 41 41 Nephthorides
3. Nephthorides 7 7 Amonisophtha
4. Aimophtha 7 7 Amonisophtha
5. Kaup 37 37
6. Paleshnes 12 12

XXII. 1. Samoines 51 51 Semcheh
2. Semcheh 15 15
3. Others 25 25
4. Takeltib 13, 3
5. Others 42 42

XXIII. 1. Ptolemais 40 40 Ptolemais
2. Nechoes 15 15
3. Ptolemais 15 15

XXIV. 1. Bocchides 6 6
2. Selchoes 7 7
3. Selchoes 14 14
4. Takres 16 16

XXVI. 1. Amones 17 17
2. Nepehnes 6 6
3. Naach 6 6
4. Ptolemaise 54 54 Ptolemaise
5. Nakun 17 17
6. Ptolemaise H 17 17
7. Nakun 17 17
8. Nakun 44 44

XXVII. 1. Kambasse 44, 2 months.
2. Dyreus (son of) Hatasou 58
3. Xerox the Great 51
4. Aratoshes 1 1
5. Aratoshes 41 41

XXX. 1. Caphtor 19 19
2. Durenas 19 19

XXXI. 1. Nephthides 6 6
2. Amenemh 6 6
3. Amenemh 6 6

XXXII. 1. Nakobes 15 15
2. Nakobes 15 15
3. Others 5 5
4. Others 5 5
5. Aras 2 2
6. Durenas 2 2

Conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great.

XXII. History.—I. Traditory Period.—We have first to notice the indications in the Bible which relate to the earliest period. In Gen. x we find the colonization of Egypt traced up to the immediate children of Noah, for it is there stated that Miriam was the second son of Ham, who was himself the second son of Noah. That Egypt was colonized by the descendants of Noah in a very remote age is further shown by the mention of the migration of the Philistines from Caphtor, which had taken place before the arrival of Abraham in Palestine (Gen. x. 14; compare Deut. i. 28; Amos ii. 9). Before this migration, the people of the Carthaginians and other Philistines have occupied Egypt for some time. Immediately after these genealogical statements, the sacred narrative (Gen. xii.) informs us that the patriarch Abraham, pressed by famine, went down (B.C. 2067) into Egypt, where it appears he found a monarch, a court, princes, and servants, and where he found also those supplies of food which the well-known fertility of the country had led him to seek there; for it is expressly stated that the favor which his wife had won in the reigning Pharaoh’s eyes procured him sheep and oxen, as well as horses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels. A remarkable passage points to the knowledge of a date at which an ancient city of Egypt was founded: “Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt” (Num. xiii. 22). We find that Hebron was originally called Kirjath-sepher, and was a city of the Amakim (Josh. xiv. 15), and it is mentioned under that appellation in the history of Abraham (Gen. xxiii. 2): it has therefore been founded by the giant race before the days of patriarchal. In Gen. xxii, 9, mention is made in the case of Ishmael, the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whose mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt (B.C. cir. 2065), of a mixed race between the Egyptians and the Chaldeans, a race which in after times became a great nation. From this mixture of races it has been supposed the Arabs (אַרְעָבָא, “mixed people”) had their name (Sharpe’s Early Hist. of Egypt, i. 11).

The evidence of the Egyptians as to the primeval history of their race and country is extremely indefinite. They seem to have separated mankind into two great stocks, and each of these again into two branches, for they appear to have represented themselves and the negroes as the red and black races, as the children of the god Horus, and the Semites and Europeans, the yellow and white races, as the children of the goddess Pesht (comp. Brugsch, Geogr. Juschr. ii. 90, 91). They seem, therefore, to have held a double origin of the species. The absence of any important traditional period is very remarkable in the fragments of Egyptian history. These commence with the divine dynasties, and pass abruptly to the human dynasties. The latest portion of the first may indeed be traditional, not mythical, and the earliest part of the second may be traditional and not historical, though this last conjecture we are hardly disposed to admit. In any case, however, there is a very short and extremely obscure time of tradition, and at no great distance from the earliest date at which it can be held to end we come upon the clear light of history in the days of the pyramid-midas.

There is no trace of the tradition of the Deluge which is found in almost every other country of the world. The
priests are indeed reported to have told Solon, when he spoke of one deluge, that many had occurred (Plat. Tim. 23), but the reference is more likely to have been to great floods of the Nile than to any extraordinary cataclysm. 2. Uncertain Period.—The history of the dynasties preceding the 18th is not told by any continuous series of monuments. Except the bare lists indicated in the above table, there are scarcely any records of the age left to the present day, and thence in a great measure arises the difficulty of determining the chronology of the period. From the time of Menes, the first king, until the Shepherd invasion, Egypt seems to have enjoyed perfect tranquillity. During this age the Memphite line was the most powerful, and by it, under the 4th dynasty, were the most famous pyramids raised. The Shepherds were Egyptians, who came from the east, and, in some manner unknown to Manetho, gained the rule of Egypt. Those whose kings composed the 15th dynasty were the first and most important. They appear to have been Phenicians, and it is probable that their migration into Egypt, and thence at last into Syria, was permitted whilst the menace to which the coming of the Phenicians from the Erythrean Sea, and the Philistines from Caphtor, belonged. It is not impossible that the war of the four kings—Chedorlaomer and his allies—was directed against the power of the kingship of the 15th dynasty. Most probably the Pharaoh of Abraham was of this line, which lived at Memphis, and at the great fort or camp of Avaris on the eastern frontier. The period of Egyptian history to which the Shepherd invasion should be assigned is a point of dispute. It is generally placed after the 12th dynasty, for it is argued that this powereful line could not have reigned at the same time as one or more Shepherd dynasties. Poole is of the opinion that this objection is not valid, and that the Shepherd invasion was anterior to the 12th dynasty. It is not certain that the foreigners were at the outset hostile; on the contrary, for they may have come in by marriage, and it is by no means unlikely that they may have long been in a position of secondary importance. The rule of the 12th dynasty, which was of the Thebans, lasting about 160 years, was a period of prosperity to Egypt, but after its close those calamities appeared to be threatened whilst the Pharaohs which succeeded the Phenicians were hated by the Egyptians. During the interval to the 18th dynasty there seems to have been no native line of any importance but that of the Thebans, and more than one Shepherd dynasty exercised a severe rule over the Egyptians. The paucity of the monuments proves the troubled nature of this period. See IV. rasos. Of these first seventeen dynasties, Menes, the first mortal king of Egypt, according to Manetho, Herodotus, Erastosthenes, and Diodorus, and preceded, according to the first, by gods, heroes, and Menes (?), winder, is accepted on all hands as a historical personage. His hieroglyphic name reads MEN or MENA, and is the first on the list of the Ramessseum of el-Kurneh. It is also met with in the hiearic of the Turin Papyrus of Kings. Strong reasons are given by Mr. Stuart Poole for the Restoration of the accession of Herodotus (p. 94–98); but even this date must be somewhat lowered, as it would precede that of the Flood (B.C. 2515); on the other hand, Unger (ut sup.) raises it to June 27, B.C. 6513. As one step in Poole's argument involves a very ingenious elucidation of a word. With Mr. Poole the Deluge of B.C. 5672 cannot be borne to mention. Herodotus says that, in the interval from the first king to Sothem, the priest of Hephastus, the priests told him that "the sun had four times moved from his wonted course, twice rising where he now sets, and twice setting where he now rises." It is evident, on this that the priests told Herodotus that great periods had elapsed since the time of Menes, the first king, and that, in the interval from his reign to that of Sothem, the solar risings of stars—that is to say, their manifestations—had twice fallen on those days of the Vague Year on which their settings fell in their time, and vice versa; and that, if the historian, by a natural mistake, supposed they spoke of the sun itself." Menes appears to have been a Thinite king, of the city of This, near Abydos, in Upper Egypt. Herodotus ascribes the building of the city of Memphis to him, while Manetho says that he made a foreign expedition and acquired the power, and that he was killed by a hippopotamus. Menes, after a long reign, was succeeded by his son Athothis, who was the second king of the first dynasty. Manetho says that he built the palace at Memphis, that he was a physi- cian, and left anatomical books; all of these statements implying that an age of science and learning the Egyptians were in a high state of civilization. About the time of Athothis, the 3d dynasty is supposed, according to the scheme which seems most reasonable, to have commenced, and Memphis to have become independent, giving its name to five dynasties of kings. The 5th, 6th, and 7th. The last Thinite dynasty probably lasted about two centuries and a half. Of the 2d very little has reached us; under one of the kings it was determined that women could hold the sovereign power; in the time of another it was for some time uncertain to whom the throne belonged. By the space of eleven days. The duration of this dynasty was probably between 300 and 400 years, and it seems to have come to a close at the time of the Shepherd invasion. The 3d (Memphite) dynasty, after having lasted about 200 years, was succeeded by the 4th, one of the most famous of the lines which ruled in Egypt; while the 5th dynasty of Elephanthine kings arose at the same time. This was emphatically the period of the pyramids, the earliest of which was probably the northern pyramid of Abu-Sir, supposed to be the tomb of Soris or Shur-ru, the successor of the 5th dynasty. But, the pyramid built by two kings of the name of Sphex, the first of whom, the Cheops of Herodotus, the Shpshn of the monuments, was probably the builder of the great pyramid. On these wonderful monuments we find traces at that remote period of the advanced state of civilization of later times. The stones, or the stones and the stones by the masons proves that writing had been long in common use. Many of the blocks brought from Syene are built together in the pyramids of Gih- zeh in a manner unrivalled at any period. The same manners and customs are portrayed on them as on the later monuments. The same boats and the same costume of the priests, the same trades, such as glass-making and cabinet-making. At the beginning of the 4th dynasty, moreover, the peninsula of Sinai was in the possession of the Egyptians, and its copper mines were worked by them. The duration of this dynasty probably exceeded two centuries, and it was followed by the 6th. The 6th dynasty of Elephantinite, as just remarked, began the same time as the 4th. The names of several of its kings occur in the Necropolis of Memphis. The most important of them is Se- phres, the Shphrea of the Monuments. The story of Herodotus, and Chephren of Diodorus. This dynasty lasted nearly 600 years. Of the 6th dynasty, which lasted about 150 years, the two most famous sovereigns are Piopi or Pepi and queen Nitocris. The former is said to have ruled for a hundred years. His name is written in the Monuments. With Pepi, all known records of Egyptian history break. Lower Egypt was invaded by the Shepherds, who entered the country from the north-east, about 700 years after Menes, and eventually drove the Memphites from the throne. Of the 7th and 8th dynasties nothing is known with certainty; they probably followed one another. Poole assigns a duration of 70 years, and 150 years to the latter. The 9th dynasty of Heracleopolitans, or,
more properly, of Hermonithes, as Sir G. Wilkinson has shown; the seat of power was in the 6th of the 10th and 12th dynasties, which together may have lasted nearly 600 years, ending at the time of the great Shepherd war of expulsion, which resulted in the overthrow of all the royal lines except the Diospolite or Tell-el-Amarna, which was destroyed by the 12th, 13th, 14th, and 17th dynasties, and which lasted about 130 years. The 12th dynasty, which lasted some 400 years, probably began before the close of the 12th. The kings of this dynasty were of little power, and probably tributary to the Shepherds. The Diospolites, indeed, did not recover their prosperity till the end of the 12th dynasty. With the 16th, 17th, and 18th dynas- ries, the Shepherds began to have a powerful influence in the land. The 18th dynasty, as we have seen, was the period of the Hyksos, who were the first to have subdued Egypt without a battle. The question of great uncertainty. Their name is called Hyksos by the Egyptians, who are variously interpreted to mean shepherd kings, or foreign shep- herds. They have been pronounced to have been As- syrians, Scythians, Ethiopians, Phoenicians, and Ar- abs. The kings of the 18th dynasty were the greatest of the foreign rulers. The kings of the 16th and 17th dynasties are very obscure. Mr. Poole says there are strong reasons for supposing that the kings of the 16th and 17th dynasties were god-kings, and that they may have been Assyrians. Having held possession of Egypt 511, or, according to the longest date, 652 years, the Shepherds were driven out by Amon, or Amosis, the first king of the 18th dynasty; and the whole country was then united under one king, who rightly claimed the title of Lord of the Two regions, or of Upper and Lower Egypt.

3. Period of the Hebrew Sojourn.—In Gen. xxxix begins the interesting story of Joseph's being carried down to Egypt, with all its important consequences for the great-grandchildren of Abraham. The produc- tiveness of the country is the alluring incentive to the impulse. Attendant circumstances show that Egypt was then famous also for its commercial pursuits; and the entire narrative gives the idea of a complex sys- tem of society (about B.C. 1890), and a well-constituted and developed form of government. The Shepherds, the leaders of the northern and western courts at later periods of history, elevated to high offices was marked and sudden. The slave Joseph is taken from prison and from impending death, and raised to the dignity of prime vizier, and is intrusted with making provision for an approaching dearth of food, which he had himself foreseen, during which he effects a favor of the ruling sovereign one of the greatest revolutions of property which history has re- corded. The high consideration in which the priestly order was held is apparent. Joseph himself marries a daughter of the priest of On. Out of respect towards, as well as by the direct influence of Joseph, the He- brews were well treated. The scriptural record, how- ever, distinctly states, xlvi, 21, 25, before the Exod of Israel and his sons "every shepherd was an abomination unto the Egyptians." The Heb- brews, whose trade had been about cattle, must have been odious in the eyes of the Egyptians, yet they are expressly permitted to dwell "in the best of the land" (Gen. xlv, 4), which is beside the land of Goshen, the place which the Israelites had prayed might be assigned to them, and which they obviously desired on account of the adaptation of its soil to their way of life as herdsmen. Having settled his father and family satisfactorily in the land, Joseph proceeded to supply the wants of his famine-stricken country at the same time converted the tenure of all property from freehold into tenancy-at-will, with a rent-charge of one fifth of the produce, leaving the priests' lands, however, in their own hands; and thus he gave an- other evidence of the greatness of his character.

The richness of Goshen was favorable, and the Is- raelites grew and multiplied exceeding, so that the land was filled with them. But Joseph was now dead; time had passed on, and there rose up a new king (probably one of a new dynasty) "which knew not Joseph." (Exod. i. 8) The law of Moses had not been heeded, and, if it be, in the service of his people; who, becoming jealous of the increase of the Hebrews, set about persecuting them with the avowed intention of diminishing their numbers and crippling their power. Severe task-masters are therefore set over them, severe tasks are imposed on them, and the laws are compelled to build "treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." It is found, however, that they only in- crease the more. In consequence, their burdens are doubled and their lives made bitter with hard bondage (Exod. i. 14), in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field. See Br-Am. The firstborn males, moreover, are doomed to destruction the moment they come into being. The deepest heart- burnings ensue; hatred arises between the oppressor and the oppressed; the Israelites seek revenge in pri- vate and by stealth (Exod. ii. 19). At last a higher power interferes, and the afflicted race is permitted to quit Egypt (B.C. 1658). At this time Egypt appears to have been a well-peopled and well-cultivated country, with numerous cities, under a despotic monarch, surrounded by officers of his court and a life-guard. There was an army at some time, and officers of ranks, a state-prison, and a prime minister. Great buildings were carried on. There was set apart from the rest of the people an order of priests who probably filled offices in the civil government; the priest of Midian and the priest of On seem to have ruled over the people of these cities so named. There was in the general class of priests an order—wise men, sorcerers, and magi- cians—who had charge of a certain secret knowledge; there were physicians or embalmers of the dead; the royal army contained chosen captains, and horsemen, and chariots. The attention which the people at large paid to agriculture, and the fixed notions of property which they in consequence had, made them hold the shepherd or nomad tribes in abhorrence, as freeboot- ers only less dangerous than hunting-tribes. See PHARAOH.

According to the scheme of Biblical chronology, which we have adopted as the most probable, the whole sojourn in Egypt would belong to the period be- fore the 18th dynasty. The Israelites would have come in and gone forth during that obscure age, for the history of which we have little or no monumental evi- dence. This would explain the absence of any posi- tive mention of them on the Egyptian monuments. Some assert that they were an unimportant Arab tribe, and therefore would not be mentioned, and that the calamities attending their departure could not be com- memorated. These two propositions are contradictory, and the difficulties are unsolved. If, as Lepsius sup-
poses, the Israelites came in under the 18th dynasty, and went out under the 19th, or if, as Bunsen holds, they came in under the 12th, and (after a sojourn of 1454 years!) went out under the 19th, the oppression in both cases falling in a period of which we have abundant contemporary monuments, sometimes the record of every year. It is impossible that the movements should be wholly silent if the Biblical narrative is true. Let us examine the details of that narrative. At the time to which we should assign Joseph's rule, Egypt was under Shepherds, and Egyptian kings of no great strength. Since the Pharaoh of Joseph must have been a powerful ruler and held Lower Egypt, there can be no question that he was, if the dates be correct, a Shepherd of the 15th dynasty. How does the Biblical evidence affect this inference? Nothing is more striking throughout the ancient Egyptian inscriptions and writings than the fact that the Pharaohs, especially Egyptians, were constantly spoken of in the same terms as the inhabitants of the inferior regions, not alone when at war with the Pharaohs, but in time of peace and in the case of friendly nations. It is a feeling paralleled in our days by that of the Greeks towards the Chinese. The scope of this work, the whole history of the later period, abundantly confirm this estimate of the prejudice of the Egyptians against foreigners. It seems to us perfectly incredible that Joseph should be the minister of an Egyptian king, a Shepherd of Lower Egypt, and that the evidence is not less strong. The Pharaoh of Joseph is a despot, whose will is law, who kills and pardons at his pleasure; who not only raises a foreign slave to the head of his administration, but through his means makes all the Egyptians, except the priests, serfs of the crown. The Egyptian kings, on the contrary, were restrained by the laws, shared the public dislike of foreigners, and would have avoided the very policy Joseph followed, which would have weakened the attachment of their fellow-countrymen by the loosening of local ties and complete reducing to bondage of the population, although it would have greatly strengthened the power of an alien sovereign. Pharaoh's conduct towards Joseph's family points to the same conclusion. He gladly invites the strangers, and gives them leave to dwell, not among the Egyptians, but in Goshen, where his own castle seems to have been (Gen. xlix. 14, xlvi. 6). His acts indicate a fellow-feeling, and a desire to strengthen himself against the national party. See Joseph. The "new king," "which knew not Joseph," is generally thought by those who hold with us to the present date of the story, to have been an answering echo of the 18th dynasty. It seems at first sight extremely probable that the king who crushed, if he did not expel the Shepherds, would be the first oppressor of the nation which they protected. Plausible as this theory appears, a close examination of the Biblical narrative seems to us to overthrow it. We read of the new king that—"he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel [are] more and mightier than we: come on, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass, when there falleth out any war, that they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land" (Exod. i. 9, 10). The Israelites are therefore more and stronger than the people of the oppressor; the oppressor fears war in Egypt, and that the Israelites would join his enemies; he is not able at once to adopt open violence against them. In order that the population may be reduced by them as making them perform forced labor, and soon after takes the stronger measure of killing their male children. These conditions point to a divided country and a weak kingdom, and cannot, we think, apply to the time of the 18th and 19th dynasties. The whole narrative of subsequent events to the departure is consistent with this conclusion, to which the use of universal terms does not offer any real objection.

When all Egypt is spoken of, it is not necessary either in Hebrew or in Egyptian that we should suppose the entire country to be strictly intended. If we conclude, therefore, that the Exodus most probably occurred before the 18th dynasty, we have to ascertain, if possible, whether the Pharaohs of the oppression appear to have been the Egyptians or the Shepherds. The change of policy is in favor of their having been Egyptians, but is by no means conclusive, for there is no reason that all the foreigners should have had the same feeling towards the Israelites, and we have already ready an example of the effect of Egyptian foreigners in general in having been friendly to them throughout their history, and that the Egyptians were privileged by law, apparently on this account. It may be questioned whether the friendship of the two nations, even if merely a matter of policy, would have been maintained if it had been left to the Egyptians to look back on their conduct towards the Israelites as productive of great national calamities, or had the Israelites looked back upon the persecution as the work of the Egyptians. If the chronology be correct, we can only decide in favor of the Shepherds. During the whole period to which the story refers, there were no important lines but the Theban, and one or more of Shepherds. Lower Egypt, and especially its eastern part, must have been in the hands of the latter. The land of Goshen was in the eastern part of Lower Egypt, and was not, like the land of Shepherds, oppressed, whose capital or royal residence, at least in the case of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, lay very near to it. Manetho, according to the transcript of Africanus, speaks of three Shepherd dynasties, the 16th, 16th, and 17th, the last of which, according to the present text, was of Shepherds and Pharaohs, but this is probably incorrect, and the dynasty should rather be considered as of Shepherds alone. It is difficult to choose between these three: a passage in Isaiah, however, which has been strangely overlooked, seems to afford an indication which narrows the choice. "My people were brought into Egypt, to sojourn there, and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause" (Isa. xi. 19). This indicates that the oppressor was an Assyrian, and therefore not of the 16th dynasty, which, according to Manetho, in the epistles, was of Phoenicians, and opposed to the Assyrians (Josephus, Ant. i. 14). Among the names of kings of this period in the royal Turin papyrus (ed. Wilkinson) are two which appear to be Assyrian, so that we may reasonably suppose that some of the foreign rulers were of that race. Their exact date, however, is undetermined. It cannot be earlier than 1220 B.C. It cannot be later than 1000 B.C. It was only after the invasion of Egypt by Sais that the title Pharaoh was applied to the kings connected with the Israelites, and that they must therefore have been natives, for it is almost certain that at least some of the Shepherd kings were Egyptianized, like Joseph, who received an Egyptian name, and Moses, who was supposed by the daughters of Jethro to be an Egyptian (Exod. ii. 19). It has been urged by the opponents of the chronological schemes that place the Exodus before the later part of the fourteenth century B.C., that the conquests of the Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties would have involved collisions with the Israelites that they were in those times already established in Palestine, whereas neither the Bible nor the monuments of Egypt indicate any such event. It has been overlooked by the advocates of the Rabbinical date of the Exodus evidence whether the Biblical evidence whether the Exodus occurred in the country or not. Shishak's list, on the contrary, presents several well-known names of towns in Palestine, be-
Egypt.

side that of the kingdom of Judah. The policy of the Pharaohs, as previously explained, is the key to their conduct towards the Israelites. At the same time, the character of the portions of the Bible relating to this period prevents our being sure that the Egyptians may not have passed through the country, and even entered into it, at a time later than that of the whole question under consideration that, in the most flourishing days of the sole kingdom of Israel, a Pharaoh should have marched unopposed into Palestine and captured the Canaanitic city Gezer, at no great distance from Jerusalem, and that this should be merely, as it is generally considered, as at a later time instead of being noticed in the regular course of the narrative (1 Kings ix. 15, 16). See EZEK.

4. Definite Period.—With the 18th dynasty, about B.C. 1520, a new and clearer epoch of Egyptian history begins, both as regards the numerous materials for reconstructing it, and also its great importance. In fact, the history of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties is that of the Egyptian empire. Amosis, or Ahmose, the head of the first of these, overthrew the power of the Shepherd, and probably expelled them. No great monuments remain of the first king, but various edicts, containing districts, testify that he was a powerful king. During his reign we first find mention of the horse, and, as it is often called by the Semitic name azia, seems probable that it was introduced from Asia, and possibly by the Shepherds themselves. As they were without horses, the strength of their cavalry for their easy conquest of Egypt. It is certain that, while other animals are frequently depicted on the monuments, neither in the tombs near the pyramids, nor at Beni-Hasan, is there any appearance of the horse, and yet, subsequently, Egypt became the greatest and most prosperous of all the animal, inasmuch that in the time of Solomon they were regularly imported for him, and for “all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria;” and when Israel was invaded by Sennacherib, it was on Egypt that they were said to put their trust for chariots and horses. Amenophis I., the next king (B.C. cir. 1498), was sufficiently powerful to make conquests in Ethiopia and in Asia. In his time we find that the Egyptians had adopted the five intercalary days, as well as the twelve hours of day and night. The arches of approaching stones also are found at Thebes, bearing his name on the bricks, and were in common use in his time. See ARCH. Some of the more ancient chambers in the temple of Amen-ra, or El-Karnak, at Thebes, were built by him. In the reign of his successor, Thothmes I. (B.C. cir. 1480), he is said to have discovered the land of Azania, or the land of “Naharayn;” by some Naharayn is identified with the Nairi, a people south-west of Armenia. Libya also was subject to his sway. A monument of his reign is still remaining in one of the two obelisks of red granite which he set up at El-Karnak, or Thebes. The name of Thothmes II. (B.C. cir. 1470) is found as far south as Napata, or Gebel Berkel, in Ethiopia. With him and his successor was associated a queen, Amose or Amen-numt, who seems to have received more honor than either. She is thought to have been a Semiramis, that name, like Sosoteis, probably means great goddess. She was apparently the only Amem-nent and Thothmes II and III are the earliest sovereigns of whom great monuments remain in the temple of El-Karnak, the chief sanctuary of Thebes. Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1465) was one of the most remarkable of the Pharaohs. He married into a family as far as Niseveh, and reduced perhaps Bablyon also to his sway, receiving a large tribute from Asiatic nations over whom he had triumphed. This was a common mode of acknowledging the supremacy of a conqueror, and by no means implied that the territory was surrendered to him; on the contrary, he may only have defeated the army of the nation, and that beyond its own frontier. The Pun, a people of Arabia, the Shepseda, supposed to be of Cyprus, and the Raeten, a people of the Euphrates or Tigris, thus confessed the power of Thothmes; and the monuments at Thebes are rich in delineations of the elephants and bears, camelopards and asses, the eagle, ivory, gold, and silver, in which the Pharaohs of the Memphite period of Egyptian art, all the earlier time showing a gradual improvement, and all the later a gradual declension. In the reign of Thothmes IV. (B.C. cir. 1410), according to Manetho, the Shepherds took their final departure. The conquests of Amenophis III. (B.C. cir. 1400) were very extensive; traces of his power are found in various parts of Ethiopia; he states on scarabai, struck apparently to commemorate his marriage, that his northern boundary was in Mesopotamia, his southern in Kara (Cholod?). From his features, he seems to have been partly Ethiopian origin. His long reign of nearly forty years was marred by the construction of magnificent temples. Of these, the greatest were two at Thebes; one on the west bank, of which little remains but the two great colossal that stood on each side of the approach to it, and one on the east side of which is the vast temple of Amon. Also built, on the opposite bank, the great temple, now called that of El-Ukase, which Ramesses I. afterwards much enlarged. The tomb of this king yet remains at Thebes. For a period of about thirty years after the reign of Amenophis III, Egypt was disturbed by the rule of a strange people, who abandoned their old religion, and introduced a pure sun-worship. It is not known whence they came, but they were regarded by the Egyptians as usurpers, and the monuments of them are defaced or ruined by those who overthrew them. Sir G. Wilkinson supposes that Amenophis III. may have belonged to their race; but, if so, we must date the commencement of their rule from the end of his reign, as then began that change of the state religion which was the great peculiarity of the foreign domination. How or when the sun-worshippers were destroyed or expelled from Egypt does not appear. Horus, or Harem-heb, was thegod them (B.C. cir. 1367), was probably the prince by whom they were overthrown. He was a son of Amenophis III, and continued the line of Deltaic sovereigns. The records of his reign are not important; but the sculptures at a subsequent time at Sielilli commemorating his conduct towards the negroes. Horus was indirectly succeeded by Ramesses I., with whom substantially commences the 19th dynasty, about B.C. 1324. His tomb at Thebes marks the new dynasty, by being in a different locality from that of Amenophis III, and being the first in the valley the necropolis set apart as the necropolis of the Theban kings. After a short and unimportant reign, he was succeeded by his son Sethi I., or Sethos (B.C. 1322). He is known by the magnificent hypostyle hall in the great temple of El-Karnak, which he built, and on the outside of the north wall of which are sculptured the achievements of his reign. He was friendly to travellers, is the most beautiful in the Valley of the Kings, and shows that his reign must have been a long one, as the sepulchre of an Egyptian king was commenced about the time of his accession, and thus indicates the length of his reign. He conquered the Keta, or Hittites, and took their stronghold Ketesh, variously held to be at or near Emesa, on or near the Orontes, or Kadesh, or even Ashsharot. His son Ramesses II., who was probably for some time associated with him in the throne, became the most illustrious of the ancient kings of Egypt (B.C. cir. 1300). If he did not exceed all others in foreign conquests, he
Egypt. Chief campaign, as recorded on his numerous monuments, was against the Akhet or Hittites, and a great confederacy they had formed. He defeated them at Kadesh, and made them to conclude a treaty with him, though this last object does not seem to have been immediately attained. It is he who is generally intended by the Sensoatri of classic writers. He built the temple which is erroneously called the Memnonium, but properly the Ramesseum of El-Amarna, the largest in Egypt, theaci of the most beautiful of Egyptian monuments, and a great part of that of E1-Usofr, on the opposite bank, as well as additions to that of E1-Karnak. Through-out Egypt and Nubia are similar memorials of the power of Rameses II, one of the most beautiful temples of Ahum-Simbel, not far north of the second cataract. The temple of Ptah, at Memphis, was also adorned by this Pharaoh, and its site is chiefly marked by a very beautiful colossal statue of him, fallen on its face and partly mutilated through time. Under him the power of Egypt evidently declined, and towards the close of the dynasty the country seems to have fallen into anarchy, the high priests of Amen having usurped regal power at Thebes, and a Lower Egyptian dynasty, the 21st, arisen at Tanis. Of these, however, but few records remain. With the succession to this dynasty occurred the first defection of Nubia, or the Sceptre of the Nile, being divided against the Pharaoh. The last king of this dynasty was Tirhakah, or Tekh- rak (B.C. 690), who, probably while yet ruling over Ethiopia or Upper Egypt only, advanced against Sennacherib to protect Hezekiah, king of Judah, B.C. 718. It does not appear whether he met the Assyrian army, but it seems certain that its miraculous destruction occurred before any engagement had been fought between the rival forces. Perhaps Tirhakah availed himself of this opportunity to restore the supremacy of Egypt west of the Euphrates. See TirHAKA.

Egypt. Sculptured remains of the temples of Busbata; they were probably not of unmixed Egyptian origin, and may have been partly of Assyrian or Babylonian race. The 1st king was Sheshonk I (B.C. cir. 990), the contemporary of Solomon, and in his reign it was that "Jerobeam begat Abijah, and Abijah begat Rehoboam." He conquered, as king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon" (I Kings xi, 40), B.C. 973. In the 5th year of Rehoboam, B.C. 969, Sheshonk invaded Judah with an army of which it is said "the people were without number that came with him out of Egypt, the Lubims, and the Emims which were in the eastern parts of the Libyans, and the Hittites, one of the most beautiful of Egyptian monuments, and a great part of that of El-Usofr, on the opposite bank, as well as additions to that of E1-Karnak. Through-out Egypt and Nubia are similar memorials of the power of Rameses II, one of the most beautiful temples of Ahum-Simbel, not far north of the second cataract. The temple of Ptah, at Memphis, was also adorned by this Pharaoh, and its site is chiefly marked by a very beautiful colossal statue of him, fallen on its face and partly mutilated through time. Under him the power of Egypt evidently declined, and towards the close of the dynasty the country seems to have fallen into anarchy, the high priests of Amen having usurped regal power at Thebes, and a Lower Egyptian dynasty, the 21st, arisen at Tanis. Of these, however, but few records remain. With the succession to this dynasty occurred the first defection of Nubia, or the Sceptre of the Nile, being divided against the Pharaoh. The last king of this dynasty was Tirhakah, or Tekh- rak (B.C. 690), who, probably while yet ruling over Ethiopia or Upper Egypt only, advanced against Sennacherib to protect Hezekiah, king of Judah, B.C. 718. It does not appear whether he met the Assyrian army, but it seems certain that its miraculous destruction occurred before any engagement had been fought between the rival forces. Perhaps Tirhakah availed himself of this opportunity to restore the supremacy of Egypt west of the Euphrates. See TirHAKA.
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Egypt was governed by a Persian satrap till Persia itself was conquered by Alexander the Great, B.C. 332. When Alexander's army occupied Memphis, the numerous Greeks who had settled in Lower Egypt at this time found themselves ruled by a Greek king. Egypt had been once a Greek kingdom, and Alexander showed his wisdom in the regulations by which he guarded the prejudices and religion of the Egyptians, who were henceforth to be treated as inferior, and forbidden to enter the Holy City of Jerusalem. He founded Alexandria, the capital. On his death, his lieutenant Ptolemy made himself king of Egypt, being the first of a race of monarchs who governed for 300 years, and made it the second chief kingdom in the world, till it sunk under its own luxuries and vices and the rising power of Rome. The Ptolemies founded a large public library and a museum of learned men. See ALEXANDRIA.

After the time of the exile the Egyptian Ptolemies were for a long while (from B.C. 801 to about 180) masters of Palestine, and during this period Egypt became as of old the place of refuge for those who had suffered persecution, and many favors and privileges were conceded. This shelter seems not to have been for ages withdrawn (Matt. ii, 13). Yet it cannot be said that the Jews were held in esteem by the Egyptians (Philo, c. Apion, i, p. 521).

Indeed, it was from an Egyptian, Manetho (B.C. 3000), that the most defamatory misrepresentations of Jewish history were given to the world; and, in the days of Augustus, Charonem took special pains to make the Jewish people appear despicable (Josephus, Apion, i, 32; comp. Creuzer, Com. Herod. i, 270). See PTOLEMY.

In the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, Onias, whose father, the third high-priest of that name, had been murdered, fled into Egypt, and rose into high favor with the king and Cleopatra his queen. The high-priesthood of the Temple of Jerusalem, which belonged of right to his family, having passed from it to the family of the Hasmoneans, he now protested against to this office (B.C. 158), Onias used his influence with the court to procure the establishment of a temple and ritual in Egypt which should detach the Jews who lived there from their connection with the Temple at Jerusalem. The king complied with the request. To recover the Egyptian Jews to a second temple, Onias alleged Isa. xix. 18, 19. He chose for the purpose a ruined temple of Babastis, at Leontopolis, in the Heliopolitan nome, one hundred and fifty stadia from Memphis, which place he converted into a sort of miniature Jerusalem (Josephus, War ii, 1, 5), erecting an altar in imitation of that in the Temple, and
constituting himself high-priest. The king granted a tract of land around the temple for the maintenance of the worship, and it remained in existence till destroyed by Vespasian (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 3; xx, 9; War, vii, 11). The district in which this temple stood appears to have been, after Alexandria, the chief seat of the Jews in Egypt and that of the headquarters of the church, was called Oisou w5pa (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 8; Helon's Pilgrin. p. 328). See Omas, City of.

Under these Alexandria kings the native Egyptians still continued building their grand and massive temples, nearly in the style of those built by the kings of the New Empire. The temple of Phile, in the Great Oasis, at Latopolis, at Ombos, at Dendera, and at Thebes, prove that the Ptolemies had not wholly crushed the zeal and energy of the Egyptians. An Egyptian phalanx had been formed, armed, and disciplined like the Greeks. These soldiers rebelled unsuccessfully against Ephiphanes, and then Thebes rebelled against Soter II, but was so crushed that it never again held rank among cities. But while the Alexandrians were keeping down the Egyptians, they were themselves sinking under the Romans. Ephiphanes asked for Roman help; his two sons appealed to the senate to settle their quarrels and guard the kingdom from Syrian invasion. Alexander II was placed on the throne by the Romans, and Aurelius took to Rome to ask for help against his subjects. Lastly, the beautiful Cleopatra, the disgrace of her countrymen, was made a symbol of the weakness that had destroyed her power by surrendering her person, first to Julius Caesar, and then to Mark Antony. On the defeat of Mark Antony by Augustus, B.C. 30, Egypt became a province of Rome, and was governed by the emperors with jealous suspicion. It was still a Greek state, and the Ptolemaic dynasty, the chief seat of learning and science. Its library, which had been burned by Caesar's soldiers, had been replaced by that from Pergamus. The Egyptians yet continued building temples and covering them with hieroglyphics as of old; but on the spread of Christianity: 'I old superstitions lost their sway, the animals were no longer worshiped, and we find few hieroglyphic inscriptions after the reign of Commodus. On the division of the Roman empire, A.D. 387, Egypt fell to the lot of Constantineople. See Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr., s. v. Egypt.

Ever since its first occupancy by the Romans Egypt has ceased to be an independent state, and its history is incorporated with that of its different conquerors and possessors. In A.D. 618 it fell under the power of the Persians, but in 649 it was transferred to the Sassanid Persians, and in 649 the name of Omar, under whose successors it continued till about 1171, when the Turkomans expelled the caliphs; these again were in their turn expelled in 1250 by the Mamelukes. The latter raised to the throne one of their own chiefs with the title of sultan, and this new dynasty reigned over Egypt till 1517, when the Mamelukes were totally defeated, and the last of their sultans put to death by the Turkish sultan Selim. This prince established the government of Egypt in twenty-four years, whose authority he subjected to a council of regency, supported by an immense standing army. The conqueror did not, however, entirely suppress the Mameluke government, who continued to be "the power behind the throne" until their massacre in 1811, which made the pacha virtually independent of the Sublime Porte. Great and rapid changes have taken place in the affairs of Egypt since the beginning of the last fifty years. The campaign of the French army in 1800, undertaken with a view to subdue Egypt, and so secure to the French an important share of the East Indian trade, though it resulted unsuccessfully, was attended with important consequences to the interests of science and learning. Mohammed Ali, the late viceroy, though a perfect despot, did much to elevate his dominions to a rank with civilized nations in arts, commerce, and industry. The works of internal improvement which he undertook, the extensive manufactures he established, and the encouragement he gave to literary institutions, have done much to change the political, if not the moral aspect of Egypt. His successors have followed out this policy by establishing railroads and opening out canals, which, while they increase the commerce of the country, greatly facilitate communication with India by what is called the overland route—by the Mediterranean, Egypt, and the Red Sea, to Bombay. See M'Culloch's Hist. of Econ. Letters, vol. ii. 322.

For the history of Christianity in Egypt, see Egypt, Christian. XXIII. Monumental Localities.—Of the towns on the northern coast the most western is Alexandria or El-Avendos of the Shepherds. B.C. 320 had a population of 140,000. But the most remarkable remains of the place were the walls built by the Greeks, of which the most remarkable is the great wall, which was about 28,000 inhabitants. The town of Alexandria, which is the site of Helium, the Sin of Scripture, and the ancient name of Egypt, towards Palestine. No important remains have been found here. Between this site and the Damietta branch are the mounds of Tanis, or Zaan, the famous city of the Delta. The modern town of the Delta, on the eastern bank of the river, is the site of the ancient Helipolis, or On, marked by a solitary obelisk, and the ruins of a massive brick wall. The Delta is the site of Osiris, or the head of the 12th dynasty. At a short distance south of the Helipolis stands El-Khirki, or the ancient city of Memphis, founded by Menes, stood on the western bank of the Nile, about ten miles above Cairo. The kings and people who dwelt there chose the nearest part of the desert as their burial-place, and built tombs on its rocky edge or excavated them in its sides. The kings raised pyramids, round which their subjects were buried in smaller sepulchres. The site of Memphis is marked by mounds in the cultivated tract. A few blocks of stone and a fine colossus of Rameses II are all that remains of the great temple of Pharaoh, the local deity. See MEMPHIS.

There is no space here for a detailed account of the pyramids; suffice it to say that the present perpendicular height of the great pyramid is 450 ft. 9 in., and its present base 746 ft. It is about 20 ft. lower than it was when first built. The upper part was covered with the last fifty years, but it has been set off and other man's violence. Like all the other pyramids, it faces the cardinal points. The surface presents a series of great steps, though when first built it was gabled, and smooth, and polished. The platform on the summit is about 22 ft. square. The pyramid is almost entirely solid, containing only a few chambers, so small as not to be worth of consideration in calcu-
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It was built by Khufu (Cheops), or Shufu (Suphis). The second pyramid stands at a short distance south-west of the great pyramid, and is not of much smaller dimensions. It is chiefly remarkable for a great part of its casing having been preserved. It was built by Khafra or Shafra (Chephren), a king of the same period. The third pyramid is much smaller than either of the other two, though it is constructed in a more costly manner. It was built by Mycerinus or Mentcheres, the fourth ruler of the 4th dynasty. Near the three pyramids are six smaller ones; three of them are near the east side of the great pyramid, and three on the south side of the third pyramid. They are supposed to be the tombs of near relatives of the kings who founded the great pyramid. To the east of the second pyramid is the great sphinx, 188 feet in length, hewn out of a natural eminence in the solid rock, some defects of which are supplied by a partial stone casing, the legs being likewise added. See Pyramids.

In the tract between the pyramids of Sakkarah and Abu-Sir are the remains of the Serapeum, and the burial-place of the bulls Apis, excavated by M. Mariette. They are inclosed by a great wall, having been connected, for the Serapeum was the temple of Apis. The tomb is a great subterranean gallery, whence smaller passages branch off, and contains many sarcophagi in which the bulls were entombed. Serapis was a form of Osiris, his name being Osir-hapi, or Osiris Apis. In ascending the river we arrive at the ancient Abydos, supposed by some to be the Hanes of Isaiah, and about sixty miles above Cairo, at Beni-Suef, the port of the province of the Fayum. In this province are supposed to be the remains of the famous Labyrinth of Morris, probably Amenem-hus III, and not far off, also, may be traced the site of the Lake Morris, near the ancient Arsinoh, or Crocodilopolis, now represented by Medinet el-Fayum. The next objects of peculiar interest are the grottos of Beni-Hassan, which are monuments of the 18th dynasty, dating about B.C. 2000. Here are found two columns of an order which is believed to be the prototype of the Doric. On the walls of the tombs are depicted scenes of hunting, fishing, agriculture, etc. There is also an interesting representation of the arrival of certain foreigners, supposed to be Joseph’s brethren—at least illustrative of their arrival. In the town of Abydos, higher up the river, is seen the representative of the ancient Lycopolis. It was an important place 3500 years ago, and has thus outlived Thebes and Memphis, Tanis and Pelusium.

Further on, a few miles south-west of Girga, on the border of the Libyan desert, is the site of the sacred city of Abydos, a reputed burial-place of Osiris, near which, also, must have been situated the very ancient city of This, which gave its name to the 1st and 2nd dynasties. Not far from the temple of Abydos, near the same latitude, is the village of Denderah, famous for the remains of the temple of Aton, the Egyptian Venus, who presided over the town of Tentyra, the capital of the Theban nome. This temple dates from the time of the earlier Casars, and the names of the last Cleopatra, and Caesarion her son, are found in it. See Denderah.

About twenty miles still higher up the Nile than Denderah, and on the western bank, are the ruins of Thebes, the No-Amon of the Bible. In the hieroglyphic inscriptions the name of this place is written AP-T, or with the article prefixed T-AP, and AMEN-NAH, the abode of Amen. The Copts write the former name Taphe, which becomes in the Memphitic dialect Theba, and thus explains the origin of the Greek Oxyrhynchus. The time of its foundation is unknown, but remains have been found which are ascribed to the close of the 11th dynasty, and it probably dates from the commencement of that first Diopolite line of kings. Under the 18th and two following dynasties it attained its highest prosperity, and to this period its greatest monuments belong. The following is a description of this celebrated locality by Mr. Pocock:

“The monuments of Thebes, exclusive of its sepulchral grottos, occupy a space on both sides of the river, of which the extreme length from north to south is about two miles, and the extreme breadth from east to west about four. The city was on the eastern bank, where is the great temple, or, rather, collection of temples, called after El-Karnak, a modern village near by. The temple of El-Karnak is about half a mile from the river, in a cultivated tract. More than a mile to the south-west is the temple of El-Uksur, on the bank of the Nile. On the western bank was the suburb bearing the name Memnonia. The desert near the northernmost of the temples on this side almost reaches the river, but soon recedes, leaving a fertile plain generally more than a mile in breadth. Along the edge of the desert, besides the small temple just mentioned as the northernmost, are the remains of El-Kurnehe, and that of Medinet-Abbâ less than a mile farther to the south-west, and between them, with-in the cultivated land, the remains of the Amenophi-

A Restoration of the Propylon, or Gate of the Temple of El-Uksur, or Luxor.
Edifices rise the mountain, which here attains a height of about 1200 feet. It gradually recedes in a south-western direction, and is separated from the cultivated tract by a strip of desert in which are numerous tombs, partly excavated in two isolated hills, and two small temples. A tortuous valley, which commences not far from the northernmost of the temples on this bank, leads to those valleys in which are excavated the tumbi, or the king's highest part, of the mountain, which towers above them in bold and picturesque forms" (Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Egypt, p. 506).

At the entrance to the temple of El-Uksur stood two very fine obelisks of red granite, one of which is now in the centre of the Place de la Concorde, at Paris. The other portal was 20 feet in width, covered with sculptures of the highest interest, illustrating the time of Rameses II. Within is a magnificent avenue of 14 columns, having capitals of the bell-shaped flowers of the papyrus. They are 60 feet high, and elegantly sculptured. These are of the time of Ameenophis II. The temple of the great and little oasis, and the valley of the Netron lakes, containing four Coptic monasteries, the remains of the famous anchorite settlement of Nitria, recently noted for the discovery of various Coptic MSS. In the eastern part of the temple is a remarkable fulfilment. The visitor to the country needs not to be reminded of him; everywhere he is struck by the precision with which they have come to pass. We have already spoken of the physical changes which have verified to the letter the words of Isaiah. In like manner, the Egyptian experience, in the singular disappearance of the city of Memphis and its temples in a country where several primeval towns yet stand, and scarce an ancient site is unmarked by temples, the fulfilment of the words of Jeremiah: "Noph shall be waste and desolate without an inhabitant" (xiv, 19), and those of Ezekiel, "Thus saith the Lord God, I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause [their] images to cease out of Noph" (xxx, 15).

The principal passages relating to Egypt are as follows: Hesiod, Works and Days, iv, 290. Ovid, Metamorphoses, xxxix-xxix, inclusive. The course of what has been said, several allusions have been made to portions of these prophecies; and it may here be observed that the main reference in them seems to be to the period extending from the times of Nebuchadnezzar to those of the Persians, though it is not easy to elucidate them to any great extent from the history furnished by the monuments. Nebuchadnezzar appears to have invaded Egypt during the reign of Apries, and Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that the story of Amasis's rebellion was invented or used to conceal the fact that Pharaoh-Hophra was deposed by the Babylonians. It is not improbable that Amasis came to the throne by their intervention. The forty years' desolation of Egypt (Ezek. xxix, 10) is a point of great difficulty, owing chiefly to the statements of Herodotus (ii, 161, 177) as to the uncertainty of the prosperity of the state of Egypt and Amasis (B.C. 588-25), during which period in question must have fallen. That the Greek historian was misled by the accounts of the Egyptian priests, who wished to conceal the extent of the national humiliation by Nebuchadnezzar and Cambyses, is made evident by Browne (Oratio Sacrover, p. 191 sq.), who thus arranges the events: "Soon after B.C. 572, Nebuchadnezzar invades Egypt, conquers Apries, and puts him to death, and carries off the spoil of Egypt, together with its chief men, to some other part of his dominions: Amasis is appointed his viceroy."
EGYPT

about B.C. 532, "turns the captivity of Egypt," as he had before done that of the Jews. On his death Amasis revolted, and Cambyses invaded and finally subjugates all Egypt, B.C. 525." See EZEKIEL.

XXIV. Literature.—For a very full classified list of works on Egypt, see Jolowicz's Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca (Lpz. 1858, 8vo), with the Supplement thereto (ib. 1861). The following are some general works which are of especial value in connection with references to the modern history of Egypt: Description de l'Egypte (3d ed. Par. 1821-9); Encyclopedie Britannica (8th ed. art. Egypt). Description, Productions, and Topography: Abd-Allatif, Relation de l'Egypte (ed. Sylvestre, Par. 1810); D'Anville, Memoires sur l'Egypte (Par. 1766); Belzoni, Narrative de Operations (London, 1820); Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften der alt-ägyptischen Denkmäler (Lpz. 1857); Id., Reiseberichte aus Agypten (ib. 1855); Champollion le Jeune, L'Egypte sous les Pharaons (Par. 1814); Id., Lettres sur les conduits du voyage en Egypte (2d ed. Lpz. 1838); Ehrenberg and Hemsch, Naturlgeschichte der Reisender-Risien in Agypten, etc. (Lpz. 1829); Symonds, Palæstina-arabica (ib. 1773); Harris, Hieroglyphica Stendardis (London, 1822); Robert, Les de Bellonda, Memorie e Notizie (Par. 1843); Quatremère, Memoires Géographiques et Historiques (Paris, 1811); Russegger, Reisen (Lpz. 1848-1); Vyse and Perring, Pyramids of Gizeh (Lpz. 1839-45); Perring, 58 Large Views, etc., of the Pyramids of Gizeh (Lpd. 1841); Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and the Monuments of Pharaohs (Lpz. 1831-3); Id., More Egyptian Monuments (2d ed. Lpz. 1848); Id., Survey of Thebes (plan); on the Eastern Desert (in the Jour. Geogr. Soc. ii. 1832, p. 28 sq.); Hartmann, Naturgesch. der Niländer (Lpz. 1865); Kremer, Ägypten (modern), Lpz. 1865; Parthey, Erdk. der alten Ägypten (ib. 1860); Pothick, Egypt, etc. (London, 1861); Untersuchungen und hamollion le Jeune, Monuments (Par. 1829-47); Id. Notices descriptives (ib. 1844); Gliddon, Lectures (N. Y. 1843); Lepsius, Denkmäler (Lpz. 1849 sq.); Le Strange, Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines d'Egypte (Par. 1843); Rosellini, Mon. Vaticani (Pia. 1822-44); Dümichen, Allägypt. Inschriften (in three series, Lpz. 1865-8); Brugsch, Recueil de Monuments Egyptiens (Par. 1862-63); Leemann, Monuments d'Egypte (ib. 1866); Rhind, Thebes, etc. (Lpd. 1862). Language: Brugsch, Grammaire Demotique (Berl. 1855); Id., Hier.-Demot. Wörterb. (Berl. 1862); Id., Zweite bibliographische Zeitschrift (1863); Birch, Dictionary of Hieroglyphics (in Bunsen, vol. v); Champollion le Jeune, Grammaire Egyptienne (Par. 1836-41); Dictionnaire Egyptien (ib. 1841); Encyclop. Brit. (8th ed. art. Hieroglyphics); Parthey, Vocabulaire Copto-Latin, etc. (Berl. 1844); Peyron, Grammaire Copte (Tunis 1841); Id., Lexicon (ib. 1885); Schwartz, Das Alte Agypten (Lpz. 1848). Ancient Chronology, History, and Manners: Bunsen, Egypt's Place (London, 1850-59); Cory, Ancient Fragments (2d ed. Lpz. 1882); Herodotus (ed. Rawlinson, vols. i-iii, Lond. and N. Y. 1861); Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses (Lond. 1861); Id., Untersuchungen, etc. der Chronologie (Lpz. 1825); Leipsius, Chronologie der Aegypter (vol. i, Lpz. 1849); Id., Königsbuch der alten Aegypter (ib. 1858); Pocok, Horae Aegyptiacae (Lond. 1851); Wilkinson, Moose and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians (ib. 1887); Id., Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians (Lond. and N. Y. 1855); Kenrick, Egypt under the Pharaois (Lond. and N. Y. 1852); Osborn, Monumental History (Lpd. 1854); Sharpe, Hist. of Egypt (Lpd. 1846); Brugsch, Histoire de l'Egypte (Paris, 1859 sq.); Hincks, Years of the Egyptians (Lond. 1852); Lauth, Geheimnisse der Mystikoi (Leipz. 1865); Unger, Chronologie des Manetho (Berlin, 1867). Ancient Religion: Herodotus; Diodorus of Sicily; Plutarch; Phorpyniamblichus, etc.; Jablonski, Punthon Aegypt. (Frank. 1795-82, 8 vols.); Schmidt, De ascens. et sacrific. Aegyptiorum (Tub. 1780); Hirt, C. d. Rihnd aegyptiaca Catholicae (1821); Champollion, Punthon Aegypt. (Paris, 1832); Haymann, Darstellung d. A.-M. (Bonn, 1887); Roth, Die ägypt. u. Zoroastrische Glaubenslehre (Mann. 1846); Beuregard, Les divinités Egyptiennes (Paris, 1866); Sharpe, Egyptian Mythology (Lond. 1863); Lepsius, D. Todtenbuch (Lpz. 1867); Rough, Ritual des Egyptischen (Paris, 1866); Birch, The Funeral Ritual (in Bunsen, vol. v). Religious aspects are also treated in the following works: Playfair, La religion des Egyptiens (Lpd. 1830); Id., Early Inhabitants: Lane, Modern Egyptians (3d ed. 1860); Id., Thousand and One Nights (2d ed., by Poole, Lpz. 1859); Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt (Lpd. and N. Y. 1844). The periodicals of Great Britain, France, and Germany contain many articles and papers on Egyptian history and antiquities, by Dr. Hincks, Mr. G. M. de Rouge, and others. There is a monthly Egyptological Journal, edited by M. Brugsch, published at Berlin; and a society called the "Eg. Explor. Fund" of London, has published several Memoirs of new researches.

EGYPT, BROWK or RIVER OP. This is frequently mentioned as the southern limit of the Land of Promise (Gen. xv. 18; Deut. vii. 19; Num. xiii. 14; Josh. xiv. 4). See BROOK BEARER. Calmet is of opinion that this was the Nile, remarking that Joshua (xiii. 3) describes it by the name of Sihor, which is the true name of the Nile (Jer. ii. 18), "the muddy river," and that Amos (vi. 14) calls it the river of the wilderness, because the Israelites wandered therein after fleeing from the more perilous wilderness, in Hebrew Arabah, and watered the district by the Egyptians called Arabian. In answer to this, it is said that this stream was the limit of Judea toward Egypt, and that the Sept. (Isa. xxxvii. 12), "unto the river of Egypt," render it to "Rhinocorura," an interpretation which is adopted by Cellarius, Bochart, Wells, and others, although that is the name of a town certainly not adjacent to the Nile. See NILE. Besides, it is extremely dubious whether the power of the Hebrew nation extended at any time to the Nile, and, if it did, it was over a mere sandy desert. But, as this desert is unquestionably the natural boundary of the Syrian dominions, no reason can be given why the political boundary should exceed it. Most geographers, therefore, understand by "the River of Egypt," the modern Wady el-Aris, which drains the middle of the Sinaitic desert; a few, however, take it to be the brook Beare, between Gaza and Rihnocorura. (See Josh. xv. 47.) See EGYPT.

EGYPT, CHRISTIAN.—I. Church History. The first seeds of Christianity were undoubtedly scattered in Egypt at the time of the apostles. According to some ancient historians, Peter founded the Church of Alexandria and several other Egyptian churches. Mark the Evangelist is said by an old tradition, preserved by Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. li. 16), to have been "the bishop that was sent to Egypt, and first established churches at the city of Alexandria." See ALEXANDRIA. The testimony of Eusebius, that the first Christians of Egypt followed a rigidly ascetic school, is very doubtful, because Philo, to whom he refers, does not speak of Cassian or John the Baptist, etc. The hermits, and expressly mentions that they lived, not in Alexandria, but on Lake Moris. From Lower Egypt Christianity soon spread to Cyrene, Pentapolis, Libya, Central and Upper Egypt. There were at least twenty bishops in Egypt about the middle of the third century, for that number of bishops were assembled at a council in 235. Five councils of Egyptian bishops were held before 311; a great many in the fourth and following centuries. As Egypt had been in the times before Christ the seat of philosophy and mysticism, it is not surprising that the religious and intellectual life of the Christians was a good deal the same as the life of Christian literature. The Alexandrian school was the oldest of the higher class of institutions for Christian education. Jerome and others hold Mark the Evangelist to have been its founder, but the succession of catechists is differently stated. See ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL. Among the scientific men whom it gave to
the Church were Clement, Athanasius, Origen, Cyril. Gnosticism found numerous adherents. Barildas, Valentinus, Heracleon, Ptolemaeus, Carcoprates, were Egyptians. The Ophites and Dositheus sprang up there; Sabellianism and Ariantism were also products of the region. The history of Egypt, the history of the Christian Church in Egypt has also had a considerable influence. In no other country of the East were hierarchical tendencies so early developed, for the patriarchs of Alexandria soon sought to obtain privileges which no other of the superior bishops enjoyed. The Church of Egypt, who first realized the name of Copts, became in Egypt the predominant Church, and gradually wrested nearly all the churches from the orthodox Christians, who, as early as the end of the sixth century, were reduced to a very insignificant condition. Their great ecclesiastical seat, Alexandria, was occupied almost exclusively by Monophysite (Jacobite) patriarchs, with the exception of Cosmas (elected about 726) and Eutychus (elected in 924). The orthodox (Greek) Christians received from their opponents the nickname Melchites (q. v.). In 615 Egypt was occupied by the Persians, but when few of the bishoprics were spared. The dominion of the Persians lasted only a few years, when the whole country, with the capital city of Alexandria, passed into the power of the Mohammedans in 643 (according to others in 640). Under them Christianity suffered incalculable injuries, and gradually declined, as to become despised and oppressed sect. See Copts. Better prospects for Christianity did not open till the beginning of the 19th century, when Egypt, under the reign of the enlightened Mehemet Ali, was brought under the influence of European civilization. Since then educated Egyptians have earnestly appreciated the superiority of European nations, especially of England and France; many young men of talent have been sent to European schools; the native Christian population begins to rise from its degradation and despoiled condition. A large body of Christendom in northern and central Mesopotamia and Cairo, are filling up with an intelligent and influential population of foreign-born Christians; Christian schools, and other religious and charitable institutions, are multiplying; and the signs of the times seem to indicate that the prospects of Christianity are at present the brightest in the East.

An attempt to establish a Protestant mission in Egypt was made by the Moravians in 1768. A missionary, Hocker, who previously had sought to open communication with the Abyssinian Church, but had been compelled to return to Europe in 1761, was in 1768 commissioned, together with a young man named Danke, a carpenter by trade, to return to Egypt, and await any opening that might present itself to penetrate into Abyssinia. "On March 5, 1769, they reached Cairo, Hocker earning a livelihood by practicing as a physician and Danke by working at his trade. They later moved to the coast, where Hocker made his living in Arabic, and when an assistant arrived for Hocker in the person of John Antes, a watchmaker, he set out on his first journey to the Copts, landing at Gizeh, in Upper Egypt. The state of the country at this time was exceedingly favorable. The British consul was in Egypt, and the province of the Copts against the Turkish government, and many of them being also at war with one another. Hocker had been summoned to attend members of the household of Ali Bey (for a time the chief in Egypt), and Danke's connection with the 'English physician,' as Hocker was called, brought him into favor with the officers and soldiers at Gizeh, who treated him with the greatest kindness. He met a number of Copts in this city, with whom he formed a very intimate friendship. At first several of them invited him to visit their native city, Behnese, the population of which was exclusively Coptic, but afterwards they endeavored to deter him by describing the danger to which he would expose himself. He wrote a history of the Copts, and the history of the Church, and was also a monograph of the Coptic language, which was published in 1780. He was also engaged in the printing of the Coptic version of the New Testament, which was published in 1785. His labors were by many eagerly accepted, by others they were viewed with suspicion or openly opposed. His testimony in favor of Christianity was not without effect, and many of the priests even became his firm supporters, and begged him to remain amongst them. On his third visit he caught a severe cold, upon which followed an attack of malignant fever. Notwithstanding the most careful nursing on the part of the Copts, the disease increased upon him, and on Oct. 6th, 1772, he died, aged only 38 years. By permission of the Greek patriarch, his body was interred in a vault of St. George's church, in the Old City of Cairo. In May, 1775, George Wimger arrived as Danke's successor. He was welcomed, and was allowed to reside at the Coptic monastery of St. Antony, where he labored zealously for the conversion of the Copts. In 1779, he was succeeded by his brother, who also labored for the conversion of the Copts.

In 1826, the "Church Missionary Society" of London sent out some German missionaries to labor among the Copts. After spending some time in studying the Arabic language, and in collecting the Bible and religious tracts, the missionaries fixed the location of the mission at Cairo, where they had two schools, attended by Greek, Coptic, Armenian, Roman Catholic, and even pure Mohammedan children. In 1838 a missionary school was established by the native Copts for the purpose of reading the Scriptures; that the patriarch had sanctioned both these meetings and a plan for the establishment of an institution in Egypt for the education of the Coptic clergy. In 1841, a pupil of the missionary school of Cairo was appointed by the patriarch Abuna, or head of the Coptic Church. Bishop Gobat, who visited Egypt in 1849, expressed in a letter dated Jan. 9, 1850, the opinion that the plan on which this mission had been established, to seek the friendship of the higher clergy of the Coptic church, and to induce them to reform their churches, had failed. The mission was subsequently abandoned.

A mission established by the American Missionary Association has also been again abandoned. The most successful of any of the Protestant missions has been the one that undertook the labor of saving the Copts from being lost to the Mohammedan religion. It organized a number of congregations and schools, and, through the liberality of the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, who married a pupil of the mission school, it obtained a press, through which a large amount of useful reading has been scattered throughout the land. The growth of the Christian Church is encouraging the organization of the churches into the Presbyterian Church of Egypt, in connection with the General As-
The mission of the American United Presbyterian Church reported at the General Assembly for 1888 the following statistics: missionaries, 12; including one medical missionary; conversions, 24; organized out-stations, 85; communicants, 2307. The mission occupies seven central stations, the chief ones being at Alexandria, Cairo, Assiût, Fayûm, and Ghûdha. The theological school at Assiût had in 1888 20 theological students. The only church for boys was established at Alexandria, in connection with each of the five churches and at each of the out-stations. The distribution of the Bible is prosecuted by the agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by the American missionaries, by the Copts, and by others. There were, in 1889, three printing presses in Cairo and Alexandria, and the yearly sale of the Scriptures averaged from 7000 to 12,000 copies. The Copts, or Pilgrim mission, from Alexandria far into the heart of Abyssinia. Of these, the following stations were, in 1886, in active operation in Egypt: St. Matthew's in Alexandria; St. Mark's in Cairo; St. Peter's at Assouan, at the falls of the Nile; St. Thomas at Khartoum, at the junction of the White and Blue Niles; and St. Paul's at Massimmah, on the border of Abyssinia. The annual visitor's report for 1886 states that in nearly all the churches gratifying accessions have been made to the membership during the past year, and that during the persecution only four shrunk back, all of whom subsequently returned. The Presbytery have taken the proper steps for each native church to have a native pastor duly called, ordained, and installed. The churches of Ghûdha and Cairo have already called native pastors, and taken steps for providing the necessary salaries. The Presbytery of Egypt, in 1867, also adopted strong resolutions denouncing all attempts to proselytize the people, which is carried on in Egypt with the connivance of the government.

2. Statistics.—The large majority of the inhabitants are Mohammedans. The theological school connected with the mosque of Cairo is one of the most frequented schools of the Islam. All the elementary schools and educational institutions for Mohammedans are of a strictly religious character. Mehmet Ali established several schools after the European model, in which young Egyptians were to be educated, partly by European teachers, for civil and military offices. Such schools were the medical school at Abou-Zaide, the cadet school at Tiznit, the marine school at Alexandria, the school of engineers at Charka, the medical college of Casr-el-Ayin, the artillery school of Turrah, and the musical institute in the Citadel of Cairo. A special college for young Egyptians was also established in Paris. Several of these schools were, however, suppressed under the reign of Abbas Pasha. The most numerous body of Christians are the Copts, who have a patriarch, four metropolitan, and seven other bishops, and a population estimated from 130,000 to 250,000 souls. See COPRA. The number of the Copts, who recognize the authority of the Pope, is about 10,000. They have a vicar apostolic at Cairo. For the Latin Roman Catholics there is another vicar apostolic at Alexandria, who is at the same time delegate for the United Orientalis of other rites than the Coptic. According to letters of Roman Catholic missionaries, Alexandria had, in 1888, 7200 Latinis, 600 United Copts, 240 Maronites, 385 Melchites (United Greeks), 50 Syrians, 60 Armenians—together 8820. The Roman Catholic population of Cairo at the same time consisted of 4148 Latins, 200 Melchites, 800 Copts, 300 Maronites, 800 Armenians, 200 Syrians, 100 Chaldees. Since then the Roman Catholic population of these two cities has undoubtedly largely increased in consequence of the rapid growth of the total population of the two cities; but no later trustworthy statistics are known. There are Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits in Cairo. There is also a Coptic seminary in Alexandria, which is independent of the diocese of Egypt, and is controlled by its own bishops. The heretics, or Coptic priests, are not allowed to ordain their own clergy. The Catholics are not allowed to ordain their own clergy.

3. Slander.—The Catholic and the Copts have been the chief objects of the Coptic writers. The Copts have been accused of being agents of the papal state, and of being the tools of the Papists in Egypt. The Copts have also been accused of being the agents of the French government in Egypt. The Copts have also been accused of being the agents of the French government in Egypt.

4. The sects in Egypt.—The sects in Egypt are the Copts, the Jacobites, the Nestorians, and the adherents of the Coptic and the Greek Church. The Copts are divided into two classes: the Copts of the East and the Copts of the West. The Copts of the East are divided into two classes: the Copts of the East and the Copts of the West.

5. The Church in Egypt.—The Church in Egypt is divided into two classes: the Church of the East and the Church of the West. The Church of the East is divided into two classes: the Church of the East and the Church of the West.
in the public services of the Copts, it was not known in Europe till Dr. Marshall, of Lincoln College, contributed some readings from it to bishop Fell's New Testament (Oxford, 1675). The Pentateuch has been published by Wilkins (London, 1731, 4to), by Faller (Paris, 1856, 8vo), and by Le Duc (Paris, 1867, 8vo); the Psalms at Rome (1744 and 1749) by the Propaganda Society. In 1837 Ideler published the Psalter more correctly; and in 1844 the best critical edition, by Schwartze, appeared. The twelve minor prophets were published by Tattam (Oxon. 1836, 8vo), and the major prophets by the same (1852). Bardelli published Daniel (Pisa, 1841). A few pieces of other books were printed at different times by Mangarelli, Quattremère, and Münter. The N. T., made from the original Greek, was published by Wilkins, with a Latin translation (Oxford, 1716). In 1846 a new and more correct edition, and very little in Schwartze, and continued, but in a different manner, after his death, by Bötticher (1852, etc.). In 1848-52, the "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge" published the N. T. in Memphitic and Arabic (London 2 vols. fol.). The text was revised by Lieder. The readings of this version were taken from the papyri, as far as it was possible, but the rest was made, coinciding with the Alexandrine family, and carefully compared with the Latin versions. Fortunately, the version has not yet been adequately edited. It belongs perhaps to the 1st century. See Davidson, in Horne's Introd., ii. 66.

2. The Theotic.—This version was also made from the Greek, both in the O. and N. T., and probably the 1st century. Only some fragments of the O.-T. part have been printed by Münther, Mangarelli, and Zœga. In the N. T. it agrees generally, though not uniformly, with the Alexandrine family. Not a few readings, however, are peculiar; and some harmonize with the Latin versions. Fragments of it have been published by Mangarelli, Giorgi, Münther, and Ford.

3. The Bashmoric, or Ammonim.—Only some fragments of such a version in the O. and N. T. have been published, and very little use is made of it. Scholars are not agreed as to the nature of the dialect in which it is written, some thinking that it does not deserve the name of a dialect, while others regard the Bashmoric as a kind of intermediate dialect between those spoken in Upper and Lower Egypt. Hug and De Wette are inclined to believe that it is merely the version of Upper Egypt transferred to the idiom of the particular place where the Bashmoric was spoken. The origin of this version belongs to the 3d or 4th century. See Tregelles, in Horne's Introd., 277—279, "Erasmij (or the Bible)."

E'bud (Heb. אֶבִּד, אֶבָּד, prob. a modified form of the name Ah'bi; Sept. Εὔβοιον, Vulg. Evbi). one of the "sons" of Benjamin (Gen. xlvii. 21), apparently the grandson of Aahram (q. v.) in Num. xxvi. 38 (from which the name is perhaps contracted). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. viii. 6) he seems to be called "Ehod (q. v.)."

E'bud (Heb. אֶבִּד, אֶבָּד, union), the name of two or three Benjamites, and apparently hereditary in that tribe, like Gera (q. v.)

1. (Sept. עֶבְד לְרֹקע אָוֹד). A descendant of Benjamin, progenitor of one of the clans of Geba that removed to Manahath (1 Chron. xiii. 10). The name is there written טָבַד, Ebud, either for טָבָד, as above, or altogether erroneously for טְבָד, Ech'bi, i.e. Ebi (q. v.), the grandson of Benjamin, which appears in the parallel list of Gen. xlvii. 21, and as a son of Bela by the daughter of the Seirite, verse 21 of that passage. He seems to be the same as Aab'ram, אָבָרָם, in the list in Num. xxvi. 38, and, if so, Aahram is probably the right name, as the family were called Aahramities. In 1 Chron. viii. 1, the same person seems to be called טְבַד, Aarah, and perhaps also טָבֵד, Ahoah, in
tation takes place in the summer-parlor (Σαλόνι)
In Judges the king exposes himself to the dagger by ris-
ning apparently in respect for the divine message which
Ehud professed to communicate (Patrick, ad loc.;)
In Josephus it is a dream which Ehud pretends to reveal,
and the king, in delighted anticipation, springs up
from his throne. The obesity of Eloquent, and the literary
conspicuousness of the writings of Josiah, are not
mentioned by Josephus (vid. Judg. iii. 17, 41, arietis,
Sept.; but "crassus," Vulg., and so Gesenius, LXX.)
The "quarries that were by Gilgal," to which Ehud
retired in the interval between the two interviews (iii.
29, 13), were in the region of Judah, as in Deut. viii.
25, "grave images" (Patrick, ad loc.; comp. Gesen.
"Σαλόνι" LXX. s. v. το βάπτισμα.) See ELO
After this destructive achievement Ehud repaired to
Seirah (improp., Seirath; see Gesen. LXX. s. v.)
in the mountains of Ephraim (iii. 26, 27), or Mount Ephraim
(Isoh. xix. 50). To this wild central region, com-
manding, as it did, the plains east and west, he
mobilized the Israelites by sound of horn (a national
custom according to Josephus; A.V. "a trumpet").
Descending from the hills they fell upon the Moabites,
dismayed and demoralized by the death of their king
(Josephus, not Judges). The greater number were
killed; only 2000 men made the transfer, with the
view of crossing into their own country.
The Israelites, however, had already seized the fort;
and not one of the unhappy fugitives escaped. As
a reward for his conduct Ehud was appointed judge (Jo-
sephus, not Judges). The Israelites continued to en-
joy for eighty years (B.C. 1939-1859) the independ-
ence obtained through this deed of Ehud (Judg. iii.

Eckach. See CARBUNCLE.

Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried, a celebrated
German Orientalist and theologian, was born Oct.
15, 1752, at Dörenzimmer, in the principality of Holen-
lohe-Erlangen. He received his education at the
monastery of Heilbronn, and at the University of
Göttingen, under Michaelis and Heyne. He became
professor of Oriental literature at Jena in 1775,
and was named court-councillor by the duke of
Saxe-Wei-
mar in 1788. In 1786 he succeeded Michaelis as pro-
fessor of philosophy at the University of Göttingen,
and in 1811 he was named professor of theology
there, which post he retained until his death, June 26,
1815. Eichhorn was a thoroughly industrious student
and a very voluminous writer. His first proof of
Oriental knowledge was given in his Geschichte des Ostindischen
Handels vor Mohammed (Gotha, 1773, 8vo.)
This was followed by Historiae Christianae ab Abraham
post Alb. Schultens, ab Arabe edidit, latina vertit, et
adnotavit. adiect. J. G. Eichhorn (Gotha, 1775, 8vo.)
—De rei nummariie opud Arabos imitata (Jena, 1776, 4to.)
At Jena he devoted himself to Biblical literature, and
established, as a sort of organ, a magazine entitled
Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Literatur,
which lasted from 1777 to 1786 (Leipzig), and was
followed by the Allgemeine Bibliothek d. biblischen
Literatur (Leipzig. 1787-1808, 10 vols. 8vo.)
His professor
ship at Göttingen opened him to a wider field (1786)
after the death of J. D. Michaelis. He lectured not
only on Oriental literature, and on parts of the
O. and N. T., but also in the field of general history,
in which he soon appeared as an author. In 1790-38
appeared his Umgcrichtliche (Primitive History), edited
by Gabler from the Repertorium (Nurem. 8vo.)
His most important works, in addition to his
Kritisches Lexikon in Apocryphae (Gotha, 1791, 2 vols. 8vo.)
—Einleitung ins A.T.: Einleitung ins N.T. (also published
under the general title of Kritische Schriften, Leips.
1804-1814, 8vo, 7 vols.)
He also published a number of
historical writings, besides many essays, reviews,
etc.; and all this time his lectures were kept up in
the university. The zealous and continued indus-
ty of Eichhorn is one of the marvels of modern lit-
erature.
As an interpreter of the Bible, Eichhorn, following
Michaelis, transcended him in the boldness of his crit-
icism and in his far-reaching Rationalism. The re-
results of his criticism were that the Bible, as we have it,
has only formal and literary value over other
books. The primeval history attributed to Moses
was made up of ancient sagas, and gathered up, partly,
by Moses into the Pentateuch. His system of interpre-
tation multiplies paradoxes, and tends to uphold
the Christian revelation, as such, entirely. In his view
the Apocalypse is a prophetic drama, and he comments
on it as he would on a play of Aristophanes or Terence.
But his vast labors in Biblical literature retain great
part of their reputation, while his method of interpre-
tation is fast passing into oblivion, even in Germany.
—Saintes, History of Rationalism, chap. xi; Herzog,
Real-Encyklop. iii. 710.

Eichhorn, Karl Friedrich, son of Johann Gott-
fried Eichhorn (q. v.), was born at Jena in 1781.
After completing his studies at the University of Göt-
ingen, he became privatdocent of law at the University
of Jena. In 1805 he was appointed professor at the
University of Frankfurt am Oder, and in 1811 was
made ordentlicher Professor of Church Law in Berlin, where he
was editor, with Savigny, Glieder, and, later, with
Rusdorf, the Zeitschrift für geschieltliche Rechtsaenderung.
from 1817 to 1829 he was professor of Church law,
and other branches, at Göttingen; from 1831 to 1888 pro-
fessor at the University of Berlin. In 1889 he was
appointed a member of the supreme state council, and
subsequently filled some other high offices in the civil
administration. He was regarded as the head of
the historical school of German jurists. He died at
Berlin July 4, 1894. Besides a number of law books,
which still occupy a high rank in that literature, he
wrote a work on Church law (Grundriss des Kirchen-
rechts der kathol. u. evangel. Religionsparteien, Götting,
1831-1838).—Herzog, Real-Encyk. xi, 470.

Einhard. See EINHARD.

Einsiedeln (Marie-Einsiedeln, Diepaur Virgina
Eremus, Notre Dame des Ermites), a Benedictine mon-
astery in Switzerland, founded in the 9th century by
Meinrad of Soleure, who was murdered by robbers
A.D. 661. In 934, Eberhard, provost of the cathedral of
Strasburg, was named prior of a certain monastery, then
the church Otto, in 946, endowed with the free right
of election. The convent was to be consecrated Sep-
tember 14, 948, by the bishop of Constance, but the
latter claimed to have heard the preceding night the
song of angels, and to have seen Christ himself, at-
tended by angels and flying into the mass and church;
and when the next morning, he prepared to perform
the act of consecration, he was admonished by a
voice saying, "Hold on, brother, God himself has
dedicated the chapel." The story was believed, and
on the sole strength of it the annual pilgrim-
age to Einsiedeln on September 14, to commemora-
te the "Angelic Consecration" (Engel-Wihe), became,
and still is, one of the most famous pilgrimages in
the Church of Rome. The pilgrim is granted full absolu-
tion to all who went in pilgrimage to the church.
The congregation is made up of a majority of scions of noble fami-
lies, and the convent steadily increased in power and
riches. A new church was built in the beginning of
the last century on the model of the Lateran church,
and contains Meinrad's cell and the image of the Vir-
gin. In the time of the Reformation most of the
monks left the church, but it was subsequently recon-
organized by Ludwig Hilarer, a Benedictine monk of St.
Gall. In 1710 260,000 are said to have visited Ein-
siedeln, and in 1851 the number was over 200,000.
The vendors of blessed images, medals, etc., do a thrive-
ning business there, and at a large profit. Things
are at Einsiedeln confessional for the people of different
nations and languages, each bearing an inscription by which it is recognised. In 1867 the convent had 75 priests, and 6 clerical and 17 lay brothers. The "Stiftsschule" ("Gymnasium") and Lyceum numbered about 200 pupils. Until 1825 the convent had a second "gymnasium" in Villach, founded by the Bishops of Tar- sin, and in that year it was suppressed by the Liberal government of the canton. See Placidus, Documenta Archivi Seminarii Einsiedelensis (3 vols. folio); Annales Hieremi Desparae Matriae (Frib. Brug. 1612, fol.); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iii, 742; Landolt, Urspruny u. erste Gestaitung d. Einseide-Wald-Monastery (Einsiedel 1845); Staudinger, Der heil. Meinrad u. die Wallfahrt von Einsiedeln (Einsiedeln, 1861).

EISENMENGER, JOHANN ANDREAS, a German Orientalist, was born at Mannheim in 1654, and studied at the University of Heidelberg, where, in 1700, he became a professor of Oriental languages. He died in 1764. His principal work is entitled Eudecktes Judenthum (Frankf. 1700). The Jews opposed its publication by all means in their power, and even obtained an imperial edict against it. At the time of his death nearly the whole edition of the work was under arrest. It was shortly before his death published 12,000 florins for the surrender of all the copies, but he asked 80,000. Friedrich I of Prussia appealed, in behalf of the heirs of Eisenmenger, to the emperors Leopold and Joseph for permission to publish the book, and, when this led to no result, had 12,000 florins spent in its publication and publication at the expense (Königsberg, 1711). Subsequently the Frankfort edition was also permitted to see the light. Eisenmenger also compiled a Lexicon Orientalis harmonicum, which has never been printed, and he published, conjointly with Leusden (q. v.), in 1694, an edition (without points) of the Heb. Bible,—He-erzog, Real-Encyklop. iii, 744; Hoe- fer, Biog. Genn. xv, 776; Wetscher u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. xii, 811; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden, vol. vii. (J. H. W.)

E'kker (Heb. i. n. 720, a plant root up and transplanted, e. g. metaph. a resident foreigner, Lev. xxv, 47), the youngest of the three sons of Ram, the grandson of Horeon (1 Chron. ii, 27; Sept. Aesp, Vulg. Achar). B.C. post 1856.

Ekkehard, the name of several learned monks of St. Gall. The first of the name, about the middle of the 10th century, was the director of the convent school, and subsequently dean of the convent. He laid the foundation of the literary celebrity of St. Gall, wrote several ecclesiastical hymns, and is honored by mention in the earliest works of German literature. Another Ekke- hard, a nephew of the former, was also a director of the convent school, and subsequently a chaplain of emperor Otto II. He also composed ecclesiastical hymns, and is supposed to have been familiar with stone-ography. He died April 53, 950. A third Ekkehard, born about 890, was a pupil of Notker Laboe, and became distinguished for his knowledge of Latin, Greek, German, mathematics, astronomy, and music. Aribio, archbishop of Mentz, appointed him superior of the cathedral school of that city. He continued the An- nals of St. Gall, which a monk by the name of Rat- perius had begun and carried to the year 883. This work, Carus Monasterii Sancti Galli (printed in Monumenta Germaniae histor. Scriptor. ii, 74-163) is of great importance for the Church history of the 10th century. Ekkehard also compiled a collection of ecclesiastical hymns, under the title Liber Benedicthuom. He wrote a poem, De ornatu dictis, and translated a life of St. Gall, in German verses by Ratperius, into Latin. He died in 1036. A fourth Ekkehard, who lived at the beginning of the 12th century, wrote a Vita Sancti Not- kers.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iii, 742 (A. J. S.)

Ekleode (Ekleode): Pash. Ferabad; Vulg. omita; a point on the Caspian Sea, above Kios, on the creek which is on the brook Moochun; apparently somewhere in the hill country to the south-east of the Plain of Edesaion and of Dethain. The Syriac reading of the word points to the place Akrabbe, mentioned by Eusebius in the Onomasticon as the capital of a district called Akrabastes, and still standing as Akrabat, about six miles south-east of Nablus (Shechem), in the Wady Makauty, and close to the Jordan valley (Van de Velde, ii, 304, and Map). Though frequently mentioned by Josephus (War, i, 20, 4; iv, 3, 5, etc.), neither the place nor the district are named in the Bible, and they must not be confounded with those of the same name in the south of Judah. See AKRAMBE; ARA- BATTA; MAHALIM-AKRABRAM.

Ekal 'tron (Heb. Ekoron, 11 527, erodation; comp. Zeph. ii, 4, which apparently contains a play upon the word; Sept. [usually] and Josephus ὡρακοπεῖος, Vulg. Acorra), one of the five towns belonging to the lords of the Philistines, and the most northerly of the five (Josh. xiii, 3). Like the other Philistine cities, its situation was in the maritime plain. In the general distribution of territory (unconquered as well as conquered) Ekron was assigned to Judah, as being straight west of it (Josh. xv, 47, and Josh. xvi, 45; 2 Sam. xix, 48; Judg. i, 18; comp. Josephus, Ant. vi, 1, 22; v. 2, 4). But it mattered little to which tribe it nominally belonged, for after the monarchical government in full perfection had been established by the Philistines (1 Sam. v, 10). In Scripture Ekron is chiefly remarkable from the ark having been sent home from thence, upon a new cart drawn by two milch kine (1 Sam. v, 10; vi, 1-8). Ekron was the last place to which the ark was carried before its return to Israel, and the mortality there in consequence seems to have been greater than at either Ashdod or Gath. (The Sept. in both Mss., and Josephus [Ant. vi, 1, 1], substitute Ascalon for Ekron throughout this passage [1 Sam. v, 10-12]. In support of this it should be remarked that, according to the Hebrew text, the golden trespas-offerings were given for Ashkelon, though it is omitted from the detailed narrative of the journeyings of the ark. There are other important differences between the Sept. and Hebrew texts of this transaction. See especially v. 6.) From Ekron to Bethsberheq (q. v.) was the highway (Theoph. Land. med. Book ii, 309). After David's victory over Goliath, the Philistines were pursued as far as this place (1 Sam. xvii, 52). Henceforward Ekron appears to have remained uninterrupted in the hands of the Philistines (1 Sam. xvii, 52; 2 Kings i, 12, 16; Jer. xxv, 20). Except the site of a noted palace of the King of Samaria, Haz- zeal (q. v.) existing there (2 Kings i, 2, 3, 6, 16), there is nothing to distinguish Ekron from any other town of this district. In later days it is merely named with the other cities of the Philistines in the denunciations of the prophets against that people (der. xxv, 20; Amos i, 8; Zeph. ii, 4; Zech. ix, 5). The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions of the (q. v.) of the Assyrian monuments. In the Apocrypha it appears as Acoron (Ἀκορων, 1 Macc. x, 89, only), bestowed with its borders (ἲδον ὡρακοπεῖον) by Alexander Balas on Jannthini as a reward for his services. Eusebius and Jerome describe it (Onomast. s. v. Ἀκορών, Acaroun) as a large village of the Jews, be- tween Azotus and Jamnia towards the east, or east-ward a line drawn between these two places. The same name Acorum occurs incidentally in the his- torians of Alexander and Romulus of Carthage De rerum gestis (2500). The site of Ekron has lately been recognised by Dr. Robinson (Bib. Researches, iii, 24) in that of 'Akrur, in a situation corresponding to all that we know of Ekron. The radical letters of the Arabic name are the same as those of the Hebrew, and both the Chris- tians and Moslems of the neighbourhood call it by the same name, as that of the ancient Ekron. It is a considerable Moslem village, about five miles south-west of Ram-

El, mighty, since God, either Jehovah or a false deity; sometimes a hero or magistrate (see God) occurs as a prefix (and also as a suffix) to several Heb. names, e.g. El-Beth-El; El-Elon-Jishah, all of which see in their place. Compare Eli.

Elah (Heb. Elah, Vulg. Jolaman), one of the heads of the class of priests (2 Sam. v) who had taken foreign wives after the Babylonian exile (1 Esdr. ix, 27); evidently the Elam (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ex. xx, 26). See also Elah.

Ela'dah (Heb. Eladah, מַעֲלָה, from God has put on, i.e. fills with himself; Sept. Ελαθάδ, V. Ελάθαδ, Vulg. Eladu), one of the sons (rather than grand- son or lesser descendant, as the text seems to state) of Ephraim (1 Chron. vii, 20), perhaps the same as Ekha (q. v.) of ver. 21, since several of the names (see Tahath) in the list appear to be repeated (compare Num. xxxvi, 36, where the only name is Ethan). See also Elah.

Elah (Heb. Elah, מַעֲלָה, terebinth or oak [q. v.]), the name of a place, and also of five men.

1. The VALLEY OF ELAH (מַעֲלָה, מָעָלָה, vale of the terebinth or oak; Sept. έλαζ άλας Ηλάς, but translated "Elath of the two rivers" in 1 Sam. vii, 2, 19; Vulg. Elagius), a valley in (not "by," as the A.V. has it) which the Israelites were encamped against the Philistines when David killed Goliath (1 Sam. vii, 2, 19; xii, 9). It lay somewhat near Shocho of Judah, and Azekah, and was nearer Ekron than any other Philistine town (1 Sam. vi, 17). Shocho, with a great probability identified with Shewihek, near Beit Netif, some 14 miles S.W. of Jerusalem, on the road to Beit Jibrin and Gaza, among the most western of the hills of Judah, not far from where they begin to descend into the great Philistine plain. The village stands on the south slopes of the wady el-Sam, or valley of the acoustic, which runs off in a N.W. direction across the plain to the sea just above Asdhood. Above Shewihek it branches into two other wadys, large, though inferior in size to itself, and the junction of the three forms a considerable open space of not less than a mile wide cultivated in fields of grain. In the centre is a wide torrent bed thickly strewn with round pebbles, and bordered by the acacia bushes from which the valley derives its present name. There seems to be no reason to doubt that this is the Valley of the Terebinth. It has changed its name and been identified after another kind of tree (the sumut, or acacia), but the terebinth (baum) appears to be plentiful in the neighborhood, and one of the largest specimens in Palestine still stands in the immediate neighborhood of the spot, in wady Sur, the southernmost of the branch wadys. For miles along the wadys, and along wady Masur, the other branch, is the khan and ruined site Akeb, which Van de Velde proposes to identify with Azekah. These identifications are confirmed by that of Ephraddim (q. v.), the site of the Philistine camp. Ekron is 17 miles, and Bethlehem 12 miles distant from Shocho. (For the valley, see Robinson, Researches, ii, 380; Van de Velde, Narrative, ii, 191; Porter, Handb. p. 109, 200, 204; Schwalbach, Paläst., p. 77.)

There is a point in the topographical indications of 1 Sam. xvii which it is very desirable should be carefully examined on the spot. The Philistines were between Shocho and Azekah, at Ephes-dammim, or Pas-dammim, on the mountain on the S. side of the wady, while the Israelites were in the "valley" (מָעָלָהפְּל) of the terebinth, or, rather, on the mountain on the N. side, and in the "valley" or "canyon" (מָעָלָהאֲנָשִּׁים) between the two armies (ver. 2, 3). Again (ver. 52), the Israelites pursued the Philistines "till you come to the ravine" (the same word). There is evidently a marked difference between the "valley" and the "ravine," and a little attention on the spot might lead to their identification. In the above location, the distance between the armies was about a mile, and the vale beneath is flat and rich. The ridge rises on each side to the height of about 500 feet, and have a uniform slope, so that the armies ranged along them could see the combat in the vale. The Philistines, when defeated, fled down the valley towards Gat and Ekron.

The traditional "valley of the Terebinth" is the wady Beiti-Hanoa, which lies about 4 miles to the N.W. of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Nebi Samwil. The spot of David's conflict was marked out a little N. of the "Tombs of the Judges," close to the traces of the old paved road. In this valley olives and carob-trees now prevail, and terebinth-trees are few; but the brook is still indicated whence the youthful champion selected the "smooth stones" with which he smote the Philistine. The brook is dry in summer, but in winter it becomes a mighty torrent, which inundates the vale (Kitto, Pictorial Palest., p. 121). But this spot is in the tribe of Benjamin, and otherwise does not correspond with the narrative of the text (see Thenius, Sitzungsber. 1897, ii, 151).

2. (Sept. Ηλάς, but Ηλάς in Chron.; Vulg. Ela.) One of the Edomish "dukes" or chieftains in Mount Seir (Gen. xxxvi, 41; 1 Chron. i, 52). B.C. post 1563. By Knobel (Comment. ad Gen. in loc.) he is connected with Elath (q. v.) on the Red Sea.

3. (Sept. Ελάθ v. r. Αλάθ.) The middle one of the three sons of Caleb the son of Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv, 15), B.C. 1618. In that passage his sons are called Kenaz or Kznax, but the words may be taken as if Kenaz was, with Elath, a son of Caleb. It is a singular coincidence that the names of both Elath and Kenaz also appear among the Edomish "dukes."

4. (Properly Elah, Heb. Ela, מַעֲלָה, Sept. Ηλάς.) The father of Shimeon, Ela, Saul's commissariat officer in Benjamin (1 Kings iv, 18), B.C. 1013.

5. (Sept. Ηλάς, Josephus Ηλαναυς, Vulg. Eda.) The son and successor of Bashah, king of Israel (1 Kings viii, 9-10); his reign lasted for little more than a year (comp. verse 8 with verse 10). B.C. 928. He was killed while drunk by Zimri, in the house of his steward Arza, who was probably a confederate in the plot. This occurred, according to Josephus (Ant. viii, 12, 4), while his army and officers were absent at the siege of Gibeon. He was the last king of Bashah's line, and by this catastrophe the predictions of the prophet Jeshua were accomplished (1 Kings vii, 6, 7, 11-13).

6. (Sept. Ηλάς.) The father of Hoshia, last king of Israel (2 Kings xv, 38; xviii, 1), B.C. 729, or ante.

7. (Sept. Ηλάς v. r. Ηλάς, Vulg. Ela.) The father of Uzzi, and Hadad, and of the tribe of families who were taken into captivity (1 Chron. ix, 8), or rather, perhaps, returned from it. B.C. 536.

Ela. See Oak; Terebinth.

Elalah (Eläh), a Phoenician city mentioned by Dionysius (Periég. 910) and other ancient authors as
ELAM

ELAM (Heb. Elyon, Elion, corresponding to the Pehvī Airjana [see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 101 c]), the name of a man and of the region settled by his posterity, also of several Hebrews, especially about the latter part of the Babylonian captivity.

1. (Sept. Δαράθα, Jos. Δαραθα; Ecclus. Anv. i. 6, 4; Vg. Elyon). Originally, like Abram, the name of a man—the son of Shem (Gen. x. 22; 1 Chron. i. 17). B.C. post 2514. Commonly, however, it is used as the appellation of a country (Gen. iv. 19, 1: Isa. xi. 11; xxi. 2; Jer. xxxv. 26; xlix. 34-39; Ezek. xxxix. 24; Dan. viii. 2). In Gen. xiv. 1, it is introduced along with the kingdom of Shinar in Babylon, and in Isa. xxi. 2, and Jer. xxxv. 25, it is connected with Media.

In Ezra iv. 9, the Elamites are described among the nations of the Persian empire; and in Dan. vii. 2, Susa is said to lie on the river Ulai (Elaeus or Choaspe), in the province of Elam. This river was the modern Karun (Layard, Nineteen and Bab. p. 146), and the capital of Elam was Shushan (q. v.), one of the most powerful and magnificent cities of the primeval world. The name Elam occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.) found on the bulls in Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh. The country is called Na- vaiki, as we learn from the monuments of Khorsabad and Bavian (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 492).

The Elam of Scripture appears to be the province lying south of Assyria and east of Persia Proper, to which Herodotus gives the name of Cissia (iii. 91; v. 49, etc., and which is in part termed Susa or Susana by the geographers (Strab. xv. 8, § 12; Ptolem. vi. 8, etc.). It includes a portion of the mountainous country separating between the Mesopotamian plain and the high table-land of Iran, together with a fertile and valuable tract at the foot of the range, between it and the Tigres. The passages of Daniel (vi. 2) which places Shushan (Susa) in "the province of Elam," may be regarded as decisive of this identification, which is further confirmed by the frequent mention of Elamians in this district (Strab. xi. 15, § 6; xvi. 1, § 17; Ptolem. vi. 3; Plin. H. N. xiv. 28, etc.), and which is found in Scripture (see Gen. xiv. 1; Isa. xxii. 2; Ezek. xxxix. 24). It appears from Gen. x. 22, that this country was originally peopled by descendents of Shem, closely allied to the Ariameses (Syrians) and the Assyrians, and from Gen. x. 21-19, it is evident that before the time of Abraham a very important power had been built up in the same region. Not only is "Chedor-lazur, king of Elam," at the head of a settled government, and able to make war at a distance of two thousand miles from his own country, but he manly exercises a supremacy over a number of other kings, among whom we even find Amraphel, king of Shinar, or Babylon, or Babylon. It is plain, then, that at this early time the predominant power in Lower Mesopotamia was Elam, which for a while held the place possessed earlier by Babylon (Gen. x. 10), and later by Babylon or Assyria. Discoveries made in the country itself confirm this view. They exhibit to us Susa, the Elamite capital, as one of the most ancient cities of the East, and show that its monarchs maintained, throughout almost the whole period of Persian and Assyrian greatness, a quasi-independent position, and that it was the home of Chedor-lazur himself, whom some are inclined to identify with an early Babylonian monarch, who is called the "Ravager of the West," and whose name reads as Kudur-mapula. The Elamite empire established at this time was, however, but short in duration. Babylon and Assyria proved, on the whole, stronger powers, and Elam during the period of their greatness can only be regarded as the foremost of their feudatories. Like the other subject nations she retained her own monarchs, and from time to time, for a longer or a shorter space, asserted and maintained her independence. But generally she was content to acknowledge one or other of the two leading powers as her suzerain. Towards the close of the Assyrian period she is found allied with Babylon, and engaged in hostilities with Assyria; but she seems to have declined in strength after the Assyrian empire was destroyed, and the Median and Macedonian arose upon its ruins. It is commonly called a "province" of Persia, and was called Elam in Belshazzar's time (Dan. viii. 2), and we may presume that it had been subject to Babylon at least from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. The desolation which Jeremiah (xlili. 30-34) and Ezekiel (xxxi. 24, 25) foresees was probably this conquest, which destroyed the last remnant of Elamite independence. Elam is uncertain at what time the Persians added Elam to their empire. Possibly it only fell under their dominion together with Babylon; but there is some reason to think that it may have revolted and joined the Persians before the city was besieged. The prophet Isaiah (xxiv. 1; xxxvii. 2; xxii. 6; xxvi. 18), in speaking of Elam as taking part in the destruction of Babylon, and, unless we are to regard him with our translators as using the word loosely for Persia, we must suppose that, on the advance of Cyrus and his investment of Babylon, the Chaldean capital, Elam made common cause with the assyrians, and the country became menace to the Persian empire, forming a distinct satrapy (Herod. iii. 91), and furnishing to the crown an annual tribute of 300 talents. Susa, her capital, was made the ordinary residence of the court, and the metropolis of the whole empire. This mark of favor did not, however, prevent revolts. Not only was the Magian revolution organized and carried out at Susa, but there seem to have been at least two Elamite revolts in the early part of the reign of Darius Hystaspis (Beist. Inv., col. i, par. 16, and col. ii, par. 5). After these futile efforts, Elam acquiesced in her subjection, and, as a Persian province, followed the fortunes of the empire. These historic facts illustrate the prophecy of Jeremiah (xlili. 38, 39), "And upon Elam will I bring the four winds from the four quarters of heaven, and I will scatter them towards all these winds." The situation of the country in two principal parts (xvi. 1) seems to speak to the Medes, and Babylonians; and it suffered from each in succession before it was finally embodied in the Persian empire. Then another part of the prophecy was also singularly fulfilled: "I will set my throne in the Elam, and will destroy that but the time of Abraham a very important power had been built up in the same region. Not only is "Chedor-lazur, king of Elam," at the head of a settled government, and able to make war at a distance of two thousand miles from his own country, but he manly exercises a supremacy over a number of other kings, among whom we even find Amraphel, king of Shinar, or Babylon, or Babylon. It is plain, then, that at this early time the predominant power in Lower Mesopotamia was Elam, which for a while held the place possessed earlier by Babylon (Gen. x. 10), and later by Babylon or Assyria. Discoveries made in the country itself confirm this view. They exhibit to us Susa, the Elamite capital, as one of the most ancient cities of the East, and show that its monarchs maintained, throughout almost the whole period of Persian and Assyrian greatness, a quasi-independent position, and that it was the home of Chedor-lazur himself, whom some are inclined to identify with an early Babylonian monarch, who is called the "Ravager of the West," and whose name reads as Kudur-mapula. The Elamite empire established at this time was, however, but short in duration. Babylon and Assyria proved, on the whole, stronger powers, and Elam during the period of their
often attached. They were a warlike people, trained to arms, and especially skilled in the use of the bow (I sa. xxi. 2; Jer. xlix, 55); they roamed abroad like the Bedawin, and like them, too, were addicted to plunder (Strabo, xi, 361). Josephus mentions a town called Elymais, which contained a famous temple dedicated to Diana, and rich in gifts and votive offerings (Ant. xii. 219). He says it was situated 100 miles N. of Susa (Bochart, Opp. i, 70 sq.). Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to plunder it, but was repulsed (1 Macc. vii). It is a remarkable fact that little image of the goddess, whose Assyrian name was Anatis, were discovered by Loftus in the mounds of Susa (Chaldec, p. 379). The Elamites who were in Jerusalem at the feast of the Pentecost were probably descendants of the captive tribes who had settled in Elam (Acts ii, 9).

It has been repeatedly observed above that Elam is called Cissia by Herodotus, and Susiana by the Greek and Roman geographers. The latter is a term formed artificially from the capital city, but the former is a genuine territorial title, and probably marks an important fact in the history of the country. The Elamites, a Semitic people, who were the primitive inhabitants (Gen. x, 22), appear to have been invaded and conquered by the Hittites early in the 16th century B.C. or earlier (Strabo and Plutarch). In Susa, which is called by its primitive title without reference to subsequent changes; in the Greek writers it takes its name from the conquerors. The Greek traditions of Memnon and his Ethiopian's are based upon this Cushite conquest, and rightly connect the Cissians or Cossians of Susiana with the Cushites inhabitants of the upper valley of the Nile.

The fullest account of Elam, its physical geography, ruins, and history, is given in Loftus's Chairdans and Susians (Lond. 1856; N. Y. 1857). The southern part of the country is flat, and towards the shore of the gulf marshy and desolate. In the north the mountain ranges of Bachtiari and Luristan rise gradually from the plain in a series of calcareous terraces, intersected by ravines of singular wildness and grandeur. Among these mountains are the sources of the Ulai (Loftus, p. 306). The chief towns of Elam are now Shuster ('little Shush') and Disful; but the greater part of the country is over-run by nomad Arabs. See ELMITE.

2. (Sept. Σεσμολοχία v. Σεσμολοχία, also 'Σεσμόλοχαι and 'Σεσμόλοχα; Vulg. Elam.) A Korhite Levite, fifth son of Meshheleunah, one of the Bnei-Asaph, and superintendent of the fifth division of Temple wardens in the time of king David (1 Chron. xxvi, 8). B.C. 1014.

3. Sept. Σραμολοχία v. Σραμολοχία, Vulg. Elam.) A chief man of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the sons of Shashak, resident at Jerusalem at the captivity or on the return (1 Chron. i, 50). B.C. 537.

4. (Sept. 'Aλημ, 'Ηλιος, Vulg. Elam.) "Children of Elam," Bene-Elam, to the number of 1254, returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezra ii, 7; Neh. vii, 12; 1 Esdr. v, 12), and a further detachment of 71 men with Ezra in the second caravan (Ezra vili, 7; 1 Esdr. viii, 30). It was one of this family, Shechaniiah, son of Jehiel, who encouraged Ezra in his efforts against the indiscriminate marriages of the people (Ezra x, 2, text בֵּיתָל, i.e. בֵּית עָלָם, Olam), and six of the Bene-Elam accordingly put away their foreign wives (Exx x, 26). The lists of Ezra ii and Neh. vii contain apparently an irregular mixture of the names of places and of persons. In the former, ver. 21-34, with one or two exceptions, are names of places; 3-12, on the other hand, are not known as names of places, and are probably of persons. No such place as Elam is mentioned as in Palestine, either in the Bible or in the Onomasticon of Eusebius, nor has since been discovered as existing in the country, although Schwarz endeavors (Polest. p. 143) to give the word a local reference to the grave of a Samaritan priest El, at a village named by him as אַרְיָם ben-Elam, on the bay, 8 miles N. of Damascus. See Harim. Most interpreters have therefore concluded that it was a person. B.C. ante 536. It is possible, however, that this and the following name have been borrowed from No. 1, perhaps as designating Jews who resided in that region of the Babylonian dominions during the captivity.

5. In the list of the Jews who were in Jerusalem at the feast of the Pentecost, were probably descendants of the captive tribes who had settled in Elam (Acts ii, 9).

The coincidence of the numbers is curious, and also suspicious, as arguing an accidental repetition of the foregoing name. B.C. ante 536.

6. (Sept. 'Aλημ, Vulg. Elam.) One of the sacerdotes or Levitical singers who accompanied Nehemiah at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446.

7. (Sept. 'Aλημ, Vulg. Elam.) One of the chiefs of the people who signed the covenant with Nehemiah. (Neh. xii, 43). B.C. 446.

B'Elamaburishiah. Elam'ay, Elam'may, in the plural 'Elim'may, Gr. Elam'men, Strabo, Plutarch, or 'Ele'ma-ras, Acts ii, 9; Vulg. Elam'me.) This word is found in the O.T. only in Ezra iv, 9, and is omitted in that place by the Sept. translators, who probably regarded it as a gloss upon "Susanchites," which had occurred only a little before. The Elamites were the original inhabitants of the country called Elam; they were the descendents of them, and drew their name from an actual man, Elam (Gen. x, 22). It has been observed in the preceding article that the Elamites yielded before a Cossian or Cushite invasion. See ELAM. They appear to have been driven in part to the mountains, where Strabo places them (xii, 13, § 6; xvi, 1, § 17), in part to the coasts, where they are located by Penelomy (vi, 8). Little is known of their manners and customs, or of their ethnic character. (See Müller, in the Journal Asiatic, 1839, vii, 299; Wahl, Amm. p. 603; Mannert, Geogr. V, ii, 158; comp. Flattarch, Vit. Pomp. 36; Justin, xxxvi, 1; Tacit. Ann. vii, 44). Strabo says they were skillful archers (xv, 3, § 10; comp. Xenoph. Cyrop. iv, 1, 16; Livy, xxxvi, 48; Appian, Syr. 82), and with this agrees the notices both of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the latter of whom speaks of "the bow of Elam" (xlix, 35), while the former says that "Elam bare the quiver" (xxxi, 6). Isaiah also adds in this place that they fought both on horseback and on chariots. They appear to have retained their national with peculiar tenacity, for it is plain from the mention of them on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 9) that they still at that time kept their own language and dress. (B.C. 30 B.C.) They have been noticed by them as a people by Plutarch, as Elym'ians, and in 1 Macc. vi, 1, mention is made of a city Ely'maïs (q. v.).

B'el'asha'ah (some El'as'ah). (Heb. Elak'asăh, אֶלָכָּשׁ, whom God made; Vulg. Elasa). the name of four men (variously Anglicized in the A.V.). See also El'asha

1. (Sept. El'āshād.) The son of Helez, and father of Sisamah; one of the descendants of Judah, of the family of Hezron (1 Chron. ii, 52, A.V. "Eel'sahah"). B.C. post 1046.
2. (Sept. ‘Bekōn v. r. ’Ελαθ, A. V. "Elishah.") A son of Rapha or Rehbarah, and father of Azel; descendant of king Saul through Jonathan and Meribaal or Mephibosheth (1 Chron. viii. 37; ix. 43). B.C. considerably ante 588.

3. (Sept. Εἰλαθ, A. V. "Elishah.") The son of Shiphah; one of the two men who were sent from Bani to see the kingdom of Nechochadnazar at Babylon after the first deportation from Jerusalem, and who at the same time took charge of the letter of Jeremiah the prophet to the captives in Babylon (Jer. xxix. 3). B.C. 694.

4. (Sept. הֵלָת, A. V. "Elath.") One of the five sons of Helbah, whose name was pronounced to Nechochadnazar, the king of Babylon (Ezra x. 22). B.C. 458.

Elath (Heb. עֵילָת, ‘elāṭ, grow, perhaps of terebinth-trees; occurs in this form Deut. ii. 8; 2 Kings xiv. 22; xvi. 6; also in the plur. form יְלָת, ‘elāṯı̂m [q. v.], 1 Kings ix. 26; 2 Chron. viii. 17; xxvi. 6; "Elath.", 2 Kings xvi. 6; in the Sept. Αἰλάθ and Αλαμάω; in Joseph. [Ant. viii. 6, 4] Αλαμών; in Jerome, Αἰλάθ [who says that in his day it was called Αἰλάθ by all the kings]; also in other Greek authors; αἰλάθ in Arabic writings occurs; the name διακόπτει παλαιστίνας, ‘Elāth (Patol. v. 17, [Ἀλαμών Strabo, xvi. 708, comp. Pliny, v. 12; vi. 32]; in Arabic authors ‘Aila, a city of Idumea, having a port on the eastern arm or gulf of the Red Sea, of which the native name was given, Elatha or Elath of ‘Akabah. According to Eusebius (Onomast. s. v. Ἐλαδσ), it was ten miles east from Petra. It must have been situated at the extremity of the valley of El-Gbor, which runs at the bottom of two parallel ranges of hills, north and south, through Arabia Petraea, from the Dead Sea to the northern parts of the Eleanitic Gulf; but on which side of the valley it lay has been matter of dispute (see M’Culloch’s Geog. Dict. s. v. Akabah). In the geography of Arabia it forms the extreme northern limit of the province of the Hijaz (El-Makrizi, Khiat; and Marisid, s. v.; comp. Arabia), and is connected with some points of the history of the country. According to several native writers the district of Elath was in very ancient times peopled by the Sameyda, said to be a tribe of the Amalekites (the first Amalek). The town itself, however, is stated to have received its name from Eliezer, son of Midian (El-Makrizi, Khiat), or, by some (Caussin’s Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes, i. 23), from the Amalekites, if we may credit the writings of Arabic historians, passed in the earliest times from the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf through the peninsula (q. v.), and finally passed into Arabia Petraea. Future researches may trace in these fragments of primeval tradition the origin of the Phoenicians. Herodotus seems to strengthen such a supposition when he says that the latter people came from the Erythrean Sea. Were the Phoenicians a mixed Cushite settlement from the Persian Gulf, who carried with them the known maritime characteristics of the peoples of that stock, developed in the great commerce of Tyre, and in that of the Persian Gulf, and, as a link between their extreme eastern and western settlements, in the fleets that sailed from the Persian Gulf and of Elath, and from the southern ports of the Yemen? See Arabia; Capiton; Mizraim. It should be observed, however, that Tyrian sailors manned the fleets of Solomon and of Jehoshaphat (see Journ. Soc. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 155, n.).

The first time that Elath is mentioned in Scripture is in Deut. ii. 8; in speaking of the journey of the Israelites towards the Promised Land: "When we passed by from our brethren the children of Esau, which dwelt in Seir, through the way of the plain from Elath, and from Ezion-geber." These two places are mentioned together again in 1 Kings ix. 26 (comp. 2 Chron. viii. 17), in such a manner as to show that Elath was more ancient than Ezion-geber, and was of so much repute as to be used for indicating the locality of other places: the passage also fixes the spot where Elath itself was to be found: "and king Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber, which is beside Elath, on the shore (Num. xxxii. 38) of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom." See Ezion-geber. Solomon discovered the vicinity of Elath shows that the country was at that time in his possession. Accordingly, in 2 Sam. vii. 14, we learn that he had previously made himself master of Idumea, and garrisoned its strong-holds with his own troops. Under Jo'zai'ah, however (2 Kings viii. 20), the Idumeans revolted from Judah, and made Elath a king over themselves. Joram thereupon assembled his forces, "and all the chariots with him," and, falling on the Idumeans by night, succeeded in defeating and scattering their army. The Hebrews, nevertheless, could not "Edom down, notwithstanding the hand of Judah unto this day;" thus exemplifying the striking language employed (Gen. xxvii. 40) by Isaac: "By thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." But so far as the Greek writers are concerned it appears that ‘Uzlah recovered Elath, and, having so regained and adorned the city as to be said to have built, that is, rebuilt it, he made it a part of his dominions. This connection was not of long continuance; for in chap. xvi. 6 of the same book, we find the Syrian king Rib‘a-i‘d, who captured Elath and drove out the Jews, and annexed the place to his Syrian kingdom, and "the Syrains came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." At a later period it fell under the power of the Romans, and was for a time guarded by the tenth legion in Syria, which afterwards was given to the King of Palæstina Tertia (Jerome, Onomast. s. v. Ailath; Strabo, xxi. 4, 4; Reland, Pallad. p. 556). It subsequently became the residence of a Christian bishop. Bishops of Elath were at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and at that of Constantinople (A.D. 556). At the Council of Chalcedon, Beryclus thus wrote his designation as "bishop of Elath of Third Palestine" (Ἀρχιεπίς τῆς ἑπτάετῆς τριάδος). In the days of its prosperity it was much distinguished for commerce, which continued to flourish under the auspices of Christianity (Cellarius Notit. ii. 698 sq.). In the 6th century it is spoken of by Procopius as being inhabited by "Romans." From 329 A.D. the bishops of Elath were seated at successive times until the present century, Elath lay in the darkness of Islamism. It is merely mentioned by the supposed Ibn-Haukal (Engl. translation of D’Arvieux, Append. p. 535), perhaps in the 11th century; and, after the middle of the 12th, Edrisi describes it as a small town frequented by the Arabs, who were now its masters, and forming an important point in the route between Cairo and Medina. In A.D. 1118, King Baldwin of Jerusalem took possession of it. Again it was wrested from the hands of the Christians by Saladin I, A.D. 1157, and never again fully recovered by them, although the rock forming the site of Chalit-sūl, the site of Elath, was seized, and for a time held, the town. In Abuelfeda’s day, and before A.D. 1300, it was already deserted. He says, "In our day it is a fortress, to which a governor is sent from Egypt. It had a small castle in the middle of the town, but it was destroyed, and most of the houses were removed to the fortresses on the shore." Such as Elath was in the days of Abuelfeda, is Akabah now. Mounds of rubbish alone mark the site of the town, while a fortress, occupied by a governor and a small garrison under the pasha of Egypt, serves to keep the neighboring tribes of the desert in awe, and to minister the wants and protection of the annual Egyptian Hajj.
or pilgrim caravan. Under the Roman rule it lost its former importance with the transference of its trade to other ports, such as Berenice, Myos Hormos, and Arinna; but in Mohammedan times it again became a place of some note. It is now quite insignificant. It lies on the route of the Egyptian pilgrim-caravan, and the mountain-road or 'Akabah named after it was improved or reconstituted by Ahmad ibn-Tulun, who ruled Egypt from A.D. cir. 840 to 848. This place has always been an important station upon the route of the Egyptian Hajj. Such is the importance of this caravan of pilgrims from Cairo to Mecca, both in a religious and political point of view, that the rulers of Egypt, from the time of Suleiman, onwards, have given it special care and protection. For this purpose a line of fortresses similar to that of Akabah has been established at intervals along the route, with wells of water and supplies of provisions (Robinson's Biblical Researches, i, 250.). The first Frank who visited this place in meseen times was Rappell, in 1822 (Reise, p. 248 sq.). Labore (Journey through A rabia Petraea, London, 1836) was well received by the garrison and inhabitants of the castle of Akabah, of which he has given a view (i, 116). The fortress, he states, is built on a regular plan, and is in a pretty good condition, though such good habits have been suffered to fall. It has only two guns fit for service (Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, p. 99 sq.). The ancient name of the place is indicative of groves in the vicinity, and Strabo says it was the palm-woods of (xvi, 776), which appear still to subsist (Niebuhr, Baschir. p. 400; Schubert, ii, 379).

El-Bethel (Heb. El Beth-El, 'el béth-él, 'God of Bethel'; Sept. simply Baeth, Vulg. Domus Dei'), the name given by Jacob to the altar erected by him as a sanctuary (Gen. xxxv, 7), on the spot where he had formerly experienced the vision of the mystical ladder (chap. xxxi, 19; xxviii, 18). See Bethel.

Elcesaites. See Elkesaites.

El cia (Elcia), one of the forefathers of Judith, and therefore belonging to the tribe of Simeon (Judg. vii, 1); what Hebrew name the word represents is doubtful. Hilkiah is probably Chaldeans, two steps back in the genealogy. The Syriac version has Elkama. In the Vulgate the names are hopelessly altered.

El daih [some Eddah (Heb. Eddah, e'dah, whom God has loved; comp. Theophilos; Sept. Eddah), one of the seventy elders who had been appointed under Moses to assist in the administration of justice among the people. B.C. 1558. He is mentioned along with Medad, another elder, as having on a particular occasion received the gift of prophecy, which came upon them in the camp, while Moses and the rest of the elders were assembled around the door of the tabernacle. The spirit of prophecy was upon them all; and the simple peculiarity in the case of Eldad and Medad was that they did not lose their share in the gift, though they abode in the camp, but they prophesied there. It appeared, however, an irregularity to Joshua, the son of Nun, and seems to have suggested the idea that they were using the gift with a view to their own aggrandizement. He therefore ordained Moses to forbid them. But Moses, with characteristic magnanimity, replied, "Easiest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" (Num. x, 24-26).—Fairbairn, s. v. The great fact of the passage is the more general distribution of the spirit of prophecy, which had hitherto been concentrated in Moses; and the implied sanction of a tendency to separate the exercise of this gift from the service of the tabernacle, and to make it more generally available for the enlightenment and instruction of the Israelites, a tendency which afterwards led to the establishment of "schools of the prophets." The circumstance is in strict accordance with the Jewish tradition that all the prophetic inspiration arose originally from Moses, and was transmitted from him by a legitimate succession down to the time of the captivity. The mode of prophecy in the case of Eldad and Medad was probably the extempore production of hymns, chanted forth to the people (Hammond); comp. the case of Saul, 1 Sam. x, 11. From Num. x, 25, it appears that the gift was not merely intermittent, but a continuous energy, though only occasionally developed in action. See Prophecy.

ElDER (properly ἔλευθος, sakos; πρεσβύτερος, a term which is plainly the origin of our word "priest,; Sax.-on preos, and pret)e; then priest, High and Low Dutch priest, French prêtre and prêtre, Ital. prete, Span. presbítero, due to the origin of the words yuqawwā (a council of elders), senatus, alderman, etc.)

I. In the O. T.—The term elder was one of extensive use, as an official title, among the Hebrews and the surrounding nations. It applied to various offices; Eil-ezer, for instance, is described as the "elder of the house," i.e. the major-domo (Gen. xxiv, 2); the officers of Pharao's household (Gen. i, 7, and, at a later period, David's head servants (2 Sam. xii, 17) were so termed; while in Ezek. xxxiii, 3 the "old men of Gebal" are the master-servants. But the term "elder" appears to be also expressive of respect and reverence in general, as aigneur, seigneur, senator, etc. The word occurs in this sense in Gen. i, 7, "Joseph went up to bury his father, and with him went up all the servants of Pharao, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt. (See of the old ones, Vulg. et ren.) These elders of Egypt were probably the various state officers. As betokening a political office, it applied not only to the Hebrews and Egyptians, but also to the Moabites and Midianites (Num. xxii, 7). The elders of Israel, of whom such frequent mention is made, may be said, in early times, to have been the descendants of the patriarchs (Exod. xii, 21). To the elders Moses was directed to open his commission (Exod. iii, 16). They accompanied Moses in his first interview with Pharao, as the representatives of the Hebrew nation (ver. 16); through them Moses issued his communications and commands to the whole people (Exod. xix, 7; Deut. xxxi, 9); they were his immediate attendants in all great transactions in the wilderness (Exod. xvii, 5); seventy of their number were selected to attend Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, at the giving of the law (Exod. xix, 7); on which occasion they are called the nobles (τὸν ἀνθρώπον, lit. deep-rooted, i.e. of high-born stock; Sept. ἀνθρώποι) of the children of Israel, who did eat and drink before God, in ratification of the covenant, as representatives of the nation (ver. 11). In Num. x, 16, 17, we meet with the appointment of seventy elders to bear the burden of the people along with Moses; and these were selected by Moses out of the whole number of the elders, and are described as being already officers over the children of Israel. It is the opinion of Michaelis that this council chosen to assist Moses should not be confounded with the Sanhedrim, which, he thinks, was not instituted till after the Babylonish captivity. See SASHEDOR. He ob
ELDER

See COURSIC. Thus they are associated sometimes with the chief priests (Matt. xxvii, 23), sometimes with the chief priests and the scribes (Matt. xvi, 21), or the council (Matt. xvi, 59), always taking an active part in the management of public affairs. Luke describes the whole order by the collective term πρεσβυτεροι, i.e. eldership (Luke xvi, 16; Acts xxii, 5). Like the scribes, they obtained their seat in the Sanhedrin by election, or nomination from the executive authority. See Acts.

II. In the New Testament and in the Apostolic Church. In the New Testament we find eldership (πρεσβυτερίον) which was planned and functions of the eldership in the N.T. and in the early Church are treated at some length, especially with regard to the question of the original identity of bishops and presbyters (or elders). Referring our readers to that discussion, we add here the following points.

1. Origin of the Office.—In the Apostolic Church, § 120. The origin of the eldership in the Christian Church is given in the N.T. "The demand for it arose, no doubt, very early; as, notwithstanding the wider diffusion of gifts not restricted to office, provision was to be made plainly for the regular and fixed instruction and conduct of the church, as also which were planned and functions of the leadership in the N.T. and in the early Church are treated at some length, especially with regard to the question of the original identity of bishops and presbyters (or elders). Referring our readers to that discussion, we add here the following points.
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of good behavior, given to hospitality, up to teach (ἐκτητὸς), etc.; so also Tit. i. 5, where it is required of a bishop that he shall 'hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught (ἀντὶκρυμένων τοῦ καθ' ἐμν ζητῆσαι πνεύμονά λόγον), that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. For the term may be used of a pastor, as well as of the persons mentioned in the three epistles of St. John. The word is applied to elders in the apostolic age who were not in their own persons dignified with the name of bishop. The churches would scarcely be able (as they were mostly poor) to provide stipends at first for their pastors' (Neander). Nevertheless, men specially called and fitted for the work, and devoted to it, were enrolled by the Christian law, as set forth by the apostles, to be supported by the people; but there was no distinction of rank, honor, or authority between those elders who had stipends and those who had none, unless, indeed, the latter, who, following Paul’s example, ‘worked with their own hands’ (1 Cor. xvi. 12), may not have been more highly favored in the arrangements of the primitive church. The principle of a full-time priestly title may stand apart from stipend is fully recognized in modern times in the system of local preachers (q.v.) in the Methodist Episcopate (see Steward, On Church Government, Lond. 1855, p. 128).

The term ‘elder’ is also used of the synagogues, as well as of the political administration of cities, which from of old was vested in the hands of a senate or college of decurions, every church had a number of preachers. We meet them everywhere in the plural and as a corporation: at Jerusalem, Acts xiii. 6; xvi. 16; xvi. 18; and Ephesus, ch. ii. 14, etc. In the Acta of Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. 14, where mention is made of the laying on of the hands of the presbytery; and in the churches to which James wrote, James v. 14: ‘Is any sick among you? let him call for the presbyters of the church, and let them pray over him,’ etc. The term ‘presbyter’ is imported by the New Testament (Acts xiv. 23) that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders for every church, several of them of course, and still more clearly by the direction given to Titus (Tit. i. 5) to ordain elders, that is, a presbytery of such officers, in every city of Crete. Some learned men, indeed, have imagined that the number named in the largest church and in several congregations, while, however, each of these had but one elder or bishop; that the principle of congregational polity thus from the beginning was neither democratic nor aristocratic, but monarchial. But this view is not sustained by any one of the primitive, theological, or scriptural texts, which the preachers appear as a college, as well as by the associative tendency which entered into the very life of Christians from the beginning. The household congregations (εἰκονὶς καὶ εἰκόνα), which are often mentioned and quoted (Rom. xvi. 4, 14, 15; 1 Cor. xvii. 20; Col. iv. 15; Phil. ii. 2), indicate merely the fact that where the Christians had become very numerous they were accustomed to meet for edification at different places, and by no means exclude the idea of their organized union as a whole, or of their being governed by a common body of preachers. Hence we find: (a) That the title presbyter applied also to elders never addressed to a separate part, an ecclesia in ecclesia, a conventicle, but always to the whole body of Christians at Rome, at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Philip- phi, at Thessalonica, etc., treating them in such case as a chargeable (ἐπικεφαλίσθησις) to the people themselves; (b) Col. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; v. 1 sq. ; 2 Cor. i. 1, 28; ii. 1 sq. ; Col. iv. 16; Phil. i. 1, etc.). Whether a full parity reigned among these collegiate presbyters, or whether one, say the eldest, constantly presided over the rest, or whether, finally, one followed another in such presidency as presus inter presus by some certain rotation, cannot be distinctly determined from the N. T. The analogy of the Jewish synagogue leads here to no entirely sure result, since it is questionable whether a particular presidency belonged to its eldership as early as the time of Christ. Some sort of presidency, indeed, would seem to be almost indispensable for any well-organized government and the regular transaction of business in the church, even, sexuistically, the case of these primitive Christian presbyteries, only the particular form of it we have no means to determine’ (Schaaff, 1. c.).

III. In the Early Church (post-apostolic).—Very soon after the apostolic age the episcopacy arose, first in the smaller communities, after the congregation had lived in a synaxis. See EPISCOPACY. Until the full development of the latter, elders or presbyters were the highest order of ministers. No trace of ruling elders, in the modern sense, is to be found in the early Church. There was a class of seniores ecclesiæ in the African Church, who some writers have corresponded to the ruling elder; but Bingham clearly shows the contrary. The name occurs in the writings of Augustine and Optatus. In the Diocletian persecution, when Menasurius was compelled to leave his church, he committed the ornaments and utensils to a presbyter for safe keeping (Epist. 128). In the works of Optatus there is a tract called ‘the Purging of Felix and Cecilian,’ where is mention of these seniores. Augustine inscribes one of his epistles, Clera, seniores et universae ecclesiae (cfr. the clerk of the clergy and the whole people) (Epist. 187). According to Bingham, some of these seniores were the civil optimates (magistrates, aldermen); the Council of Carthage (A.D. 408) speaks of magistratus vel seniores locorum. Others were called seniores ecclesiastici, and had care of the church’s utensils, trusted with the education of children, and assigned to modern churchwardens or trustees (Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. ii. ch. xix., § 19; Hitchcock, in Amer. Presb. Review, April, 1868).

IV. In the Modern Church.—I. In the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the word ‘priest’ is generally used instead of ‘presbyter’ or ‘elder’ to designate the second order of ministers (the three orders being bishops, priests, and deacons). See PRIEST; PŘESTY.

2. In the Methodist Episcopal Church but two orders of ministers are recognised, viz. elders and deacons, the bishop being chosen as primus inter pares, or superintend. See EPISCOPACY. For the election, ordination, duties, etc., of elders, see the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, pt. ii. ch. ii., § 15, and Appendix, ch. i. The presbyter, or presbytery, is appointed by the bishop, once in four years, to superintend a district. For the nature and functions of this office, see PRESENTING ELDERS.

3. Among Congregationalists, the only Church officers now known are elders (or ministers) and deacons. Ruling elders were first of all recognized in the Cambridge platform (q.v.), and their duties particularly pointed out; but neither the office itself nor the reasons by which it was supported were long approved. Ruling elders never were universal in Congregationalism, and the office was soon everywhere rejected (Upham, Ratio Disciplinæ, 184, 185, etc., Daedale, On Congregationalism, 43, etc.).

4. Among Presbyterian churches (i.e. all which adopt the Presbyterian form of government, whether designated by that name or not) there are generally two classes of elders, teaching and ruling elders. The teaching elders constitute the body of pastors; the ruling elders are laymen, who are set apart as assistants to the minister in the oversight and ruling of the flock. Together with the minister, they constitute the Session, the lowest judiciary in the Church. See PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. They cannot administer the sacraments, but aid at the Lord’s Supper by distributing the elements to the communicants.
1. In Scotland, ruling elders constitute, with the ministers, the "Kirk Session." The Form of Government annexed to the Confession of Faith asserts that "as there were in the Jewish Church elders of the people, joined with the priests and Levites in the government of the Church, so in the Christian Church, besides the ministers of the Word, with gifts for government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the minister in the government of the Church, which officers respect is commonly called "elders." Those elders are chosen from among the members, and are usually persons of tried character. After their acceptance of office, the minister, in the presence of the congregation, sets them apart to their office by prayer, and sometimes by imposition of hands, and concludes the ceremony of ordination by exhorting both elders and people to discharge their respective duties. They have no right to teach or to dispense the sacraments. 'They generally discharge the office, which originally belonged to the deacons, of attending to the interests of the poor and the sick, of making frequent visits among the members by the name "ruling elders;" for in every question of jurisdiction they are the spiritual court of which the minister is officially moderator, and in the presbytery—of which the pastors within the bounds are officially members—the elders sit as the representatives of the seven years of advancement, selected from the people to unite with the bishops in giving admonition, and exercising discipline. No other interpretation can be given of 'He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence' (Rom. xii, 8). . . . Now that this was not the regulation of a diocesan archbishop, it is not surprising. This passage, however, occurs first in the 8th edition of the Institutes, 1548; it is not found in the editions of 1568 or 1569. The office of lay elders had existed before among the Unitas Fratrum, who were supposed to have borrowed it from the Waldenses; but these lay elders were more in the way of being superintendents than elders. Calvin himself organized a lay eldership in Geneva, to be elected yearly, and seems afterwards to have sought a Scriptural warrant for it. In so doing he formed a novel theory, viz., that of a two-fold eldership. 'This cardinal assumption of a dual presbyterate was controverted by James Panton in his Presbyterian Churches (1838), and by Thomas Smyth in his Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders (1845). The drift of critical opinion is now decidedly in this direction. It is beginning to be conceded, even among Presbyterians of the staunchest sort, that Calvin was mistaken when he interpreted the expression 'two orders of presbyters' as meaning that two orders of presbyters are not there brought to view, but only one order, the difference referred to being simply that of service, and not of rank. And if this famous passage fails to justify the dual presbyterate, much less must it rely upon the ἐξουσία τῆς ἡττας, that ruleth with diligence' (1 Cor. xi, 28). Chapter xiii gives the rules for the election and ordination of ruling elders. Each congregation elects 'according to the mode most approved and in use in that congregation;' and the whole procedure is very similar to that of the U. F. Church rectified above. The order of ordination—"by the right hand of fellowship," not by imposition of hands. The office is perpetual. The elders, with the pastor, constitute the Session; one elder from each church is a member of Presbytery and Synod; and one for every twenty-four ministers in each presbytery is sent to the General Assembly. In the Reformed Church the elders are chosen for two years only, by the congregation or by the Consistory (Constitution of the Ref. Dutch Church, ch. i, art. iii). They are entitled to membership in Classis and Synod as delegates (Constitutions, 1849). There is a form given in the book for their ordination, without imposition of hands. So also in the new liturgy prepared for the German Reformed Church.

2. Ruling Elders.—The distinction between teaching and ruling elders originated with Calvin, and has diffused itself among the churches. The Reformed Churches adopt the Presbyterian form of government; and the authority of the N. T. is claimed for it (see above, 2) in the Presbyterian "Form of Government" (bk. i, ch. v); in the Reformed Church Form of Ordination (Constit. p. 118); in the Lutheran Church Formula of Concord (art. 64); and in the Congregationalists of New England admitted this distinction for a while (see above), but soon abandoned it.

Calvin (Institutes, bk. iv, chap. iii, § 8) seeks a Scriptural basis for lay eldership as follows: 'Governors (1 Cor. xii, 2) I apprehend to have been persons of advanced years, selected from the people to unite with the bishops in giving admonition, and exercising discipline. No other interpretation can be given of 'He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence' (Rom. xii, 8). . . . Now that this was not the regulation of a diocesan archbishop, it is not surprising. This passage, however, occurs first in the 8th edition of the Institutes, 1548; it is not found in the editions of 1568 or 1569. The office of lay elders had existed before among the Unitas Fratrum, who were supposed to have borrowed it from the Waldenses; but these lay elders were more in the way of being superintendents than elders. Calvin himself organized a lay eldership in Geneva, to be elected yearly, and seems afterwards to have sought a Scriptural warrant for it. In so doing he formed a novel theory, viz., that of a two-fold eldership. 'This cardinal assumption of a dual presbyterate was controverted by James Panton in his Presbyterian Churches (1838), and by Thomas Smyth in his Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders (1845). The drift of critical opinion is now decidedly in this direction. It is beginning to be conceded, even among Presbyterians of the staunchest sort, that Calvin was mistaken when he interpreted the expression 'two orders of presbyters' as meaning that two orders of presbyters are not there brought to view, but only one order, the difference referred to being simply that of service, and not of rank. And if this famous passage fails to justify the dual presbyterate, much less must it rely upon the ἐξουσία τῆς ἡττας, that ruleth with diligence' (1 Cor. xi, 28). In short, the pure divino theory of the lay eldership is
steadily losing ground. A better support is sought for it in the New-Testament recognition throughout of the right and propriety of lay participation in Church government; in the general right of the Church, as set forth by Hooker in his Ecclesiastical Polity, to govern itself by whatsoever forms it pleases, provided the great end and purpose be to elevate and in the proved fitness and efficiency of our present Presbyterian polity, as compared either with prelacy on the one side, or Congregationalism on the other’ (Hitchcock, in A. M. Presb. Rev. 1868, p. 253). Dr. Thornwell (Southern Presb. Review, 1863; Spirit of the XIXth Century, in A. M. Presb. Rev. 1863). July, 1867) sets forth a peculiar theory of the divine right of the ruling eldership, viz. that the ruling elder is the presbyter of the N.T., whose only function was to rule, while the preachers were generally selected from the class of elders. This view is also maintained by Breckinridge (Knowledge of God, subjectively considered, p. 629) and is refuted by Dr. Smyth, Princeton Review, vol. xxxiii (see also Princeton Review, xv, 319 sq.). Principal Campbell (Theory of Ruling Elderships, Edinburgh and London, 1866) aims to show that ‘elders’ in the N. T. always means pastor, and never ministerial leader, more than ‘ruling elder’ (see ibid., and For. Exam. Rev., Jan. 1866, p. 222). He shows that the Westminster Assembly, after a long discussion, refused to sanction Calvin’s view; but he seeks to find lay elders, under another name, in Rom. xii, 8; 1 Cor. xii, 28, also in early Church history. For a criticism of his view, and a luminous statement of the whole subject of lay eldership, with a conclusive proof that there is no trace of it in the N. T., see Dr. Hitchcock’s article in the American Presbyterian Review, April, 1868, p. 253 sq. See also an able critical and historical discussion of the subject in Dexter, Congregationalism (Boston, 1865), p. 120 sq. The scriptural right of lay elders is maintained in The divine Right of Church Government, with Dr. Owen’s Argument in Favor of Ruling Elders (New York, 1844, 12mo); in Miller, On Ruling Elders (Presb. Board, 16mo). See also King, Eldership in Christ’s Church (New York, 1865). H. Muhlenberg, On the Office of Ruling Elders; Kerferd, Office of Ruling Elders (London, 1846); Engles, Duties of Ruling Elders (Presb. Board); Smyth, Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders (N. T. 1845, 12mo); Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. ii, ch. xx, § 19; Gieseler, Church History, bk. ii, ch. xix, § 28; Stier, Elements of Church Training, bk. ii, c. vii; Davidson, Eccl. Polity of N. T.; Watson, Theol. Institutions, pt. iv, ch. i; Schaff, Apostolic Church, § 123, 132; Rothe, Anfänge d. christlichen Kirche, § 28, 29; Bilson, Perpetual Government of Christ’s Church, Owen, Works (Edinburgh, 1851), xvi, 504.

Belyad (Heb. Ekd, יִאַדָּא, whom God has appealed; Sept. Εὐθυς, Vulg. Eligens), a descendant of Ephraim (1 Chron. vii, 21), but whether through Shuthelah (v. q.), or a son of the patriarch (the second Shuthelah being taken as a repetition of the first, and Exer and Elyad as his brothers), is not determined (see Berthau, Comment on Chronicles, p. 82). B.C. ante 1356. Perhaps he is the same with ELADAH (q. v.) in the preceding verse, who appears to have survived, if identical with IADAN (Num. xxxvi, 36).

Eileath (Heb. אֵילָה, מֹּדְלָה, whither God has ascended, once Eile’t, אֵילֶּה, Num. xxxii, 37; Sept. Εἰλάθ), a place on the east of Jordan, in the pastoral country, taken possession of and rebuilt by the tribe of Asher (Josh. xiii, 31). We lose sight of it till the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah, by both of whom it is mentioned as a Moabitish town, and, as before, in close connection with Heshbon (Isa. xxv, 4; xvi, 9; Jer. xlviii, 34). It apparently lay close to the border of Reuben and Gad (Josh. xiii, 28). On the decline of Jewish power, Eileath, with the whole Mishor, fell into the hands of the Moabites, and is thus included in the woes pronounced by Isaiah on Moab (xvi, 9); “I will water thee with my tears, O Heshbon and Eleath: for the alarm is fallen upon thy summer fruits, and thy harvest.” Eileath was still a large village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, one mile from Heshbon (Onomasticon, s. v. Εἰλαθ, Elelæa). The extensive and very nearly their ancient name, Εἰλαθ, though with a modern significance, “the high,” a little more than a mile north of Heshbon (Robinson, Researches, ii, 278). It stands on the summit of a rounded hill commanding a very extended view of the plain, and the whole of the southern Bexit (Burckhardt, Reise, ii, 365; Stee- zen, 1864, p. 407). The whole surrounding plain is now desolate. The statements of all travellers who have visited it show how fully the prophetic curses have been executed (Irby and Mangles, 1st ed. p. 471; Ritter, Pfl. and Syr. ii, 1172; G. Robinson’s Pseudo- and Syr. ii, 1180 sq.).

Elyas (Elias, Alex. MS. Αλέκας; Vulg. Elea-, a place at which Judas Maccabaeus encamped before the fatal battle with Baccichides, in which he lost his life (1 Macc. ix, 5). It was apparently not far from Azotus (comp. ver. 15). Josephus (Ant. xii, 11, 1) has Bethzeba (בֶּתֶזֶבָה), by which he elsewhere renders Baytzeba, and this may be but a corrupt writing of Bethzetra or Bethzeba, which is found in some MSS. for Barea in 1 Macc. ix, 4. Elsewhere (War, i, 1, 6), however, Josephus states that Judas lost his life in a battle with the generals of Antiochus Epiphat at Adaia (q. v.), which is probably the correct reading here, since Adaia was where Judas had encamped on a former memorable occasion (1 Macc. vii, 40). It is singular that Bethzetra should be mentioned in this connection also (see verse 19).

Elyasah [many E·layash], the name (in the A. V.) of two men (1 Chron. ii, 89; viii, 37; ix, 43), identical (in the Heb.) with that of two others (Jer. xxii, 5; Ezra x, 22), more properly Anglicized Elyasah (q. v.).

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

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

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

Thus the two branches of the school, or the two schools, starting from the same point, but pursuing divergent courses, arrived at exactly opposite conclusions. The Eleatics disregarded the sensible, the Epicureans the divine element; the former contemplated the imperishable, the latter the perishable aspects of the universe. But one, neither denying what they denounced.

In the present article, the Eleatic School proper will alone be considered; for a notice of the other branch, reference is made to the title Epicurean Philosophy.

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

The Eleatic School is rather united by a common principle than by agreement in the application of the principle (as Aristotle, Metaphysics, i, v). Each distinguished philosopher of the sect creates his own scheme, and differs in procedure and in doctrine from the rest: hence it is impracticable to give any general exposition which will be true for its whole development, and it therefore becomes necessary to consider the peculiar modifications as they assumed in the hands of its successive teachers. The principal exponents of the Eleatic philosophy were Xenophanes, Parmenides, Zeno, and Melipus: the first of these was its founder. The period during which they flourished may be considered to extend over the century preceding the Ptolemaic Age. But the chronological data are confused and uncertain.

_Xenophanes._—Xenophanes of Colophon, in Asia Minor, an exile from his native land, migrated to Sicily, and may have resided in Elee, whose foundation he celebrated verse. The dates are uncertain; but Cousin, in an elaborate essay, fixes his birth in the 40th Olympiad (B.C. 620-616), and he lived nearly a century. His philosophy was presented in a metrical form in his poem On Nature, of which fragments remain, though they are too broken and obscure to give any conception of his tenets. His leading doctrines, as far as they can now be ascertained, appear to have constituted an indistinct, confused, and undeveloped idealism, remarkable at the period of their introduction, but requiring expansion and rectification before they could be arranged in any harmonious system. They are rather germs of thought than precise principles. They needed the acute logical intellect of Parmenides to give them consistency, as the Socratic speculations received definite form from Plato.

Parmenides probably deviated as far from the simple reveries of Xenophanes as Plato did from the practical maxims of Socrates. Xenophanes apparently adopted from Pythagoras, either directly or indirectly, the conclusion that there must be an ultimate term of being, which was not the sensible universe, but the divine intelligence. But Pythagoras distinguished between God and nature; while Xenophanes, by exaggerating, confused this distinction, and resolved everything into a single divine essence. He denied all beginning, and therefore that anything could have existed which had not always been. The doctrine ex nihilo nihil fit had with him a broader and deeper significance than it received from Epicurus, and his Roman expositor, Lucretius. If nothing commences and nothing becomes, then all things are eternal, and all things are one. The unity of the Godhead is this essential against polytheism; the individuality of the Deity against the dualism of conflicting forces. This antagonism to the current creed and prevalent speculations is developed in his attacks on Homer, Hesiod, and the whole Hellenic mythology, and by his earnest repudiation of the world as a mere dream. The possibility of the sensible world is necessarily rejected: God and the universe are identified, and a close approximation is made to Spinozaism, though not without essential differences. The only reality is the divine intelligibility; there is no God, no Spaced are (Diogenes Laërt, ix, x, six). Everything cognizable by the human senses represents merely the accidents and shows of things. The sensible world is in an unceasing flux, but the divine essence is unchanging, unchangeable, unmovable, incapable of being moved, impassive, eternal, infinite, though possessing spherical dimensions. It is uncomprehended, one (πᾶν ἀπόστροφος ἀπὸ δύναμιν—πάν ὁ ἄλογος—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβάνειν—καταλαμβά

De Xeno. i. 1: "unum esse omnia, neque id esse mutabile, et id esse Deum, neque natum unumquemque, et semper- num, cum tam multa spectantur quae sint in hac mundo, quam in aetatibus tuis." All change is but apparent—the restless play of colors on the surface of the immanent Existence—the incessant agitation of the waves on the bosom of the boundless and unalterable deep. There is no denial of the actuality of sensible facts and changes; there is a denial of all accidents which are the hindrances of the eternal, the mists and vapors that disguise and conceal the eternal infinite One.

Unquestionably there are contradictions involved in this scheme, but the acceptance of antinomies is one of the most striking characteristics of the doctrines of Xenophanes. Naturally and necessarily it is necessary to declare all things incomprehensible. Certain knowledge is thus impossible; all truth evaporates into opinion; scepticism is introduced—the scepticism which disregards the sensible as a delusion—the scepticism which excludes the eternal and the divine as unintelligible, or the scepticism which regards truth as unattainable. Thus the fundamental positions of the Eleatics prognosticate the age of the Sophists, and the theories of the Epicureans the Pyrrhonists and the Neo-Platonists. It is not easy to discover the exact mode in which Xenophanes interpreted the order of the sensible creation. The remarkable feature in his cosmogony is that he anticipated geology, and made it the basis of some of his deductions. He thus contributed to science the commencements of that marvellous investigation, and thus the contemplation of the ultimate, the geometrical harmonies of the universe, and divided the Copernican system. It may appear a remarkable incongruity that, after identifying God and the universe, and asserting the infinity, immutability, and eternity of the divine sensible world, the tenets of this school should both have held the periodicity of the destruction of the world—the former by water, the latter by fire. This conclusion may have been suggested
to the earlier philosopher by the fossil remains which he recognized as aqueous deposits; but it also results from the dogma that all things are in a perpetual flux except the one eternal existence. The phenomena change recurrently, the One remains unchanged.

Phenomenon philosophy, in its first eruption, was a crude idealism, an extravagant expression, in moderation in design. It was an anxious attempt to unite the operation of the omnipotence, omnipresence, and unity of the divine Intelligence with the recognition of its continual support and government of the creation. Inadequately, it tries to distinguish the individual abstractions, the materialistic tendencies, and the polytheistic creed of the Hellenic world; but in the endeavor to avoid popular and philosophical errors, it fell into the opposite extreme, and became in tendency, though not in purpose, distinctly pantheistic. It is impossible to estimate the influence between the Creator and the Creation—the distinction and the union of the intelligible and the sensible universe. To these heights the mind of man cannot soar. There is a truth of things sensible and a truth of things spiritual. Neither can be safely disregarded or more appreciated.

The world of matter, with all its changes, the world of mind, with all its intuitions and reasonings, are essentially real as the divine Being on whom they depend. But what the degree and mode of the dependence—when the dependence is interrupted and the laws imposed and put into motion is the hidden spring of natural forces, whom shall define? If Xenophanes ran into errors as hazardous as those which he resisted, he is entitled to indulgent censure when it is considered that he was the first, or among the first, to introduce into Greek speculation worthwhile, if inadequate, conceptions of the grandeur and glory, and ineffable sovereignty of the divine Intelligences.

Parmenides. The most illustrious name produced by the Eleatic School is that of Parmenides, the disciple, probably, of the founder of the sect. He was, by all accounts, a native of Elea (about 536 B.C.), and already from his childhood on, he was the chief cause for the designation habitually bestowed upon this type of philosophy. He is frequently represented as the founder of dialectics, though this distinction is given by Aristotle to his pupil Zeno. He is, however, entitled to the credit of having given a logical development to the views of his famous teacher. So far as any authoritative exposition of his doctrines is concerned, we are in nearly as unfortunate a position as in the case of his predecessor. Insufficient fragments of his philosophical poem are preserved, but the rest of our statements must be obtained in the caricatured, or the polemics of his adversaries, and from the statements of late compilers. He is commended by Aristotle for his perspicacity, and certainly gave greater coherence to the system expounded by him. In doing so he may have improved its form at the expense of its elevation. The divinity of the universal existence disappears; for his point of departure is not the all-embracing Intelligences, but the abstract conception of being. In the main he agrees with Xenophanes, though he presents his tenets in a different order and connection. He states precisely the antithesis of the judgment of the senses and the demonstration of the reason, but he leaves it undeveloped. This has been regarded as his most important addition to the Eleatic metaphysics, though the principle is latent and presupposed in the whole speculations of the earlier philosopher. The antithesis of existence to non-existence, eternal and unchangeable, is a condition of entity and nonentity. What is cannot be non-existent; what is non-existent is not. But everything that is, exists. Hence the universality and unity of existence must be admitted; and as nothing can spring from nothing; or proceed from non-existence to existence, all existence is eternal and unchangeable. There is nothing but being; therefore there is a plenum without any vacua; and all being is thought. Being is limited, but limited only by itself, and embodied in a perfect sphere. It is independent of time, space, and motion, all of which are denied to have any absolute existence. It is a state of everlasting repose. All changes and motions are apparent only; they are mere semblances. On this system being is indissoluble; a dogma which afterward was put upon us unexpectedly in the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, and those with whom he coincides. There is no loss or cessation of existence, only variation of species, or change of apparent condition. Everything is in constant conjunction, in indwelling union. What is involved in the existence by which it is revealed.

There is a singular accordance in the procedure of Parmenides and that of De Cartes. The highest speculations of man roll, like the world on which he dwells, in one self-repeating orbit around the centre of attraction, determined by a single force, precisely described, but never deviating so far as to destroy the uniformity of the course. Contrasted but connected schemes of thought succeed each other in each revolution like the seasons, and all lead up the golden path.

In the physical application of his principles Parmenides recurred, like Xenophanes, to the procedure of the Ionic and Pythagorean schools, admitting antagonistic elements and forces, whose collisions and conjunctions produced the phenomena of the universe. In all the circumstances of his system, the indwelling of the soul and the order and arrangement of the universe is the occupant and impalpability of abstract terms. We are at the mercy of the abracadabra with which the enchantments are attempted. The perplexity and hallucination resulting from loose and elastic phrases was of course most perilous, and least sanctioned before logical science arose, and before metaphysicians distinguished between rigorous thought and current expression.

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

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

Increase of logical precision may give greater consistency and intelligibility to a philosophical system, but it renders its errors and dangers more prominent. This was what was done with Zeno in distinction of the views of Parmenides. In urging the unreliability of the senses, and of inferences from observation, he arrayed experience against reason, and denied the validity of the former. He acknowledged, at the same time, that in the purest science, there is no contradiction of the unity which was alone real existence, and thus invited scepticism and provoked the age of the Sophists.

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

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

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

Literature.—Plato, Sophista; Parmenides; Aristotle, De Xenoephane, Zeno and Gorgias; Metaphysics, lib. i, cap. v.; Diogenes Laertius, Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Civit. s. v. Xenoephane; Roeschmann, Diss. Hist. Philosoph. de Xenoephane (Altona, 1792); Fellenberg, Chrest. de Xenophon, Zeno, Gorgias, Aristotelis milo tributum, partim illustratus (Hal. 1798); Fragmenta de Xenophaneis et Parmenides (Zullichau, 1795); Van der Kemp, Parmenides (Edmè, 1781); Gundling, Observations on the Philosophy of Parmenides; Brandis, Compendium de Xenoephane (Altona, 1794); V. Courtois, Nouveau Essais Philosophiques (Paris, 1828); Rosebery, De Eleastic phils. primordiis (Berl. 1829); Karsten, Philosophorum Graecorum veterum Reliquiae (Bruxelles, 1830); Mullach, Aristoteles de Melianib lib. Deputationes (Berol. 1846); Lewes, Hist. of Philosophy (London, 1867, i, 67 sq.); Ueberweg, Gesch. d. Philosophie, i, 47; and the various historians of Greek philosophy. (G. F. H.)

Eli’azar (Heb. Elazar), ‘‘El’azar, whom God has helped: Sept. and N. T. El’azar; from the Græcised form Ελαζαρ[ου found in Maccabees and Josephus], came by contraction the later name Αζαρ[ου, Αζα-]

r(a), a common name among the Hebrews, being borne by at least six persons mentioned in Scripture, besides several in the Apocrypha and Josephus. See also Eli’azar.

1. The third son of Aaron, by Elisheba, daughter of Amminadab, who was descended from Judah, through Pharez (Exod. vi, 23; xxxvii, 1; for his descent, see Gen. xxxvii, 29; xlvi, 12; Ruth iv, 18, 20). He married a daughter of Putiel, who bore him Phinehas (Exod. vi, 25). After the death of Nadab and Abihu without children (Lev. x, 1; Num. iii, 41), Eleazar was appointed chief over the principal Levites, to have the oversight of those who had charge of the sanctuary (Num. iii, 32). With his brother Ithamar he ministered as a priest during their father's lifetime, and immediately before the death of their father he was invested on Mount Hor with the sacred garments, as the successor of Aaron in the office of high-priest (Num. xx, 1-3). He died two years after the death of Moses (Exod. xxxv, 21), in conjunction with Moses, to superintend the census of the people (Num. xxvi, 3). He also assisted at the inauguration of Joshua, and at the division of spoil taken from the Midianites (Num. xxxvii, 22; xxxvi, 21). After the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, he took part in the distribution of the land (Josh. xiv, 1). The time of his death is not mentioned in Scripture; Josephus says it took place about the same time as Joshua’s, 25 years after the death of Moses. He is said to have been buried in “the hill of Phinehas” his son (Josh. xxiv, 33), where Josephus says his tomb existed (Ant. v, 1, 29), or possibly a town called Gibeath-Phinehas (Gesienithus, Theaur. p. 260, b). The high-priesthood is said to have remained in the family of Eleazar until the time of Eli, a descendant of Ithamar, into whose family, for some reason unknown, it passed until it was restored to the family of Eleazer in the person of Zadok (1 Sam. ii, 27; 1 Chron. vi, 8; xxiv, 3; Kings ii, 27; Josephus, Ant. viii, 1, 3). See High-
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2. An inhabitant of Kirjath-jearim, on the “hill” (פִּקְרֵי-יַרְיִם), who was set apart by his fellow-townsmen to attend upon the ark, while it remained under the roof of his father Abinadab, after it had been brought up to the Hezekians (1 Sam. i, 2). B.C. 1124. His service in this capacity was doubtless somewhat irregular, but justifiable under the circumstances; for there is no evidence that he belonged to the priestly order, although it is probable that he was of a Levitical family (who were not allowed to touch the ark, but had only the general charge of it, Num. iii, 31; iv, 15). He seems to have continued to exercise this sole care of the sacred deposit for the twenty years that intervened till the judgment of Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 1), although the ark remained in the same place much longer (1 Chron. xiii, 7).

3. A Levite, son of Mahli, and grandson of Merari. B.C. c. 1104. He is mentioned as having had only daughters, who were married by their “brethren” (i.e. their cousins) (1 Chron. xxiii, 21, 22; xxvii, 28).

4. The son of Dodo the Ahohite (עִבְרֵי-יַרְיִם), i.e. possibly a descendant of Ahohah, of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 4); one of the three most eminent of David’s friends, who were distinguished by being very brave (1 Chron. xi, 12), who “fought till his hand was weary” in maintaining with David and the other two a daring stand against the Philistines after “the men of Israel had gone away.” He was also one of the same three whose bones broke through the Philistine host to gratify David’s longing for a drink of water from the well of his native Bethlehem (2 Sam. xxiii, 9, 10, 13). B.C. c. 1046. See David.

5. Son of Phinehas, and associated with the priests and Levites in taking charge of the sacred vessels restored to Jerusalem after the Exile (Ex. vii, 53). B.C. 450. He is probably the same with one of those who compassed the walls of Jerusalem on their completion (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446. It does not appear from these passages, however, that he was necessarily a priest or even a Levite.

6. One of the descendants (or citizens) of Paroch, or an Israelite of the laymen who renounced the Gentile wife whom he had married from Babylon (Ezra x, 25). B.C. 410. Possibly he is the same with No. 5.

7. The first-named of the “principal men and learned” sent for by Ezra to accompany him to Jerusalem (Ez. viii, 42), is evidently the Eli’azar (q. v.) of the Heb. text ( Ezra viii, 16).

8. According to Josephus, the Jewish high-priest,
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brother and successor of Simon the Just, and son of Onias I, whose correspondence with Ptolemy Philadelphus resulted in the Septuagint translation being made (Am. xii, 5 sq.; 4, 4). See High Priest.

9. Surnamed Avatar (1 Mac. ii, 5, Αιβάραρ, or Αιβαρος, and so Josephus, Ant. xii, 6, 1; 9, 4. In 1 Macc. x, 18, the name is written Αιβαρος). This singular name is derived from the insertion of C by mistake after O, or from a false division of (Ελαζαρος Αιβαρος), the fourth son of Mattathias, who fell by a noble act of self-de
dedication in an engagement with Antiochus Epiphat, being crushed to death by the fall of an elephant which he had taken in the army in the time of the king, B.C. 164 (1 Mac. vi, 43 sq.; Josephus, Ant. xii, 19, 4; War, i, 1, 5; Ambrose, De offic. min. 40). In a former battle with Nicanor, Eleazar was appointed by Judas to read "the holy book" before the attack, and the watchword in the fight — the "help of God"—was his own name (2 Macc. vii, 29).

The surnamed "Avatar" is probably connected with Arab. καιραρ, "to pierce an animal behind" (Michaelis, s. v.). This derivation seems far better than that of Koldiger (Ebrach u. Gruber, s. v.) from Arabic καιραρ, "to choose, to select, to choose, to appoint." In either case the title is derived from his exploit.

10. A distinguished scribe (Ελαζαρος . . . των πρωτομεταφωνων γραμματιων, 2 Macc. vi, 18) of great age, who suffered martyrdom during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc. vi, 18-51). B.C. cir. 165. Eleazar, as he is generally called by Greek chroniclers, is the hero of the Jewish martyrology (Chrysost. Hom. 3 in Macc. init. Comp. Ambrose, De Jacobo, ii, 10). For the general credibility of the history comp. Grimm, Exerc. ubi 2 Macc. vi, 18-51, in Erg. Hund.; also Ewald, Gesch. 341, 582. See Maccabees.

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

11. The father of Jason, ambassador from Judas Maccabeus to Rome (1 Macc. xiv, 6; 16, 61, 68). See Jason.

12. Son of Eliud and father of Matthathias, who last was the grandfather of Joseph, Christ's reputed father (Matt. i, 15). B.C. cir. 150. See Matthathias.

13. A priest mentioned by Josephus as having charge of the Temple treasures, who sought to divert Orarios from pillaging the sanctuary by the largess of a beam of gold (Am. xiv, 7, 1).

14. A son of Bothus, whom Archelaus put into the high-priesthood in place of his brother Joazar, but soon displaced by Jesus the son of Sie (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 18, 1).

15. Son of Ananus (or Anania), made high-priest in the room of Iasmeal (son of Phabi) by Gratus, who deposed him after one year in favor of Simon son of Camithus (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 2, 2). While a youth, his boldness led him, as precent of the Temple, to advice the Jews to refuse all foreign presents (Josephus, War, ii, 17, 5). He had been seized by the Sicarii as a hostage for ten prisoners of their own number (Ant. xx, 9, 3). He was one of the generals chosen by the Jews for Idumaea during the revolt under Cestius (War, ii, 20, 4).

16. Son of Dineus, a robber who for many years infested the mountains of Searama, whose troop was at length broken up by Cumanus (Josephus, Ant. xx, 6, 1). He was himself captured by stragglers and sent to Rome by Felix (xi, 8, 5). He seems to be the same with the notorious rebel commander of Massada, at whose instigation the desperate garrison committed suicide (War, vii, 8-9; comp. Ant. xx, 1, 1; War, ii, 13, 2).

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

18. A young Jew of great valor in the siege of Ma
cerous by Titus, he and his brothers, Rufus, but released by the Romans on condition of the surrender of the fortress (Josephus, War, vii, 6, 4).

19. A Jewish conjurer whom Josephus speaks of having seen exercise demons in the presence of Ves
pasian and his officers by means of a magical ring or charm (Ant. viii, 2, 10). B.C. 68.

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

21. Son of Simon, and ringleader of the Zealots in the final convulsions of the Jewish nation (Josephus, War, iv, 4, 1). He first appears as possessor of a large amount of plunder from the Romans under Cestius, which gave him control of public affairs (ib. ii, 20, 3). During the siege by Titus he held the Temple against the flames for three days (ib. ii, 7), being supplied by the sacred stores of provisions (ib. 3), but after he formed a coalition with one of these opponents, John of Gischala, who occupied the remainder of the eastern part of the city (ib. v, 6, 1), having lost his vantage by a stratagem of the latter (ib. 3, 1). See the full account under Jerusalem.

Eleazar (in Armenian, Էլեազար), an Armenian patriotic, born at Anthab, in Syria. In 1650, David, the patriarch of Constantiopolis, was ejected from his seat, and Eleazar elected in his place. He held this position only for two years, for in 1652 Philip, the patriarch of Echmiadzin, and supreme head of the Church, arrived at Constantiopolis, expelled Eleazar, and consecrated John of Meghri, who, in turn, was soon ejected by the intrigues of Eleazar. The see then remained vacant for some time. Eleazar went to Jerusalem, in compliance with an invitation of the patriarch of that city, Azduzadzor, who wished his assistance in a quarrel with the Greeks, and promised to make him his successor. While residing in the convent of St. James, Eleazar discovered a treasure of 100,000 pieces of gold and 100,000 pieces of silver. After many troubles with Turkish officials and several imprisonments, he succeeded in obtaining possession of the constantiopolite Church, called after the residence of the chief patriarch of the Armenians, Echmiadzin, and caused himself to be elected independent patriarch of Jerusalem. He was expelled in 1654, and again, after having regained possession of the dignity, in 1668, when he was succeeded by a personal enemy, Martyr. The people, dissatisfied with this change, replaced Azduzadzor, after whose death Eleazar took forcible possession of the patriarchal see. He maintained himself in this position until 1680, when, after the death of James IV, the patriarch of Echmiadzin, he assumed the title of patriarch of all the Armenians. A subsequent election confirmed him in this position, and in 1682 he took up his residence in Echmiadzin. His chief aim as head of the Armenian Church was to put an end to internal dissensions. He died at Echmiadzin in 1691.—Hoefer, Nouv. Rev. Gen., 1891, p. 91.

Eleaza'tius (a strange rendering for Elieza'tes, Alex. MS. Ελειαζαθες, Vulg. Eliazaeath), one of the Leviti
can musicians who married a Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. ix, 24); evidently the Elieza
thus (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 24).

Elect, a term sometimes applied in the ancient Church (1) to the whole body of baptized Christians, who were called Δισυς, i.e., δισυς, saini, elect; (2) to the highest class of catechumens elected to baptism;
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(3) at other times to the newly baptized, as especially admitted to the full privileges of their profession, and sometimes called the perfect.

As of the time being considered the most eminent of Christian professors, were called the elect of the elect, - Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. v, ch. ii, § 5. See Catechumenes.

Electa or Electa (ἐκλεκτά, Aut. Vera, "elect" lady). According to Grotius, Wetstein, and some other critics, this word is used as a proper name in the address of John's second epistle, ὁ Προφήτης ὁ Ἐκλεκτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ — "The Prophet to the Lady Electus." This word is also employed by the bishop of Dunstable in his treatise on the Doctrine of the Greek Article (2d edit. Cambridge, 1289, p. 626-629). He adds in support of it several epistolary inscriptions from Basil, in which the name precedes, and the rank or condition in life is subjoined, such as ἐκλεκτάς ἀδημότας νυμφαῖς — to ἐκλεκτοὶ νυμφαῖς — convict of those, however, are purely homiletic titles. To meet the objection that the sister of the person addressed is also called Electa in verse 13, he suggests that the words ᾳ των ἐκλεκτῶν are a gloss, explanatory of σωτῆς. But this is mere conjecture, unsupported by a single manuscript. He hints that such a gloss, if it occasionally (as bishop Middleton supposes) by the return to the singular number, would more naturally have been inserted after σωτῆς, in which position, however unnecessary, it would at least produce no ambiguity. Some writers, both ancient and modern, have adopted a mystical interpretation of the word, through contrast to the κακομονῆς, and to all apostolic usage, and suppose with Jerome that the term ἐκλεκτοὶ referred to the Church in general, or with Cassiodorus, to some particular congregation. The last-named writer (born A.D. 470, died 520), in his Commentaries in Epistles, etc. (London, 1722, p. 180), says, "Johannes — electa dominus esse, illi, quibus ejus, quae sacros fono generarent." Clemens Alexander, in a fragment of his Ἀδιαματαιαντατα, attempts to let the literal and the apocalyptic meanings—"Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Elec- ta publica, significat autem electum illam ecclesiam sanc- tam" (Opera, ed. Klots, iv, p. 66). The Archdeacon translates the words in question as "the elect lady," an interpretation approved by Castello, Beza, Mill-Wolf, Le Clerc, and Macknight. Most modern critics, however—Schleusner and Breitnerchold, in their lexicon (1831); Vater, in his Commentary, and Tischendorf (1841), in their editions of the N. Testament; Neander (Plating of the Church, ii, 71), De Wette (Lehrbuch, p. 389), and Rucke (Commentary on the Epistles of St. John, p. 314-320, Eng. transl.)—agree with the Syriac and Arabic versions in making θησους a proper name, and render the words "to the elect of the Church." (See Gruter Inscript, p. 1127.) Lardner has given a copious account of critical opinions in his History of the Apocryphal and Pseudoapocryphal, c. xx (Works, vi, 284-288). See also Heumann, De Cyria (Gotting, 1726); Rittmeyer, De Eclipsi Cuius (Hanet, 1780); Knauer, Uber Θησους και Θησους (in Der Theol. Zeitung, u. Krit. v, 452 sq.); Amer. Preb. Rec., Jan. 1867. See Zook (Third Epistle). 

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

1. The account in Acts i, 15 of the choice of an apostle in place of Judas is cited as proof that even the apostles would not elect without the voice of the Church at Jerusalem. So in the choice of the deacons (Acts vi, 2), the "choice Stephen and set him before the apostles." On the other hand, the apostles themselves appointed elders, and St. Paul empowered Titus and Titus to do the same (Acts xiv, 23; 2 Tim. iii, 1; Tit. i, 5); though some interpret the word χωροφύλακαι, in these passages, as implying ordination only and not excluding a previous election by the people. Compare also Acts xv, 1; 1 Cor. xiv, 2; 2 Cor. viii, 19.

2. Clemens Romanus (+100) (Epist. ad Corinthiac, i, § 44) asserts that the apostles appointed bishops and deacons with the concurrence of the whole Church. It is cited as a statement, that in his time the Church had a share in the appointment of its ministers.

Cyprian (+256) testifies to the share of the people in the election of bishops and elders, calling it matter of divine authority that "sacerdos plebe presentat et omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus munus et pontifici vocatur. et testimonio communitatis jussus est" (Epist. 68). Bingham cites Lampadius (Vit. Alex. Socinus, c. 45) as stating that the emperor (A.D. 222-235) gave the people a negative vote in the appointment of procurator, on the express ground that "what the Christians did in the election of their priests and ministers, should certainly be allowed the people in the appointment of governors of provinces."

3. Even after the establishment of the hierarchy, it seems to have been usual for the clergy or presbytery, or the sitting bishop or presbyter, to nominate a person to fill the vacant office, and then for the suffrages of the people—not merely testimonial, but positive suffrages—to be taken. Bingham sums up the facts (Orig. Eccles. bk. iv, chap. ii) in substance as follows: 1. No bishop could be-obtruded upon an orthodox people against their consent (in case a majority were heterodox or schismatics, the case was otherwise provided for) when they agreed upon the person of the bishop, they were usually gratified in their choice. The emperor Valentinian III held it to be a crime in Hilary of Arles that "he ordained bishops against the consent and will of the people." 2. In many cases the voices of the people prevailed against the nominations of the bishops. 3. The modes of voting illustrate the power of the people in the elections; if they were unanimous for or against a man, they cried out "worthy" or "unworthy" (ἀξιός, ἄξιος; dignus, in dignus). If they were divided, they expressed their dissent in aund in tumultus. There are instances in which persons were brought by force to the bishop to be ordained, or were elected to the office by acclaimation. It was decided by the fourth Council of Carthage, that as the bishop might not elect clerics without the advice of his clergy, so likewise he should secure the consent, nomination, and tacit assent of the people. The popular elections, however, became scenes of great disorder and abuse. A remarkable passage from Chrysostom (De Sacerdotibus) has been frequently quoted, and applies more or less to such elections, not only in Constantinople, but also in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and other cities. He enforces the necessity of the people witnessing the proceedings at our public festivals, in which, more especially, according to established rule, the election of ecclesiastical officers take place. You will find there complaints raised against the minister as numerous and as various in their character as the multitude of those who are the subjects of the civil government. For all those in whom the right of election is vested split into factions. It is evident that there is no good understanding, either among themselves, or with the appointed president, or with the presbytery. One supposes, another another, and one another. The son of this is, that they all neglect to look at that point which they ought to consider, namely, the intellectual and moral qualifications of the person to be elected. There are other points by which their choice is determined. One, for instance, says, it is necessary to elect a person who is a good farmer, and another would choose a wealthy person, because he would not require to be supported out of the revenues of the Church. A third votes for a person who has come over from some opposite party. A fourth uses his influence in favor of a relative or friend, while another lends his influence to one who has won him by his own speeches and plausible pretensions. In order to
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set aside these abuses, some bishops claimed an exclusive right of appointing to spiritual offices. In this way they gave offence to the people. In the Latin and African churches an attempt was made to secure greater simplicity in elections by introducing intercessors or "visitors." This did not, however, long continue. Another plan was to vest the election in municipal officials. This was attempted by J. A. a. v.; Riddle, Christan Antiquities, bk. iii, chap. xv.; Coleman, Christian Antiquities, chap. v. See Patronage.

Election of Grace.—On the history of the doctrine of Election, see ARMINIANISM; PREDESTINATION; LAW OF GOD; LAW OF GRACE in INDEX. I. A. a. v.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, bk. iii, chap. xv.; Coleman, Christian Antiquities, chap. v. See Patronage.

Election from the Calvinistic or Calvinst point of view, by Rev. C. Hodge, D.D., of Princeton; II. A statement of the doctrine from the Methodist point of view; III. Some other conceptions of the doctrine.

1. Election from the Calvinst Point of View.—The Scriptures speak, 1st, of the election of individuals to office, or to positions of honor and privilege. Thus Abraham was chosen to be the father of the faithful, and the depositary of the promise of redemption. Thus Jacob was chosen, in preference to Esau, to be the progenitor of the chosen people. In like manner, Saul was chosen by God to be king over Israel, and subsequently David, and after him Solomon, were selected for the same high dignity. Thus also the prophets, and, under the new dispensation, the apostles, were chosen to take their places among the great assembly of Christ's followers. The Bible speaks of the election of nations to special privileges. The Hebrews were chosen from all the nations of the earth to be God's peculiar people. To them were committed the oracles of God. They were his inheritance. They received from him their laws and their religion, and were under his special guidance and protection. In Deut. vii, 6, it is said, "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." xxxii, 9, "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is his lot by inheritance;" or, Rom. ix, 4, "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving to the law, and the service of God, and the promises." 8d. Besides election of individuals and of nations to external advantages, the Scriptures speak of an election to salvation: 2 Thess. ii, 13, "We are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Of this election to eternal life all Augustinians teach, first, that its objects are not nations, nor communities, nor classes of persons, but individuals. 1. Because neither the nations nor communities, as such, are saved. God did not choose all the nation of the Jews to salvation. Neither does he choose the nations of Christendom to eternal life; nor any organized Church, whether Papal or Protestant. The heirs of salvation are individual men. 2. Because those chosen to salvation are chosen to "sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. They are chosen "to be holy and without blame before him in love" (Eph. i, 4). They are elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. i, 2). But nations and communities are not sanctified, or obedient, or unblamable before God in love.

We accordingly find that the elect are always addressed as individuals. Paul, when writing to a number of persons residing in "the province of Macedonia and Thessalonica," hath chosen you to salvation." Writing to the Ephesians, he says, "God hath chosen us," "having predestinated us." Our Lord (John xiii, 18) says, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen;" and again (John vi, 37), "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." John xvii, 3, "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Ver. 9, "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me; I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. Therefore, clearly teach that the elect are certain individuals chosen out of the world to be the heirs of salvation.

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

That such is the doctrine of the Scriptures on this subject is argued, 1. Because the Bible expressly says that election is of grace and not of works. It is not of works means that it is not what a man does that determines whether he is to be one of the elect or not. The apostle, in Rom. xi, 11, teaches that the choice of Jacob instead of Esau was made and announced before their birth,"that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth." He was not not chosen, but was spoken of to be eternal life or to temporal advantages. The apostle refers to this incident in proof of God's sovereignty, and therefore be infers from it, "It is not of him that willleth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (ver. 16). In like manner, in ch. xi of the same epistle, he refers to the election made in the Old Test. to Elias: "I have reserved unto myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal;" and adds, "Even so, then, at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace" (ver. 4-6). The mass of the Jews were cast off. A remnant was saved. That remnant consisted of those whom God chose. His choice was a sovereign one. It was of grace, and not of works. It was determined before the foundation of the world, and not by the good pleasure of God, or by the good pleasure of the objects of that choice had done. Paul himself belonged to that remnant. He was an illustrous example of the sovereignty of God in election. He had done nothing to secure the favor of God. He was chosen to eternal life because he repented and believed. He was converted not because he had faithfully used the means of securing a knowledge of Christ. On the contrary, he was converted in the midst of his wicked career of persecution. He was brought to faith and repentance because, as our Lord says, "He was a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts ix,
Paul's experience, as well as the teaching of the Holy Spirit, impressed upon his mind a deep conviction of the sovereignty of God in the salvation of men. He knew he had been chosen not for, but notwithstanding, his previous character and conduct. And he knew that, had he not been thus chosen, he would have perished forever. It is not surprising, therefore, that he valued this doctrine, or that he so often refers to himself as a monument of the grace of God in the election and salvation of sinners. In his epistle to the Galatians, after reviewing the doctrine that he had "beyond measure persecuted the Church of God," he adds, "It pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me" (Gal. 1:15). See also Acts xxii, 14; 1 Cor. xxv. 9; 1 Tim. i, 15, 16: "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all suffering, for a pattern to them which hereafter believe in him to life everlasting." Nothing could have pinned the apostle more than that one should attribute his own conversion to himself. His constant and grateful acknowledgment was, "By the grace of God I am what I am." The negative statement that election is "not of works," is often, as in the passages above cited, connected with the positive assertion that it is of grace, or due to the sovereignty of God. 

2. It is, however, merely in isolated passages that this doctrine is taught; it is elaborately proved and vindicated. Thus, in 1 Cor. i, 17-31, the opponents of Paul in Corinth had urged against him that he had never been chosen before the foundation of the world, to be holy and without blame before him in love (v. 4). He had thus chosen them to holiness, because he had, according to the good pleasure of his will, precedented them to the high dignity of sonship (v. 5). He had thus predestined them to be his sons, in order to glorify his grace or unmerited love (v. 6). In these few verses the whole Augustinian doctrine on this subject is stated with the utmost clearness and precision.

In the 8th chapter of the epistle to the Romans, the design of the apostle is to show the security of believers. Those who are in Christ shall never be condemned; because they are justified; because they have the principle of spiritual life through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; because they are the children of God; because the Spirit makes intercession for them; because he thus predestinates, he effectually calls or renews, all whom he predestinates, he calls; whom he calls, he justifies: whom he justifies, he glorifies. This is a chain which cannot be broken. Those in whom he fixes his choice, he predestines, as said in the Ephe- sians, to be his sons and daughters; and those whom he thus predestinates, he effectually calls or renews, all whom he predestinates; he calls; whom he calls, he justifies; whom he justifies, he glorifies. All this the apostle confirms by a reference to the infinite and immutable love of God. "If God so loved us," he argues, "that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us, how shall he not with him freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." It was a natural objection to the apostle's doctrine that God was not in such a manner absolutely sovereign, but that God, in his mercy, must consider the will of man; that it involved a violation of his promise to the patriarch Abraham. To this objection he gives, in the ninth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, a twofold answer. The one is, that the promise of salvation pertained not to the natural, but to the spiritual children of Abraham; not to Abraham and his sons, but to the Iσραηλ επτὰ νήσιμα. The other is, that God acts as a sovereign in the dispensation both of temporal and of spiritual blessings. This he illustrates in the choice of Isaac instead of Ishmael, and of Jacob instead of Esau. Besides, he expressly claims this prerogative, saying to Moses, "He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." To the objection that it is unjust thus to dispense or withhold mercy at his own good pleasure, Paul's answer is, that any attribute which the Scriptures ascribe to God is inoperative with him but in his disposition; in those cases, we must admit rightfully to belong to him. If God, in his Word, claims this prerogative of having mercy on whom he will have mercy, and if he actually exercises it in his providence, and in the dispensation of his grace, it is the exercise of his freedom and justice, and men are not to complain or protest. The judge of all the earth must do right. Besides, as the inspired writer continues his argument, if the potter has the right of the same mass of clay to make one vessel to honor and another to dishonor, has not the infinite-God the same right over his fallen creatures, if he chooses to admit them to freedom, and to bless them, and to cast them away? If he does not destine his mercy, it saves some of the guilty children of men, and to manifest his justice he allows others to bear the just recompense of their sins? This is only doing what every good and wise human sovereign is expected and required to do.

It can be said, "He did not define the character of the apostle's doctrine is determined by the objections to it. Had he taught that God chooses as vessels of mercy those who he foresees will believe, and leaves to perish those who he foresees will reject the Gospel, there he would have answered the objections of the Jews. It was because he taught that God gave repentance and faith to some and not to others that his opponents charged him with teaching what was inconsistent with impartial justice on the part of God.

5. God is sovereign in the election of the heirs of salvation is plain, because men are chosen to holiness; faith and repentance are gifts of God, and fruits of his Spirit. If it is election to salvation which secures repentance and faith, repentance and faith cannot be the ground of election. The passages of Scripture already quoted distinctly assert that election precedes and is the exercise of faith. In Eph. i, 4, it is referred to "the mighty power of God," which wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. In 1 Pet. i, 2, it is said, we are elected, unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Vocation, that is, regeneration, the fruits of which are faith and holiness, is taught in Rom. viii, 30, whom he did predestinate, them he also called." In a preceding verse of that chapter, it is said, we are predestinated
to be conformed to the image of his Son." But conformity to the image of Christ includes all that is good in us. Christ was exalted "to give repentance and forgiveness of sin" (Acts v. 31). "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth" (2 Tim. ii. 25).

Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God taken from the hand of this world to be rich in faith" (James ii. 5). "It is of him ye are in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 30). It is, however, unnecessary to multiply quotations. The Bible is full of the doctrine that regeneration is the gift of God; that the remission of sins is a free gift of his Spirit. All Christians recognize this truth in their prayers. They pray earnestly for the conversion of those dear to them. This takes for granted that God can and does change the heart; that all that pertains to salvation, the means as well as the end, are his gift, though not necessarily to enemies. It is mysterious love. It is compared to the instinctive love of a mother for her child, which is independent of its attractions. This is the most wonderful, and, perhaps, the most glorious of all the known attributes of God. It is distinctly told that the spiritual object of the redemption of man was the restoration of this divine perfection; it was for the manifestation "of the glory of the riches of his grace" (Eph. i, 6). He hath quickened us, raised us up, made us sit in heavenly places, "that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 6-7). Such being the design of redemption, it must, in all its stages, be a work of grace. It was a matter of grace that redemption was provided for man and not for angels; it was a matter of grace that God gave his Son for our salvation. To make the mission of the Son a matter of justice, something to which our fallen race had a righteous claim, would alter the whole character of the Bible. The incarnation, sufferings, and death of the Son of God are everywhere set forth as manifestations of the unmerited and infinite love of God. But if a man who from the beginning of the world is a child of men, it was a matter of grace that the knowledge of the plan of salvation was communicated to some and not to others—to the Jews and not to the Gentiles. It is of grace that any sinner is justified, that he is made a Saint by this act of God. Everything that is said of salvation is of grace. To introduce the element of works or merit into any part of the plan vitiates its character. It is expressly taught that regeneration or conversion, the fact that one man is converted and not another, is a matter of grace. This is what the apostle specially insists upon in the first chapter to the Corinthians, already referred to. He calls upon his readers to look at their calling, to see who among them were called. It was not the wise or the great, but the foolish and the insignificant, whom God chose, for the very purpose that no flesh should glory in his presence. It was necessary that riches should be of the kindred of Christ, that the move in which it reveals itself in the heart of the believer. His theory may be one thing, but his inward and, it may be added, his delightful consciousness is that he owes his salvation to the grace of God alone.

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

6. The system of doctrine with which these views are connected is frequently designated as Pauline. But this is a misnomer. Although clearly taught by the apostle Paul, these views are far from being peculiar to his writings. They not only pervade the Scriptures, but were inculcated with greater solemnity, clearness, and frequency in the teaching of his beloved disciple, John, and in the teaching of any other of the messengers of God. He constantly addressed men as in a hopeless and helpless state of sin and misery, from which nothing but the almighty power of God could deliver them. Of the mass of mankind thus lying under the just displeasure of God, he speaks as having been delivered from their sins by the blood of Christ, given him, who should certainly come to him, and whom he would without fail bring into his heavenly kingdom. He constantly refers to the good pleasure of God as the only assignable reason why one is saved and not another.

At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight" (Matt. xi. 25, 26). "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God; but to the sons in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand" (Luke viii. 10). 

All that the Father hath given me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him the Father giveth him eternal life (John v. 24). "No man can come to me except the Father draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day" (v. 44). "No man can come to me except it were given unto him of my Father." (v. 66). "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world" (John xv. 19). "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. Your sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father who hath given them is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one" (John x, 28-29).

"Thine were they, and thou gavest them me" (v. 6). I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine" (v. 9). "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me" (v. 11). "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me in my glory." Our Lord thus teaches that those who are saved are certain persons chosen out of the world and given
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To him by the Father; that those thus given to him certainly come to him; that this certainty is secured by the drawing of the Father; and that those thus given to him are certainly saved.

7. There is an intimate relation between truth and Christ, and the heart. The one concords with the other. What the Bible teaches of the sinfulness of man, the believer feels to be true concerning himself. What it teaches of the helplessness and dependence of the sinner, his own experience teaches him to be true; what is said of the nature and effects of faith answers to what he finds in his heart. He thus sees, that the Bible teaches that it is of God, and not of himself, that the believer is in Christ Jesus; that he, and not others, repent and believe; that he has been made to hear the divine voice, while others remain deaf—this will find a response in the heart of the experienced Christian. We consequently find all these truths impressed upon the common consciousness of the Church, as it finds expression in its liturgies, its prayers, praises, and confessions. "Not unto us, not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be the glory," is the spon- taneous cry of the Church. If we consider her history as experimental religion, in the theology of the heart, that the children of God differ, but in the form in which the understanding undertakes to reduce these facts of Scripture experience to logical consistency.

8. As there is this correspondence between the two, there is a great analogy between them. There is a like analogy between the providence of God and the dispensations of his grace. He is not more sovereign in the one than in the other. It is of him that we were born in a Christian land and not heathendom; among English instead of in Spain or Italy; of Christian parents and in the bosom of the Church instead of being the children of the irreligious and immoral. It is in the "Lord that maketh poor and maketh rich; he bringeth low and lifteth up" (1 Sam. ii. 7). "God putteth down one and setteth another" (Ps. 103. 17). "It is he that giveth power over to the rich" (Deut. viii. 18). "Be giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them who know understanding" (Dan. ii. 12). "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he wills" (iv, 17). The Bible is full of this doctrine. God governs all his creatures and all their actions. "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Eph. i. 11). This is a truth of even natural religion; at least it is recognised by all Christians. They pray for favorable seasons, for protection from disease and accident, and from the machinations of their enemies. When the pestilence sweeps over the land, the Christian takes as an expression of heavenly will, what Solomon has said; if it be the Lord's will, he will show the judgment of God. All that Augustinians teach concerning election is, that God acts in the dispensation of grace as he does in his providential government of the world. If sovereignty be consistent with justice and goodness in the one case, it must be in the other.

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

The importance of the doctrine in question arises from the fact that it is the doctrine, as far as it can be gathered from the Bible, and as it is made known in the Church through the means of grace, the doctrine, as far as it can be gathered from the Bible, and as it is made known in the Church through the means of grace, the doctrine of the Spirit common to all who hear the Gospel, all would continue in their sins. Had not Christ by his condescension healed our external nature, we should have been sealed; had he not opened some sightless eyes, all the blind would have continued in darkness.

The practical effect of the doctrine that we are entirely helpless in our sin and guilt, lying at the mercy of God, is to lead us to cast ourselves at his feet, saying, "Not me, but you, Lord." Just as lumps of gold are hard to melt, so we have to melt and be disposed of by the fire. Blind and leprous, under a sense of helplessness and misery, crowded to Christ for healing, so souls burned with the leprosy of sin are constrained to look to him for help, and those who come to him he will in no wise cast out. (Cf. Par. in end.)

II. The Doctrine of Election from the Arminian Point of View. —I. John Wesley sums up his view of election as follows: "I believe it commonly means one of these two things: (1.) A divine appointment of some particular men to do some particular work in the world; (2.) The election I believe is to be not only personal, but absolute and unconditional. Thus Cyrus was elected to rebuild the Temple, and St. Paul, with the twelve, to preach the Gospel. But I do not find this to have any necessary connection with eternal happiness. Nay, it is plain it has not; for one who is elected to the office of a king is not elected to the counsel of his own will" (Ps. 45. 17). It is a truth of even natural religion; at least it is recognised by all Christians. This is a truth of even natural religion; at least it is recognised by all Christians. They pray for favorable seasons, for protection from disease and accident, and from the machinations of their enemies. When the pestilence sweeps over the land, the Christian takes as an expression of heavenly will, what Solomon has said: if it be the Lord's will, he will show the judgment of God. All that Augustinians teach concerning election is, that God acts in the dispensation of grace as he does in his providential government of the world. If sovereignty be consistent with justice and goodness in the one case, it must be in the other.

The difficulty which is usually felt on this subject arises from looking at only one aspect of the case. It is true that God gives health, wisdom, riches, power, the knowledge of the truth, saving grace, and life everywhere. But in the good providence he exercises the prerogative of having mercy upon whom he will have mercy. It is true that in what fact occurs God intended to permit. Although he can, as all Christians admit, control the acts of free agents, he permits the fall of man. He permits the presence among of sin, and the presence of multitudes perish in their sins, it is undeniable that God intended, for wise reasons, to permit them to perish. While all this is true, it is no less true that he never interferes with the free agency of his rational creatures. He permits the acquisition of wealth the end of his life, he is perfectly free in forming that determination. If he determines by diligence and honesty to accomplish his
or, as St. Peter expresses it, 'elect according to the
terms elect, chosen, and peculiar in the New Testa-
ment, when the apostles are writing to the churches.
This, however, does not explain fully the reason for
the use of these terms. The abrogation of the church-
state of the Jews and the acknowledgment of the
equality with Jews as the people of God, will account
for the adoption of this phraseology. The reason
of their peculiar existence as a nation ceased with
the coming of Christ, for he was a light to lighten the
Gentiles, as well as the glory of his people Israel.
There was no need to continue the distinction of
be composed of Jews, not by virtue of their natural
descent, but by faith in Christ ; and of Gentiles of all
nations, also believers, and placed on an equal ground
with the believing Jews (see Rom. xi). It is easy,
therefore, to see what is the import of the 'calling'
and 'election' of the Christian Church, as spoken of
in the New Testament. It was not the calling and
the electing of one nation in particular to succeed
the Jews, but it was the calling and the electing of believ-
ers in all nations; nowhere, the Gospel should be
preached, to be in reality, what it was technically;
and therefore in an inferior degree, had been—the vis-
ible Church of God, 'his people,' under Christ 'the
head;' with an authenticated revelation; with an ap-
pointed ministry, never to be lost; with authorized
worship; with holy days and festivals; with instituted
forms of initiation; and with special protection and
favor.

Now what were the effects of this election? (1.)
Plainly the ancient election of the Jews to be God's
peculiar people did not secure the salvation of every
Jew individually, nor did it exclude the non-elect
Gentiles from adequate means of salvation ; nay, the elec-
tion of the Jews was intended for the benefit of the
Gentiles—to restrain idolatry and diffuse spiritual
truth. (2.) As to the election of the Christian Church,
it does not infallibly secure the salvation of every
member thereof, nor prevent anything against the saving mercy of God being still extended
to those who are out of the Church; nay, the very
election of Christians (who are the 'salt' of the earth)
is intended to bring those who are still in 'the world'
to Christ.

This collective election is often confounded by Cal-
vinists with personal election. This is especially done in the interpretation of Paul's argument in Romans
xxi. But a just exegesis of these chapters shows that
they can be interpreted only of collective elec-
tion, not of personal election (see the full examin-
ation of this question, ii. 88.); personal election, the
apostle does, indeed, treat of unconditional election in
this discourse, but it is of unconditional collective
election.

The third kind is personal election of individuals
to be the children of God. Our Lord says, 'I have
chosen you out of the world.' St. Peter says, 'Elect
according to the foreknowledge of God the Father,
through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and
sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.' Then elec-
tion must take place in time, and must be subsequent
to the administration of the means of salvation. The
calling goes before the 'election,' and the 'sprink-
ling of the blood of Christ' before that 'sanctifica-
tion' through which they become the 'elect' of God.
In a word, 'the elect' are the body of true believers;
and personal election into the family of God is through
personal calling of all who truly believe; and all to whom the Gospel is sent have, through the
grace that accompanies it, the power to believe placed
within their reach; and all such might, therefore, at-
tain to the grace of personal election. The doctrine
of personal election is therefore brought down to its
true meaning. Actual election can never exist, neither
from eternity the elect were not actually chosen out
of the world, and from eternity they could not be
'sanctified unto obedience.' The phrases 'eternal
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the Arminian doctrine is that it "subverts grace!" How? Because "it is not an act of grace for the Most High to do justice!" Does this mean that God cannot be at once gracious and just? Grace, in this discussion, is not opposed to justice (this is the doctrine, but not that of grace), but by his own faithfulness, to offer salvation in Christ to all who fell in Adam. This is the doctrine of Arminians; this, too, is the doctrine of Scripture. The Gospel system is called by St. Paul the "grace of God, given to us in Christ Jesus." And he tells us that "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men (ἡ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων πάνω καὶ άδιανθρώπων) hath appeared" (Tit. ii. 11); that the living God is the Saviour of all men, especially those that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10); that he will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4). According to the Gospel scheme, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." This ἀνέγνωσμα Θεος is his determinate counsel—a decree of his good pleasure. "Not, however, that it would have been better for them to have perished rather than to have come to this pass to perish; the divine goodness forbids such a supposition. The simple meaning is that no external necessity compelled him to it, and that it was his free grace, without desert or worthiness on the part of man." (Knapp, Theol. § 88). Were God bound, by any peremptory necessity in man, to restore from death the sacerdotal doctrine of the eternal salvation of infants; nor, finally, with the proper end of punitive justice, which is, to deter men from sin, and to add strength to the law of God.

b. As to the second branch of this doctrine, viz., that personal election is unconditional. (1) According to this doctrine, the Church of God is constituted on the principle of the divine purpose, not upon the basis of faith and obedience, which manifestly contradicts the Word of God, according to which Christ's Church is composed not merely of men, as Peter, James, and John, but of Peter, James, and John believing and obeying, while all who "believe and obey," and obey them are of the world, not of the chosen. (2) This doctrine of election without respect to faith contradicts the history of the commencement and first constitution of the Church of Christ. The first disciples became such as the Word of God, before God's men were required to believe, so that their actual election had respect to faith. (8) There is no such doctrine in Scripture as the election of individuals unto faith, and it is inconsistent with several passages which speak expressly of personal election, e.g. John xv. 19; 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 13. 14. (4) There is another class of texts in which the term election occurs, referring to believers, not personally, but as a body forming the Church of Christ, which texts, containing the word election, are ingeniously applied to the support of the doctrine of the unconditional personal election, when in fact they do not contain it. Such is Eph. i. 4, 5. Now in regard to this text, it might be shown (a) that if personal election were contained in it, the choice spoken of is not of men merely, but of believing men; but (b) it does not contain the doctrine of personal election, but conveys the idea that Christ had his Church in view, and desires that his name may be glorified in the church, and his Church have the honor and glory of the world. (3) It is, indeed, the doctrine of the elect unbeliefers (c) and how can the Spirit of truth convince such of sin and danger, when they are, in fact, in no danger? The fundamental objection made by Calvinists to
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(1) from materialists) on the one hand, and of the various schemes of modified Augustinianism which have been proposed within the theocentric sphere as substitutes for extreme Calvinism, as Baxterianism, the so-called moderate Calvinism (q. v.) and the New-England Theology (q. v.).

1. Dr. Nevin (Mercer's Church Reviser, April, 1845, not with-drawn from the vineyard point of view) конструировал the New-Testament idea of election with the Calvinistic as follows: "Are the references to the idea of election in the New Testament such, as a general thing, that they may be fairly construed in the known and established sense of the Calvinistic dogma; or are they restricted to a condition of existence requisite to a true basis of the doctrine of election is given in the Lutheran doctrine of universal grace and conditional decrees" (§ 206-210).

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

2. Martensen (Christian Dogmatik, Edinb. 1866), a modern Lutheran divine, remarks that Calvin "con-
that all boles consist of certain first, specific ingredients (στρογγυλικά), into which they are all resolvable, although different opinions prevailed respecting the number and nature of these primary constituents of things. Hesychius explains στρογγυλικά by πύρι, πυρίων, introducing also πολύμορφον, these being the elements of woods; also the elements, rudiments, or first principles of any art or science.

The word occurs in its primary sense, Wis. vii. 17, στρογγυλος κόσμον και ειπταρχοι στρογγυλικά, "the constitution of the world and the operation of the elements," also in Jer. ii. 18, στρογγυλα "the elements burning will be dissolved and melted." The Jews, in Peter's time, spoke of four elements (Josephus, Ant. iii. 1, 7).

The word occurs in a secondary sense in Gal. iv. 8-9, τοις γαρ στρογγυλικά και μεταξίωσαν, "the elements, rudiments of the world," which the apostle calls ανθρώπων και πυρίων στρογγυλικών, "weak and poor elements." He introduces the word to preserve the unity of his comparison of the law to a pedagogue (iii. 24), and of persons under it to children under tutors; and by the elements or rudiments of the world he evidently means that state of religious knowledge which had subsisted in the world, among Jews and Gentiles, before Christ; the weakness of which, among the Jews, may be seen in Heb. vii. 18, 19, x. 1; and among the Gentiles, in the apostle to the Romans, passim. The "elements of the world" occurs again, Col. ii. 8-20, in the same sense, as appears from the various allusions both to the terms used in Grecian philosophy, and the dogmas of the Judaizers in the subsequent verses; the phrase being possibly suggested to the apostle by his previous use of it to describe the elements of the world (Col. i. 18). The word occurs in Heb. vi. 12, is restricted, by the addition ταν αυτών τοις φύσει, to the rudiments of Christianity (see Rosenmüller and Benson on the passages).

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

ELEPHANT. See JONATH.-ELEPH.-RECHO-KIN.

'Eleph (Heb. with the art. ha-'Eleph, ה'לֵּפ, Vulg. Eleph), one of the second group of towns allotted to Benjamin, and named between Zelah and Jerusalem (Josh. xviii. 28). It is possibly the ruined site marked as Kattana on Van de Velde's 'Map of the environs of Jerusalem,' about one mile S.W. of Jerusalem. The Sept. unites the preceding name with this, and under the latter the evidence mete, east, west, and air, of which bodies are formed. This, which is the simplest, may be called the primary sense of the word. A secondary use of the word relates to the organized parts of which anything is framed, as the letters of the alphabet (Hesychius gives also γυμνόμενοι), these being the elements of works; also the elements, rudiments, or first principles of any art or science.

The word occurs in its primary sense, Wis. vii. 17, στρογγυλος κόσμον και ειπταρχοι στρογγυλικά, "the constitution of the world and the operation of the elements," also in Jer. ii. 18, στρογγυλα "the elements burning will be dissolved and melted." The Jews, in Peter's time, spoke of four elements (Josephus, Ant. iii. 1, 7).

The word occurs in a secondary sense in Gal. iv. 8-9, τοις γαρ στρογγυλικά και μεταξίωσαν, "the elements, rudiments of the world," which the apostle calls ανθρώπων και πυρίων στρογγυλικών, "weak and poor elements." He introduces the word to preserve the unity of his comparison of the law to a pedagogue (iii. 24), and of persons under it to children under tutors; and by the elements or rudiments of the world he evidently means that state of religious knowledge which had subsisted in the world, among Jews and Gentiles, before Christ; the weakness of which, among the Jews, may be seen in Heb. vii. 18, 19, x. 1; and among the Gentiles, in the apostle to the Romans, passim. The "elements of the world" occurs again, Col. ii. 8-20, in the same sense, as appears from the various allusions both to the terms used in Grecian philosophy, and the dogmas of the Judaizers in the subsequent verses; the phrase being possibly suggested to the apostle by his previous use of it to describe the elements of the world (Col. i. 18). The word occurs in Heb. vi. 12, is restricted, by the addition ταν αυτών τοις φύσει, to the rudiments of Christianity (see Rosenmüller and Benson on the passages).

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

Elephant (African) does not occur in the text of the canonical Scriptures of the A. V., except in the adj. λαχθατισμός, "of ivory," Rev. xviii. 12. But the animal is believed to be referred to in the Heb. בֵּיתוֹ, ορφέων, "elephant's tooth, i. e. "ivory," 1 Kings x. 22; 2 Chron. ix. 21. See IVORY. Some have also regarded it as identical with the בֵּיתוֹ, "house of ivory," as in the margin of Job x. 15, 15. Elephants, however, are repeatedly mentioned in the 1st and 20th books of Maccabees as being used in warfare. The way in which they were used in battle, and the method of exciting them to fight, is described in 1 Macc. vii. The essential syllable of the Greek (and modern) name seems to be derived from that which all the nations of the south and west of Asia have for many ages generally used, namely, φίλ, φιλ, phel, phil, βήλος: for we find it in the Chal. (בֵּיתוֹ, pîlu, Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1722), Syr. (תַּנִּי), Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, extending to the east far beyond the Ganges, where, nevertheless, in the indigenous tongues, anei, waranam, and katti are existing names. See (Cassel, Die reinr elefant, denomi- na. ttr. i. i. 136 sqq.; Zeichn. f. Kunde des Morgenl. i. iv. 12 sqq. It is well known that these animals were ancienly employed in battles, originally in India (Aristotle,
ELEPHANT

Asiat. elephant. The animals of this genus consist at present of two very distinct species, one a native of Southern Asia, once spread considerably to the westward of the Indus, and the other occupying southern and middle Africa to the edge of the great Sahara. In a fossil state, however, there are six more species clearly distinguished. The elephant is the largest of all terrestrial animals, sometimes attaining above eleven feet of vertical height at the shoulders, and weighing from five to seven thousand pounds: he is of a black or slatey-black color, and almost destitute of hair. The head, which is proportionally large, is provided with two broad pendulous ears, particularly in those of the African species, which are occasionally six feet in length. This species has also two molar teeth on each side of the jaw, both above and below, and only one toe-nail on each of the hind feet, whereas the Asiatic species is provided with only one tooth on each side above and below, and, though both have tusks or defences, the last mentioned has them confined solely to the males: they are never of more than 70 pounds in weight, often much less, and in some breeds even totally wanting; while in the African both sexes are armed with tusks, and in the males they have been known seven feet in length, and weighing above 150 pounds each. The forehead of the African is low, that of the Asiatic high; in both the eyes are comparatively small, with a malevolent expression, and on the temples are pores which exude a viscous humor; the tail is long, hanging nearly to the heels, and distichous at the end. But the most remarkable organ of the elephant, that which equally enables the animal to reach the ground and to grasp and to hold a trunk, is the proboscis or trunk—a cylindrical elastic instrument, in ordinary condition reaching nearly down to the ground, but contractile to two thirds of its usual length, and extensible to one third beyond it; provided with nearly 4000 muscles crossing each other in such a manner that the proboscis is flexible in every direction, and so abundantly supplied with nerves as to render the organ one of the most delicate in nature. Within is the double canal of the nostrils, and at the terminal opening a finger-like process, with which the animal can take up very minute objects and grasp others, even to a writing
pen, and mark paper with it. By means of the pro-
boscis the elephant has a power of suction capable of
raising nearly 200 pounds' weight; and with this in-
strument he gathers food from trees and from the
erth, draws up drink to squirt it down his throat,
draws corks, unties small knots, and performs num-
berless other minutes of service. There are two
 tears down branches of trees more than five inches in
diameter with no less dexterity than strength. The
gait of an elephant is an enormous stride, performed
with his high and ponderous legs, and sufficiently rap-
id to require brisk galloping on horseback to outstrip
him, though a great deal of foaming at the mouth
is incurred. In the presence of men these animals;
sociable among themselves, and ready to help each other;
gregarious in grassy plains, but more
inclined to frequent densely-wooded mountain gorges;
at times not unwilling to visit the more arid wastes,
but contrived to avoid it for, being easily washed
through mud and water among reeds and under the shade
of trees. They are most assuredly more sagacious than
observers, who, from a few visits to menageries, com-
pare them with dogs, are able to appreciate, for on this
question we must take into account, on the one hand, the
individual experience gained by an animal slow in
growth, and of a longevity exceeding a century, but
still placed in contact with man after a birth free in
every sense, where his powers expand without human
education; while, on the other hand, dogs are the off-
spring of a few years, and all the education of dogs
is fashioned to the will of a master, and consequently with
innate dispositions to acquire a certain education. In
Griffith's 'Cruiser' are found several anecdotes illustrating
the sagacity of these animals, to which we shall add only
a single one, related by the late Captain Hobson,
R. N., as observed by himself at Travancore, where
several of these animals were employed in stacking
teak-timber balks. They had scarcely any human aid
or direction, but each beam being successively noosed
and slung, they dragged it to the stack, raised one end
up, as contrived to show it forward, nicely watching
when, being poised by its own weight, the lower end
would rise, and then, placing their foreheads against
the butt end, they pushed it even on the stack; the
sling they unfastened and carried back to have it
fitted
again. In a wild state no other animal has the
ease with which they can carry heavy branches of
such forest trees, or use it as a fan, and use it as a brush to drive away flies.
The Asiatic species, carrying the head higher, has
more dignity of appearance, and is believed to have
more sagacity and courage than the African, which,
however, is not inferior in weight or bulk, and has
never been tamed. It is held only in the East Indies as
a native of the Indian Peninsula, and by the Indians
as the Mohauts, are who have acquired such
deep knowledge of the character of these beasts that
they make them submit to almost incredible opera-
tions; such, for example, as suffering patiently
the extraction of a decayed part of a tooth, a kind of
chisel
and mallet being the instrument used for the pur-
pose. Elephants walk under water as long as the end
of the proboscis can remain above the surface, but when
in greater depth they float with the head and back only
about a foot beneath it. In this manner they swim across the broadest streets, and guide themselves
by the sense of smelling till they reach footing to look
about them and land. They are steady, assiduous
workmen in many laborious tasks, often using discre-
tion when they require some dexterity and attention
in the performance. Good will is all man can trust to in
the process of enforcing correction beyond their patience; but flattery, good treatment,
kind words, promises, and rewards, even to the wear
of finery, have the desired effect. In history they ap-
pear most conspicuous as formidable elements of battle.
From the remotest ages they were trained for war by
the nations of India, and by their aid they no doubt acquired and long held possession of several regions of
High Asia westward of the Indus. They are noticed in
the ancient Mahabaraty. According to Sausti, the
relative force of elephants in an akshashami, or great
army corps, was one to each chariot of war, three horse-
men, and five foot soldiers, or, rather, archers mounted
on the animal's back within a defensible konaksh—
In the West Indies the elephant, on one hand, was a
symbol of war, the war elephant, one chariot, and three horsemen, formed a pattri
or squad of at most eleven men, and, if there were oth-
er bodies of infantry in the army, they are unnoticed.
This enumeration is sufficient to show that in India,
which furnished the elephants and the model of arm-
ment, the latter followed the former, and in the rest of
the world it has been with the elements of war
without the mohaut or driver, and that, consequently,
when the successors of Alexander introduced them in
their wars in Syria, Greece, and even Italy, they could
not be encumbered more than perhaps momentarily
with one of these and still be mobile, and for the
weight carried by a war-elephant is less than
that of one used for burden, which seldom equals 2000
pounds. In order to ascend his back when suddenly
required, the animal will hold out one of his hind legs
horizontally, allowing a person to step upon it until he
has grasped the hump or ridge, as the French
phrases, where they were considered for a time of great impor-
tance, no doubt the squad or escort was more consider-
able than in the East, and may have amounted to
thirty-two foot-soldiers, the number given, by some
mistake, as if actually mounted, in 1 Macc. vi.
7. Although we are ignorant of the exact use made of the
elephant in Egypt, it may be observed that the use of mulberry-juice or grapes must have been intended as an excitement to
their taste, for they are all fond of fruit. Wine, so as
to cause an approach to intoxication, would render
them ungovernable, and more dangerous than when in
a state of, for were only too frequent to urge them on in a modern battle, with all its flashes of
fire, smoke, and explosion; and red colors usually
employed for their trappings produce more of a satis-
factory feeling than rage. Judicious and long-con-
tinued training by the only good remedy against sud-
den surprises caused by objects not yet examined by
their acutely-judging senses, or connected with former
scenes of danger, which are alone apt to make them
turn. It is likely that the disciplined steadiness of
well-armed ranks frightened them by their novelty
more than the danger of the Macedonian tactics, for the
war elephant must have been feeble in the ears of elephants accu-
stoned to the roar of hundreds of thousands of Indians. It is probable that the Carthaginians made the
experiment of training African elephants in imitation of
Polyben Philelpidusus: they are noticed in their army
by Cato, and besides the discipline of the mode of managing them, there is reason to be-
lieve, as already noticed, that they were never so thor-
oughly subdued as the Indian elephants (see Penay
Cyclopedia, s. v.).
Eleusian Mysterys, the sacred rites with-
which the annual festival of Eleusis was celebrated
at Eleusis, a town in Attica, situated to the north-west
of Athens, and opposite the island of Salamis. They
were the most ancient and most venerated mysteries of
Greece, and were probably at first a national and
harvest festival instituted in thank Demeter for the
gift of fruit, to remember the barbaric times preceding
the introduction of agriculture, and to rejoice at the
progress made since. Both the founder of the myste-
ries and the time of their foundation are unknown. It
is probable that the first foundation of them was laid
by Thracians, who from Asia spread over Europe. In
the time of the Pisistratidae, and that they were farther developed by the
Athenians themselves, especially at the time of the
Pisistratidae. The place in which they were celebra-
ted was the temple of Demeter at Eleusis, a spacious,
almost circular, temenos, which had been erected by
the architect Iktinos, and was surrounded with a
double vestibule (peribolos). At the time when Her-
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acls came to Athens to be initiated into the mysteries it was not yet permitted to admit any foreign Greek. In fact, not until the death of the priestess, and, from being thus the most scrupulous secrecy. No initiated person might reveal what he had seen under pain of death, and no uninitiated person could take part in the ceremony under the same penalty. The priestesses were chosen from the sacred family of the Eumolpides, whose name means 'the most splendid' because of the splendid art of Ceres. The chief-priest was called the 'Hierophant,' or 'Mystagogue'; next in rank to him was the Daduchus, or Torch-bearer; after whom came the Hiero-Ceryx, or Sacred Herald, and the priest at the altar. Besides these were three assistants, one a multitude of inferior priests and servants' (Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.). It was undoubtedly one chief aim of these mysteries to spread among the educated classes of the people more elevated religious ideas than were held by the mass of the people, especially with regard to the immortality of the soul, the punishment of the wicked, and the rewards of the good. The initiated were supposed to be especially protected by the gods, and to be sure of the joys of the future life. See Ou- waroff, Envoi sur les mystères d'Eleusis (8d ed. Paris, 1816; Freiler, Denemer und Persepheme (Hamb. 1857); Memminger, Archaische Anhänger auf die städtischen Festen der Athen (Leipzig, 1864). (A. J. S.)

Eleutheropolis (Eleutheropolis, free city), a place not named in Scripture, but which was an episcopal city of such importance in the time of Eusebius and Jerome that they assume it as the point whence to estimate the distance and flocks of cattle were mentioned, in southern Palestine (Onomast. s. v. Esthene, Sephela, Jermus, etc.; see Reland, Polyst. p. 410, 411). It appears from these and many other notices that E-leutheropolis was the capital of a large province during the fourth and fifth centuries of our era. It was also an episcopal city of Palæstina Prima (St. Paul, Geogr. Sac. p. 306; Notitia Ecclesiastica, p. 6). Its site remained unknown for many centuries, though defined by several ancient writers with much minuteness. Eusebius states that the plain of Shephelah extends from Eleutheropolis westward and southward (Onomast. s. v. Sephela), and hence it must have stood at the southwestern base of the mountains of Judah. He also states that Bethabnem was ten miles distant from it, on the road to Nicopolis; and Jedna, six miles on the road to Hebron; and Sochoth, nine miles on the road to Jerusalem, within the territories of which the lines of road being traced and the distances measured, we find that the site indicated is Beit Jibrin (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 348, 369, 398, 404-420, 642-646). In the Acta Sanctorum Martyrum, published by Assemani in Syriac, Greek, and Latin, Peter Abelaama the martyr is said to have been born at Ana, which lies according to the Syriac version, in the district of Beth Gabrin, while both the Greek and Latin read in the district of Eleutheropolis (ib. p. 66). This establishes the identity of Beth Gabrin and Eleutheropolis. Josephus mentions a town in this neighborhood called Betarsis, which some copies read Byrabsas, and it appears to be the same place (War, iv, 8, 1). Under its ancient name Betogalab(h) (Barroyaabaph, i.e. house of Gabra or Gabriel), it is enumerated by Ptolemy among the cities of Palestine (v. 16), and it is also laid down as Beth Gabrin in the Itinerary of Ptolemy (Polyst. p. 421). The name Eleutheropolis first appears on coins of this city inscribed to Julia Donna, the wife of Septimus Severus, in A.D. 202-3 (Eckhel, lii, 488). The emperor had been in Syria about that time, and had conferred important privileges on various cities, among which was Bethogalab, which appears to have been then called Eleutheropolis, as being made a free city. Epiphanius, the well-known writer, was born in a village three miles from the city in the beginning of the 4th century, and is often called an Eleutheropolitan (Reland, p. 731, 732). In the year A.D. 706, little
more than a century and a half after the Sarmacian con-
quest, Eleutheropolis was razed to the ground, and left
completely desolate. The Greek language now gave place
to the Arabic, and this city lost its proud name and its prouder rank together (Reland, p. 967). Like
so many other cities, the old Aramic name, which had passed
down to the Byzantine country, was revived among
writers, and we thus find Beidgeliran, or some form
like it, constantly in use after the 8th century
(Reland, Palast. p. 222, 227; Gesta Dei per Francos,
p. 1044). In the 12th century the Crusaders found it
in ruins, and called by the Arabs Bethgelirion (doubt-
lessly the Arabic of Beidgeliran) which they built a
strong fortress on the old foundations to guard against
the incursions of the Moslems, the remains of which,
and the chapel connected with it, still exist. After
the battle of Hattin it fell into the hands of Saladin,
but was retaken by Richard of England. It was
finally captured by Gibars (see WilI. Tyr. xiv, 29; Jac-
de Vit. in Gestae Dei, p. 1070, 1071; Bohaeddin, Vit.
Salad. p. 229). It has since crumbled to ruin under the
blight of Mohammedan rule.

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

 Beit Jibrin lies on the side of which the ruins of Eleu-
theropolis lie, runs up among the hills for two miles
or more south-by-east. On each side of it are low
ridges of soft limestone, which rises here and there in
white bare crowns over the dark shrubs. In these
ridges are some of the most remarkable caverns
and excavations in Palestine, rivalling in extent and in-
terest the catacombs of Rome and Malta. They are
altogether different in character from the rock-tombs
of Jerusalem and the grottos of Petra. They were
examined and described by Dr. Robinson, and they
have since been more fully explored by Mr. Porter.
They are for the most part in clusters in isolated subter-
anean villages. Some are rectangular, 100 feet and
more in length, with smooth walls and lofty arched
roofs. Others are bell-shaped—from 40 to 70 feet in
diameter, by nearly 60 feet in height—all connected
in many instances to other caverns of the same subter-
anean passage. A few are entirely dark, but most of
them are lighted by a circular aperture at the top.
They occur at short intervals along both sides of the
whole valley, and may also be seen at several other
neighboring villages. The origin and object of these
singular excavations are certainly ascertained. During
the Babyloan captivity the Edomites inhabited and
occupied the whole of southern Palestine, which is
therefore called by Josephus Idumea. Jerome calls
the Idumeans Horites, and says they inhabited the whole
country extending from Eleutheropolis to Petra and
Elah, and that they dwelt in caves—preferring them
both on account of their security and their coolness
from the summer heat (Cassius, ad obid. i). The original
inhabitants of Edom were the Moabites (2 Sm. xxv, 22;
Trogodytes, "dwellers in caves." The descendants
of Esau adopted the habits of their predecessors, and
when they took possession of southern Palestine exca-
vated rock dwellings wherever practicable (see Robin-
son's Biblical Research, p. 68 ed. ii, 28, 57 sq.; Yan do
Velde, Narrative, ii, 147 sq.; Thomson, Land and Rock,
i, 358 sq.).

Eleutherus or Eleutherus, a native of Nicop-
olis, elected bishop of Rome after the death of
Soter, May 3, 177. He is previously (186) mentioned as a
dean of bishop Anicetus of Rome. He opposed with
much bitterness the opinions of the Valentinians, and
in his epistles he reproves them for having the power of
his name inscribed on his seal. His epistles have been
published by U. C. C. (Rom. Acta, i, 25). He was
the founder of the Church of Rome, and is the first
mentioned in the Catacomb inscriptions. He died in
the year 206, and was succeeded by Cyprian.

His name is mentioned by Origen and by Eusebius,
and is found in the early Church fathers. He is also
mentioned by Cyprian, Africa, i, 4; and by the
Church fathers, and is found in the early Church fathers.

Eleutherus (Heb. Ekhoman), זיבק"מ, whom God has
graciously bestowed [compare Hamaneal, Hamanahamah,
Ekhoman, Phun, Honsalib; also Bok-hanam, etc.];
ELIHANAN

3. Elhanan is elsewhere called the son of Dodo of Bethlehem, one of "the thirty" of David’s guard, and named first on the list (2 Sam. xxiii, 24; 1 Chron. xi, 26). See Kennicott’s Dissertation, p. 179. Perhaps his father had both names. See Jair.

Elevation of the Host. See Host and MASS.

Eliezer. See ALFRIC.

Eli (Heb. Eli, יְלִי, l. q. יִלְי, recent; Sept. ʼHai [so N. T. see HÉLI], Josephus HâUi, Vulg. Heili), the high-priest of the Jews when the ark was in Shiloh (1 Sam. i, 3, 9). He was descended from Aaron through Ithamar, the youngest of his two surviving sons (Lev. x, 1, 2, 12), as appears from the fact that Abiathar, who was certainly a lineal descendant of Eli (1 Kings ii, 27), had a son Ahimelech, who is expressly stated to have been "the son of Elnathan, the Elnathan" (1 Chron. xxvi, 23; 2 Sam. viii, 17). With this accords the circumstance that the names of Eli and his successors in the high-priesthood up to and including Abiathar are not found in the genealogy of Eleazar (1 Chron. vi, 4–15; comp. Ezra vii, 1–6). As the history makes no mention of a lineal successor of Abiathar after David, Eli is generally supposed to have been the first of that line who held the office (Josephus, Ant. vii, 1, 9). From him, his sons having died before him, it appears to have passed to his grandson Ahitub (1 Sam. iv, 3; comp. however Josephus, Ant. iv, 11, 2), and it certainly remained in the family of Eli Abiathar, the judge of Abiathar, was "thrust out from being priest unto the Lord" by Solomon for his share in Adonijah’s rebellion (1 Kings ii, 26, 27; i, 7), and the high-priesthood passed back again to the family of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1 Kings ii, 25). How the office ever came into the younger branch of the house of Aaron we are not informed; perhaps it was through the incapacity or minority of the then sole representative of the elder line, for it is very evident that it was no unauthorized usurpation on the part of Eli (1 Sam. ii, 27, 28, 29). See ITHAMAR. Eli also acted as regent, or civil judge of Israel after the death of Samuel, being the immediate predecessor of his pupil Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 6, 15–17), the last of the judges. This function, indeed, seems to have been intended, by the theocratic constitution, to devolve upon the high-priest, by virtue of his high-priesthood, and in the absence of a civil judge, actually appointed by the divine King to deliver and govern Israel. He is said to have judged Israel 40 years (1 Sam. iv, 18): the Septuagint makes it 20. It has been suggested, in explanation of the discrepancy, that he was sole judge for 20 years, and then co-judge for 20 (Actx xxiii, 20). But the probability is that the number 40 is correct, but that it comprehends only the period of his administration as judge; for not only does the whole tenor of the narrative imply that this immediately succeeded the judgeship of Samson (as indeed Josephus evidently understood it; a fact apparent not only from his history, but also from the summing up of his numbers as computed by himself, Ant. v, 9; xiii, 3; title to book v), but this view is evidently taken by Paul in his assign- ment of the period of 450 years to the judges (Acts xiii, 20), a number that immediately suggests adding together the items as given in the O.T. history, including Samson and Eli as continuous to the others. See JUDGES. As Eli died at the age of ninety-eight (1 Sam. iv, 15), the forty years (B.C. 1165–

Jerome, in his Quast. Heb., on both passages—he does not state whether from ancient tradition or not—translates Elhanan into A -δος, and adds φιλός σαι- τος. (B.C. 1125) must have commenced when he was fifty-eight years old. His Works, i, 53, 57, 60, fol. Lond. 1684; Selden, De Success. in Pontif. Heb., lib. i, cap. 4). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Eliezer seems to have been a religious man, and the only fault recorded of him was an excessive easiness of temper, most unbecoming in his position and of his official character. His son Hophni and Phine- has, whom he invested with authority, misconducted
themselves so outrageously as to excite deep disgust among the people, and render the services of the tabernacle odious in their eyes (1 Sam. ii. 27-36; 1 Kings ii. 27). This misconduct Eli had aware, but he contented himself with mild and ineffectual remonstrances (1 Sam. ii. 22-25), with his position being more secure and vigorous action (1 Sam. iii. 18). For this neglect the judgment of God was at length denounced upon his house, through the young Samuel (q. v.), who, under peculiar circumstances, had been attached from childhood to his person (1 Sam. ii. 29; iii. 18). Some years passed (1 Kings ii. 37), and Samuel anointed the young Saul as king. The public adulation of this denunciation, but it came at length in one terrible crash, by which the old man's heart was broken. The Philistines had gained the upper hand over Israel, and the ark of God was taken to the field, in the confidence of victory and safety from its presence. But in the battle which followed the ark itself was taken by the Philistines, and the two sons of Eli, who were in attendance upon it, were slain. The high-priest, then blind and age, sat by the wayside at Shiloh, awaiting tidings from the war, "for his heart trembled for the ark of God." A man of Benjamin, with his clothes rent, and earth upon his head, brought the fatal news; and Eli heard that Israel was defeated—that his sons were slain—that the ark of God was taken—at which last word he fell heavily from his seat, and died (1 Sam. iv.). According to Schwarzer (Pulivest, p. 142), and others, it is conjectured from his grave to an elegant building at the village Charim ben-Elime, eight miles N.N.E. of Jaffa, on the shore. The ultimate doom upon Eli's house was accomplished when Solomon removed Abiathar (the last high-priest of this line) from his office, and restored the line of Eleazar, in the person of Zadok (1 Kings ii. 37). See ABIAH. Another part of the same sentence (1 Sam. ii. 31-38) appears to have been taking effect in the reign of David, when we read that "there were more chief men found of the sons of Eleazar than of the sons of Ithamar."—sixteen of the former, and only eight of the latter (1 Chron. vi. 8). 

Eli (אֵלִי; for Heb. "אֵל" [Psa. xxi, 3], "el", my God, as it is immediately rendered), an exclamation used by our Saviour on the cross, in appeal to his heavenly Father (Matt. xxvii, 46). See AGONY. In the parallel passage (Mark xv, 34) it is written 'Elel (Eloï). 

Eli (אֵלִי), an old form of the "construct state" of הָיָה, the "Highest", i.e. Almighty, the usual vowl being used as in אֶלִי, אֵלִית, etc.) often occurs as the first element of proper names (comp. Elia, Elijah, and many others here following), and as referring to the highest notion of the Deity among the Semitic races. As such epithet it is sometimes interchangeable with בָּאָל (q. v.) (see 2 Sam. v, 16; 1 Chron. xiv, 7), or even גִּהוֹ (q. v.) (see 2 Kings xxiii, 34). This constructive form is also sometimes interchanged with the abbreviation of the simple הָיָה into הָיָה (1 Chron. iii. 8; 4: 5; comp. Exod. vi. 22; Num. iii. 30), or it even exchanges places with the other element of the name, e.g. Eliah (2 Sam. 3, 3) becomes Ammiel (1 Chron. iii, 5). As in the words beginning with Abi-, Abi-, etc., this element often melts into the other member, not strictly in a genitive sense, but as a sort of liturgical invocation or eulogium of the Deity, as is found to be the case with similar names used as religious formulae, especially among the ancient Phoenicians (see Elhanan). 

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

1. A Reubenite, son of Pallu or Phallu, whose family was one of the principal in the tribe and father or progenitor of Dathan and Abiram, the leaders in the revolt against Moses (Num. xxvi, 8, 9; xvi, 1, 12; Deut. xi, 6). B.C. post. 1586. Eliab had another son named Nemuil; and the record of Num. xxxvi is interrupted expressly to admit a statement regarding his sons.

2. A son of Helon, and phylarch of the tribe of Zebulun at the time of the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num. i, 9; ii, 7; vii, 24, 29; x, 16). B.C. 1657.

3. An ancestor of Samuel (q. v.) the prophet, being a Kohathite Levite, son of Nahath and father of Jehoham (1 Chron. vi, 27 [12]). B.C. cir. 1250. In the other statements of the genealogy this name appears to be given as the ELI尤 (1 Sam. i, 1) and ELIEL (1 Chron. vi, 34 [19]).

4. The eldest son of Jesse and brother of David (1 Sam. xvi, 6; xvii, 15; 1 Chron. ii, 13). It was he that made the contemptuous enquiry, by which he sought to screen his own cowardice, when David proposed to fight Goliath, "With whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness?" (1 Sam. xvii, 29.) B.C. 1063. His daughter Abigail married her second cousin Rehoboam, and bore him three children (2 Chron. xi, 18); although, taking into account the length of the reigns of David and Solomon, it is difficult not to suspect that the word "daughter" is here used in the most abstract sense of granddaughter or descendant. In 1 Chron. xxvii, 18, we find mention of "Elihu, of the brethren of David," as "ruler" (אֵלִיָּהוּ) or "prince" (אֵלִיָּהוּ) of the tribe of Judah. According to the ancient Hebrew tradition preserved by Jerome (Quaeest. Hebr. ad loc.), this Elihu was identical with Eliab. "Brethren is, however, often used in the sense of kinsman, e.g. 1 Chron. xii, 2.

5. The third of the Gadite heroes who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (1 Chron. xii, 9). B.C. 1061.

6. A Levite in the time of David, who was both a "porter" (מכהן, shebêr, i.e. a door-keeper) and a musician on the "psaltery" (1 Chron. xv, 18, 20; xvi, 5). B.C. 1013.

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

Eli'ada (Ebl. El'ada), שְׁנַיִם, whom God has known, the name of three men.

1. (Sept., in Kings, 'El'aci, and repeated, בַּאֲלָדִית; in Chron. 'Ele'ad, v. r. 'Ele'da; Vulg. Eladá, Eladu, Eladu, Eladu). One of David's sons; according to the list, the youngest but one of the family born to him after his establishment in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v, 16; 1 Chron. iii, 8). B.C. post 1033. From the latter passage it appears that he was the son of a wife and not of a concubine. See 1 Chron. xiv, 7, the name appears in the form of רָעָל, רֵעָל (q. d. whom the Master has known); Birellada (q. d. whom the Master has known), and Zebina (p. 460, רָעָל being the Syriac form of רָעָל, Lord). This curious reading of the Masoretic text is not, however, indisputable; De Rossi's Cad. 186 (prima manu) reads רָעָל, the Sept. 'Elādi, and the Peshito Elīdā. On the strength of these authorities, De Rossi (after Dathanus, Lib. Hist. V. T. 664) pronounces in favor of assimilating this passage to the other two, and refers to the improbability of David's using the names רָעָל and רָעָל promiscuously (see De Rossi's Var. Lect. V. T. Hebrevi- cor, iv). We must note, however, the intensity of careful criticism, too hastily succumb to arguments of this kind. As to MSS, the four or five which Kennicott adduces all support the text of 1 Chron. xiv, 7; the authority of the Sept. is neutralized by Codex Alex. and Fral. August., the former of which has רָעָל and the latter רָעָל, evidently corroborating the Masoretic text, as does the Vulg. Baaladu. As to the difficulty of David's using a name which contained רָעָל for one of its elements, it is at
least very doubtful whether that word, which literally means *master, proprietor, luminary*, and is often used in the earlier Scriptures inoffensively (see Gesenius, Thes., p. 224), in David's time had acquired the bad sense which *baal*-worship in Israel afterwards imparted to it. It is much to the present point that in this very chapter (ver. 11) David does not object to employ the word *baal* in the same *baal*-punishment as a condemnation of a victory vouchsafed to him by the Lord (see 2 Sam. v. 20, where the naming of the place is ascribed to David himself). It is possible that this appellation of his son might itself have had reference to that signal victory. The name appears to be omitted by Josephus in his list of David's family (Ant. viii, 3, 3), unless he be there called Elon (Elyon).

2. (Sept. *Ela'nas, v. r.* *Ela'nus; Vulg. *Elidus*.) Apparently an Aramean of Zobah, the father of Rezon, which latter was captain of a marauding band that annoyed Solomon (1 Kings xi. 23, where the name is Anglicized "Elidah"). B.C. ante 976.


*El'idad* (1 Kings xi. 23), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name of Elad (q. v.).

*El'idad* (Ela'das, Vulg. Elidus), one of "the sons of Zammoth" who divorced his Gentle wife after the restoration from Babylon (1 Esdr. ix. 28); evidently the Elnocati (q. v.) of the Heb. text ( Ezra x. 27).

*El'adun* (Ela'donas v. r. *Ela'donas, Vulg. omits*), a name given as that of the father of Joda, whose sons and brethren assisted in rebuilding the Temple after the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. v. 38); apparently a corruption for the Henadad (q. v.) of the Hebrew narrative (Ezra iii, 19).

*El'ah* (1 Chron. viii. 27; Ezra x. 26), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name of Eliah (q. v.), but referring to others than the prophet.


1. The son of Meleah and father of Nathan, in the genealogy (q. v.) of David (Luke iii. 30), probably the grandson of Nathan, of the private line of David's descent (Strong's Harm. and Expos. p. 16). B.C. considerably post 1013.

2. Son of Hickish, and priest of the palace under king Hezekiah, who sent him to receive the message of the invading Assyrians, and report it to Isaiah (2 Kings xviii. 18; xix. 2; Isa. xxxvi. 3, 11, 22; xxvii. 2), B.C. 735. He succeeded Shebna in this office after the latter had been ejected from it (Grotius thinks by reason of his leprosy) as a punishment for his pride (Isa. xlii. 15-20). Elakim was a good man, as appears by the title emphatically applied to him by God, "my servant Elakim" (Isa. xlii. 20), and as was evinced by his conduct on the occasion of Sennacherib's invasion (2 Kings xvii. 37; xix. 1-15) and also in the discharge of the duties of his high station, in which he acted as a "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah" (Isa. xxix. 21). It was as a special mark of the divine approbation of his character and conduct of which, however, no further details have been preserved to us, that he was raised to the post of authority and dignity which he was held at the time of the Assyrian invasion. What this office was has been a subject of some perplexity to commentators. The ancients, including the Sept. and Jerome, understood it of the priestly office, as appears by the rendering of שְׁכָר (Isa. xxii, 15; A. V. "treasurer") by πιστοφόρος, the "priest's chamber," by the former, and of כָּבָד (Isa. xxxvi, 9) by "pretpositor templi," by the latter. Hence Nicephorus, as well as the author of the Alexandrian Chronicle, includes in the list of high-priests Somnas or Sobnas (i.e. Shebna), and Elakim, identifying the latter with Shallum or Meshshullam. But it is certain from the description of the office in Isa. xxii, and especially from the expression in ver. 22, "The key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder," that it was the king's house, and not the house of God, of which Elakim was prefect, as Ahiah had been in the reign of Solomon (1 Kings iv, 6), and Azrikam in that of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxvii. 7). With this agrees both all that is said, and all that is not said, of Elakim's functions. The office seems to have been the highest under the king, as was the case in Egypt, when Pharaoh said to Joseph, "Thou shalt be over my house (יוֹרֵא בָּעַם) . . . only in the throne will I be greater than thou" (Gen. xli. 40; comp. xxix. 4). In 2 Chron. xxvii. 7, the officer is called "governor (יוֹרֵא בָּעַם) of the house." It is clear that the "scribe" was inferior to him, for Shebna, when degraded from the prefecture of the house, acted as scriba and scribe to Elakim (2 Kings xix. 14). The whole description of it too by Isaiah implies a place of great eminence and power. This description is transferred in a mystical or spiritual sense to Christ the son of David in Rev. iii. 7, thus making Eliakim in some sense typical of Christ. The true meaning of מָשְׁמַר, *watchman*, is very doubtful. "Friend," i.e. of the king, and not a general of the provost, is the most probable significations. See Treasurers. Elakim's career was a most honorable and splendid one. Most commentators agree that Isa. xxii. 25 does not apply to him, but to Shebna.

3. The original name of Jehoiakim (q. v.), king of Judah (2 Kings xxiii, 44; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 4).

4. Son of Abid, and father of Elal (q. v.); postorer of Zelseal (Matt. i. 35). He is probably identical with the Shechechiah (q. v.) of 1 Chron. iii. 21 (Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 11). See Genealogy of Christ.

5. A priest in the days of Nehemiah, who assisted at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (Neh. xii. 41). B.C. 446.

*El'ali (Ela'li v. r. *Ela'li, Vulg. Diluas*), one of "the sons of Maanit" who divorced his gentle wife after the exile (1 Esdr. ix. 34); apparently a corruption for the Binnui (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x. 38).

*El'iam* [usually *El'iam*] (Heb. *El'iam*, *Elam*, God is [his] people, i.e. friend; Sept. *Ela'ios*, Vulg. *Ealem*), the father of Bathseba, the wife of Uriah and afterwards of David (2 Sam. xii. 8). In the list of 1 Chron. iii. 5, the names of both father and daughter are altered, the former to the equivalent Ammiel (q. v.), and the latter to Bathshua, both the latter names being also those of non-Israelite persons, while Uriah was a Hittite (comp. Gen. xxx, 12; 1 Chron. ii, 3; also 2 Sam. xvi. 27). The same name Elam also occurs as the father of Gilo, i.e. "shining one," of one of David's "thirty" warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 34). It is omitted in the list of 1 Chron. xi. but is now probably discernible as "Ahabiah the Pelonite" (ver. 86) (see Kennicott, Dissertation, p. 207). The ancient Jewish tradition preserved by Josephus (Ant. xiv. 2 Sam. xi. 20; 1 Chron. xi. 5) is that the two Elims are the same person. An argument has been founded
on this account for the hospitality of Abithopel to king David, as having dishonored his house and caused the death of his son-in-law (Blunt, Coincidences, pt. ii, s.). But he would perhaps have rather been proud of this alliance with royalty. B.C. 1496.

Eli'az'ónias [many Elyazónias] (Elyazonzes, Vulg. Magulæon) included in the preceding list of the Ammonites and N.T. (Ecles. xviii. 1, 4, 12; 1 Matt. ii. 58; Matt. xi. 14, xvi. 14, xvii. 3, 4, 10, 11, 12; xxvii. 47, 49; Mark vi. 15; viii. 28; ix. 4, 5, 11, 12, 13; xv. 33, 35, 86; Luke i. 17; iv. 25, 26; ix. 8, 10, 30, 33, 84; John i. 21, 25; Rom. xi. 2; James v. 17). In Rom. xi. 2, the reference is not to the prophet, but to the portion of Scripture designated by his name, the words being Ιωακιων, "in Elias," not as in A.V. "of Elias."—Smith, s. v.

Eli'as Levita (properly Elyas the Levite, son of Asher), one of the greatest Jewish scholars of modern times, was born in the latter half of the fifteenth century, and the year and the place of his birth have been the subject of literary controversy. The former point seems to have been settled by the learned Rossi (see below), who showed that Elias was born in 1471 or 1472, not, as Hirt maintains, in 1469, or, as Nagel undertook to prove, in 1477. The second point is still a point of dispute, both Italians and Germans being desirous to claim this great writer for their country. The chief argument of the former is that Elias, in one of his works, speaks of Italy as "my country" and Venice as "my city;" the chief arguments of the Germans are that Elias, on the titlepages of several of his books, calls himself "Lacchermoru (לכְּכֶרֶמ), or "the German," and that, according to the express testimony of his friend and pupil, Sebastian Münster (q. v.), he was born at Neustadt, on the Aich, not far from Nuremberg. The marginal note of Neustadt expelled Elias, together with several other Jews, from that town. He then went to Italy, lived in several places as teacher of the Hebrew language, especially (from 1594) at Padua, where he lectured on the Hebrew grammar of Moses Kimchi, and wrote a commentary on it. When Padua, in 1509, was captured and plundered, Elias lost all his property and went to Venice, which city, in 1512, he again left for Rome. There he met with the very respectful reception of Cardinal Egidio of Viterbo, who even received him and his family into his own house. For many years Elias instructed the cardinal in the Hebrew language, who, in turn, made him better acquainted with the classical languages. Through Egidio, Elias entered into intimate relations with a number of other cardinals and bishops, who so warmly recommended him that he received an honorable call from king François I of France, which he, however, declined. When Rome, in 1527, was plundered by the troops of Karl V, Elias again lost his whole property. He again went to Venice, where he remained until 1540, when he accepted a call from Paul Fagius to assist him in the establishment of a new Hebrew printing-office, and in the publication of several Hebrew books, at Isny, in Swabia. He remained in Isny until 1545, when he returned to Venice, where he died in 1549. Elias rejected many of the Jewish traditions, and always spoke favorably of the Christians; but he expressly denied that he had secretly become a Christian, and averred that, "thanks to God, he was still a Jew despite his universally esteemed scholarship; only some fanatical Jews hated him, as they suspected his fidelity to Judaism. His celebrated works on Hebrew grammar procured him the surname of "the Grammarien" (הָלָךְּכֶרֶמ). His first work was a commentary on the Mo'asia (Mahaiah), or grammar of the rabbi Moses Kimchi, first published by a certain Benjamin who had stolen the MS. (at Pesaro, 1508; frequently reprinted, with a Latin translation by Sebastian Münster, Basel, 1527, 1531; and another by L'Empeureur, Leyd, 1681). This is a different work from his scholia on Kimchi's הָלָךְּכֶרֶמ (Pethach Debarray), or brief grammatical introduction, the text of which had appeared at Naples in 1492, and Levita's scholia on it at Pesaro in 1508, and later editions. At Rome he composed a grammar entitled "Lxegyprnix" (Buchner, Rome, 1518), and a work on "Composition" (הָלָךְּכֶרֶמ), in which he treats of the irregular words of the Bible. Both works were translated by Münster (the former first at Basel in 1518, and the latter in 1536). He also wrote a more extensive grammatical treatise in four parts, entitled הָלָךְּכֶרֶמ, "Elijah's Sections" (Soncino, 1520, and later elsewhere; trans. by Münster, Basel, 1527, and later). After his return to Venice he wrote a book on the accents הָלָךְּכֶרֶמ, Fáb Tomus (1509, and further editions, translated by Münster, Basel, 1539), and, the most celebrated of all his works, a critical book on the Biblical text and its authors הָלָךְּכֶרֶמ, Masorah ham-Masoroth (Venice, 1568, 1546; Basel, 1539 [with a Latin summary of the work by Münster; Sulzbach, 1769 and 1771]). This work, remarkable alike for literary merit, although it anticipated the judgments of the highest modern criticism, and the questions of which it treats, and although it was, in fact, the father of the great Buxtorf and Cappell controversy, which raged round the Hebrew Scriptures for more than a hundred years after Levita's death, had, until recently, never been actually translated either into Latin or any modern language. Nagel translated into Latin the three introductions (Alteldorf, 1757-1771); and there is a so-called German translation of Levita's book, published at Halle in 1772, and commonly known as Semler's. But Semler was not really, as indeed he did not profess to be, the translator of Levita. The translation, so-called, as it was, was executed by a young Jewish convert to Christianity of the name of Meyer, and all that Semler did was to supervise and annotate the German rendering. After all, the work was full of errors, and many valuable passages of the original are altogether overlooked or omitted, and a valuable edition, by exec-
ELIASHEB

1. Son of Renel or Deuel, and phyrarch of the tribe of Dan (Num. i, 14; ii, 14; vii, 42, 47; x, 20). B.C. 1635.

2. Son of Lael, and chief of the family of the Ger-somite Levites (Num. iii, 24). B.C. 1657.

Elish'ahib (Heb. Elishahib, אֵלִישָׁהִיב, whom God will restore; Sept. Ἑλισσαβ, Ἑλισάβ, Ἑλισάβει, Ἑλισαβει, etc.; Josephus Ἑλισσαβοῦ; Vulg. Eliasub, Eliasib), a common name of Israelites, especially at the later period of the O.T. history.

1. A priest in the time of king David; head of the eleventh "course" in the order of the "governors" (חָיוֹן) of the sanctuary (1 Chron. xxiv, 12). B.C. 1013.

2. A Levitical singer who repudiated his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 24). B.C. 458.

3. An Israelite of the lineage of Zattu, who did the same (Ezra x, 27). B.C. 458.

4. An Israelite of the lineage of Bani, who did the same (Ezra x, 36). B.C. 458.

5. The high-priest of the Jews in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 28). B.C. 446. With the assistance of his fellow-priests, he rebuilt the eastern city wall adjoining the Temple (Neh. iii, 1). His own extensive efforts avoided all doubtless instigated by the same vicinities, probably on the ridge Ophel (Neh. iii, 20, 21). See Jerusalem.

Elishahib was in some way allied (רַבְּשָׁם) near to Tobiah the Ammonite, for whom he had prepared an ante-room in the Temple, a desecration which excited the pious indignation of Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 4, 7). One of the grandsons of Elishahib also married the daughter of Sanballat the Horite (xiii, 28). There seems no reason to doubt that the same Elishahib is referred to in Ezra x, 6, as the father of Joahan, who occupied an apartment in the Temple (comp. Josephus, Ant. xi, 5, 4). He is evidently the same as the Joashin and father of Joiaah (Josephus, "Judas," Ant. x, 7, 1), in the succession of high-priests (Neh. xii, 10, 22). See High-priest.


Elish'ah (אֶלֶישָׁה, the Graced form for 1 Esdr. ix, 1) of the name of the high-priest Elishah (q. v.).

Elish'aa (אֶלֶישָׁא, אֶלֶישָׁא v. r. 'El'Ìshà'aa), a name given (1 Esdr. ix, 34) to one of the twelve houses of the tribe of Manasseh, who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity, and corresponding in position to Mattenai (q. v.) of the Heb. list (Ezra x, 33); but probably a merely erroneous repetition of Emarib (q. v.) preceding in the same verse.

El'Ìthah (Heb. Êlitha'h, אֵלִיתָה, 1 Chron. xxxv, 4, or Êlithy'h, אֵלֶיתָּה, ver. 27, in whom God will come; Sept. Ἑλιθαία, T. Ἑλίθας, Vulg. Elathah), the eighth named of the fourteen sons of the Levite Heman, and a musician in the Temple in the time of king David (1 Chron. xxxv, 4), who, with twelve of his sons and brethren, had the twentieth division of the Temple-service (xxv, 27). B.C. 1013. In Jerome's Quest. Hebr. on ver. 27, the name is given as Elithah, and explained accordingly; but not so in the Vulgate.

Elilberis. See Elivra.

El'Ìd (Hebrew Eldad), אלִדָּה, whom God has loved; Sept. Ἑλιδᾶ, Vulg. Eldad), the son of Chilion, and phyrarch of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the commissioner appointed to portion out the promised land among the tribes (Num. xxxvi, 21). B.C. 1819.

El'Ìlei (Heb. Ἑλίλει, אֶלְיֵלֶה, to whom God is moist), the name of the ninth Israelite.

1. (Sept. Ὠτίλα.) A valiant phyrarch of the tribe of Manasseh east (1 Chron. vi, 24). B.C. post 1612.

2. (Sept. Ὠτίλα.) Son of Tash and father of Jerome, ancestors of Heman the singer and Levite (1 Chron. vi, 34); probably identical with the Eliab of Chron. vi, 34, and the Elihu of 1 Sam. i, 1. B.C. cir 1250. See Samuel.

3. (Sept. Ὠτίλα.) One of the descendants of Shimhi, and head of a Benjamite family in Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 20). B.C. between 1612 and 588.

4. (Sept. Ὠτίλα.) One of the descendants of Shashak, and likewise head of a Benjamite family at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 22). B.C. eod.

5. (Sept. Ὠτίλα v. Ὠ. Ὠτίλα.) The seventh of the Gadite and head of Joseph, who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (1 Chron. xii, 11), possibly the same with No. 6 or 7. B.C. 1061.

6. (Sept. Ὠτίλα v. Ἑλικσαβ.) A Mahanite (q. v.), and one of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chron. xii, 46).

7. (Sept. Ὠτίλα v. Ἑλικσαβ.) Another of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chron. xi, 47). B.C. eod.

8. (Sept. Ὠτίλα.) Chief of the 68 Hebronite Levites assembled by David to assist in bringing the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 9, 11). B.C. 1048.

9. (Sept. Ὠτίλα.) One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah to have charge of the offerings for the Temple services (2 Chron. xxxii, 13). B.C. 726.

Eliz'na'ì (Heb. Elizmyn, אֵלִיָּם, perh. contract ed for Elizma'ìn v. 5; Sept. Ἑλιζαμων, T. Ἑλιζαμων, Vulg. Elizeum), one of the Bene-Shimhi Benjamite families of heads of families resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 20). B.C. between 1618 and 588.

Eliz'zer (Heb. אֵלִיֶּזֶר, God is his help, a modification of the name Eliezer (see Lazzarus); Sept. Ἑλιζαζαρ, T. Ἑλιζαζαρ, N. T. Ἑλίζηρ), the name of eleven men mentioned in the O.T.

1. "Elizer of Damascus," mentioned in Gen. xvii, 5, 23, apparently as a house-born domestic (see Slave) and steward of Abraham, and hence likely, in the absence of direct issue, to become the patriarch's heir. B.C. 2098. The Sept. interprets the title thus: "he of Damascus, my house-born slave, is this Elizer of Damascus." It appeared even early that the passage of Scripture in which the name of Elizer occurs is one of some difficulty. Abraham, being promised a son, says, "I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Elizer of Damascus (עֵלִיָּזֶר דָּמָכָא, he of Damascus, Elizer) . . . Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, one born in thy house is to be my heir." (Gen. xix, 2, 8). The common notion is that Elizer was Abraham's house-born slave, adopted as his heir, and meanwhile his chief and confidential servant, and the same who was afterwards sent into Mesopotamia to seek a wife for Isaac (q. v.). This last point we may dismiss with the remark that there is no less evident than his "elder servant of his house." (Gen. xxiv, 2), whom Abraham charged with this mission, was the same as Elizer. The obvious meaning is that Elizer was born in Damascus, and how this is compatible with the notion of his being Abraham's house-born slave, seeing that Abraham's household never was at Damascus? It is true that there is a tradition, quoted by Josephus from Nicolaus of Damascus (Ant. i, 7, 4), that Abraham "reigned in Damascus;" but the tradition was probably founded on this very passage, and has no claim on our belief. The Mohammedans call him Damasheb, or Damascusini, and believe him to have been a black slave given to Abraham by Nimrod, at the time when he saw him, by virtue of the name of God, walking out of the midst of the flames (Ur.), into which he had been cast by his orders. See Abraham, and the "steward of the house of the great house," in ver. 2. "elìth elìth, (2 note) the alliteration between the obscure term mesthet and Damasconet, literally translated, is "the son of possession of my house," i.e. one who shall possess my house, my property, after my death, and is therefore exactly the same as the phrase in the next verse, "the son of my house
Eliezer ben-Elias Aschenazi (i.e. son of Elia- 

jah, the Germain), a distinguished Rabbi, was born 
about the opening of the 16th century, and practiced 
medicine at Cremona. Obliged to leave that town, he 
went to Constantinople, and was intrusted with the 
care of the synagogue at Naxos, in the Archipelago. 
Finally he settled in Poland, and was made the chief 
Rabbi of the synagogue at Posen. His coreligionists 
regard him as one of the most learned men of the 16th 
century. He died at Cracow in 1586. He published 
רות ציון (Cremona, 1576, and often), a commentary 
on Esther: — תבישופ (Work of Jehováh), in which 
he describes the historical events of the Pentateuch 
(Venice, 1588; Cracow, 1584, and later), and one or 
two less important works. — Hoefer, Nouv. Bioogr. Géné- rale, xv, 827.

Eliezer ben-Hyrkânos, surmamed the Great, 
was born about the middle of the 1st century. He 
was of a good family, but his early education was 
very much neglected, and at the age of 28, urged by an 
awakened impulse after knowledge, he left his father's 
house and became a disciple of Johanan ben-Zachai. 
Eliezer soon repaired his deficiencies, and became one 
of the distinguished Rabbis of his age. Profound in the 
Cabala (q. v.), he made many practical acquisi- 		tions in magical science, and became the theamatur- 
gist of the whole country. During the controversies 
twixt Gamaliel (q. v.) and the rabbinc doctors, he 
formed a school at Lydda, where his teaching appears 
to have assumed so mystical a character as to involve 
him in difficulties with the rabbinical authorities. 
The Karaites regarded Eliezer as one of the defenders 
of their doctrines. He died about 79 A.D., at Cæsarea, 
in Palestine. His principal work is Pirke R. Eliezer 
edit. Prin. Hebræica. Venet. 1544, 4to, translated into 
Latin with notes by Vorstius (Leyd. 1614, 4to, ed. by 
Ab. Aaron Broda, with a Heb. commentary (Wilna, 
1808, 4to), and often republished. See Bornaisch 
R. Eliezer; by Leop. Zunz (Berlin, 1839), a critical ac-
tount of the work and its author. He is regarded also 
as the author of Orthochasism (The Way of Life), which 
has been often repriented. — Hoefer, Nouv. Bioagr. Géné-
rale, xv, 825–6; ETHIDGE, Intro. to Heb. Literature, p. 60 
Gräce, Allgem. Literaturgesch. i, 1108 sq. (J. H. W.)

Eliezer ben-Judah (sometimes called ELIKA- 
ZAAR garmiza, but apparently without good reason), 
of Worms, the son of Kalonymos of Mentor, was one of the 
most distinguished Rabbis of the 13th century. He 
was a pupil of Judah the Saint, and died in 1238. 
He wrote thirty works, of which only a few have been 
printed. The principal ones are: Yoreh Chatoim מדרש קביו- 
ין, "he will instruct sinners") a liturgical 
and ascetic formulary (Venice, 1569, 8vo, and often): — 
Yegam ha-Rebakh (מגדולה בדכ), "wine of epicycle", a 
cabalistic commentary on Canticles and Ruth (Lub- 
lin, 1606, 4to); — Sepher Rebakh (כלא ספירה, "spiced 
book"), on the fear of God and repentance (Pano, 
1506, fol. ; also often in smaller or larger 
commentary on the cabalistic book Joeloch (Mentor, 1562, 4to, and since) — תבישופ, etc., a cabalistic exposition 
of the Pentateuch (extracts in Azulai's יתנimentary 
Leghorn, 1800); — תבישופ, on angelology (in part, 
Amst. 1701, 4to). Several of his works in MS. are at 
the Bibliothèque de l'Oratoire at Paris. — Hoefer, 
ili, 521; Forst, Bibliotheca Judaeica, i, 228. (J. H. W.)

Eliezer ben-Nathan, sometimes also surmamed 
Metz, from his native place, was a contemporary of 
Rashi, and eminent in the cabalistic science. His 
renown is greatly due to a work on the Sefer ha-
ẓikhr, in which he composed in 1152, under the title לוחות 
יפלון (stone of help), printed at Prague in 1610. The 
Rabbin Jachia and Wolf ascribe to him also the author-
Elihu, son of Abimelech, was the youngest son of Mezhelemiah (v. 7), the Levite, of the time of David (1 Chron. xxxvi. 3, where the name is improperly Anglicized "Elioenai").

B.C. 1045-18.


Elihu's speech (Heb. Elishaphai, ʾešlāphay, "God is my righteousness"). The speech of Elihu is not in the right spirit. He does not appear to have offended God by his words.

B.C. 1012.

Elihu (Heb. Elīḥū, אֵלִיהוּ, [but abbreviated ʾelīḥū in Job xxxii, 4; xxxvi, 1; 1 Chron. xxxvi, 7; xxxvii, 18], whose God is Ie, i.e. Jehovah), the name of five men.

1. (Sept. ʾElophans v. r. ʾElophans.) The seventh and youngest son of Mezhelemiah (v. 7), the Levite, of the time of David (1 Chron. xxxvi. 3, where the name is improperly Anglicized "Elioenai").

B.C. 1045-18.


The speech of Elihu is not in the right spirit. He does not appear to have offended God by his words.

B.C. 1012.

2. (Sept. ‘Hānō‘). Son of Tobu, and grandfather of Elkanah, Samuel’s father (1 Sam. i, 1). In the statements of the genealogy of Samuel in 1 Chron. vi. the name ELIR (q.v.) occurs in the same position—son of Samuel, the town of Maon (vi. 19) and son of Phud (vi. 33); and, also ELIZ (vi. 27 [Heb. 12]), father of Jeroham, and grandson of Zophah. The general opinion is that ELI is the original name, and the two latter forms but etymologists’ variations of it.

3. (Sept. Eliov. v. r., ‘Eliyovê). One of the chieftains of Manasseh who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 20), after he had left the Philistine army on the eve of the battle of Gilboa, and who assisted him against the marauding band (יִתְנַג) of the Amalekites (comp. 1 Sam. xxx). B.C. 1083.

4. (Sept. Eliov. or Eliov. One of the eminently able-bodied members of the family of Obed-edom (apparently a grandson by Shemaijah), who were appointed porters of the Temple under David (1 Chron. xxvi, 7). B.C. 1043. Terms are applied to all these doorkeepers which appear to indicate that they were not only “strong men,” as in A.V., but also fighting men. (See ver. 6, 7, 5, 12, in which occur the words יתנ = army, and מבנים = warriors or heroes.)

5. (Sept. ‘Eliyau.) A chief of the tribe of Judah, slain by the brethren of David (1 Chron. xxvi, 18), and hence supposed by some to have been his oldest brother ELIH (1 Sam. vi, 6). B.C. 1013 or ante.

Elijah (Heb. Elîjah, אֱלִיָּהוּ, whose God is Jehovah, 2 Kings i, 3, 4, 8, 12; 1 Chron. viii, 27; Ezra x, 21, 26; Mal. iv, 5; elsewhere in the prolonged form Eliyahu, אֱלִיָּהֻו; Sept. ‘Hâôv. v. r., ‘Hâvîî; N.T. Ῠαῖων; Josephus, Ὅτης, Ant. viii, 13, 4; Vulg. Elias), the name of several men in the O.T., but the latter apparently all namesakes of the famous prophet.

1. ELIJAH THE TISHBI’, the “Eli” of the N.T., a character whose rare, sudden, and brief appearances, undaunted courage and fiery zeal—the brilliancy of whose triumphs—the pathos of whose despondency—the glory of whose departure, and the calm beauty of whose reappearance on the Mount of Transfiguration—throw such a halo of brightness around him as is equalled by none of his compatriots in the sacred story.

1. Origin. This wonder-working prophet is introduced to our notice like another Melchizedek (Gen. x, 17, 18; Ps. cxlii, 3), without any mention of his father or mother, or of the beginning of his days—as if he had dropped out of that cloudy chasit thatafter, his work was done on earth, conveyed him back to heaven.

“Eliah the Tishbi, of the inhabitants of Gilead,” is literally all that is given us to know of his parentage and locality (1 Kings xvii, 1). The Hebrew text is מנֶפֶּלֶת אֱלִיָּהֹו הַיָּשָּׁר הָיוּ שְׁתָּרָה. The third word may be pointed (1), as in the present Masoretic text, to mean “from the inhabitants of Gilead,” or (2) “from Tishbi of Gilead,” which, with a slight change in form, is what the Sept. has (ις θεωσιν θαυματουργος). The latter is followed by Ewald (Jer. Gesch. iii, 446, note), Lightfoot, or without giving his authority, that Elijah was from Jabez-Gilead. By Josephus he is said to have come from Theshbon—ις πόλις θεωσιον της Γαλααδιτος χωρας (Ant. viii, 13, 18, 2). Perhaps this may have been read as Heshbon, a city of the priests, and given rise to the statement of Eusebius that he was “of the tribe of Aaron and grandson of Zadok.” (See also the Chron. Pasch. in Fabricius, Cod. Pseudo. V. T. p.1070, etc.; and Querius, Elucid. ii, 605.) According to Jewish tradition—grounded on a certain similarity between the Hebrew and Greek names—Elijah is identified with Philip, the son of Eleazar the priest. He was also the angel of Jehovah who appeared in fire to Gideon (Lightfoot on John i, 21; Eisenmenger, i, 866). Arab-tradition places his birthplace at Gilgal (Jalid), a few miles north of es-Salt (Irby, p. 98), and his tomb near Damascus (Mislîn, i, 490). The common assumption—perhaps originating with Hiler (Onom. p. 947) or Reland (Pali. p. 1035)—is that he was born in the town of Tekoa, and that he joined the Tharbelites (vi. 19); and, not to insist on the fact that this Tharbe was not in Gilead, but in Naphtali, it is nearly certain that his name has no real existence in that passage, but arises from a mistaken translation of the same Hebrew word which is rendered “inhabitants” in 1 Kings xviii, 1. See Tishbi.

2. Personal Appearance. The mention of Gilead, however, is the key-note to much that is most characteristic in the story of the prophet. Gilead was the country on the further side of the Jordan—a country to this he occasionally wore the “mantle” (q.v.), or cape of shee-kine, which has supplied us with one of our most familiar figures of speech. In this mantle, in moments of emotion, he would hide his face (1 Kings xix, 13), or when excited would roll it up as into a kind of staff. On one occasion we find him bending his knees down upon the ground, and touching the ground between his knees. Such, so far as the scanty notices of the record will allow us to conceive it, was the general appearance of the great prophet—an appearance which has no reason to think was other than uncommon even at that time. The solitary life in which these examples had been, and the manners they had been nurtured that fierceness of zeal and that directness of address which so distinguished him. It was in the wild loneliness of the hills and ravines of Gilead that the knowledge of Jehovah, the living God of Israel, had been impressed on his mind, which was to form the subject of his mission to the idolatrous court and country of Israel.

3. History. The northern kingdom had at this time forsaken almost entirely the faith in Jehovah. The worship of the calves had been a departure from him, it was a violation of his covenants, a rejection of his remembrances; but still it would appear that even in the presence of the calves Jehovah was acknowledged, and they were at any rate a national institution, not directly imported from the idolatries of any of the surrounding countries. See CALF. They were announced by Jeroham as the observers of the nation during the great crisis of its existence: “Behold thy gods, O Israel, that brought thee up out of the land of Egypt” (1 Kings xii, 28). But the case was quite different when Ahah, not content with the calf-worship, introduced the image of the golden calf; and, when the ship containing the first calf-shaped image of the Jerobaal, the son of Nebat—married the daughter of the king of Sisôn, and introduced on the
most extensive scale (Josephus, Ant. ix, 6, 6) the foreign religion of his wife's family, the worship of the Proconsul. But to this the Chersonesians objected, and said that we are ignorant—doubtless it was of a gay, splendid, and festal character, and therefore very opposite to the grave, severe service of the Mosaic ritual. Attached to it and to the worship of Asherah (A. V. "Ashtaroth," and "the groves") were licentious and impure rites, which had been branded by the heaviest judgments on the nation (Num. xxxvi; Judg. ii, 13, 14; iii, 7, 8). But the most obnoxious and evil characteristic of the Baal religion was that it was the worship of power, of mere strength, as opposed to that of a God of righteousness and goodness—a foreign religion, imported from nations the hardy spirit of which was insculpted in every page of the law, as opposed to the religion of that God who had delivered the nation from the bondage of Egypt, had "driven out the heathen with his hand, and planted them in," and through whom their forefathers had "trodden down their ene-
""against these two evils that Elijah comes forward. (B.C. cir. 507.)

What we may call the first act in his life embraces between three and four years—three years and a half, according to the duration of the journey to Horeb and the return to Gilgal (1 Kings xvii, 1–xix, 21). His introduction is of the most startling description: he suddenly appears before Ahab. As the unrestricted preacher of Eastern manners he would have no difficulty in doing, and proclaims the vengeance of Jehovah for the apostasy of the king. This he does in the remarkable formula evidently characteristic of himself, and adopted after his departure by his follower Elias—a formula which includes everything that is said at this time and the king—the name of Jehovah—his being the God of Israel—the living God—Elijah being his messenger, and then—the special lesson of the event—that the god of power and of nature should be beaten at his own weapons. As Jehovah, God of Israel, liveth, before whom I stand, what constant servant I am, there shall be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word. Before, however, he spoke thus, it would seem that he had been warning this most wicked king as to the fatal consequences which must follow his apostasy and his departure from the inquisitive course he was then pursuing, and this may account for the apparent abruptness with which he opens his commission. What immediate action followed on this we are not told; but it is plain that Eli-
ghad to fly before some threatened vengeance, ei-
ther of the king, or more probably of the queen (comp. xix, 2). Perhaps it was at this juncture that Jezebel "cut off the prophets of Jehovah" (1 Kings xviii), 4). We can imagine Ahab and Jezebel being greatly incensed against Elijah for having foretold and prayed that such calamities might befall them. For some time they might attribute the drought under which the nation suffered to natural causes, and not to the interposition of the prophet; and, therefore, however they might despise him as a vain enthusiast, they would not proceed immediately to punish him. When, however, they saw the unequivocal prediction of Elijah taking effect far more extensively than had been anticipated, they would naturally seek to wreak their vengeance upon him as the cause of their sufferings. But we do not find him taking one step for his own preservation till the God whom he served interposed. He was di-
rected to the brook Cherith, either one of the torrents which cleave the high table-lands of his native hills, or on the west of Jordan, more in the neighborhood of Samaria, perhaps the present wady Kelt. See CHERITH. There, in the hollow of the torrent-bed, he remained, supported in the miraculous manner with which we are all familiar, till the failing of the brook obliged him to forsake it. How long he remained in the hollow is uncertain. In the Chersonesian inscriptions of the very time of which we are simply "at the end of days;" nor does Josephus afford us any more information. A vast deal of ingenuity has been devoted to explaining away Elijah's "ra-
vens." The Hebrew word, עַדָּגַב, osînîm, has been interpreted as "Arabians," as "merchants," as "in-
habitants of some neighboring town of Orôbo or Orôn. By others Elijah has been held to have plundered a raven's nest, and this twice a day regularly for several months! See RAVEN.

His next refuge, under the divine guidance (1 Kings xviii, 9), was at Zarephath, a Phoenician town lying between Tyre and Sidon, certainly the last place at which the enemy of Baal would be looked for. The widow woman in whose house he lived is thought, however, to have been an Israelite, and no Baal-wor-
shipper, by some who take her adoration by "Jeho-
vah thy God" as an indication. But the obvious cir-
cumstances of the case, and her mention by our Saviour (Luke iv, 26), imply her heathen character. Here Elijah performed the miracles of prolonging the oil and the meal, according to his power, and after he had fed the son of the widow to life after his sudden death. The traditional scene of his meet-
ning with the widow was in a wood to the south of the town (Mislin, i, 582, who, however, does not give his authority). In the time of Jerome the spot was marked by a town called Gaad. As a thank offering a church dedicated to the prophet was erected over the house of the widow, in which her chamber and her kneading-trough were shown (Anton. Martyr and Pho-
cas, in Relig., p. 985). This church was called Ρούχοιον (Acta Sermoeorum). The Jewish tradition, quoted by Jerome as a proof that the resurrected boy was the servant who afterwards accompanied Elijah, and finally became the prophet Jonah (Jerome, Pref. to Jonah; and see the citations from the Talmuds in Esen-
menger, i, 720).

The drought continued, and at last the full horrors of famine, caused by the failure of the crops, descended on Samaria. During this time the prophet was called upon passively to suffer God's will; now he must once again resume the more active duties of life; he must make one great public effort more to reclaim his coun-
try from apostasy and ruin. According to the word of the Lord, he returned to Israel; Ahab was yet alive, and the king, and the prophet Jezebel, and the queen and the princesses, and all the children of Ahab were still mad upon her idols; in a word, the prophets of Baal were prophecying lies, the priests were bearing rule by their means, and the people loved to have it so. The king and his chief domestic officer had divided between them the mournful duty of ascertaining that neither round the springs, which are so frequent a feature of central Palestine, nor in the nooks and crannies of the most shaded torrent-beds, was there any of the herba-
egage left, which in those countries is so certain an indi-
cation of the presence of moisture. No one short of the two chief persons of the realm could be trusted with this quest for life or death. "Ahab went one way by himself, and Obadiah went another way by him-
self." It is the moment for the reappearance of the prophet. Wishing not to tempt God by going unneces-
sarily into danger, he first presented himself to good Obadiah (1 Kings xviii, 7). The king, in his path, asked him and his master have been seeking for more than three years. Before the sudden apparition of that wild figure, and that stern, unbroken countenance, Obadiah could not but fall on his face. Elijah requested him to announce to Ahab that he had been looking for him. Obadiah, aware of the unkindness of this request, replied, "What have I sinned, that thou shouldest thus expose me to Ahab's rage, who will certainly slay me for not apprehending thee, for whom he has so long and so anxiously sought in all lands and in confederate countries, that they
should not harbor a traitor whom he looks upon as the author of the famine," etc. Moreover, he would delicately intimate to Elijah how he had actually jeopardized his own life in securing that one hundred of the Lord's prophets, and whom he had fed at his own expense, might perish by fire. Elijah spoke highly touching appeal, wherein he removed all his fears about the Spirit's carrying him away (as 2 Kings ii, 11-16; Ezek. iii, 4; Acts viii, 39), he resolves to be the prophet's messenger to Ahab. Intending to be revenged on him, or to inquire when rain might be expected, Ahab now sends for Elijah. He could not help it; he was charged with troubling Israel, i.e. with being the main cause of all the calamities which he and the nation had suffered. But Elijah flung back the charge upon himself, assigning the real cause to be his own sin of idolatry. Regarding, however, his magisterial position, while he reproved his sin, he requested him to execute his authority in summoning an assembly to Mount Carmel, that the controversy between them might be decided by a direct miracle from heaven (comp. Matt. xvi, 1). Whatever were his secret motives, however, Elijah's (xxvi, 20)—at the rain, and therefore was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside, the prophet proposes (wishing to give them every advantage), that, two bullocks being slain, and laid each upon a distinct altar, the one for Baal, the other for Je-hovah, whichever should be consumed by fire must prove the true God. Many of his opponents, however, were aware that it was their duty to serve. The people consented to this proposal, because, it may be, they were not altogether ignorant how God had formerly answered by fire (Gen. iv, 4; Lev. ix, 24; Judg. vi, 21; xiii, 20; 1 Chron. xxvi, 26; 2 Chron. vii, 1). Elijah will have summoned not only all the elders of Israel, but also the four hundred priests of Baal belonging to Jezebel's court, and the four hundred and fifty who were dispersed over the kingdom. The former, however, did not attend, being, perhaps, glad to shelter themselves under the plea that Jezebel would not allow them to do so. Why Mount Carmel, which we do not hear of until now, was chosen in preference to the nearer Eli or Gerizim, is not evident. Possibly Elijah thought it wise to remove the place of the meeting to a distance from Samaria. Possibly in the existence of the altar of Je-hovah (xxvi, 20)—in the rain, therefore was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside— we have an indication of an ancient sanctity attaching to the spot. On the question of the particular part of the ridge of Carmel which formed the site of the meeting, there cannot be much doubt. See Carmel.

There are fewer mundane stories in history than this. On the one hand the solitary servant of Jehovah, accompanied by his one attendant, with his wild shaggy hair, his scanty garb, and sheepskin cloak, but with calm dignity of demeanor, and the minutest regularity of procedure; on the other hand, the prophets of Baal and Asherah, doubleless in all the splendor of their vestments (2 Kings x, 22), with the wild din of their "vain repetitions" and the maddened fury of their disappointed hopes, and the silent people surrounding all—these things form a picture which brightens the whole evening every time we consider it. Having reconstructed an altar which had once belonged to God, with twelve stones—as if to declare that the twelve tribes of Israel should again be united in the service of Jehovah—and having laid thereon his bullock, and filled the trench by which it was surrounded with earth and water, lust of these people of Baal is due—decadence which the old prophet himself would not allow them to do so. Why Mount Carmel, which we do not hear of until now, was chosen in preference to the nearer Eli or Gerizim, is not evident. Possibly Elijah thought it wise to remove the place of the meeting to a distance from Samaria. Possibly in the existence of the altar of Jehovah (xxvi, 20)—in the rain, therefore was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside—we have an indication of an ancient sanctity attaching to the spot. On the question of the particular part of the ridge of Carmel which formed the site of the meeting, there cannot be much doubt. See Carmel.

There are fewer mundane stories in history than this. On the one hand the solitary servant of Jehovah, accompanied by his one attendant, with his wild shaggy hair, his scanty garb, and sheepskin cloak, but with calm dignity of demeanor, and the minutest regularity of procedure; on the other hand, the prophets of Baal and Asherah, doubleless in all the splendor of their vestments (2 Kings x, 22), with the wild din of their "vain repetitions" and the maddened fury of their disappointed hopes, and the silent people surrounding all—these things form a picture which brightens the whole evening every time we consider it. Having reconstructed an altar which had once belonged to God, with twelve stones—as if to declare that the twelve tribes of Israel should again be united in the service of Jehovah—and having laid thereon his bullock, and filled the trench by which it was surrounded with earth and water, lust of these people of Baal is due—decadence which the old prophet himself would not allow them to do so. Why Mount Carmel, which we do not hear of until now, was chosen in preference to the nearer Eli or Gerizim, is not evident. Possibly Elijah thought it wise to remove the place of the meeting to a distance from Samaria. Possibly in the existence of the altar of Jehovah (xxvi, 20)—in the rain, therefore was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside—we have an indication of an ancient sanctity attaching to the spot. On the question of the particular part of the ridge of Carmel which formed the site of the meeting, there cannot be much doubt. See Carmel.

There are fewer mundane stories in history than this. On the one hand the solitary servant of Jehovah, accompanied by his one attendant, with his wild shaggy hair, his scanty garb, and sheepskin cloak, but with calm dignity of demeanor, and the minutest regularity of procedure; on the other hand, the prophets of Baal and Asherah, doubleless in all the splendor of their vestments (2 Kings x, 22), with the wild din of their "vain repetitions" and the maddened fury of their disappointed hopes, and the silent people surrounding all—these things form a picture which brightens the whole evening every time we consider it. Having reconstructed an altar which had once belonged to God, with twelve stones—as if to declare that the twelve tribes of Israel should again be united in the service of Jehovah—and having laid thereon his bullock, and filled the trench by which it was surrounded with earth and water, lust of these people of Baal is due—decadence which the old prophet himself would not allow them to do so. Why Mount Carmel, which we do not hear of until now, was chosen in preference to the nearer Eli or Gerizim, is not evident. Possibly Elijah thought it wise to remove the place of the meeting to a distance from Samaria. Possibly in the existence of the altar of Jehovah (xxvi, 20)—in the rain, therefore was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside—we have an indication of an ancient sanctity attaching to the spot. On the question of the particular part of the ridge of Carmel which formed the site of the meeting, there cannot be much doubt. See Carmel.
saying, that he was a man of like passions with us. His now altered state of mind would seem to have been less unmistakably that of what Moses centuries before, it was proclaimed that Jehovah was "merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth." Elisha knew the call, and at once stepping forward and hiding his face in his mantle, stood waiting for the call to come to him, as the words as before, and so is his answer; but with what different force must the question have fallen on his ears, and the answer left his lips! "Before his entrance to the cave he was comparatively a novice; when he left it he was an initiated man. He had experienced the earthquake, and as the voice which would be the great witnesses of the Lord. But He was not in them; not they, but the still small voice had that awe in it which forced the prophet to cover his face with his mantle. What a conclusion of all the past history! What an interpretation of its meaning! (Maurice, "Prophecy and Kings," p. 156). Not in the peripetations of Ahab and Jezebel, nor in the slaughter of the prophets of Baal, but in the 7000 unknown worshippers who had not bowed the knees to Baal, was the assurance that Elisha was not alone as he had seemed to be.

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

(2.) For about six years from this calling of Elisha we find no notice in the sacred history of Elisha, till God sent him once again to pronounce sore judgments upon Ahab and Jezebel for the murder of unoffending Naboth (1 Kings xx1, 17, etc.). How he and his associate in the prophetic office employed themselves during this time we are not told. We may conceive, however, that they were much engaged in prayer for their country, and in imparting knowledge in the schools of the prophets, which were at Jericho and Bethel. Ahab and Jezebel now probably believed that their power had been so great and so long continued, that they had seen the last of their tormentor. At any rate, this may be inferred from the events of chaps. xx1. See AHAH. Foiled in his wish to acquire the ancestral plot of ground of Naboth by the refusal of that sturdy peasant to alienate the inheritance of his fathers, Ahab and Jezebel proceeded to possess themselves of it by main force, and by a degree of monstrous injustice which shows clearly enough how far the elders of Jeze- reel had forgotten the laws of Jehovah, how perfect was their submission to the will of their mistresses. At her orders Naboth is falsely accused of blaspheming
God and the king, is with his sons (2 Kings ix, 26; comp. Josh. vii, 24) stoned and killed, and his vineyard then—as having belonged to a criminal—becomes at once the property of the king. See Naboth.

Ahab loses no time in entering on his new acquisition. Apparently the very next day after the execution he hurried to the chariot to take possession of the covetous vineyard. Behind him—probably in the back part of the chariot—rose his two pages Jehu and Bidkar (2 Kings ix, 26). But the triumph was a short one. Elijah had received an intimation from Jehovah of what was taking place, and rapidly as the accusation of Naboth's sons had been heard over, he was there to meet his ancient enemy, and as an enemy he does meet him—as David went out to meet Goliath—on the very scene of his crime; suddenly, when least expected and least wished for, he confronting the miser, and fire had done. Ahab is now in terms fearful to any Orient—peculiarly terrible to a Jew, and most of all significant to a successor of the apostate princes of the northern kingdom—"I will take away thy posterity; I will cut off from thee even thy very dogs; I will make thy house like that of Jeroboam and Baasha: thy blood shall be shed in the same spot where the blood of thy victims was shed last night; thy wife and thy children shall be born in this very garden by the wild dogs of the city, or as common carrion devoured by the birds of the sky"—the large vultures which in Eastern climes are always wheeling aloft unheeded, and blue sky, and doubtless suggested this expression to the prophet. How tremendous was this scene we may gather from the fact that after the lapse of at least twenty years Jehu was able to recall the very words of the prophet's burden, to which he and his companion had listened as they stood behind the master in the chariot. The whole of Elijah's denunciation may possibly be recovered by putting together the words recalled by Jehu, 2 Kings ix, 26, 36, 7, and those given in 1 Kings xxii, 19-25. Fearing that these predictions would prove true, as those about the rain and fire had done, Ahab now assumes the manner of a penitent; and, though subsequent acts proved the insincerity of his repentance, yet God rewarded his temporary abasement by a temporary arrest of judgment. We see, however, in after parts of this sacred history, how the judgments denounced against him, his slain, destroyed court, and children took effect to the very letter. See jezebel.

(3.) A space of three or four years now elapses (comp. 1 Kings xxii, 1; xxii, 51; 2 Kings i, 17) before we again catch a glimpse of Elijah. The denunciations uttered in the vineyard of Naboth have been plain and striking; Ahab is dead, and his successor, Ahaziah, has met with a serious accident, after a troubled reign of less than two years (2 Kings i, 1, 2; 1 Kings xxii, 51). Fearing a fatal result, as if to prove himself a worthy son of an idolatrous parentage, he sends an oracle or shrine of Baal at the Philistine town of Ekron to ascertain the issue of his illness. But the oracle is nearer at hand than the distant Ekron. An intimation is conveyed to the prophet, probably at that time inhabiting one of the recesses of Carmel, and, as on the former occasions, he suddenly appears on the path of the messengers, without proof or inquiry uttering his message of death, and as rapidly disappears. The tone of his words is as national on this as on any former occasion, and, as before, they are authenticated by the name of Jehovah—"Thus saith Jehovah, is it because there is no God in Israel that ye send to inquire of Baal? In the same manner of the gods of the heathen ye have done, and ye will go down to Hades." That Joram began to reign during the lifetime of his father Jezebel is stated in 2 Kings viii, 16. According to one record (2 Kings i, 17), which immediately precedes the account of Elijah's last acts on earth, Joram was actually on the throne of Judah at the time the vision of the prophecy of Haggai, and he was, though this is modified by the statements of other
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places (2 Kings iii, 1; viii, 16), yet it is not invalidating, and the conclusion is almost inevitable that Joram ascended the throne as viceroy or associate some years before the death of his father. See Jo-
ram; Jehoshaphat; Judah. The ancient Jewish
commentators get over the apparent difficulty by say-
ing that the letter was written while Elijah was still on earth. (See Lightfoot, Chronicle, etc., "Jeho-
ram." Other theories will be found in Fabricius, Cod. Pseudoepigr. p. 1075, and Otho, Lex. Robb. p. 167.)

In its contents the letter bears a strong resemblance to the speeches of Elijah, while in the details of style, it is very peculiar, and quite different from the nar-
ration in which it is embedded (Bertheau, Chronic., ad loc.).

(5.) The prophet's warfare being now accomplished on earth, God, whom he had so long and so faithfully served, will translate him in a special manner to heav-
enly glory. Considering this, he determined on his last moment in imparting divine instruction to, and
pronouncing his last benediction upon, the students in the colleges of Bethel and Jericho; accordingly, he made a circuit in this region (2 Kings ii, 1, etc.). It was at Gilgal (q. v.)—probably not the ancient place of Joshua and Samuel, but another of the same name still surviving on the western edge of the hills of Ephraim
—that the prophet received the divine intimation that
his departure was at hand. He was at the time with Elisha, who seems now to have become his constant companion. Perhaps his old love of solitude returns upon him, perhaps he wished to spare his friend the pain of a too sudden parting, or perhaps he desired to test the affection of the latter; in either case he endeav-
ers to persuade Elisha to remain behind while he goes on an errand of Jehovah.

"Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to Bethel." But Elisha will not so easily give up his master—"As Jehovah liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee.

They went together to Bethel. The event which was about to happen had apparently been communicated to the sons of the prophet at Bethel, and they inquire if Elisha knew of his impending departure. His answer shows how fully he was aware of it. "Yes," says he, with emphasis, "indeed I do know it (יִדְעָהוּ יִדְעָהוּ) : hold ye your peace." But, though unex-
pecting, it was not to happen that day. Again Elijah at-
tempts to escape to Jericho, and again Elisha protests that he will not be separated from him. Again, also, the sons of the prophet at Jericho make the same un-
necessary inquiries, and again he replies as emphatisch
ally as before. Elijah makes a final effort to avoid what they both so much dreaded. "Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to the Jordan." But Elisha is not to be conquered, and the two set off across the undulating plain of burning sand to the dis-
tant river—Elijah in his mantle or cape of sheep-kin
Elisha in ordinary clothes (נָעַר נָעַר). Fifty men
of the sons of the prophets ascend the abrupt heights
behind the town—the same to which a late tradition
would attach the scene of our Lord's temptation—and
which command the plain below, to watch with the
clearness of Eastern vision what happens in the dis-
tance. Talking as they go, the two reach the river,
and stand on the shelving bank beside its swift current
not to stop, but to go on as if the aged Gileadite cannot rest till he again sets foot on his own side of the river. He rolls up (נָעַר נָעַר) his
mantle as into a staff, and with his old energy strikes
the waters as Moses had done before him—strikes
them as if they were an enemy (נָעַר נָעַר); and they are
divided hither and thither, and they two go over on dry ground. What follows is best told in the simple words of the narrative. "And it came to pass when they were gone over, that Elijah said to Elisha, 'Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee.' And Elisha said, 'I pray thee let a double portion
of thy spirit be upon me.' And he said, "Surely thou hast asked a hard thing: if thou see me taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so.

And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that, behold, a chariot of fire and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up by the whirlwind into heaven. (The tempest (נָעַר נָעַר), which was an earthly substratum for the theophany, was accompanied by a fiery phenomenon, symbolizing the translation, which appeared to the eyes of Elisha as a chariot of fire with horses of fire, in which Elijah rode to heaven (Keil). Well might Elisha cry with bitterness (נָעַר נָעַר), "My father, my father." He had gone who, to the discerning eye and loving heart of his disciple, had been "the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof" for so many years; and Elisha was at last left alone to carry on a task to which he must often have looked forward, but to which in this moment of grief he may well have felt unequal. He saw him no more; but his mantle fell to him and this he took up. It was a personal relic and a symbol of the double portion of the spirit of Elijah with which he was to be clothed. Little could he have realized, had it been then presented to him, that he who was by his greatest claim to notice was that he had "poured water on the hands of Elijah," should hereafter possess an influence which had been
denied to his master—should, instead of the terror of kings and people, be their benefactor, adviser, and friend, and that over his death-bed a king of Israel should be found to lament with the same words that had just burst from him on the departure of his stern and silent master, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" (2 Kings xiii, 14).

4. Traditumary View and Character. —Elijah and Moses are the only men whose history does not terminate with their departure out of this world. Elijah appeared with Moses on Mount Hermon at the time of our Lord's transfiguration, and consequently respecting the latter's redemption which he was about to accomplish (Matt. xvii, 1-8). The author of the book of Ecclesiastes (ch. xlviii) justly describes him as a prophet "who stood up as a fire, and whose word burned as a lamp." But, with the exception of the sultonic crest that came to him and the 1 Macc. ii, 58, and the passing allusion in Luke ix, 54, none of the later references allude to his works of destruction or of portent. They all set forth a dif-
ferent side of his character from that brought out in the historical narrative. They speak of him as being a man of like passions with ourselves (James v, 17); of his kindness to the widow of Sarepta (Luke iv, 25); of his "restoring all things" (Matt. xxi, 11); "turning
the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just" (Mal. iv, 5, 6; Luke i, 17). In the sternness and power of his re-
proaches, however, he was a striking type of John the Baptist, and the latter is therefore prophesied of under his name: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal. iv, 5, 6). Our Saviour also declares that Elijah is already "in some spirit and manner of John the Baptist." Many of the Jews in our Lord's time believed him to be Elijah, or that the soul of Eli-
jah had passed into his body (Luke ix, 8). See John the Baptist. How deep was the impression which he made on the mind of the nation may be: judged from the fixed belief in our mind centuries after, viz., that Jerusalem would never fall until Elijah would again appear for the relief
and restoration of his country. The prophecy of Mal
In the Mohammedan traditions Hajas is said to have drained of the Fountain of Life, "by virtue of which he still lives, and will live to the day of judgment." He is by some confounded with St. George, and with the mysterious St. Khid, one of the most remarkable of the Moslem saints (see Lane's Arabic Nights, Intro. note 2; also selections from the Kur'an, p. 221, 222). The Persian Sefa are said to trace themselves back to Eliaj (Fabricius, p. 1072); and he is even held to have been the teacher of Zoroaster (D'Herbelot, Bib. Or. s. v.).

Among other traditions, it must not be omitted that the words "Eyes hath not seen," etc., 1 Cor. ii, 9, which are without doubt quoted by the apostle from Isaiah lxiv, 4, were, according to an ancient belief, from the "Apocalypse, or mysteries of Elijah," râ Hâqiq ãrzûk (Ardor of the heart). The first mention of him is in the 10th book of the Chronicles (Hom. on Matt. xxvii, 9), and it is noticed with disapproval by Jerome, ad Pamelaum (see Fabricius, p. 1072).

By Ephesians, the words "Awake, thou that sleepest," etc., Eph. v, 14, are inadecately alleged to have been quoted "from Elijah," i.e. the portion of the O. T. containing his history—râqâ' râ Hâqiq (comp. Rom. xi, 2).

5. Literature.—On the general subject, Anon. Lectures on Elijah (London, 1685); Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, 2 vols. (London, 1826); Snaith, Corpus i. (1853); Syrus, In Elijah (Opp. iii, 240); Basil, In Elijah (Opp. p. 61); Ambrose, De Elia (Opp. i, 385); Chrysostom, In Hezalin (Opp. Spauri, vi, 108); Alexander, De Elia (Hist. Ecc. iii, 353); Zouch, Life of Elijah (Works, ii, 219); Robinson, Elijah (Script. Char. ii); Krummacher, Elijah the Tishbi (from the Germ., London, 1840); N. Y. 1847); Anderson, Discourses on Elijah (London, 1855); Evans, Elijah (Script. Biog. i); Williams, Elijah (Char. of O. T. p. 222); Fricshuth, De Elia (Críticas Sacri, ii); Camartus, Elias Theobos (Paris, 1631); Simpson, Lectures on Elijah (London, 1886); Brett, Notes sur Èlie (Nancy, 1766); Seez, Charactéristique de l'Elios de Syrie, 1792; Schwier, Der Oelcoronomus alumno (Wittenb. 1717); id. ib. (Alostv. 1719); Mayer, Elias corvorum convictor (Viteb. 1868); Van Hardt, Corceaux d'Elie (Helmsin. 1799); Heimann, Dissert. syolog. i, 896; Beykert, De Êlios Oelam aevihi (Arb., 1774); Berg, in the Ducb. Wochbld. 1768, 52; 1709, No. 1; Gumpeh, Alstetam Stud. pub. 290 sq.; Deyling, Obs. Sacer, p. 15, No. 5. On his "mutes" Brockhomb, in the Ducb. Wochbld. (Iryshb. 1770). On Eliaj's "coming," Hartung, De El. adventus (Jen. 1659); Jour. Soc. Lit. July, 1852, p. 420 sq. On his proceedings at Carmel, Klausing, De sacrificio Elia (Lips. 1720); Jour. Soc. Lit. Jan. 1867. On his vision at Horeb, Verschuur, De apparitio Elie (Dussert. phil. 1730; Soc. Lit. 1852). On his stay at Cherith, Zarephath, Jour. Soc. Literature, 1860, p. 1: Unters. einiger Verstorbem (Lips. 1798). On his ascension, Hergett, De curra Elia (Wittenb. 1676); Muller, Elir ascension (1. p. 17.—); Piff, De rapu Elir (Tubs. 1739). On his letter to Joram, Piff, De ritris El. ad. Jor. (Tubs. 1750); Berg, in the Ducb. Wochbld. 1774, No. 5, 6.

2. (Sept. Hiia v. r. Epias.) One of the "sons of Eimi" (q. v.), who divorced his gentle wife on returning from the exile (Exa x, 21, where the name is likewise wrongly Anglicized "Eliah"). B. C. post 1812.

3. (Sept. Hiia.) One of the "sons of Jeroham," and heads of Benjaminite families resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 27, where the name is inaccurately Anglicized "Eliah"). B. C. post 1612.

4. (Elia.) Some of the "Eiia of Emmaus," (Heb. Eliai, of the rejeetor; Sept. Eliai v. r. Enea, Vulg. Eicoca), a Haradite (q. v.), one of David's thirty-seven distin-
Elilm. See Telmud.

Elilm (Heb. Elilm, פַּלְמָן), 121, 259, trees [so called from their strength; see OAK]; pers. herein palm-trees; Sept. Αλμα, a place mentioned in Esod. xxv, 27; Num. xxxiii, 9, as the second station where the Israelites encamped after crossing the Red Sea. (See Huldorich or Uhlich, De fontibus in Elim repetita, Brem, 1728). See also Beer-Elilm. It is distinguished as having "twelve wells (rather "fountains," פְּתָגִים) of water, three more, and ten palm-trees. (Geographical Commentary on Esod. xxv, 27) supposed wady Ueit to be Elilm, the second of four wadys lying between 29° 7' and 29° 30', which descend from the range of et-Th (here nearly parallel with the shore) towards the sea. The route of the Israelites, however, cannot be better mistaken. It evidently lay along the desert plain on the eastern shore of the Red Sea. Elilm must consequently have been in this plain, and not more than about fifty miles from the place of passage. With these data, and in a country where fountains are of such rare occurrence, it is not difficult to find Naby Elilm. Naby is, near the southeastern end of this plain, and not far from the base of Jebel Humram, the outpost of the great Sinai mountain-group, a charming vale, called wady Ghurneld, intersects the line of route. It is the first of the four wadys noticed above, and is, in fact, the western outlet of that region, and the only one in the vicinity containing water (Robinson, Researches, i, 100, 105). In the dry season it contains no stream, but in the rainy season it becomes the channel of a broad and powerful mountain current, being bounded by high ridges, and extending thence and ten palm-trees. Laborde, (Geographical Commentary on Esod. xxv, 27), supposed a "well," remaining, the others anciently existing being doubtless filled up. This principal fountain springs out at the foot of a sandstone rock, forming a pool of sparkling water, and sending out a tiny but perennial stream. This, in fact, is one part of that chief watering-places in the peninsula of Sinai (Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, p. 33 sq.). There are no palm-trees at present here, but the place is fringed with trees and shrubbery, stunted palms, with their hairy trunks and dishevelled branches; tamarisks, their feathery leaves dripping with what the Arabs call manna; and the acacia, with its gray foliage and white blossoms (Stanley, Palestine, p. 68). These supply the only verdure, which, however, in contrast with the naked desert, is quite refreshing (Ollin's Travels, i, 302). Well might such a wady, in the midst of a bare and treeless waste, be called emphatically Elilm, "the trees." Leupan takes another view, that Ghurneld is Mara, by others identified with Hotar (24 hours N.W. from Ghurneld, and reached by the Israelites, therefore, before it), and that Elilm is to be found in the last of the four above named, wady Shuketek (Travels, Berlin, 1845, p. 27 sq.). See EXODUS.

Elilmech (Heb. Elilmech, פַּלְמָן, God is his king; Sept. Αλμαλησ; Josephus, Antiquitaten, Ant. v, 9, 1), a man of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of the Hezronites and kinsman of Boaz, who dwelt in Bethlehem-Ephratah in the days of the judges. B.C. cir. 1368. In consequence of a great deal in the land he went with his wife Naomi, and his two sons, Mahlon and Chilion, to dwell in Moab, where he and his sons died without posterity (Ruth i, 2, 3; ii, 3; iv, 3, 9). See Ruth.

Elilo'sen (Hebr. Elilosan, פַּלְמָן, a contracted form of the name Elilosan), the name of several men.


3. (1 Chron. xxvi, 8.) See ELIHOMIAN.

4. (Sept. Elilmosan v. r. Elilosan, Vulg. Eliomian.) A priest of the posterity of Phashur, who had married a foreign wife after the return from Babylon, but who, at Ezra's instigation, put her away with the children born of her, and offered a ram for a trespass offering (Ezra x, 22). B.C. 458. He is perhaps the same mentioned in 1 Chron. xlii, 41, as one of the priests who accompanied Nehemiah with trumpets at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem. B.C. 446.


6. (Sept. Elilmosan v. r. Elilosan, Vulg. Eliomian.) Eldest son of Meiriah, son of She-maiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel; his family are the latest mentioned in the Old Test. (1 Chron. iii, 28, 24). B.C. ante 299. He appears to be the same with Eliel, the maternal ancestry of Christ (Luke iii, 29). (Calmet's History and Explanations of the Holy Bible, p. 16.) According to the present Heb. text he is in the seventh generation from Zerubbabel, or about contemporary with Alexander the Great; but lord Hervey thinks that She-maiah is identical with Shimeah (ver. 19). Zerubbabel is his brother (Geneal. of our Lord, p. 101-109, and c, viii).

Elionmous (Ἐλιονμός, doubtless a Greekized form of Eliomian), a high-priest of the Jews, who succeeded Matthias, son of Ananus (A.D. 42), and was the next year succeeded by Simon Cantharos (Josephus, Ant. xix, 8, 1). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Elios (Ἐλίος, the name of two men in the Apocalypse. 1. (Revel. iii, 12.) Elios, son of Adam, one of the sons of "Phaisur," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdras ix, 22); evidently the ELIOMAN (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 22).

2. (Ελίος, Vulg. Nomeas.) One of the sons of "Anna," who did the same (1 Esd. i, 32); doubtless the ELIZEKER (q. v.) of the Heb. text.

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

Eliot, John, styled "the apostle of the Indians," was born in the county of Essex, England, in 1604, and studied at the University of Cambridge. Emigrating to New England in 1631, he joined the Church in Boston. He was settled over the Church in Roxbury Nov. 5, 1632. Here he studied the Indian language, with the view of converting the natives to Christianity. The first Indian Church, established by the labor of Protectors in America, was formed at Natick in 1660, after the manner of the Congregational churches in New England. Those who wished to be organized into a Christian body were strictly examined as to their faith and experience by a number of the neighboring ministers, and Mr. Eliot afterwards administered to them baptism and the Lord's Supper. Other Indian churches were planted in various parts of Massachusetts, and he frequently visited them; but his pastoral care was more particularly over that which he first established. He made every exertion to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes; he stimulated many servants of Jesus to engage in the missionary
work; and, although he mourned over the stupidity of many who preferred darkness to light, yet he lived to see twenty-four of the copper-colored aborigines fellow-preachers of the precious Gospel of Christ. In 1661 he published the New Testament in the Indian language, and a few years the whole Bible, and several other books best adapted for the instruction of the natives. When he reached the age of fourscore years he offered to give up his salary, and desired to be liberated from the labors of his office as a teacher of the Church at Roxbury. It was with joy that he resigned his post to his colleague. When he was bending under his infirmities, and could no longer visit the Indians, he persuaded a number of families to send their negro servants to him once a week, that he might instruct them in the truths of God. He died May 26, 1690, saying that all his labors were poor and small, and exhorting those who surrounded his bed to pray. His last words were, "Welcome joy!" (Allen). In 1649 Mr. Eliot published The glorious Progress of the Gospel among the Indians; in 1653, Tears of Repentance; in 1655, A further Manifestation of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians; and in 1670, A Brief Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel. Baxter says, in one of his letters, "There was no man on earth whom I honored above him." A handsome memorial to the "Apostle of the Indians, and the pastor for fifty-eight years of the first church at Roxbury," has been erected in the Forest Hills Cemetery, Roxbury—Life and Death of John Eliot, by Cotton Mathur (1861); Mather's Magnalia, iii. 270; Francis, Life of John Eliot (Edinb. 1828); Sprague, Annals, ii, 18; Allen, American Biography.

Eliupandas, archbishop of Toledo in the 8th century. He shared the opinions of Felix, bishop of Urgel, regarding to the person of Christ. That, with respect to his human nature, he was only the adoptive Son of God, thus giving rise to the sect of Adoptianists. Eliupandas disseminated his views in Spain, France, and Germany. Adosinde, queen of Gallicia, induced bishop Eustachius of Ousma and the priest Beatus to write against him. They published against him two books, the originals of which are said to be still extant in Toledo. Eliupandas replied by several letters, but he was condemned at the council which Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia, convened at Ciudad de Frilej in 799. The following year the edicts of Eliupandas and Felix were again condemned at a synod which Charlemagne held at Ratisbon. Pope Adrian confirmed the sentence, to which Felix submitted; but Eliupandas, and several other bishops of Spain, persisted in their views, and wrote against Felix. This letter was rejected, and condemned by aician in a council held in Italy, and in the Council of Frankfort in 794. Charlemagne himself wrote a letter (still extant) to Eliupandas urging him to submit; but the letter seemed to have had little effect, for shortly before his death (in 799) Eliupandas wrote a reply maintaining his views. See Hofer, Notiz. Biz. Gmex., xv. 389; Neander, Ch. Hist. iii, 156-158; Mosheim, Ch. Hist., bk. iii, c. viii. pt. ii, ch. v, § 3. See DOCTIAMTISM.

Eliphai (Heb. Uliphia), וֹלִפִּיה, God is his judge; Sept. "Eliaphai v. r. Eiphai, Vulg. Eliphaal", son of Ur (q. v.), and one of David's famous guards (1 Chron. xx, 35). B.C. 1046. In the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 34) he seems to be called "Eliphleth, the son of Ahabai (q. v.), the son of the Maachathite;" but the names are here greatly confused. See David.

Eliphaal (Eiphaiu, Vulg. Eliphalech), one of the sons of "Amo," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esd. ix, 28); evidently the Eliphalet (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 33).

Eliphelet (q. v.), son of "Amo," the less correct mode of expressing (2 Sam. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. xiv, 7) the name of Eliphalet (q. v.). It also occurs in the Apocalypse (Eiphalet v.) as the name of one of the sons of Adonias, who returned from the exile (1 Esdr. viii, 39); the Eliphelet of the Heb. text (Ezra vii, 18).

Eliphaz (Hebrew Eliphonas, טופח, God is his strength; Sept. "Elyphauz, but in Gen. Elyphas, Vulg. Elphaz), the name of two men.

1. The leading one of the "three friends" who came to comfort Job in his affliction (Job iv, 1), and who took a more remarkable discourse (chap. xii-xv), which occupies the book of Job. B.C. cir. 2290. He is called "the Temanite;" hence it is naturally inferred that he was of the region substantially known as Teman (q. v.), in Idumea; and as Eliphas, the son of Esaau, had a son called Teman, from whom the place took its name, not improbably concluded that this truth brought forth the descendant of the other Eliphas. Some, indeed, even go so far as to suppose that the Eliphas of Job was no other than the son of Esaau. This view is of course confined to those who refer the age of Job to the time of these patriarchs. But it is doubtful whether even this gives a date sufficiently early. See Job.

Eliphas is the first of the friends to take up the debate, in reply to Job's passionate complaints. He appears to have been the oldest of the speakers, from which circumstance, or from natural disposition, his arguments are bold and sedate than that of the other (see Eichler, De visione Eliphas (iv, 12-31), Lpex. 1781). He begins his orations with delicacy, and conducts his part of the controversy with considerable address (chap. iv, v, xxv, xxvi). On him falls the main burden of the argument, that God's retribution in this world is perfect and certain, and that consequently suffering must be a proof of previous sin. His words are distinguished from those of B jihad and Zophar by greater calmness and elaboration, and, in the first instance, by greater gentleness towards Job, although he ventures afterwards, apparently from conjecture, to impugn his moral conduct. The great truth brought out by him is the unapproachable majesty and purity of God (iv. 12-21; xv. 16). But still, with the other two friends, he is condemned for having, in defence of God's providence, spoken of him "the thing that was not right," i.e. by refusing to recognise the facts of human life, and particularly early. See Eliphas.

2. The son of Esaau by one of his first wives, Adah, and father of several Edomitis tribes (Gen. xxxvi, 1, 10, 11, 16; 1 Chron. i, 35, 36). B.C. post 1683.

Eliph'eleh (Heb. in the prolonged form Eliphele'- la, פֹּלָה עָלָה, God will distinguish him; Sept. "Elef'elai and 'Elfelely v. r. Eifeleia and 'Elfeleias, Vulg. Eliphelaeo), a Merarite Levite; one of the gatekeepers (םִירָשָׁה, A.V. porter) appointed by David to play on the harp "on the Shenmith," on the occasion of bringing up the ark to the city of David (1 Chron. xv. 18, 21). B.C. 1046.

Eliphe'let (Heb. Uliphel'et, יֹלֵפַי הֶלֶת, in pause Eliphel'et, יֹלֵפַי הֶלֶת, God is his deliverer), the name of several sons of David.

1. (Sept. "Elyphaleth v. r. 'Alyphaleth and 'Elphaleth, Vulg. Eliphelthes). One of David's distinguished warriors, styled "the son of Ahasai, the son of the Maachathite" (2 Sam. xxii, 34); but, by some error and abbreviation, Eliphael (q. v.), the son of Ur, [and] Hepher, the Maachathite," in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xi, 35, 36).

2. (Sept. "Elyphaleth v. r. 'Alyphaleth, Vulg. Elipha- leth). The third of the nine sons of David, born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathsheba (1 Chron. iii, 6; iv, 5, in which latter passage the name is written Eliphlet). B.C. post 1044.

3. (Sept. "Elyphaleth v. r. 'Alyphaleth, Vulg. Eliphalet). The ninth of the same (1 Chron. iii, 8; iv, 7; 2 Sam
v. 16, in which two latter passages the name is Anglicized "Eliphameet." It is believed that there were no two sons of this name, but David's eleven sons, and that the last two were born of concubines (Ant. vii. 3, 3). See David.


Elisabeth (Ελισαβήτα), wife of Zacharias or Zachariah, and mother of John the Baptist (Luke i, 5). She was a descendant of Aaron, or of the race of the priests; and of her and her husband this exalted character was engendered, that they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke i, 7, 15). Thy had remained childless till the decline of life, when an angel foretold to her husband Zachariah the birth of John, and Zachariah returning home, Elisabeth conceived. During five months she concealed the favor God had granted her; but the angel Gabriel discovered to the Virgin Mary this miraculous conception, as an assurance of the birth of the Messiah by herself. See Announcement. Mary visited Elisabeth, and when she saluted her, Elisabeth felt the quickening of her unborn child. When her child was circumcised she named him John, according to previous instructions from her husband (Luke i, 39-63). B.C. 7. See Zacharias.

The name in this precise shape does not occur in the Old Testament, where the names of few females are given. But it is a Hebrew name, the same in fact as Elisheba (q. v.). It is perhaps etymologically connected with Elis or Eliash, the Phoenician name of queen Dido (Virgil, Aen. iv, 335), whence the modern Elia, Elizabeth.

Elissous (Ελησσούς), the Gracian form of the name of Elissos (q. v.) in the N. T. (Luke iv. 27), and is also in Ephesians (Eph. v. 12, as well as Josephus (Ant. viii. 13, 7 etc.).

Elia (Ελία, ναζονιστής, ναζονιστής, God is his salvation; Sept. Ελιασθάνος or Ελιασθάνω, Josephus and N. T. Ελιασθάνως, Vulg. Elyasus, A. V. in N. T. and Apoc. "Elissus"), the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah (1 Kings xix, 16-19), who became the attendant and disciple of Elijah (Josephus, Ant. viii. 13, 7), and his successor as prophet in the kingdom of Israel. See Elijah.

1. History. —The earliest mention of Elia's name is in the command to Elijah in the cave at Horeb (1 Kings xix, 16, 17). But our first introduction to the full person of the prophet is found in the fields of his native place (B.C. cir. 900). Abel-meholah—the "meadow of the dance"—was probably in the valley of the Jordan, and, as its name would seem to indicate, in a moist or watered situation. See Azel. Elijah, on his way from Sinai to Damascus, chose this native valley as his retreat, and lived there in the broken, arid fields of the valley, twelve yoke before him, i. e. probably eleven other ploughs preceding him along the same line (see Thomson, Land and Book, i, 288). To cross to him, to throw over his shoulders the rough mantle—a token at once of investiture with the prophet's office, and of adoption as a son—was to Elia, but the work of an instant, and the prophet strode on as if what he had done were nothing—Go back again, for what have I done to thee?" So sudden and weighty a call, involving the relinquishment of a position so substantial, and family ties so dear, might well have caused hesitation. But the parley was only momentary. To use a figure which we may almost believe to have been suggested by this very occurrence, Elijah was not a man, but a man, putting his hand to the plough, was likely to look back; he delayed merely to give the farewell kiss to his father and mother, and preside at a parting feast with his people, and then followed the great prophet on his northward road to the land of the second blessing, where in the east that Joshua had been to Moses. Of the nature of this connection we know hardly anything. "Elisha the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah," is all that is told us. The characters of the two men were thoroughly dissimilar, but how far the lion-like daring and courage of the one had infused itself into the other, we can judge from the few occasions on which it blazed forth, while every line of the narrative of Elijah's last hours on earth bears evidence how deep was the personal affection which the stern, rough, revered master had engendered in his gentle and plant disciple.

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

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

There are several considerations from which the incompleteness of the records of Elijah's life may be inferred: (a. ) The absence of marks by which to determine the dates of the various occurrences. The "king of Israel" is continually mentioned, but we are left to infer what kings it is that he has in view; (2 B.C. cir. 8, 9, 21, 26; vii, 2; viii, 3, 5, 6 etc.). This is the case even in the story of the important events of Naaman's cure, and the capture of the Syrian host at Dothan. The only exceptions are ill, 12 (comp. 6), and the narrations of the captive of Ruth and the eulogy of Ruth (i. vii. 12). The latter story is itself a proof of the disarrangement of these records, occurring as it does after the mention of the death of Jehoshaphat (13), and being followed by an account of occurrences in the reign of Jehoshaphat his father (ver. 22, 23). (6.) The absence of chronological sequence in the narratives. The story of the Souns-
mite embraces a lengthened period, from before the birth of the child till he was some years old. Gehazi's familiar communication with the king, and therefore the story which precedes it (vii, 1, 2), must have occurred before he was struck with leprosy, though placed long after the relation of that event (v, 27). (e) The different stories are not connected by the form of words usually employed in the consecutive narrative of these books. (See Keil, Comment. on Kings, p. 348, where other indications will be found.) The call of Elisha seems to have taken place about four years before the death of Ahab. He died in the reign of Joash, the great-grandson of Ahab, B.C. c. 855. However, the public career embraces a period of not less than 65 years, for certainly 55 of which he held the office of "prophet in Israel" (2 Kings v, 8).

(1.) After the departure of his master, Elisha returned to dwell (כנף) at Jericho (2 Kings ii, 18). The town had lately been rebuilt (1 Kings xvi, 54), and was a residence of the body of the "sons of the prophets" (2 Kings ii, 5, 8). Among the most prominent features of that place are still the two perennial springs which, rising at the base of the steep hills of Quarantania behind the town, send their streams across the plain towards the Jordan, scattering, even at the hottest season, the richest and most grateful vegetation over a country, which must be a land of sandy soil.

At the time in question, part, at least, of this charm was wanting. One of the springs was noxious — had some properties which rendered it unfit for drinking, and also prejudicial to the land (ii, 19, וַנָּתַן, bad, A. V., "naught"). At the request of the men of Jericho, Elisha remedied this evil. He took salt in a new vessel, and cast it into the water at its source in the name of Jehovah. From the time of Josephus (War, iv, 8, 8) to the present (Sawulf, Mod. Trans. p. 17), the tradition of the cave has been attached to the large spring W. of the present town, and which now bears, probably in reference to some later event, the name of Ain es-Sulaim (Robinson, Researches, iii, 588 sq.). See JERICHO.

(2.) We next meet with Elisha at Bethel, in the heart of the country, on his way from Jericho to Mount Carmel (2 Kings ii, 23). His last visit had been made in company with Elijah on their road down to the Jordan (ii, 5). Sons of the prophets resided there, but still it was the seat of the calf-worship; therefore a prophet of Jehovah might expect to meet with insult, especially if not so well known and so formidable as Elijah. The road to the town winds up the defile of the wady Suweinit, under the hill which still bears what are said to be the ruins of the city that was at the site of the town, at the site of which, even now retaining some traces was at that time deserted by a forest, thick, and the haunt of savage animals (comp. Amos v, 19). See BETHEL. Here the boys of the town were gathered, waiting, as they still wait at the entrance of the villages of Palestine, for the chance passer-by. In the scanty locks of Elisha, how were they to recognize the successor of the prophet, with whose shaggy hair streaming over his shoulders they were all familiar? So, with the license of the Eastern children, they scoff at the new-comer as he walks by — Go up (תַּהֲה, hardly承接, as if alluding to Elijah, but pass out on the way), bald-head (תַּהֲה), devoid of hair on the back of the head, as opposed to תַּהֲה, baid on the forehead):" For once Elisha assumed the sternness of his master. He turned upon them and censured them in the name of Jehovah. There was in their expressions an admixture of rudeness, in- fidelity, and impurity. But the inhabitants of Bethel were to know, from bitter experience, that to dishonor God's prophet was to dishonor himself, for Elisha was at the moment inspired to pronounce the judgment which at once took effect. God, who never wants for instruments to accomplish his purposes, caused two she-bears to emerge from the neighboring wood and punish the young delinquents. It is not said that they were actually killed (the expression is תַּהֲה, to rend, which is peculiarly applicable to the claws of the bear). This fate may indeed have befallen some of the party, but it is by no means probable in regard to the greater number.

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

(3.) Elisha extricates Jehoram, king of Israel, and the kings of Judah and Edom, from their difficulty in the campaign against Moab, arising from want of water (III, 4-27). The revolt of Moab occurred very shortly after the death of Ahab (III, 5; comp. i, 1), and the campaign, however, he seems to have been on another line (iii, 6; A. V., "through the latter part of the year")... The prophet was with the army according to Josephus (Ant. ix, 3, 8) he happened to be in a tent outside the camp of Israel." Joram he refuses to bear, except out of respect for Jehoshaphat, the servant of the true God; but a minstril is brought, and an instrument made the music of Jehoshaphat comes upon him, and he predicts a fall of rain, and advises a mode of procedure in connection therewith which results in the complete discomfiture of Moab. This incident probably took place at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea. See JEHORAM.

(4.) The widow of one of the sons of the prophet—according to Josephus, of Ondabilia, the steward of Ahab —is in debt, and her two sons are about to be taken from her and sold as slaves by her creditors, as by an extension of the law (Exod. xxi, 7, and Lev. xxv, 39), and by virtue of another (Exod. xxii, 5), they had the power to do; and against this heart-broken act she implores the prophet's assistance. God will not, without a cause, depart from the general laws of his administration: Elisha therefore inquires how far she herself had the power to avert the threatened calamity. She replies that the only thing of which she was possessed was one pot of oil. This Elisha causes to be filled (ii, 6) to the top (iii, 19), and he sends the widow of Elijah at Zarephath, until the widow has filled it with all the vessels which she could borrow, and thus procured the means of payment (2 Kings iv, 1-7). No place or date of the miracle is mentioned.

(5.) The next occurrence is at Shunem and Mount Carmel (iv, 8-27). The account consists of two parts—
ELISHA 155
ELISHA

[6.] After an interval of several years, the boy is old enough to accompany his father to the corn-field, when the harvest is proceeding. The first rays of the morning sun are too powerful for him, and (affected apparently by a sun-stroke) he is carried home to his mother only to die at noon. She says nothing of her loss to her husband, but depositing her child on the bed of the man of God, she, without a tear, went to Mount Carmel. The distance is fifteen or sixteen miles—at least four hours’ ride—but she is mounted on the best ass (תתא, the she-ass, such being noted for excellence), and she does not slacken rein.

Elisha is on one of the heights of Carmel commanding the road to Shunem, and from his position opposite to her (תתא) he recognises in the distance the figure of the regular attendant at the services which he holds here now new moon and sabbath” (comp. ver. 25). He sees Gehazi approach, and, thinking it is from a reason of her unexpected visit. But her distress is for the ear of the master, and not of the servant, and she presses on till she comes up to the place where Elisha himself is stationed (תתא, the mount, ver. 27, i. e. Carmel, ver. 25); then throwing herself down in her emotion, she clasps him by the feet. Misinterpreting this action, or perhaps with an ascetic feeling of the unholiness of a woman, Gehazi attempts to thrust her away. But the prophet is too profound a student of human nature to allow this. ‘‘Let her alone, for her soul is vexed within her, and Jehovah hath hid it from me, and hath walled mine eyes” (דסי), with the enigmatic form of Oriental speech—“Did I not cast thee out, a son of my lord? Did I not say, do not deceive me?” No explanation is needed to tell Elisha the exact state of the case. The heat of the season will allow of no delay in taking the necessary steps, and Gehazi is at once dispatched to run back to Shunem with the utmost speed. He takes the prophet’s walking-staff in his hand which he is to lay on the face of the child. The mother and Elisha follow in haste. Before they reach the village the sun of that long, anxious summer afternoon must have set. Gehazi meets them on the road, but he has no reassuring report to give: the placing of the staff on the face of the dead boy had called forth no sign of life. Then Elisha enters the house, goes up to his own chamber, “and he shut the door on them twain, and prayed unto Jehovah.” It was what Elijah had done on a similar occasion, and in this and his subsequent proceedings Elisha was probably following a method which he had had from his master. The child is restored to life, the mother is called in, and again falls at the feet of the prophet, though with what different emotions—“ and she took up her son and went out” (2 Kings iv, 18–37).

There is nothing in the narrative to fix its date with much accuracy. The events recorded by Nehemiah refer to the events of the days of Nehemiah, that is, to the time of Elisha’s successor Gehazi, the “servant” (“לד,” lad) of the man of God. It must of course have occurred before the events of viii, 1-6, and therefore before the cure of Naaman, when Gehazi became a leper.

(6.) The scene now changes to Gilgal, apparently at a time when Elisha was residing there (iv, 38–41). The sons of the prophets are sitting round him. It is a time of famine, possibly the same seven years’ scarcity which is mentioned in viii, 1, 2, and during which the Shunammite woman of the preceding story migrated to the Philistine country. The food of the party must consist of any herbs that can be found. The great caldron is put on at the command of Elisha, and one of the company brings his blanket (“לד,” not “lap”) as in A. V., as a gathering of vegetables as he has collected, and empties it into the caldron. The other men have they begun their meal than the taste betrays the presence of some noxious herb [see Gunn], and they cry out, “There is death in the pot, oh man of God!” In this case the cure was effected by meal which Elisha cast into the pot and the caldron (1 Kings iv, 39–40).

(7.) The next miracle in all probability belongs to the same time, and also to the same place as the preceding. A man from Baal-shalisha (q. v.) brings the man of God a present of the first-fruits, which under the law (Num. xviii, 8, 12; Deut. xviii, 3, 4) were the perquisite of the ministers of the sanctuary—20 sheaves of the new barley, and some small bundle of green grass, which is distinctly referred to. It is no longer disputed, but which seems most likely to have been roasted ears of corn not fully ripe (בֵּית), perhaps elliptically for בֵּית, comp. Lev. xxi, 4), brought with care in a sack or bag (זית, Sept. xiiii). This moderate provision is by the word of Jehovah rendered more than sufficient for a hundred men (2 Kings iv, 42–44). This is one of the instances in which Elisha is the first to anticipate in some measure the miracle of Christ.

(8.) The simple record of these domestic incidents amongst the sons of the prophets are now interrupted by an occurrence of a more important character (2 Kings v, 1–27). The chief captain of the army of Syria, to whom his country was indebted for some signal success (the tradition of the Jews is that it was Naaman who killed Absalom. 2 Sam. viii), was afflicted with leprosy, and that in its most malignant form, the white variety (ver. 27). In Israel this would have disqualified him from all employment and all intercourse (2 Kings xv, 5; 2 Chron. xxvi, 20, 21). But in Syria no such practice appears to have prevailed; Naaman was still a “great man with his master,” “a man of countenance.” One of the members of his establishment is an Israelitish girl, kidnapped by the marauders (וָתְנָה) of Syria in one of their forays over the border, and she brings into that Syrian household the fame of the name and skill of Elisha. “The prophet in Samaria,” who had raised the dead, would, if brought into the presence of (וָתְנָה) the patient, have no difficulty in curing even this dreadful leprosy. The Sennacherib communiqué of himself (וָתְנָה), not “one told” to the king. Benhadad had yet to learn the position and character of Elisha. He writes to the king of Israel a letter very characteristic of a military prince, and curiously recalling words uttered by another military man in reference to the cure of his sick servant many centuries later—“I say to this one, go, and he goeth, and to my servant, do...
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this, and he doeth it." "And now"—so ran Benhadad's letter after the usual complimentary introduction had probably opened the communication—"and now, when this letter is come unto thee, behold, I have sent Naaman, my slave, to thee, that thou mayest recover him of his leprosy." With this letter, and with a present, in which the rich fabrics (☞22, i. e. a dress of ceremony) for which Damascus has always been in modern times so famous form a conspicuous feature, and the olive-wood articles of abundance (☞15, 23), Naaman p. proceeds to Samaria. The king of Israel—his name is not given, but it was probably Joram—is dismayed at the communication. He has but one idea, doubtless the result of too frequent experience—"Consider how this man seeketh a quarrel against me!" This occurrence soon reaches the ears of the prophet, and with a certain dignity he "sends" to the king—"Let him come to me, and he shall know that there is a prophet in Israel." To the house of Elisha Naaman goes with his whole cavalcade, the "horses and chariots" of the Syrian general fixing themselves particularly in the mind of the chronicler. Elisha still keeps in the background, and while Naaman stands at the doorway, contents himself with sending out a messenger with the simple direction to bathe seven times in the Jordan. The independent behavior of the prophet, and the simplicity of the prescription—only devoid of any ostentatious, but abundantly sufficient to the native of a city which boasted, as it still boasts, of the finest water-supply of any city of the East, all combined to enrage Naaman. His slaves, however, knew how to deal with the quick but not ungentoo temper of their master, and the result is that he goes down to the Jordan and dips himself seven times, and his flesh came again like the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." His first business after his cure is to thank his benefactor. He returns with his whole train (☞22, i. e. "host" or "camp"), and this time he will not be denied the presence of Elisha, but, making his way in, and standing before him, he gratefully acknowledges the power of the God of Israel, and entreats him to accept the present which he had brought from Damascus. But Elisha is firm, and refuses the offer, though repeated with the strongest adjuration. Naaman, having adopted Jehovah as his God, beegs to be allowed to take away some of the earth of his favored country, of which Bethel was the altar. He then invites Elisha on a difficulty which he foresees. How is he, a servant of Jehovah, to act when he accompanies the king to the temple of the Syrian god Rimmon? He must bow before the god; will Jehovah pardon this disloyalty? Elisha's answer is "Go in peace," and so this fierce war of words is ended. But Gehazi, the attendant of Elisha, cannot allow such treasures thus to escape him. "As Jehovah liveth," an expression, in the lips of this vulgar Israelite, exactly equivalent to the oft-repeated Wallah—"by God"—of the modern Arabs, "I will run after this Syrian and take something of him." So he frames a story by which the generosity of Naaman is made to send back with him to Elisha's house a considerable present in money and clothes. He then went in and stood before his master as if nothing had happened. But the prophet was not so deceiver. Rimmon had gone before him through the whole transaction, even to its minutest details, and he visits Gehazi with the tremendous punishment of the leprosy, from which he has just relieved Naaman. The date of the transaction must have been at least seven years after the raising of the Shunammite's son. This is in comparison with 1, 2, 3. Gehazi's familiar conversation with the king must have taken place before he was a leper. See Naaman. (9.) We now return to the sons of the prophets, but this time the scene appears to be changed, and is probably at Jericho, and during the residence of Elisha there. Whether from the increase of the scholars conversant on the estimation in which the master was held, or from some other cause, their habitation had become too small—"The place in which we sit before thee is too narrow for us." They will therefore move to the close neighborhood of the Jordan, and cutting down beams—each man one, as with curious minute—saw to the smallest details—make there a new dwelling-place. Why a man was selected can only be assumed. Possibly for its distance from the distractions of Jericho—possibly the spot was once sanctified by the crossing of Israel with the ark, or of Elijah, only a few years before. Urged by his disciples, the man of God consented and let them accompany him. When they reach the Jordan, descending to the level of the sea, all commence filling the trees (☞22) of the dense belt of wood in immediate contact with the water. See Jordan. As one of them was cutting at a tree overhanging the stream, the iron of his axe (a borrowed tool) flew off and sank into the water. His cry soon brought the man of God to his aid. The stream of the Jordan is deep up to the very bank, especially when the water is so low as to leave the wood dry, and is, moreover, so turbid that search would be useless. But the place at which the lost axe entered the water is shown to Elisha; he looses off (☞22) a stick and casts it into the stream, and the iron appears on the surface, and is recovered by its possessor (2 Kings vi. 1—7).

(10.) Elisha is now residing at Dothan, half way on the road between Samaria and Jerzeel. The incursions of the Syrian raiding bands (☞19, 20) still continue, but apparently with greater boldness, and pushed even into places which the king of Israel is accustomed to frequent (comp. Josephus, Ant. ix, 4, 3). But their manoeuvres are not hid from the man of God, and by his warnings he saves the king "not once nor twice." So baffled were the Syrians. He conducts them to beat failures as to make their king suspect treachery in his own camp. But the true explanation is given by one of his own people—possibly one of those who had witnessed the cure wrought on Naaman, and could conceive no power too great to ascribe to so gifted a person: "Elisha, the prophet in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber." So powerful a magician must be seized without delay, and a strong party with chariots is dispatched to effect his capture. They march by night, and before morning take up their stations on the base of the hill above which the ruins of Dothan still stand. Elisha's servant—not Gehazi, but apparently a new-comer, unacquainted with the powers of his master—is the first to discover the danger. But Elisha remains unmoved by his fears; and at his request the eyes of the youth are opened, which behold the spiritual guards which are protecting them, horses and chariots of fire filling the whole of the mountain. But this is not enough. Elisha again prays to Jehovah, and the whole of the Syrian warriors are struck blind. He then descends, and offers to lead them to the person and the place where they will find protection, and to Samaria. There, at the prayer of the prophet, their sight is restored, and they find themselves, not in a retired country village, but in the midst of the capital of Israel, and in the presence of the king and his troops. His enemies thus completely in his grasp, the king of Israel is enabled to exact from them—"Shalt thou say, I say, my father?" But the end of Elisha has been answered when he has shown the Syrians how futile are all their attempts against his superior power. "Thou shalt not say. Thou mayest say those whom thou hast taken captive in lawful fight, but not these literally. Are these the things that thou hast captured with thy sword and bow, that thou art smiting them?"

(See Benhadad.)
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(11.) But the king of Syria could not rest under such dishonor. He abandoned his marauding system, and gathered a regular army, with which he lays siege to Samaria. The awful extremities to which the inhabitants of the place were driven need not here be recalled. The next night he had inflicted on his son a terrible punishment, and the next day he was placed in the place of his father, as the murderer of Ahimasek. The king, therefore, the Shunammite had recourse, as the widow of Tekoa on a former occasion to king David (2 Sam. xiv, 4). Thus occurred one of those rare coincidences which it is impossible not to ascribe to something more than mere chance. At the very moment of the entrance of the king, and her son, imitating the example of Oriental suppliants alone clamor (נֵשָׁפֶה), for her home and her land—"the king was listening to a recital by Gehazi of "all the great things which Elisha had done," the crowning feat of all being that which he was then actually relating—the restoration to life of the boy of Shunem. The woman was instantly recognized by Gehazi. "My lord, O king, this is the woman and this is her son whom Elisha restored to life." From her own mouth the king hears the repetition of the wonderful tale, and, whether from regard to Elisha, or struck by the extraordinary coincidence, orders her land to be restored, with the value of all its produce during her absence (2 Kings vili, 1-6).

(18.) Hitherto we have met with the prophet only in his own capacity. We now find him in that of a great statesman. (The traditional spot of his residence on this occasion is shown in the synagogue at Jobar (?) Holah, a village about two miles E. of Damascus. The name village, if not the same building, also contains the cave in which Elijah was fed by ravens and the tomb of Gezah (Stanley, Palæst. p. 89; Quaresmius, ii, 283; "cana et munducis Hebrorum"). He is there to carry out the command given to Elijah on Horeb to "anoint Hazael to be king over Syria." At the time of his arrival Benhadad was prostrate with his last illness. This marks the time of the visit as after the siege of Samaria, which was conducted by Benhadad in person (comp. vi, 24). The memory of the cure of Naaman, and of the subsequent disinterestedness of the prophet, were no doubt still fresh in Damascus; and no sooner does he enter the city than the intelligence of his arrival is spread abroad. "The man of God is come hither." The king's first desire is only to attain his own fate; and Hazael, who appears to have succeeded Naaman, is commissioned to be the bearer of a present to the prophet, and to ask the question on the part of his master, "Shall I recover of this disease?" The object is to hear the answer from the lips of Hazael, and learn from his own mouth the oracle. The caravan (of 40 camels, according to Josephus, Ant. ix, 4, 6) laden with the riches and luxuries which that wealthy city alone could furnish. The terms of Hazael's address show the respect in which the prophet was held even in this foreign and hostile country. They are identical with those in which Naaman was addressed by his slaves, and in which the king of Israel in a moment of the deepest gratitude and reverence addressed Elisha himself. "Thy servant Benhadad hath sent me to thee, saying, 'Shall I recover of this disease?" The reply, probably originally ambiguous, is doubly precious in the present doubtful state of the Hebrew text, but the general conclusion was unmistakable: "Jehovah hath showed me that he shall surely die." But this was not all that had been revealed to the prophet. If Benhadad died, who would be king in his stead but the man who had been anointed upon the land for seven years? and he had warned his friend the Shunammite of it that she might provide for her safety. Accordingly she had left Shunem with her family, and had taken refuge in the land of the Philistines, that is, in the rich corn-crowing plain on the coast of Judah, who, secure from want, she remained during the death. At the end of the seven years she returned to her native place, to find that during her absence her house with the field-land attached to it—the corn-fields of the former story—the corn-fields of the former story—had been appropriated by some other person. In Eastern countries kings are (or were) accessible to the complaints of the meanest subject, and their addresses were free intercourse to the inhabitants of the Western world. To the king, therefore, the Shunammite had recourse, as the widow of Tekoa on a former occasion to king David (2 Sam. xiv, 4). Thus occurred one of those rare coincidences which it is impossible not to ascribe to something more than mere chance. At the very moment of the entrance of the king, and her son, imitating the example of Oriental suppliants alone clamor (נֵשָׁפֶה), for her home and her land—"the king was listening to a recital by Gehazi of "all the great things which Elisha had done," the crowning feat of all being that which he was then actually relating—the restoration to life of the boy of Shunem. The woman was instantly recognized by Gehazi. "My lord, O king, this is the woman and this is her son whom Elisha restored to life." From her own mouth the king hears the repetition of the wonderful tale, and, whether from regard to Elisha, or struck by the extraordinary coincidence, orders her land to be restored, with the value of all its produce during her absence (2 Kings vili, 1-6).
press" and "cut Israel short," would "thrust Gillael with threshing instruments of iron," and "make them like the dust by threshing," as no former king of Syria had done, and that at a time when the prophet would be no longer alive to warn and to advise. At Hazael's request, he comes forth at the request of Omri, a "calm and deliberate" saint. But the cause of the prophet is one which has no sorrow for Hazael. How such a career presented itself to him may be inferred from his answer. His only doubt is the possibility of such good fortune for one so mean. "But what is thy slave, dog that he is (Matthew 27:29, Mark 15:29, Luke 23:22, Acts 28:22)? I am a servant of the Lord." "Thy Lord," he says, "will show me what thou wilt be king over Syria." "Returning to the king, Hazael tells him only half the dark saying of the man of God—"He told me that thou shouldest surely recover." But that was the last day of Benhadad's life. What were the circumstances attending his death, whether in the bath as has recently been suggested (Ewald, J. G., p. 532 note), is not clear, except that he seems to have been smothered. The general inference, in accordance with the account of Josephus, is that Hazael himself was the murderer, but the statement in the text does not necessarily bear an important interpretation (2 Samuel 8:15; 2 Kings 8:12). "This shall be rendered to thee (not of) hair-cloth," i.e., perhaps divan-mattress; and, indeed, from the mention of Hazael's name at the end of the passage, the conclusion is rather the reverse (2 Kings viii, 7-15). See HAZAEL.

(14.) Two of the injunctions laid on Elijah had now been carried out, but the third still remained. Hazael had slain King Benhadad of Syria. This attempt to recover the stronghold of Ramoth-Gilead (viii, 28), or Ramah, among the mountains on the east of Jordan. But the fortress was held by the kings of Israel and Judah in alliance, and, though the Syrians had wounded the king of Israel, they had not been able to capture the place (viii, 28; ix, 15). One of the captains of the Israelitish army in the garrison was Jehu, the son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshi. At the time his name was mentioned to Elijah on Horeb he must have been a youth; now he is one of the boldest and best known of all the warriors of Israel. He had seen the great prophet once, when with his companion Bidkar he attended Ahab to take possession of the field of Naboth, and the scene of that day, and the words of the curse then pronounced, no subsequent adventure had been able to efface (ix, 25, 30). The thought of the curse of the fulness of the curse by his being anointed king over Israel. Elijah's personal share in the transaction was confined to giving directions to one of the sons of the prophets, and the detailed narrative may be found in 2 Kings ix (see MAURICE, Prophecies and Kings, serm. ix.). See JEHU.

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

(16.) The power of the prophet, however, does not terminate with his death. Even in the tomb (Josephus embalishes the account by stating that he had a magnificent funeral, Ant. x. 8, 6) he restores the dead to life. Most had been recovered from the tremendous reverse inflicted on her by the three kings at the opening of Elisha's career (2 Kings iii), and her ravaging bands had again begun the work of deprestation which Syria so long pursued (2 Kings v, 2; vi, 20). The text perhaps infers that the spring—that is, when the early crops were ripening—was the usual period for these attacks; but be it as it may, on the present occasion they invaded the land "at the coming in of the year." A funeral was going on in the cemetery which contained the sepulchre of Elisha. Seeing the Moabithit spoilers in the distance, the friends of the king were afraid to conceal his corpse in the nearest hiding-place. They chose—whether by design or by accident is not said—the tomb of the prophet, and, as the body was pushed (2 Kings iii) into the cell which formed the receptacle for the corpse in Jewish tombs, it came in contact with his bones. The mere touch of those hallowed remains was enough to effect that which in his lifetime had cost Elisha both prayers and exertions—the man "revived and sat up on his feet." Other miracles of the prophet foreshadow, as we have remarked, the acts of power and goodness of our Saviour, but this may rather be said to recall the marvels of a later period—of the early ages of the Christian Church. It is in the story of Gerasenes and Possessed and Possessed (Matthew xiv, 30-41) that the likeness is seen. It is not in any occurrence in the life of our Lord or of the apostles, that we must look for a parallel to the last-recorded miracle of Elisha (2 Kings xiii, 20-22).

2. Characteristics and Traditional Views.—In almost every respect Elisha presents the most complete contrast to Elijah. The collection of his sayings and doings which are preserved in the 3d to the 9th chapter of the 2d book of Kings, though in many respects deficient in that remarkable vividness which we have noted in the records of Elijah, is yet full of testimonies to this contrast. Elijah was a true Bedouin, the child of the desert and the slave of the curse by his being anointed king over Israel. The detailed narrative may be found in 2 Kings ix (see MAURICE, Prophecies and Kings, serm. ix.). See JEHU.

2 Kings x, 18-20; xii, 17, 1; xiii, 1-20; xiv, 1-12; xv, 1-18; xvi, 1-20; xvii, 1-40; xviii, 1-18; xix, 1-20; xx, 1-19; xxi, 1-19; xxii, 1-40; xxiii, 1-29; xxiv, 1-25; xxv, 1-21; xxvi, 1-20; xxvii, 1-36; xxviii, 1-28; xxix, 1-20; xxx, 1-28; xxxi, 1-13. See also 1 Kings iv, 33-42. See also 1 Kings iv, 33-42. The flow of the narrative here is interrupted, but we can gather that his dress was the ordinary garment of an Israelite, the, probably similar in form to the long abbyr of the modern Syrians (2 Kings ii, 12), that his hair was worn short (if not naturally deficient) behind, in contrast with the long locks of Elisha (ii, 25), and that he was a wanderer, the kind ordinarily carried by slave or aged citizens (Zechariah viii, 4). What use made of the rough mantle of Elijah, which came into his possession at their
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parting, does not anywhere appear, but there is no hint of his ever having worn it, Elisha was emphatically a destroyer. His mission was to slay and to demolish whatever opposed or interfered with the work of God. Scenes of death and destruction had been adopted as the emblem of power and force, and they were shown that he was feebleness itself compared with the God whom they had forsaken. But after Elisha the destroyer comes Elisha the healer. "There shall not be dew nor rain these years" is the earliest proclamation of the one. "There shall not be thine inheritance, of thee nor of thy father's" is the first miracle of the other. What may have been the disposition of Elisha when not engaged in the actual service of his mission we have unhappily no means of knowing. Like most men of strong, stern character, he probably had affections not less than Whiting. But it is impossible to conceive that he was accustomed to the practice of that beneficence which is so strikingly characteristic of Elisha, and which comes out at almost every step of his career. Still more impossible is it to conceive him exercising the tolerance towards the person and the religion of foreigners for which Elisha is remarkable—in communication, for example, with Naaman or Hazael; in the one case calming with a word of peace the scuffle of the new proselyte, anxious to recollect the due homage to Rimmon with his allegiance to Jehovah; in the other case contemning with tears, but still with tears only, the evil which the future king of Syria was to bring upon his country. That Baal-worship was prevalent in Israel even after the efforts of Elisha, and that Samaria was his chief seat, we have the evidence of the narrative of Jehu to ascribe unto (2 Kings x, 18, 19); but his mission is not so directly rebuke and punish it. In the eulogium of Elisha contained in the catalogue of Worthies of Eccles. xlviii., 12, 14—the only later mention of him save the passing allusion of Luke iv, 27—his special character is more strongly brought out than in the earlier narrative. Whilst he lived, he was in the presence of any prince, neither could any bring him into subjection. No word could overcome him, and after his death his body prophesied. He did wonders in his life, and at his death were his works marvelous.

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

The frequency and unparalleled nature of his miracles also furnish perhaps the best explanation of Elisha's behest of "a double portion of his own spirit" upon Elisha (2 Kings ii, 9). The ordinary meaning put upon this phrase (see, for example, J. H. Newman, subi, of the Day, p. 191) is that Elisha possessed double the power of Elisha. This, though sanctioned by the renderings of the Vulgate and Luther, and adopted by a long series of commentators from Ephraem Syrus to Krummacher, would appear not to be the real force of the words. The expression is נַעֲרָה נַעֲרָה, literally "a mouth of two"—a double mouthful—the same phrase employed in Deut. xxxi, 17 to denote the amount of a father's goods which were the right and token of a first-born son. Thus the gift of the "double portion" of Elisha as a legitimate heir is the legitimate act of the act of adoption which began with the casting of the mantle at Abel-meholah years before. It was this which Elisha sought—not a gift of the spirit of prophecy twice as large as Elisha himself possessed. This carries improbable on the very face of it; for what property could a man be asked to leave as an inheritance to another double of what he himself possessed? Nor did Elisha get any such superlative endowment; his position as a prophet was altogether of a dependent and secondary nature as compared with Elisha's; and the attempts in the Christian period to make use of the relation of the one to the other, proceeds upon arbitrary and superficial considerations. Not less arbitrary is the view of Ewald, that the request of Elisha must be understood as indicating a wish for two thirds only of Elisha's spirit (Gesen, iii, 507)—a view that requires no refutation. The true explanation is, that Elisha regarded Elisha as the head of a great spiritual household, which included himself as the first-born and all who had since been added to the fraternity under the name of "the sons of the prophets"; and what he now sought was, that he might be constituted Elisha's heir in the spiritual inheritance, by getting the first-born's double portion, and therewith authority to continue the work. For a curious calculation by Peter Damianus that Elisha performed twelve miracles and Elisha twenty-four, see the Acta Sanctorum, July 20.

Elisha is canonized in the Greek Church; his day is the 14th of June. Under that date, his life, and a collection of the few traditions concerning him—few indeed when compared with those of Elisha—may be found in the Acta Sanctorum. In the time of Jerome a "mausoleum" containing his remains was shown at Samaria (Paterv. p. 990). In it were the bones of Elisha taken from their receptacle and burned. But, notwithstanding this, his relics are heard of subsequently, and the church of St. Apollinarius at Ravenna still boasts of possessing his head. The Carmelites have a special service in honor of Elisha.


Elisha (in Armenian Eghacel) one of the most celebrated Armenian (Hrachian, was born at the beginning of the 2nd century. He was a pupil of the patriarch St. Sahag (Isaac) and of St. Mesrob, by whom he was sent to the schools of Athens, Alexandria, and Constantinople. Subsequently he became almoner and secretary of prince Varten, who, in the religious war of the Armenians against the Seljuk chief commander of the Armenian army. He died in 480. Probably he is the same person with bishop Elisha of Amathunik, who in 449 was present at the Syn-
od of Artashat, at which the bishops of Armenia replied to the summons of the Persian ruler Yazdegerd II to adopt the faith of Zoroaster. This reply, to which was added a brief apology of the Christian religion, led to the religious war which is described by Elisha. So great was the reputation of this work that its author received the surname of the Armenian Xenophanes. Elisha’s account of the accession of Yazdegerd IV describes in full the schemes of persecution devised by the Persian king against the Armenians, the resistance of the Armenian bishops and princes, the “holy alliance” concluded by the latter, and its operation and fate until the unfortunate battle at the river Tchmutch, in the province of Artas, in 451, in consequence of which the leaders of the holy alliance and most of the bishops were captured and taken to Persia. The first edition of this work was printed at Constantinople in 1641 (new ed. 1833); other editions appeared at Nakhichevan (1764), Calcutta (1816), and Venice (1822 and 1836). The last Venice edition, which is the best, contains also commentaries to the books of Joshua and Judges, a recommendation of monastic life, an exposition of the Lord’s Prayer, several homilies, and a work on the ecclesiastical canons. An English translation of the work was published by F. Neumann (The History of Varion and the Battle of the Armenians, containing An Account of the Religious Wars between the Persians and Armenians, by Eliauseus, bishop of the Amadanians, etc., Lond. 1830). It has also been translated into French by abbé G. K. Garabed (Sous les règnes des rois de l’Arménie, 1844, 8vo), and into Italian by G. Capelletti (Veneti, 1841). Elisha is also the author of a history of Armenia, which, however, appears to be lost.—Wetzler u. Wele, Kirchen-Lex., iii, 540; Hoefcr, Nouv. Bibli. Génér., xxv, 884; Neumann, Vernach einer Gesch. der arm, Litter. p. 69, 70 (A. J. S.).

Elish‘ah (Heb. Elish‘, Ἠλίσσαρ, Ἱλίσσαρ, Elish‘a, Elish‘a, Elish‘a, Elish‘a; Vulg. Elish‘a), the eldest of the four sons of Javan (Gen. x. 4; 1 Chron. i. 7). B.C. cir. 2450. He seems to have given name to a region on the Mediterranean, “the isles (Ἐλίσσαρ, Ἱλίσσαρ, Ἱλίσσαρ, Ἱλίσσαρ, Elish‘a, Elish‘a, Elish‘a, Elish‘a) of Elish‘ah,” which are described as exporting fabrics of purple and scarlet to the markets of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii. 7). If the descendants of Javan peopled Greece, we may expect to find Elish‘ah in some province of that country. It is probable that the name Elish‘ah was attached to the purple dye as a mark of the purple suits the Peloponnesus, for the fish affording the purple dyed was caught at the mouth of the Eurotas, and the purple of Laconia was very celebrated. See PIRUS. The name seems kindred to Elish‘ah (Joarch, Phileg. iii. 4), which, in a wider sense, was applied to the whole Peloponnesus; and some identify Elish‘ah with Helias (Michaels, Spec. Lyc., i. 79).—Kitto, S. V. Josephus, however, identified the race of Elish‘ah with the Eolians (Ant. i. 6, 1. His view is adopted by Knobel (Völkerk., p. 81 sq.). It appears correct to treat it as the designation of a race rather than of a locality; and if Javan represents the Ionians, then Elish‘ah the Eolians, whose name presents considerable similarity (Διόλις, having possibly been Διόλις), and whose predilection for maritime situations quite accords with the expression in Ezekiel. In early times the Eolians were settled in various parts of Greece, Thrace, Scythia, Beotia, Etolia, Locris, Elis, and Messenia: from Greece they emigrated to Asia Minor, and in Ekelion’s age occupied the maritime district in the N.W. of that country, named after them Eolos, together with the islands Lesbos and Tenedos. This is the region in which the fish was found on this coast, especially at Abydos (Virgil, Georg. i. 207), Phocaea (Ovid, Metam. vi. 9), Sigeum and Lectum (Athenaeus, iii. 88). Not much, however, can be deduced from this as to the position of the “isles of Elish‘ah,” as that shell-fish was found in many parts of the Mediterranean, especially on the coast of Laconia (Pausan. iii. 21. 6). Schlothüser (Paradies, p. 284), without the slightest probability, argues in favor of a position on the western coast of Africa, on the ground of the resemblance to Elites as the Phoenician name of Cartage. See ETHNOLOGY.

Elish‘ah‘ana (Heb. Elish‘ah‘ana, Ἠλίσσαρ, Ἱλίσσαρ, whom God has heard), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. ‘Elysh‘a‘an v. r. in Chron. ‘Elysh‘a‘an.) Son of Amihud, and “prince” or “captain” (both Nôkel, i.e. phylarch) of the tribe of Ephraim at the Exode (Num. i. 10; ii. 18; vii. 46, 55; x. 22). B.C. 1658.

2. From the position of the chronicle (Num. vii. 25), we find that he was the grandfather of Joshua.

3. ‘Elysh‘a‘an v. r. ‘Elysh‘an.) The second of the nine sons of David born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathshuha (1 Chron. iii. 6); cæsed in the par alliel passages (2 Sam. v. 15; 1 Chron. xiv. 5) by apparently the more correct name Eliesheva (q. v.).

4. (Sept. ‘Elysh‘a‘an.) The seventh of the same series of sons (2 Sam. v. 16; 1 Chron. iii. 8; xiv. 7), being one of the thirteen, or, according to the record of Samuel, the eleven, sons born to David of his wives after his establishment in Jerusalem. B.C. post 1044. The list in Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, 9) has no similar name. See DAVID.

5. (Sept. ‘Elysh‘a‘an.) Son of Jekahim, a descendant of Judah (1 Chron. ii. 41). In the Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome (Qu. Habr, on 1 Chron. ii. 41) he appears to be identified with

6. (Sept. ‘Elysh‘a‘an v. r. in Jer. ‘Elysh‘an and ‘Elysh‘an.) A member of the 1 Chron. line of Judah; father of Nethaniah, and grandfather of Ishmael who slew Gedaliah, provisional governor of Jerusalem after its capture by the Babylonians (2 Kings xxv. 25; Jer. xil. 1). B.C. considerably ante 688.

7. (Sept. ‘Elysh‘a‘an.) A royal scriber in whose chamber the roll of Jeremiah was read to him and other assembled magnates, and afterwards deposited for a time (Jer. xxxvi. 12, 20, 21). B.C. 605.

Elish‘aph (Heb. Elish‘aph, ἦλίσσαρ, whom God has judged; Sept. ‘Elysh‘aph v. r. ‘Elysh‘aph, son of Zichri, and one of the “captains of hundreds” whom Jehoiacon associated with himself in the league to overthrow the usurpation of Ahtaliah (2 Chron. xxiii. 11). B.C. 877.

Elish‘e‘ba (Heb. Elish‘ba, ἦλίσσαρ, God is her oath, or she seears by God, i. e. worshipper of God, comp. Isa. xix. 8; Sept. ‘Elysh‘ē‘ber, Vulg. Elisabeth: as in Luke i. 7), the daughter of Amminadab, phylarch of the tribe of Judah, and sister of Nahshon, the captain of the Hebrew host (Num. ii. 5); she became the wife of Asron (q. v.), and hence the mother of the priestly family (Exod. vi. 23). B.C. 1658.

Elish‘ahu‘a (Heb. id. Elish‘ahu, God is his selection; Sept. ‘Elysh‘ahu v. r. ‘Elysh‘ahu and ‘Elysh‘ahu, Vulg. Eliesheva), one of the sons of David, born at Jerusalem (2 Sam. v. 15; 1 Chron. xiv. 5); called Elish‘ahma (q. v.) in the parallel passage (1 Chron. iii. 6). B.C. post 1044.

Elish‘im (Ἐλίσσαμος; Vulg. Lusamus), an Isra‘elite of the sons of Zamath, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdr. ix. 28); evidently the Eliesheva (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Esth. x. 27).

Eli‘‘a (Ἑλίας, i.e. Eli‘‘a), one of the forefathers of Judith (Judg. viii. 1), and therefore of the tribe of Simon. See JUDITH.

Eli‘ud (Ἑλίδων, prob. for Heb. Ἠλίσσαρ, God is his praise, but not found in O. T.), son of Achim, and father of Eleazar, being the fifth in ascent in Christ’s paternal genealogy (Matt. i. 14, 15). B.C. cir. 290. See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.
Elizabeth, queen of England, ascended the throne on the death of her sister, the bloody Mary, Nov. 17, 1558, and died March 24 (April 3, New Style), 1603. She was the daughter and only living child of Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII. She was born Sept. 7, 1533, and was therefore 4 years old when she came to the crown. Before she was three years of age her mother was beheaded by her father, who, according to his own declaration, "never spared man in his anger, nor woman in his lust." On the 8th of June of the same year, 1536, the Parliament declared the divorce between her father and Anne Boleyn illegal, and bastardized the issue of both marriages. The same decision had been previously pronounced by archbishop Cranmer in the Star-Chamber, and confirmed by the Convocation. The Parliament also empowered Henry to settle the succession by testamentary disposition. In 1544, Elizabeth was restored to the line of royal inheritance.

During the lifetime of her father her education was carefully encouraged, especially by queen Catharine Parr; and it was continued after his death. She was instructed in Latin and Greek by William Grindal and Roger Ascham. The latter commended her masculine powers of application, quick apprehension, and retentive memory. "She spoke French and Italian with facility, was elegant in her penmanship, and was skilful in music, though she did not delight in it." She seems also to have had some acquaintance with literature; she was as slow in her studies as ever, and rarely free from peril.

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

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

The legitimacy of Mary was declared by Parliament, which thus stigmatized anew the birth of Eliza- beth. She conformed to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church with some reluctance, but was viewed with suspicion. In 1554 she was implicated, in connection with her discontent suitor, Courtenay, earl of Devonshire, in Wyatt's conspiracy, and was confined to the Tower for three months. Her death was demanded; but before the 11th of May, Mary's husband was inbed, and she was put under surveillance at Woodstock. Philip proposed to bestow her upon Emanuel Philipp, duke of Savoy, who afterwards married, according to the provisions of the treaty of Cateau-Cambresis, Margaret of France. These plots may appear trivial in a rapid notice of the life and reign of Elizabeth, but they affected both the development of her character and the policy of her government. The death of queen Mary exposed her to untold difficulties, requiring discernment, resolution, and singular good fortune. Her accession to the throne was unchallenged in Parliament, and was heard with demonstration of joy by the populace of London. She herself, however, in her retirement at Hatfield, recognized the gravity of the occasion. She had been declared illegitimate and incapable of the crown by her father, by her brother, by the Star-Chamber, by the Convocation, and twice by act of Parliament. For the last ten years of Edward VI, England had been determined by royal edicts and parliamentary enactments. The majority of the people were Roman Catholic in consequence of the measures of the late reign. Elizabeth, in the presence of her dying sister, had "prayed God that the earth might open and swallow her alive if in her private chapel, and throughout her life, if Roman Catholicism remained the national creed, her tenure of the crown would be wholly precarious, as the illegitimacy of her birth would be inevitably and irreparably maintained. The superior title of Mary, queen of Scots, would prevail, perhaps, with the aid of French arms, which were on the way to England and were backed by Spanish support. Roman Catholic her government could not be; but, if she renounced Rome, she united the religious with the political enthusiasm of France, under the instigation of the Guises, against her reign, and alienated or provoked Philip II, then aspiring to universal power. She had some claims to the English throne, which were afterwards advanced. He had hastened to tender his widowed heart and hand to the new queen immediately on the death of her sister. Could she venture to reject it at once, while his party was still strong, and in possession of all places of influence in England—while her own throne was still uncertain? She temporized, she coquetted, she entertained his proposals till she could reject them. She did not fully renounce the old and lately restored religion. She retained the crucifix and lights in her private chapel, and throughout her life addressed prayers to the Virgin. But she gradually abolished the most distinctive practices of the Papal Church, and established by act of Parliament her ecclesiastical supremacy. Her own Protestantism was always political rather than religious; while the ramparts of her throne were strengthened by the submission of the people. Her first measures were very cautious, and were adroitly introduced by her great minister, Sir William Cecil, who guided her councils till his death, forty years after. So insecure was her hold upon the sceptre, the crown of the lady Jane Grey was deposed by pope Paul IV, and also by John Knox, who had written a diatribe against the intolerable regimen of women, and who at this time addressed a letter to the queen to persuade her to surrender her crown.

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

In the earlier years of her reign she could trust only to those political friends whose fortunes were indissolubly connected with her own, and to her relatives, princes by birth and blood—Prince Charles, the eldest son of Mary Boleyn. As her throne became more assured, she attracted to her court the young men of ancient gentry, of adventurous spirit, of chivalrous bearing, of great but restricted ambition, and of high physical and intellectual advantages. Gentle birth, great talents, if good looks were the passport to the favor of the court. She thus created supporters and officers for her crown. The old nobility she did not and could not trust. They were powers in the land which despised, envied, and menaced her own. She accumulated favors on Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, from whom he sought the favor of the Protestant cause, and the regard for his courtly manners, perhaps for a tenderer feeling, which she deemed it unequal and unsafe to gratify. Leicester, like his father, was ever scheming for a crown. Essex she petted, indulged, spoiled, as a bright, petulant, promising youth, who was one of her trusty and capable relatives, and the chief hope of her lonely old age.

Her crown was at first held merely by the acquisitiveness of the nation; it was not confirmed by any parliamentary sanction till the fourteenth year of her reign. It was herself; it came simply by her father and bluge, and the Guexs in the Netherlands. She assisted all; she gave no decisive aid to any.

In the midst of perils and successes at home and abroad, she made head against the incessant revolts of the nobility and religious disorder desolated Scotland, France, and the Netherlands; she prevented such commissions in her own realm. She promptly suppressed the commencements of revolt; she arrested the numerous conspiracies against her life and throne before they had time to explode; and she left her people a united, a happy, prosperous, prosperous, powerful, independent, and free.

Menaced by the claims of Mary, and by their prospective advocacy by France or Spain, she placed herself at the head of the Protestant movement, and aided, openly or secretly, the Protestant lords in Scotland, the army in the Lowlands; she coaxed, she intrigued; she was the cause of the defection of the Earl of Northumberland. If Mary was innocent of the murder of her husband; if she was not involved in the Northern rebellion; if she did not beguile the duke of Norfolk; if she did not connive at Babington's conspiracy and other similar plots; if she did not instigate and promote the plot to wellhau murder her royal jailor; if she practised no collusion with Philip of Spain—all these things might have been readily credited by the English queen and her council, and such belief would remove the atrocity, if not the formal illegality, of their procedure. But if all, or most of these suspicions were well founded; if they have been confirmed by the most impassionate historians, and by the most recent and diligent investigations, the action of Elizabeth may still be illegal, but it ceases to be iniquitous. It should be remembered, too, that Elizabeth did not consent to the trial of Mary till after repeated and urgent demands from the lords and commons of England in Parliament assembled; that her signature of the death-warrant is by no means certain; that it was issued and carried into effect without her consent, and contrary to the orders; and that she doubted both the bitter agony and horror. This plea is, indeed, counterbalanced by the suspicion that she sought the removal of her royal captive by secret murder. Such a design is, of course, infamous, though in accordance with the spirit and practices of the age.

To these and other indirect procedures may be referred much of that matrimonial croquetting which furnished occasion for the malignant censure of hostile contemporaries. There was much female vanity in the fre-
more strongly than Elizabeth upon the imaginations and hearts of their people; few ever bestowed greater or more permanent benefits upon them; yet few have met with blind admiration or more undistinguished veneration. The presumptions are all adverse to this great queen. Contemporary slanders, designed for political purposes, cannot have made her entirely unworthy, degrading, or vicious, when they inspired the compliments of Sidney, and Raleigh, and Spenser, and Shakespeare, and Bacon. There is a fashion in language and manners as well as in dress, and the fashion must be regarded if we would interpret the times.

The supposition of a warmer attachment to Essex than the natural attachment of an aged relative for the hopeful representative of an almost extinct line has neither foundation nor probability. Just as little truth is there in the fancy that her life was overcast and her death hastened by the execution of Essex. The misguided Earl had been guilty of the grossest breach of trust and treachery at the head of the government and armies of Ireland; he had repeated his treason, and menaced her existence and crown, in the midst of her power. He had a solemn trial, and was inevitably condemned. He confessed his guilt, and the queen shortly after absolved the ambassador of Henry IV that she felt no scruples in regard to his punishment.

Whatever may be thought on these points, which will not affect the spiritual aspects, as the measures of Elizabeth encouraged and produced the most splendid outburst of national power and of varied abilities that any age has ever witnessed. Strong men surrounded her from the first—men of marked capacity as statesmen, of eminent qualities as princes of the Church, as the approaching splendor of William Cecil, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Ralph Sadler, the earl of Sussex, and lord Sackville. But she had been a quarter of a century on the throne, more than half her reign was passed, and she was wearying to old age before the great names whichInstant to her time; composition of those achievements which have immortalized themselves. It was under the inspiration of her rule, and of the results attained by her rule, that the brilliant generation grew up which has left to all future admiration the names of Sir Francis Walsingham, and Sir Francis Walsingham, and Bacon—of Raleigh, and Vere, and Essex, and Grenville—of Hooker and Gilbert—the generation which confirmed the independence of England and of Europe, which invented new arts, extended and applied the principles of law and government, secured the Protestant faith, bestowed on the colonies, founded colonies, established and commercial commerce, glorified letters, discovered new sciences, and established the political eminence, the industrial wealth, and the intellectual empire of England.

The first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign were occupied in consolidating her throne, by averting foreign aggression through the encouragement given by her to the insurgents in each neighboring state, by suppressing disorder and divisions at home, and by promoting Protestant interests at home and abroad. The next twenty years, which terminated with the peace of Vervins, was a period of secret or open contention with Philip of Spain. The execution of the Mary, queen of Scots, 1587, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, 1588, marked the culmination of this perilous struggle. It was closed by the death of the great minister, lord Burleigh. The last five years of her reign were free from serious apprehensions of foreign dangers, but they were distracted by the disturbances in Ireland, by the treacherous intrigues of the court, and by the ambitious designs of the reckless and unscrupulous Essex. Her whole life was one long succession of hazards, and after all her glories she died lonely, unfriended, and without friends.

Few sovereigns have ever impressed themselves
Pressburg in 1207. When only four years old she was destined by her father to become the wife of Ludwig, oldest son of landgrave Hermann of Thuringia. She was immediately sent to the court of the landgrave, at the Wartburg, where she received some education, and her betrothal was arranged with Ludwig. She early showed a remarkable inclination for ascetic exercises. Several efforts were made that account made to have sent her back to her father, but Ludwig, who in 1215 succeeded her father as landgrave, refused to dismiss her, and in 1221 married her. This marriage, however, did not improve her ascetic manners, and refused all the comforts of life. At the same time, she was indefatigable in all works of charity. She spun and sewed garments for the poor, and, at the time of a famine, fed as many as 300 people daily. Her court was open to all, and Konrad von Marburg, not only encouraged her asceticism, but made her vow absolute obedience, and that, in the case of her husband's death, she would not marry again. Ludwig died in 1227, at Otranto, while taking part in the crusade of emperor Friedrich II. In consequence of the opposition of her mother's family, as well as the courtiers generally, Elizabeth was deprived of the regency during the minority of her oldest son, and her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, assumed the administration of the Landgraviate. Soon Elizabeth, with her son Hermann, and her daughter Agnes, was expelled from the Wartburg, and for a time had to beg in the streets of Eisenach for the necessities of life. At length she found a refuge at one of the castles of her maternal uncle, the bishop of Bamberg. Repeated offers of a second marriage (even from the emperor Friedrich), which were made to her she refused. When the knights who had accompanied her husband returned from the crusade, they compelled Heinrich Raspe to restore to Elizabeth the Wartburg, and the revenue to which she could lay claim as the widow of the landgrave daily. Her confessor, Konrad von Marburg, was appointed bishop of the town of Marburg, with a number of adjoining villages, and an annual income of 500 marks in silver. Elizabeth took up her residence at Marburg in 1229, and again devoted her whole time to asceticism and beneficence. Her confessor Konrad not only continued to be very severe, but several times was Sophen guilty of acts of great cruelty with regard to her. Nevertheless, she declined an invitation from her father to return to him. Exhausted by her ascetic life, she died in a hospital which had been erected by her, Nov. 19, 1231. The fame of her ascetic life had already pervaded all Europe, and a great number of people soon ascribed to her relics a number of miracles, about the details of which there is, however, the greatest discrepancy among the contemporaneous writers, showing how little they rested on careful investigation. No longer than four years after her death, in 1235, she was canonized by pope Gregory IX. In 1236 her relics were transferred with great solemnity to a new church (St. Elizabeth's) which landgrave Konrad erected at Marburg. The emperor Friedrich II placed a golden crown on the head of the saint, and an immense crowd of people, estimated at 200,000, came to see the relics while exhibited to public view. After the Reformation, landgrave Philip, in order not to countenance the veneration of relics, had them removed from the church; subsequently the Teutonic knights obtained permission to send them to various Roman Catholic churches. Her head had rested in the church of St. Elizabeth at Breslau.—See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iii, 767; Wetter and Welte, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 511; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xv, 875; Justi, Elisabeth die Heilige (Zürich, 1797, 24 ed. Marb. 1836); Schwendener, in such case also professed the hands rested in the church of St. Elisabeth at Breslau.—See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iii, 767; Wetter and Welte, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 511; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xv, 875; Justi, Elisabeth die Heilige (Zürich, 1797, 24 ed. Marb. 1836); Schwendener, in such case also. The remains of the church are shown in the Schloß. (1893); Montalembert, Vie de St. Elisabeth (Paris, 1845); Simon, Ludwig IV u. sei Gemahlin, die heil. Elisabeth. (Frankf. 1854); Kahnin, Die heil. Elis. in Zeitschrift für Histor. Theol. 1868. See Konrad von Marburg. (A. J. S.)

Elizabethines. (1.) Associations of women whose object it was to imitate the ascetic life and the benevolent zeal of Elizabeth (q. v.) of Thuringia. They did not retire from the world, and only met for prayer and religion for some ascetic education, and the her heretical was betrothed to Ludwig. She early showed a remarkable inclination for ascetic exercises. Several efforts were made on that account made to have sent her back to her father, but Ludwig, who in 1215 succeeded her father as landgrave, refused to dismiss her, and in 1221 married her. This marriage, however, did not improve her ascetic manners, and refused all the comforts of life. At the same time, she was indefatigable in all works of charity. She spun and sewed garments for the poor, and, at the time of a famine, fed as many as 300 people daily. Her confessor, Konrad von Marburg, not only encouraged her asceticism, but made her vow absolute obedience, and that, in the case of her husband's death, she would not marry again. Ludwig died in 1227, at Otranto, while taking part in the crusade of emperor Friedrich II. In consequence of the opposition of her mother's family, as well as the courtiers generally, Elizabeth was deprived of the regency during the minority of her oldest son, and her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, assumed the administration of the Landgraviate. Soon Elizabeth, with her son Hermann, and her daughter Agnes, was expelled from the Wartburg, and for a time had to beg in the streets of Eisenach for the necessities of life. At length she found a refuge at one of the castles of her maternal uncle, the bishop of Bamberg. Repeated offers of a second marriage (even from the emperor Friedrich), which were made to her she refused. When the knights who had accompanied her husband returned from the crusade, they compelled Heinrich Raspe to restore to Elizabeth the Wartburg, and the revenue to which she could lay claim as the widow of the landgrave daily. Her confessor, Konrad von Marburg, was appointed bishop of the town of Marburg, with a number of adjoining villages, and an annual income of 500 marks in silver. Elizabeth took up her residence at Marburg in 1229, and again devoted her whole time to asceticism and beneficence. Her confessor Konrad not only continued to be very severe, but several times was Sophen guilty of acts of great cruelty with regard to her. Nevertheless, she declined an invitation from her father to return to him. Exhausted by her ascetic life, she died in a hospital which had been erected by her, Nov. 19, 1231. The fame of her ascetic life had already pervaded all Europe, and a great number of people soon ascribed to her relics a number of miracles, about the details of which there is, however, the greatest discrepancy among the contemporaneous writers, showing how little they rested on careful investigation. No longer than four years after her death, in 1235, she was canonized by pope Gregory IX. In 1236 her relics were transferred with great solemnity to a new church (St. Elizabeth's) which landgrave Konrad erected at Marburg. The emperor Friedrich II placed a golden crown on the head of the saint, and an immense crowd of people, estimated at 200,000, came to see the relics while exhibited to public view. After the Reformation, landgrave Philip, in order not to countenance the veneration of relics, had them removed from the church; subsequently the Teutonic knights obtained permission to send them to various Roman Catholic churches. Her head had rested in the church of St. Elizabeth at Breslau.—See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iii, 767; Wetter and Welte, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 511; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xv, 875; Justi, Elisabeth die Heilige (Zürich, 1797, 24 ed. Marb. 1836); Schwendener, in such case also. The remains of the church are shown in the Schloß. (1893); Montalembert, Vie de St. Elisabeth (Paris, 1845); Simon, Ludwig IV u. sei Gemahlin, die heil. Elisabeth. (Frankf. 1854); Kahnin, Die heil. Elis. in Zeitschrift für Histor. Theol. 1868. See Konrad von Marburg. (A. J. S.)
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and his company died, "the children of Korah died not." See Korah. On the above view, this Elkana becomes the son of Annah (v. v.), grandson of Korah, and father of Elissaph (q. v.). B.C. cir. 1700. See Samuel. A writer in the *Journal of Sacred Lit.* (April, 1852, p. 200), however, proposes to reject both Assir and this first Elkana from the list in Chronicles.

2. Son of Shaul or Joel, being father of Amassai, and sixth in descent from Ebiasaph, son of the foregoing (1 Chron. vi. 25, 36). B.C. cir. 1415.

3. Son of Ahimoth or Mahuth, being father of Zuph or Zophai, and great-grandson of the one immediately mentioned (1 Chron. vi. 26, 35). B.C. cir. 1540. (See Hervey, *Genealogies*, p. 210, 214, note.)

4. Another Kohathite Levite, in the line of Heman the singer. B.C. cir. 1190. He was the fifth in descent from the foregoing, being son of Jeroham, and father of Samuel, the illustrious judge and prophet (1 Chron. vi. 27, 28, 30, 34). Josephus (Ant. v. 10, 2) calls him a man "of middle condition among his fellow-citizens" (τόν ιν μην σωλην). All that is known of him is contained in the above notices and in 1 Sam. i. 1, 4, 8, 19, 21, 23, and ii. 2, 20, where we learn that he was a of a Bethlehemite stock (an "Ephri-thite") of the Levitical tribe of Zebulon, but not being confirmed in the Levitical order, lived at Ramathaim-Zophim in Mount Ephraim, otherwise called Ramah; that he had two wives, Hannah and Peninnah, but had no children by the former, till the birth of Samuel in answer to Hannah's prayer. We also learn that he lived in the time of Eli the high-priest, and of his sons Hophni and Phinehas; that he was a pious man, who went up yearly from Ramathaim-Zophim to Shiloh, in the tribe of Ephraim, to worship and sacrifice at the tabernacle there; but it does not appear that he performed any sacred functions as a Levite. A circumstance quite in accordance with the account which ascribes to David the establishment of the priestly and Levitical courses for the Temple service. He seems to have been a man of some wealth from the nature of his yearly sacrifice, which enabled him to give portions out of it to all his family, and from the costly offering of three bullocks which Samuel brought to the house of the Lord at Shiloh. After the birth of Samuel, Elkana and Hannah continued to live at Ramah (where Samuel afterwards had his house, 1 Sam. vii. 7), and had three sons and two daughters. See Samuel.

5. Another man of the family of the Korhites who joined David while he was at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 6). B.C. 1054. From the terms of ver. 2, some have thought it doubtful whether this can be the well-known Levitical family of Korhites; but the distinction there seems merely to refer to residents within the tribe of Benjamin, which included the Levitical cities. Perhaps he was the same who was one of the two doorkeepers for the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xiv. 22). B.C. 1045.

6. An officer in the household of Ahaz, king of Judah, and slain by Zichri the Ephraimitie, when Pekah invaded Judah; apparently the second in command under the prefect of the palace (2 Chron. xxvii. 7). B.C. 879. Josephus says that he was the general of the troops of Judah, and that he was merely carried into captivity by "Amaziah," the Israelish general (Ant. ix. 12, 1). See Ahaz.

7. Father of one Ass, and head of a Levitical family resident in the "villages of the Netophathites" (1 Chron. ix. 16). B.C. long ante 596.

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

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

The Elkaisaites doctrine probably arose among the Jewish Christians, who, in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, consoled with the Essenese, and were to some extent influenced by Oriental paganism. Under bishop Callistus of Rome, a certain Alchibades of Apamea went to that city as an Elkaisaites missionary, in 274 Origen met a missionary of the sect at Cæsarea. These efforts appear, however, to have met with but little success. The Clementine Homilies contain a further development of Elkaisaites doctrines, with a stronger predominance of the Christian element. At the time of the emperor Constantius, Epiphanius found Elkaisaites in Caesarea, Tabulae, Itermus, and Mabitis. He calls them Σαραπίτον, who name he explains as ἱδονας, and therefore seems to have derived from καταπελτής, "sun." From the cir-
el'koshite (Heb. 'elkōši, אֵלַּקֹשִׁע, the regular patristic form; Sept. Ἔλκοσος, Vulg. Elcosus), an epiteth (Nah. i. 1) of the prophet Nahum (q. v.), apparently as an inhabitant of Elkosh (q. v.).

El'kasar (Heb. El'kasār, אֵלַּקָּסָר), a fortress in Assyria, whose king, Arioch, was one of the four who invaded Canaan in the time of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 1). The association of this king with those of Elam and Shinar indicates the vicinity of Babylonia and Elam in the region in which the kingdom of Assyria would but could not exist on the Hebrew map. But unless it be the same as Thelasar mentioned in 2 Kings xix. 12, the Telassar of Isa. xxxvii. 12, Sylmachus and the Vulg. understand Pontus. The Jerusalem Targum renders the name by Teleasar. The Assyro-Babylonian name of the king Arioch (q. v.) would seem to point to some province in Mesopotamia. (A.S.J.)

El'kōsh (אֵלַּקֹשִׁי, i.e. God is its box, see Fürst, Heb. Handb., i. v.) the birthplace of the prophet Nahum, hence called "the Elkoshite" (Nah. i. 1). Two wildly differing Jewish traditions assign as widely different localities to this place. In the time of Jerome it is said to exist in the village of Galilee. The ruins of some old buildings were pointed out by his guide as the remains of the ancient Elkōsh (Jerome, on Nah. i. 1). Cyril of Alexandria (Comm. on Nahum) says that the village of Elkosh was somewhere or other in the country of the Jews. Ps.-Ezechiel, Prophetikon (Le Vite prophetocorum; in his Opp. ii. 247) places Elkosh on the east of the Jordan, at Betharba (sic Bryloph, Chron. Pasch. p. 150, Cod. B, has sic Bætharba), where he says the prophet died in peace. According to Schwartz (Palestine, p. 188), the grave of Nahum is shown at Keis Tanchum, a village 23 English miles north of Tiberias. A village of the name Elkauzah is found about 24 hours S.W. of Tibnin, which seems to correspond with Jerome's notice. Another village of that name, also an ancient site, lies on a high hill rather more than 2 hours S. of Nablous (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 309). But medieval tradition ascribes to it a consecration for the conveniences of the main Jewish, attached the name of the prophet's burial place to Elkouz, or Elkōsh, a village on the east bank of the Tigris, near the monastery of Rabban Hormuzd, and about two miles north of Mosul. It is situated on a low, fairly well drained land, and the village contains about 30 Greek Nestorians (London, July, 1852, p. 460). Benjamin of Tudela (p. 55, ed. Asher) speaks of the synagogues of Nahum, Obadiah, and Nahon at Assur, the modern Mosul. R. Petachia (p. 55, ed. Benisch) was the prophet's grave, at a distance of four parasangs from that of Baruch, the son of Neriah, which was itself distant a mile from the tomb of Ezekiel. It is mentioned in a letter of Masius, quoted by Asseman (Bibl. Orient. i. 325). Jews from the surrounding districts make a pilgrimage to it at certain seasons. The synagogue which is built over the tomb is described by Colonel Shiel, who visited it in his journey through Kurdistan (J. A. G. S. viii. 93). Rich evidently believed in the correctness of the tradition, considering the pilgrimage of the Jews as almost sufficient test (Kurdist. Bayle, p. 367). Nevertheless, however, he was not extremely confident (Vincke, i. 197). Gesenius doubts the genuineness of either locality (Theb. Heb. p. 1211 b). The tradition which assigns Elkōsh to Galilee is more in accordance with the internal evidence afforded by the prophecy, which gives no sign of having been written in Assyria (Kohn, Precis, ii. 299; Hitzig, Ez. Proph. p. 212; Edwards, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Aug. 1848, p. 557 sq.) See Nahum.
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her first marriage, believed this announcement, and the unfortunate woman was consequently subjected to the almost indescribable tribulations that her fate brought her. About six months, when death put an end to her sufferings. Almost immediately after her burial Eller married Anna von Buchel. His society was now deemed sufficiently strong to appear in public. Eller maintained, in union with the prophecies of Professor Horch in Marburg, the belief that his beloved Sardis would cease in 1729, and the Church of Philadelphia begin in 1730. The revelations and visions of his wife increased rapidly. What she announced as a new revelation was laid down in a writing, which was associated to the initiates under the name of the "Hirtenacle" ("The Shepherd's Bag"). The chief points of the new doctrines were, the Bible is the Word of God, but a new revelation has become necessary, and this is laid down in the Hirtenacle. Not only the ancient saints, but the Switzerland itself, will reappear upon earth. The person of the Father dwelt in Abraham, the person of the Son in Isaac, the person of the Holy Ghost in Sarah, but the fullness of the Deity in Eller. Moses, Elias, David, and Solomon were prototypes both of Christ and of Eller. The children of Anna were not the lawful children of Eller, but the works of God by himself. The faithful, whose number had largely increased, were divided into three classes. To the first class belonged those who expressed belief, but were not yet made acquainted with all doctrines and secrets; to the second those who, being initiated, were called in the "Parsons of the Saviours" ("Parsons von der Gesechenese"); to the third, the most trustworthy among the initiated, who had reached the temple, and were called "gifts" ("Geschenke"). The society believed that from Anna the Saviour would be born a second time, and there was some doubt as to whether her first child was a daughter. Her second child, born 1730, was a son, Benjamin, and he was believed by the sect to be the Saviour, manifested a second time in the flesh, but he died when only a year old. Eller, in the mean while, had sent out missionaries throughout Germany, Switzerland, and Scandinavia, but the investigations which in 1735 were made in Ellerfeld concerning the meetings held by him induced him to depart in 1737, with his family, for Ronsdorf, his native place. Many of his adherents followed him immediately, and fifty new houses arose in Ronsdorf in a short time. The money the sect had collected by Eller was now used to build the new church to be built in Ronsdorf, and in 1741 Schlieermacher was called as pastor. Eller himself was elected burgomaster, and soon established a theocratic despotism. His wife Anna died in 1744, in a mysterious manner, and Eller proclaimed that all the supernatural gifts which had been possessed by Anna had been transferred to him. But now Schlieermacher began to lose his faith and even to oppose Eller, who, however, to neutralize the sermons of Schlieermacher, caused one of his most fanatical adherents, Pastor Wulffing, of Solingen, to be called as second pastor. In 1749 Eller married the widow of a rich merchant at Ronsdorf, Besselmann, who had died under suspicious circumstances; and in the same year he procured the removal of Schlieermacher from his position of first pastor, and the election of Pastor Besselmann, of Rentingen, to succeed him. Schlieermacher, who had been a fanatical adherent of the sect, as his successor. Schlieermacher was, even after his departure from Ronsdorf, persecuted by Eller, who lodged with the government a formal charge of sorcery against him; and so great was still Eller's influence, that Schlieermacher determined it best to flee to Holland. Eller died on May 16, 1750, and soon after him died also Wulffing. After the death of these two men the sect seems to have soon become extinct. Schlieermacher's innocence was, chiefly owing to the efforts of his friend J. W. Knevel, fully established by the declarations of the theological faculties of Marburg and Herborn, and the Synod of Berg. This fanaticism singularly resembles that of the Buchanians (q.v.). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., xx, 606; Knevel, Gräuel d. Verweisung an heil. Stätt. od. d. Geheimnisse der Ros- heit d. Rosendorfer Stekte (Frankf. 1750); Wulffing, Rosendorffscher Catachismus (Düsseldorf, 1750); Joh. Bolckhaus (step-son of Eller), Rosendorfs gerechte Sache (Düsseldorf, 1752); Den nachgelassenen Schriften (compiled by Wulffing, but edited by Bolckhaus, Mül-heim, 1761); Wulffing, Rosendorfs silberne Trompete (Mülheim, 1761); Engels, Versuch einer Gesch. d. reichs. Schröderner im ehemal. Herzogthum Berg (Schwein, 1825); Henglein, Flugblatt § 421. The Hirtenacle may be found in the Historie der sechs Religions (A. S. J.).

ELLERIANS. See Eller.

Elliott, Arthur W., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland in 1874; emigrated to Butler Co., Ohio, in 1880, and was converted in 1886. In 1818 he entered the itineracy, and rapidly rose to eminence and usefulness. He filled many important charges in his Conference until his health failed. He was supernumerary eight years, and superannuated seventeen during his ministry. In 1854 he removed to Paris, Ill., where he died in January, 1888. Mr. Elliott had a "wonderful power over the multitude, and thousands of souls will call him blessed in eternity." - Minutes of Conference, 1868, p. 310.

Elliott, Charles. See p. 1042 of this vol.

Elliott, John, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Killingworth, Conn., Aug. 24, 1768, graduated at Yale College 1786, entered the ministry 1791, and was installed pastor in East Guilford Nov. 2, 1791, in which place he remained until the close of his life, Dec. 17, 1844. Dr. Elliott was made fellow of Yale College 1812, and one of the prudential committee 1816. He published An Oration on the Death of Thomas Lewis (1804), and a few sermons.—Sprague, Annaled, ii, 521.

Elliott, Stephen, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Georgia, was born in Beaufort, S. C., Aug. 8, 1806. At sixteen he entered the sophomore class at Harvard University, but returned during the junior year to South Carolina College, Columbia, where he graduated A.B. in 1826. In 1827 he engaged in the practice of law. "In 1832, under the pressure of a newly-awakened devotion to the cause of Christ, he abandoned the law, and became devoted to the work for holy orders. He was ordained by bishop Bowen in 1836, served as deacon one month in the church at Wilton, and was then elected professor of sacred literature and the evidences of Christianity in the South Carolina College. Five years later he was chosen first bishop of Georgia. He was consecrated bishop Feb. 21, 1841, removed to Savannah, and became rector of St. John's Church. In 1844 he became provisional bishop of Florida. In 1845 he removed to Montpellier, to direct in person the work of female education. Here he spent about seven years of his life, and, like many other bishops, expended his whole fortune in the noble effort. In 1853 he removed to Savannah, and took charge of Christ Church in that city as rector. This office he continued to hold, with the exception of one brief interval, till his death. His numerous home duties did not hinder his visitation of his diocese once each year, often much more frequently. But two hours before his decease he had returned, in cheerfulness and apparent health, from one of those long episcopal journeys. Instantly, not to him 'suddenly,' in the midst of his labors, and at the height of his power,' he received at Savannah, on Friday, April 16, 1866. — Amer. Quart. Church Review, April, 1867, and April, 1868.

Ellis, Reuben, an early Methodist Episcopal minister. The dates of his early life are wanting. He was a native of North Carolina, entered the itineracy in 1777, and died in Baltimore February, 1796. "His
was a man of very sure and solid parts, weighty and powerful in preaching, and full of simplicity and godly sincerity."—Minutes of Conferences, i, 67; Stevens, History of Methodist Episcopal Church, p. 59 et al.

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

Elhora, a decayed town in the dominions of the Nizam, not far from the city of Dowlatabad, in lat. 20° 2' N., and long. 75° 18' E., which are in this respect the most noted even in India. It is celebrated for its wonderful rock-cut temples. Their number has not been precisely ascertained, but Erskine reckoned 19 large ones, partly of Hindu and partly of Buddhist origin. Some are cave-temples proper—i. e. chambers cut out in the interior of the rock—but others are vast buildings hewn out of the solid granite of the hills, having an exterior as well as an interior architecture, and being, in fact, magnificent monoliths. In executing the latter, the process was first to sink a great quadrangular trench or pit, leaving the central mass standing, and then to hew and excavate this mass into a temple. The most beautiful of these objects is the Hindu temple Kailasa. At its entrance the traveler passes into an antechamber 138 feet wide by 88 deep, adorned by numerous rows of pillars. Thence he proceeds along a colonnade over a bridge into a great rectangular court, which is 247 feet in length and 150 broad, in the centre of which stands the temple itself, a vast mass of rock richly hewn and carved. It is supported by four rows of pilasters, with colossal elephants beneath, and seems suspended in the air. The interior is about 138 feet long, 56 broad, and 17 high, but the entire exterior forms a pyramid 100 feet high, and is overlaid with sculpture. In the great court are numerous ponds, obelisks, colonnades, sphinaxes, and on the walls thousands of mythological figures of all kinds, from ten to twelve feet in height. Of the other temples, those of Indra and Dumarzeyna are little inferior to that of Kailasa. Regarding their antiquity and religious significance, authorities are not agreed; but at all events they must be subsequent to the epic poems Ramayana or Mahabharata, because they contain representations taken from these poems, and also to the cave-temples at Elephants, because they exhibit a richer and more advanced style of architecture.

Ellis, Anthony, bishop of St. David's, was born in 1638. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he took his master's degree in 1716. In 1724 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Olave, Jewry, and to the rectory of St. Martin's, Frommonger's Lane. In 1725 he obtained a prebend of Gloucester, and in 1728 was created D.D. at Cambridge. He was next promoted to the bishopric of St. David's, and died at Gloucester in 1761. His writings are as follows:—1. A Plea for the Sacramental Text:—2. Remarks on Hume's Essay concerning Miracles, and sermons preached on public occasions (4to):—3. Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Protestants in England (1767, 4to):—4. Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Subjects in England: the last-mentioned are collections of tracts, and form one great and elaborate work, which was the principal object of the bishop's life. They were published posthumously.—Hook, Eccles. Biography, vol. iv; Kippis, Biographia Britannica, v, 581.

Elm stands in the Auth. Ver., as the translation of אֶלֶחְ, elah', in Hos. iv, 13; elsewhere rendered "oak" (q. v.).

El'mo'dam ('Elμωδαμος; perhaps for Ἄλμωδας, Almodad, son of Er and father of Cosam; one of the ancestors of Christ, in the private line of David, and great-grandfather of Masseiah, the great-grandfather of Salathiel (Luke iii, 28). B.C. cir. 700. He is not mentioned in the Old Test.
Eln'ā'am [many El'na'am] (Heb. Elna'am, אֶלְנָאָם, in prose בְּנֵי הָיָם, God is his delight; Sept. 'Elā'ām v. r. 'Elādā, Vulgate Elainam) father of Jerahme and Joshua, two of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chron. xi, 46). B.C. 1044. In the Sept. the second son is said to be the son of the first, and Elnaam is given as himself a member of the guard.

Elnā'than [some El'nathan] (Heb. Ebnaathan, אֶבְנָאָתָן, 2 Chron. xi, 23, whom God has given; compare John, Theodore, Didimus), the name of four leading men.

1. An inhabitant of Jerusalem, father of Nehuha, the mother of King Jehoshachin (2 Kings xxiv, 6, Sept. 'Elānāv v. r. 'Elānāv, אֶלְנָאָב). B.C. 628. He was perhaps the same with the son of Achbor, sent by Jehoiakim to bring the prophet Urijah out of Egypt (Jer. xxvi, 22, Sept. 'Elānāv, אֶלְנָאָב), and in whose presence the roll of Jeremiah was read, for the preservation of which he interceded with the king (Jer. xxxvi, 12, 25, Sept. Naānāv יְנָאָב). B.C. 605.

2, 3, 4. (Sept. 'Elānāv, Naānāv, and 'Elānāv respectively.) Three of the Israelites, of established lineage and integrity, sent by Ezra to invite the priests and Levites to accompany him to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 16). B.C. 459.

Elohim is the Heb. plural (Elohim, אֶלֹהִים), of which the sing. form, Eloah, אֱלֹהַ, is also employed to designate in general any deity, but likewise the true God. The word is derived, according to Gesenius (Thes. Heb. p. 94), from an obsolete root, gādāh, to recover, but is better referred by Fürst (Heb. Bande, p. 90) to the kindred Ŝā (see E'L), the name of God as mighty (from the extensive root Šār or Šār, to be firm), and has its equivalent in the Arabic Allah, 1. e. God. The plur. Elohim is sometimes used in its ordinary sense of gods, whether true or false (s. g. of the Egyptians. Exod. xii, 12; xxxii, 1, 4; Deut. xx, 18; xxxii, 17; including Jehovah, Psa. lxxxii, 8; Exod. xviii, 11; xxxii, 10; or distinctively of actual deity, Isa. xlv, 6; xlvi, 5, 14, 21; xlv, 1; 1 Chron. xiii, 9; once of kings (Psa. lxxxii, 1, 5); but Gesenius thinks not of angels (Psa. viii, 6; xcvii, 7; xcviii, 1), nor judges (Exod. xvi, 6; xxii, 7, 8). But it is especially spoken of one true God, i. e. Jehovah, and in this sense it is always construed as a sing., especially when it has the article prefixed (ה' אלהים). See Sach, Comment. theat. hist. (Bonn, 1821), 1; Reinhard, Allgemeine Bibelgeschichte, etc. (Viehm. 1772); Edward, Vitrvm 'Elohim' a Compendium of Sacred Antiquities (2d ed. 1806); Lind, Num Deus discort dum inae sinde (ib. 1723); Semnert, Excerpt. philol. (ib. 1678). Comp. God.

Elōhat, the name technically given in theology and sacred criticism to the assumed authors of those parts of the Pentateuch (q. v.) in which the Deity is styled Elohim rather than Jehovah (q. v.).

Elo'li (אֶלוֹלִי for Aramean אָלֹלִי, my God), an exclamation quoted thus by our Saviour (Mark xvii, 34) as the cry of a man from Psa. cxii, 2 (where the Sept. has 3 יָלִי, which is more literally Grecised ἐλιύ, Ely, by Matthew (xxvi, 46). E'lon, a name occurring in two forms in the Heb. (but both having the primitive sense of oak (q. v.), as that of a place, and also of three men.

1. (Heb. Elo'lon, אֶלוֹלָן, Sept. 'Elōlon.) A city of Dan, mentioned between Jethlah and Timnah (Josh. xix, 43); probably the same elsewhere (1 Kings iv, 9) more fully called Elnon-Beth-hanan (q. v.).

2. (Heb. Elo'lon, אֶלוֹלוֹן and יָלֹלָן, Sept. 'Elōlon and Ḥoli,) A Hittite father of Bashasham (Gen. xxxvi, 34) or Adah (Gen. xxxvi, 35), the first wife of Zasu (q. v.). B.C. ante 1653.

Elnos bēt-hānān [some Elnon- betha'man] (Heb. Elo'lon-beth-Ḥanan, אֶלוֹלָן בְּתֵי חָנָן, oak of Beth-hanan, i. e. of the house of Hanan; Sept. 'Elōlon v. r. 'Alōlonו is Βηθάναν, Vulg. Elon et in Beth-hanan), one of the Danite cities in the commodi- district of Ben-Dekar, the third of Solomon's survey- ors (1 Kings iv, 9). It is simply called Elon in Josh. xix, 42, being probably a site marked from early times by a particular tree (see Oak) of traditional fame. For "Beth-hanan" some Hebrew MSS. have "Ben- hanan," and some "and Beth-hanan;" the latter is followed by the Vulgate. To judge from the order of the list in Joshua, its situation must have been on the border of the territory of Ashbon and Elon, and the noun suggests (Exeg. Handbook., in loc.) that Beth-hanan can be no other than the village Beth-Hummus, in the rich plain near Gaza (Robinson, Researches, ii, 571); but this is entirely out of the region in question. Possibly it may be the modern Beih-Shub, a "small village, looking old and miserable," on a ridge near an ancient well, about half way between the sites of Niconopolis and Zorah (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 152).

E'lonite (Heb. with the art. and collectively, ha'Elomī, אֵלֹמִי; Sept. 'Elūlōn, the patronymic designation (Num. xxxvi, 29) of the descendants of Elnon (q. v.), the son of Zebulun.

Eloquence of the Pulpit. See Homiletics.

E'loth (Heb. Elo'loth, אֵלוֹלֹת, trees; Sept. 'Alōlōth, in Chron. Alōlōth), another (plur.) form (1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. viii, 17), 2) of the name of the city Eloth (q. v.).

E'ilpa'al [many El'pa'el] (Heb. Epa'al, בֵּאוֹר, in pause בֵּאוֹר, God is his wages; Sept. 'Alpa'ath and 'Epa'ath), the second named of the two sons of Shabrah (a descendant of Benjamin residing in the region of Moab) by his wife Hushim, and progenitor of a numerous posterity (1 Chron. vii, 12, 18). B.C. cir. 1618. The Bene-Epaal appear to have lived in the neighborhood of Lydda (Lod), and on the outposts of the Benjaminite hills as far as Ajalon (viii, 12-18), near the Danite frontier.

E'lpa'let [many El'pa'let] (Heb. Elpa'lēt, אֶלֶפָלֶט, in pause Elpa'let, אֶלֶפָלֶט, God is his wages; Sept. 'Alpa'ath and 'Epa'ath), a contracted form (1 Chron. iv, 6) of the name Eliphaleth (q. v.).

E'ilpa'aran [many El'paran] (Hebrew Epa'aran, bgColor=

Eilahus. Eilahus, WILIAM, was born at Glasgow in 1481, studied in the university of that city, and obtain-
ed the rectory of Kirkmichael. He subsequently was professor of civil and canon law at Paris and Orleans for nine years, and on his return (1471) was appointed rector of the University of Glasgow. He afterwards became successively member of Parliament and of the Privy Council, ambassador of James III to France, and bishop of Ross, from whence he was transferred to Aberdeen in 1484. As bishop of Aberdeen he was twice sent on a diplomatic mission to England. In 1488 he was for several months lord chancellor of the kingdom, and subsequently, on returning from an embassy, was appointed to the office of lord privy seal. He secured the foundation of the University at Aberdeen, for which pope Alexander VI gave a bull dated Feb. 10, 1494. King's College was in consequence erected in 1506, and Elphinston contributed 10,000 pounds Scots towards it, and the building of a bridge over the Dee. He died October 26th, 1514, while negotiations were pending with the court of Rome for his elevation to the primacy of St. Andrew's. He wrote a book of canons, the lives of some Scottish saints, and a history of Scotland, which is preserved among Fairclay's MSS. in the Bodleian Library. - Biography, Eccles. Biography, vol. iv; Oudin, De Script. Eccles. iii, 2670.

Elphias ('Elyfias, hope'), one of the wives of Herod the Great, who had by her and another wife Pherada two daughters, Roxana and Salome (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 1, 8; War, i, 28, 4).

Elrington, the Right Rev. Thomas, lord bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, obtained a scholarship in the University of Dublin in 1778, and in 1781 was elected fellow. In 1784 he was appointed Donellan legateur at his alma mater; in 1796, professor of mathematics; and in 1806, rector of Atraloe, in the county of Tyrone. In 1811 he was raised to the highest literary rank in Ireland by appointment as provost of Trinity College. This position he held with high credit to himself until 1820, when he was consecrated bishop of Limerick. In 1822 he was transferred to the see of Leighlin and Ferns. He died in 1885. Besides editing several of the classics, he published his lectures delivered while Donellan lecturer: "The proof of Christianity derived from the miracles recorded in the New Testament," under the title, Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, etc. (Dublin, 1796, 8vo);-Reflections on the Appointment of Dr. Milner as the Political Agent of the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland (1809, 8vo);-The Clergy of the Church of England truly ordained (1809, 8vo);-Reflections on some polemical writings.- used Biblical and Ominary, xx (1886);-Darling, Cyclopaedica Bibliographica, p.1084-5.

Elzlar, Jacob, D.D., was born at Saulfield, Prussia, in March, 1692. He studied at the University of Könisberg, and in 1715 became "conrector" of the reformed school in that city. Two years later he visited Utrecht and Leyden. In 1729 he was appointed professor of theology and philology at Bingen; in 1722, rector and first professor of the Joachimsthal Gymnasium at Berlin. Subsequently he became pastor at one of the Berlin churches. From 1742 to 1744 he was director of the class of belles-lettres at the Royal Society. He died Oct. 6, 1750. His principal works are: Observationes sacrorum in novi testamenti libros (Trsl. 1720-1728, 2 vols. 8vo);-Comm. sacros philologici in evang. Mathaei (Zwolle, 1767-69, 2 vols. 4to);-Commentarius in evang. Marci (Trsl. 1788, 4to).-Darling, Cyclopaedica Bibliographica; Doering, the gelehrten Theolog. Deutschland, i, 866; Hoenfer, Neue. Bibl. Gén. viii, 319.

Eltekeh [some 'Elte'ka'] (Heb. 'Eltekeh), "God is it," i.e. object of awe; but 'Eltekeh' is used (Heb. 11, 23; Josh. xxii, 5; 1 Sam. x, 11; 1 Sam. xii, 12; Josh. xxii, 5; 1 Sam. x, 11; 1 Sam. xii, 12; Josh. xxii, 5; 1 Sam. x, 11; 1 Sam. xii, 12) and mentioned between Ezron and Gibeon (Josh. xii, 44).

With its "suburbs" it was assigned as a city of refuge and Levitical city to the Kohathites (Josh. xiii, 23); but it is omitted in the parallel list (1 Chron. vi). The site is possibly now represented by El-Mansurah ("the victorious"), "a miserable little village" near a copious spring, in the plain between Nazareth and Akir (Robinson, Researches, iii, 21). Schwartz (Palest. p. 111) confounds Eltekeh with Ellekon, and locates both at a village which he calls "Alhness, far from Bellin (Baalath)."

El'tekon [some 'El'tekon'] (Heb. Ellekon), "God is its foundation; Sept. 'El'tekon v. r. 'El'tekon and 'El'tekon, Vulg. Ellekon, a city of Judah, in the mountain-district, mentioned last in order after Maarah and Anah (Josh. xv, 59), being in the group north of Hebron (Keil, Comment. in loc.). See JEHAD. It is perhaps identical in site with the present Beit-Sakur al-'Akab, a little S.E. of Jerusalem. See ELTEKON. It is perhaps the Alaq mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions. See EZRAH.

El'tolad [many 'El'tolad] (Heb. Eolah), "God is it," perhaps meaning God is its race or posterity; but, according to First (Hebr. Hamese. s. v.), whose God is Melech, the Phcenician deity (comp. MOLEDAH); Sept. 'El'tolad and 'El'tolad, r. 'Erahel and 'Erebel (Vulg. Eolah). A city in the south of Judah, mentioned between Azem and Cheesh (Josh. xv, 29), but afterwards assigned to Simeon, and mentioned between Azem and Bethul (Josh. xix, 4). It remained in possession of the latter tribe in the time of David (1 Chron. iv, 29, where it is called simply TOLAD). It is possibly the ruined site Tell-Melah, observed by Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 115) along the N branch of wady Sherah, which empties into the Mediterranean a little S of Gaza.

En'ul (Heb. Enhul), ' unh, Neh. vi, 15; Sept. 'Eolah, also in 1 Macc. xiv, 27; the Macedonian Eunamaios) is the name of that month which was the sixth of the ecclesiastical, and the twelfth of the civil year of the Jews, and which began with the new moon of our August or September, and consisted of 29 days. Several unsatisfactory attempts have been made to find a Syro-Arabian etymology for the word, as it occurs in a similar form in both these languages (see Gesenius, Thes. Hebr. p. 100); but the most recent derivation, that of Benfey, deduces it, through many communications and mutations, from an original Zend form Anamait (Monumenten, p. 126). According to the Talmud, the following are the days devoted to religious services. See CALENDAR.

1. The new month. The propitiatory prayers are commenced on the last day of the old month, and service after the new moon.

2. The festival of the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

3. A fast because of the death of the spies who brought up the evil report of the Land of Promise (Num. xiv, 8, 35).

4. The festival of wood offering (Euphhorbia). According to others, this occurred during the previous month.

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

6. This is the last day of the month, on which the Jews reckoned up the beasts that had been born, the tenth of which belonged to the king. They chose to do this on the tenth, because the first day of the month Tirst was a festival, and therefore they could not kill a flock on that day.

El'tuna ("One", apparently for the Aramaic 'el'un) see Jerome, Comment. in Exa. xv, 4), an ancient city of Idumea, frequently mentioned by writers of the fourth and sixth centuries (see the citations in Reland, Palaeis, p. 755) as an episcopal city of the Third Palestine (Concil. Grœ. iii, 445); the Elsya of the Peutinger Table, 71 Roman miles S. of Jerusalem. (Bitter, Erdk. xiv, 120; recognised by Dr. Robinson (Bib. Rev. i, 296 sq.) as the present ruins el-Khalilwek, 5 hours S.S.W. of Hierapolis, on the way to Egypt, and consisting of walls, a fine well, and includes sufficient to have contained a population of 15,000 or 20,000.)
persons (see also Stewart, Tens & Kohn, p. 296). See also CHELSEA.

ELUZAI (Heb. Ēlûzây, "God is my praise," i.e. object of praise; Sept. Ἐλοὺζαί v. r. A'oz, Vulg. Eluza), one of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. XII, 6). B.C.

ELVIRA, COUNCIL OF (Concilia Elber równum or Êlberânim; town of Elvira (or Illiberi, Hiliber, or Liberi)), in the Spanish province of Béstica. The town, which no longer existed, was situated not far from the modern Granada. That it was not Illiberia, in Galilia Narbonensis, is shown by the fact that all the signers were Spanish bishops. The council was held at the bishop of Seville in the middle of the fourth century, but the year (308, 805, 809) is uncertain. Some of the early Protestant writers (as the authors of the MagdeburgCollections) inferred, from the resolutions concerning pictures and the lighting of candles, that the synod took place as late as the year 700; but this view was abandoned. The Synod of Elvira is the most ancient among those of which all the canons (eighty-one) are extant. It was attended by nineteen bishops, among them Hocius of Cordova, and twenty-six priests. Some of the canons of the council of Seville were probably also present.

ELVIRA: The Synod was strongly influenced by the influence of Novatian and Montanist principles. The most important of the resolutions were, 1. depriving of communion, i.e. of absolution, even in death, those who, after baptism, have voluntarily sacrificed to idols; 8, relaxing the penalty in canon 1 in favor of those who, after baptism, have voluntarily offered a present to the idol. It allows of admitting such to communion at the point of death, if they have undergone a course of penance; canons 6 and 7 forbid communion even at the point of death to those who have caused the death of another maliciously, and to adulterers, who have also undergone a course of penance; 12 and 13 forbid communion even in death to mothers who prostitute their own daughters, and to women who, after consecrating themselves in virginity to God, forsake that state; 15 prohibits the clergy from the use of marriages; 94 prohibits the lighting of candles during day but they are permitted at night; for the spirits of the saints must not be disturbed; 96 declares that pictures ought not to be in a church, lest the object of veneration and worship be depicted upon walls; 63 and 64 forbid communion even in death to adulterers, who have willfully destroyed their children, or who abide in a state of adultery up to the time of their last illness; 65 forbids communion even in death to one who has falsely accused of a crime a bishop, priest, or deacon. The canons may be found in Mansi, ii. 2 sq., and in Routh, Reliquiae, vol. iv. Special treatises on the canons were written by the bishop Ferdinand de Mendoza (De Confirmandis concil. Liberen- ricas, in Mansi, i. c.), and bishop Aubeespine of Orleans (Mansi, i. c.). The canons, together with some explanatory remarks, may also be found in the Tubingen Theol. Quartalsb., 1821, p. 1-44.—Hertog, Real-Encyclop. iii, 773; Wettstein, u. Weisbach, Bekenntnisse, iii, 548; Gams, Kirchenlexicon, in Spanien, Hefele, Concilien geschichte, i, 122 sq. (A. J. S.)

ELZAI, ELZARAI. See ELZAIATI.

ELY, EDEA STILES, D.D., a Presbyterian (O. S.), was born in Lebanon, Conn., June 18, 1786. At twelve years of age he made a profession of religion. He graduated at Yale College in 1803. His theological studies were pursued under his father, the Rev. Dr. Ely, who was ordained as pastor of the church in Colchester, Conn., which he left some time after to become chaplain in the New York City Hospital. In 1811 the Old Pine Street Church, Philadelphia, became vacant. Its pulpit had been filled by the most eloquent ministers of the day, and it was necessary to choose a man of commanding intellect and power. The choice fell most wisely upon Dr. Ely. He entered upon his field of labor with earnestness. He was the principal founder of the Jefferson Medical College. He was stated clerk and moderator of the General Assembly in 1825 and 1828, and was constantly engaged in works of charity and schemes of benevolence. In 1834 he conceived the plan of establishing a college and theological seminary in Missouri. He entered into this with great zeal, and for a while with success, but the crisis of 1837 made it a failure. In this enterprise he lost his large fortune, and returned to Philadelphia a poor man—his intellect and oratorical powers unimpaired—but failed to receive that degree of attention he commanded when in Illinois. He was a member of the board of the Ecumenical Church in Northern Liberties, Philadelphia, where he labored until prostrated by paralysis in 1851. He lingered ten years, his intellect being so impaired as to preclude activity of any kind. He died June 18, 1861. He published Memoir of the Rev. Z. Ely (his father);—Collatitarian Bible, or Key to the Holy Scriptures (in connection with Bedell and M'Corkle);—Ely's Journal:—Sermons on Faith;—Visits of Mercy. He was also editor of The Philadelphiaian.—Wilson, Prefx., Historical Almanac, 1862.

Ely, so called from a Saxon word, elag, an ool, or heel, a large town in the parish of Lynn in the ten country of Cambridgeshire called the Isle of Ely. Pop. about 6000.

Ely Cathedral.—About the year 673, Etheldreda, daughter of the king of East Anglia, and wife of Os- wy, king of Northumberland, founded a monastery here, and took on herself the government of it. A new church was built in 1061, which was consecrated into a cathedral, and the abbey erected into a see in 1109. The possessions of the abbey were divided between the bishop and the community. Among the celebrated names connected with Ely are abbots Thurstan, who died in 1088, and the master against Wilhelm the quor for seven years, and bishop Andrews. The bishops of Ely, like the bishops of Durham, formerly enjoyed a palatine jurisdiction, and appointed their own chief justice, etc., but this privilege was taken from them by the 6th and 7th William IV. The bishop of Ely is visitor to St. Peter's, St. John's, and Jesus colleges, Cambridge, of which last he also appoints the master. There is a grammar-school attached to the cathedral, founded by Henry VIII. The diocese of Ely belongs to the province of Canterbury, and embraces Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, Huntingdon- shire, and the archbishopric of Suffolk, in Sheffield. The income of the bishop is £5500. The present (1890) incumbent is Alwyne Compton. The diocese has 26 deaneries and 172,368 church seats. The whole population within the territory of the diocese was, in 1861, 480,716. —Chambers, Encyclop. s. v. —Churchman's Calendar for 1868.

ELYMAM'AM ('El'mam, the Gracised form (Judith i, 6) of the designation usually Anglicized ELMAM'T (q. v.).

ELYMAM'T (El'mam). a general designation (To- bit ii, 10) of that province of the Persian empire (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s. v.) termed Elam (q. v.) in the Bible. In 1 Macce vi, i, however, the word is used (in the more specific or local sense of some Persian city, as we are there informed that An- toichus Epiphanes, understanding there were very great treasures in the temple at Elymas, determined to plunder it; but the citizens resisted him success- fully). The town of Elam was also called Elam. This was called city Perisan, probably because it formerly had been the capital of Persia: for Persepolis and Elam were very different cities: the former situated on the Araxes, the latter on the Eulm- us. The temple which Antiochus designed to pillage was that of the goddess Nana, according to 2 Macce. i, 13: Appian says (Syr. p. 60) a temple of Venus (i. e.}
probably the goddess Aauhia); Polybius (xxxi, 11), Diodorus, Josephus (Ant. xii, 9, 1), and Jerome say a temple of Diana. See Antiochus (Ephiphanes).

El' ymas ('Elymaq), an appellative commonly derived from the Arabic *Abhmas* ("a wise man," see Pfeiffer, Dubia seu. p. 941; like the Turkish title Ulema, see Lakemacher, De Elymae Mago, in his Observant. ii, 126), which must be interpreted as a eponym, the Magus or sorcerer: it is applied to a Jew named Bar-Je'sus, who had attached himself to the proconsul of Cy- prus, Sergius Paulus, when Paul visited the island (Acts xiii, 6 sqq.). A.D. 44. On his attempting to dissuade the proconsul from embracing the Christian faith, he was struck with a miraculous blindness by the apostle (see Neander's History of First Planting of the Christian Church, i, 126). A very different but less probable derivation of the word is given by Lightfoot in his Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations on the Acts (Works, viii, 461), and in his Sermon on Elymas the Sorcerer (Works, vii, 104). Chrysostom observes, in reference to the blindness inflicted by the apostle on Bar-Jesus, that the limiting clause, "for a season," shows that it was not intended so much for the punishment of the sorcerer as for the conversion of the people, Acts xiii. Apost. Homil. xxviii; Opera, ix, 241). On the same subject generally, there has been prevailing, in the decay of faith, of consulting Oriental impostors of this kind, see Combeyre and Howson, Life of St. Paul, i, 177-180, 2d ed. See Magic.

El'shabad [some El'zahbad] (Heb. El'zahbad, אֶלְׁזַחַבָּד, ḫwān, who prophesied God has bestowed, i. q. Theodore; Sept. 'El'zah- bad 'El'zahbad, v. r. 'El'zahād and 'El'zahād; that is, the name of a man).

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

2. One of the able-bodied sons of Shemah, the son of Obed-edom the Levite; he served as a porter to the "house of Jehovah" under David (1 Chron. xxvi, 7).

B.C. 1014.

El'shap [some El'zaphan] (Heb. El'zaphan, אֶלְׁזָפָן, a contracted form (Exod. vi, 22; Lev. x, 4) of the name Elizabeth (q. v.).

Emanation (Latin emanatio, a flowing forth), a religious theory concerning the relation of the universe to the Deity, which lies at the basis of some of the Oriental religions, and from them found its way into several philosophical systems. Emanation denotes a doctrine concerning the introduction of all things in the universe by degrees from the Supreme Being, the universe constituting in general, as well as in particular, a chain of revelations, the individual rings of which lose the divine character the more the farther they are remote from the primary source, the Deity. A system of emanation is different from a system of evolution, because in the latter the revelation of the Deity in the universe has for the Deity itself the signification of a process of self-cognition which grows in a progressive ratio. Emanation was the basis of the religions of India, in the northern provinces of which country it developed from the original religion of nature even before the compilation of the Vedas. The cause of all things was found in a universal world-soul. See ANIMA MUNDI. The world-soul was identified with Brahma, and, viewed as the eternal spiritual unit, the mysterious source of all life. The ancient gods were explained as the first rays of Brahma, whom he had constituted the guardians of the world. The creation was an emanation from Brahma, which became the more gross, dense, materialized, the farther it removed from the primitive source. Those who give themselves up to the corporal world sink deeper and deeper, and only rise again upward when they have been purified by the fire of hell; but those who renounce all sensuality, and direct all their thoughts to the one divine substance, are gradually absorbed by it. The religion of the Parsees is also based upon emanation. From the Zeruane akherune (the uncreated one), Ormu- zard and Ahriman proceed as the highest revelations. From Ormuizd and Ahriman all other substances emanate, from the ministering angels down to the beings of the most inferior kind. The Parsees, like the Indians, a self-destruction of personality for the purpose of obtaining a reunion with the original unit; in the Parsee system the good is perfected and completed by overcoming the bad, and the series of the imperfect creations is closed by a depiction of Ab- ramin with Ormuizd. In the Western countries, Plato is the first in whose writings we find, though not yet distinctly, traces of the doctrine of emanation. More developed, it appears in the writings of Philo. It is a prominent feature of the Neoplatonic school, and through Valentinus (q. v.) it was introduced into the Gnostic schools. Finally, it is to be found in the philosophy of the Arabs, which was more or less an Aristotelianism mixed with Neoplatonic views.—Wetzer u. Weite, Kirchen-Lex., iii, 548; Möller, Gesch. der Kosmologie in der griech. Kirche bis auf Origenes (Halle, 1860); Neander, Ch. Hist. vol. i. (A. J.)

Emancipation. 1. In the Roman Church, Emancipatio means the raising of some member of a convent to an ecclesiastical dignity, by virtue of which he is no longer subject to his former superior. The Emancipatio canonica is the release of a young canon from the obligation of visiting the foundation school when about to receive a prebend. 2. The term is also used to denote the act whereby a government or Legislature delivers from a state of slavery, or sets at political liberty, any classes of persons who have previously been declared ineligible for certain offices or privileges, on account of their religious peculiarities, e. g. emancipation of Jews in Christian countries (see Jews); Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 in England (see Tests). The freeing of slaves from bondage (see Slavery).

Embalming (Egyptian, i, to embalm, to embalm, to convert, to spice; hence spoken of the ripening of fruit, on account of its aromatic juice, improperly rendered "puttheth forth" in Cant. ii, 13), the process of preserving a corpse by means of aromatics (Gen. i, 2, 3, 26; Sept. iraporimōn, caper), this art was practised among the Egyptians from the earliest times, and arrived at great perfection in that country, where, however, it has now become lost, the practice apparently having gradually fallen into disuse in consequence of the change of customs affected by the influence of Christianity and the Christian empire. It is in connection with that country that the above instances occur, and later examples (2 Chron. xvi, 14; John ii, 39, 40) seem to have been in imitation of the Egyptian custom. The modern method of embalming is in essential points similar.

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

2. Herodotus (ii, 86-89) describes how the Egyptians embalmed those who were in
tiated into the mysteries of the art by their ancestors. The most costly mode, which is estimated by Diodorus Siculus (i, 91) at a talent of silver (over $1,000), was said by the Egyptian priests to belong to him whose name in such a matter it was not lawful to mention, viz. Osiris. The embalmers first removed part of the brain through the nostrils by means of a crooked instrument, and again by cutting a slit in the cranium. An incision was then made along the flank with a sharp Ethiopian stone, and the whole of the intestines removed. The cavity was rinsed out with palm-wine, and afterwards scoured with pounded perfume. It was then filled with a pure myrrh, galbanum, cassia, and other aromatics, except frankincense. This done, the body was sewn up and steeped in natron for seventy days. When the seventy days were accomplished, the embalmers washed the corpse and sweated it in bandages of linen, cut in strips and smeared with gum. They then gave it to the relatives of the deceased, who provided for it a wooden case, made in the shape of a man, in which the dead was placed, and deposited in an erect position against the wall of the sepulchral chamber. Diodorus Siculus gives some particulars of the process which are omitted by Herodotus. When the body was taken out of the sarcophagus, one of the operators, called the scribe (γραπτητης), marked out the part of the left flank where the incision was to be made. The dissector (σφοδρηστης) then, with a sharp Ethiopian stone (λεβροτης ψαλινας, Herod. ii, 121), hastily cut through as much flesh as the law enjoined, and fled, pursued by curses and volleys of stones from the spectators. When all the embalmers (ταυστηρια) were assembled, one of them extracted the intestines, with the exception of the heart and kidneys; another cleansed them one by one, and rinsed them in palm-wine and perfumes. The body was then washed with oil of cedar, and other things worthy of notice, for more than thirty days (according to some MSS. forty), and afterwards sprinkled with myrrh, cinnamon, and other substances, which possess the property not only of preserving the body for a long period, but also of communicating to it an agreeable smell. This process was so effectual that the features of the dead could be recognised. It is remarkable that Diodorus omits all mention of the steeping in natron; Porphyrus (De Abst. iv, 10) supplies an omission of Herodotus, who neglects to mention what was done with the intestines after they were removed from the body. In the case of a person of respectable rank they were placed in a separate vessel and thrown into the river. This account is confirmed by Plutarch (Sept. Sec. Costis).

The second mode of embalming cost about 20 minas. In this case no incision was made in the body, nor were the intestines removed, but cedar-oil was injected into the stomach by the rectum. The oil was prevented from escaping, and the body was then steeped in natron for the appointed number of days. On the last day the oil was withdrawn, and carried off with it the stomach and intestines in a state of solution, while the flesh was consumed by the natron, and nothing was left but the skin and bones. The body in this state was weighed, to determine whether it was enlightened. The third mode, which was adopted by the poorer classes, and cost but little, consisted in rinsing out the intestines with syrinx, an infusion of senna and cassia (Pettigrew, Hist. of Mummies, p. 69), and steeping the body for the usual number of days in natron. Although the three modes of embalming are so precisely described by Herodotus, it has been found impossible to classify the mummies which have been discovered and examined under one or other of these heads. Pettigrew, from his own observations, confirms the truth of Herodotus's statement that the brain was removed through the nostrils. But in many instances, in which the body was carefully preserved and elaborately ornamented, the brain had not been removed at all, while in some mummies the cavities was found to be filled with resinous and bituminous matter. M. Rouyer, in his Notice sur les Embaumements des Anciens Egyptiens (Description de l'Egypte, p. 471), endeavored to class the mummies which he examined under the principal divisions, which were again subdivided in the following manner. When the incision was made in the ventral incision, preserved, 1, by bal- samic matter, and, 2, by natron. The first of these are filled with a mixture of resin and aromatics, and are of an olive color—the skin dry, flexible, and adhering to the bone, the flesh scarlet, red, and black, the phal- lus, and are black, the skin hard and shining. Those prepared with natron are also filled with resinous substances and bitumen. II. Mummies without the ventral incision. This class is again subdivided, according as the bodies were, 1, salted and filled with asphaltum, a compound of asphaltum and natron pitch; or, 2, salted only. The former are supposed to have been immersed in the pitch when in a liquid state. The medications employed in embalming were various. From a chemical analysis of the sub- stances found in mummies, M. Roselle detected three modes of preparation of the pitch: 1, the pitch, called also funeral gum, or gum of mummies; 2, with a mixture of asphaltum and cedars, the liquor distil- led from the cedar; 3, with this mixture, together with some resinous and aromatic ingredients. The asphaltum was mixed with the bituminous matter, but sprinkled into the cavities of the body. Pettigrew supposes that after the spicing "the body must have been subjected to a very considerable degree of heat; for the resinous and aromatic substances have penetrated even into the innermost strata of the carcass, an effect which could not have been produced without the aid of a high temperature, and which was absolutely necessary for the entire preservation of the body" (p. 62). M. Rouyer is of the same opinion (p. 471). The surface of the body was in one example covered with a coating of the dust of common and barnal, now less than one inch in thickness, which "had the smell of cinnamon or cassia" (Pettigrew, p. 62, 63). At this same stage plates of gold were sometimes applied to portions of the body, or even its whole surface. Before en- rapping, the body was painted, an effect which could not have been produced without the aid of a high temperature, and which was absolutely necessary for the entire preservation of the body."
ty of the bandaging has been the subject of great admiration. The strips were very closely bound, and all directions were adopted that could carry out this object. Pettigrew is of opinion that they were certainly applied wet. Various amulets and personal ornaments are found upon mummies and in their wrappings; the former were thought to be of use to the soul in its wanderings, and they were placed with the body from the belief in the relation between the two after death. With these matters, and the other particulars of Egyptian mummies, we have little to do, as our object is to show how far the Jewish burial-usages may have been derived from Egypt. The body in the cases of most of the richer mummies, when bandaged, has been covered with what has been termed by the French a cartouche, formed of layers of cloth, plastered with lime on the inside. The shape is that of a body of which the arms and legs are not distinguishable. In this shape every dead person who had, if we may believe Diodorus, been judged by a particular court to be worthy of the honor of burial, was considered to have the form of Osiris, and was called by his name. It seems more probable, however, that the tribunal spoken of was that of Ameni, "the hidden," the Egyptian Hades, and that the practice of embalming was universal. The cartouche of the more costly mummies is generally beautifully painted with subjects connected with Ameni. Mummies of this class are enclosed in one or even two wooden cases, either of sycamore, or, rarely, of cedar. The mummmies of royal and very wealthy persons were placed in an outer stone case, within which there was a wooden case, and, probably, sometimes two such cases. See MUMMY. It would seem that the features of the face, as well as the other parts of the body, were covered over with the bandage, and that it was only through this, and latterly through the coffin, which commonly took the form of the features, that these could be recognised.

II. Hebrew-Egyptian.—The records of the embalming of Jacob and Joseph are very brief. In the former case we read, "And Joseph commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father: and the physicians embalmed Israel. And forty days were fulfilled for him; for so are fulfilled the days of embalming: and the Egyptians mourned for him three days and ten days" (Gen. I, 2, 3). Of Joseph we are only told that "they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt" (ver. 26). It should be remarked, that in Joseph's case the embalming must have been thorough, as Moses at the Exodus carried his body into Canaan. The motive of embalming in these instances was evidently that the strong desire of these patriarchs to be buried in the Land of Promise might be complied with, although, had this not been so, respect would probably have led to the same result. That the physicians were employed by Joseph to embalm his father may mean no more than the usual embalmers, who must have had medical and surgical knowledge, but it is not unlikely that the kings and high officers were embalmed by household physicians. The periods of forty days for embalming, and seventy for mourning, are not easily reconciled with the statement of Herodotus, who specifies seventy days as the time that the body remained in natron. Hengstenberg (History of the Books of Moses, p. 69) attempts to reconcile this discrepancy by supposing that the seventy days of Herodotus include the whole time of embalming, and not that of steeping in natron only. But the differences in detail which characterize the descriptions of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the impossibility of reconciling these descriptions in all points with the results of scientific observation, lead to the natural conclusion that, if these descriptions are correct in themselves, they do not include every method of embalming which was practised, and that, consequently, any discrepancies between them and the Biblical narrative cannot fairly be attributed to a want of accuracy in the latter. Perhaps the periods varied in different ages, or the forty days may not include the time of steeping in natron. Diodorus Siculus, who, having visited Egypt, is scarcely likely to have been in error in a matter necessarily well known, speaks of the anointing of the body at first with oil of cedar and other things for above thirty or forty days (Σὲ ἡμέρας πλαύον τῷ τρικαλεύτῳ; some MSS. τρικαλιστονέτων). This period would correspond very well with the forty days mentioned in Genesis, which are literally "the days of anointing," and indicate that the latter denoted the most essential period of embalming. Or, if the same period as the seventy days of Herodotus be meant by Diodorus, then there would appear to have been a change. It may be worth noticing, that Herodotus, when first mentioning the steeping in natron, speaks of seventy days as the extreme time to which it might be lawfully prolonged (ἡμέρας ἣδρομακτάτη · πλαύον ἐς τούτων αὐτὸν ἔξατο ταραχόν—
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terms, which, however, was very different in all else that relates to the disposal of the corpse. See Buriyal.

Among the later Jews a sort of embalming by means of honey occurs (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 7, 4; see Strabo, xvi, 46; compare Pliny, xxxii, 50). Wax was and still is used by the ancient Persians (Herodotus, i, 140; comp. Cicero, Tusc. Quaest. i, 42; Xenophon, Hellas, v, 3, 19).


Embalming the Dead in the Christian Church.

It was the custom of the early Church to bestow the honor of embalming upon the bodies of martyrs at least. According to an intimation of Tertullian (Apol. cap. 49), the usage appears to have been generally adopted by Christians in burying their dead. One of the chief ingredients used was myrrh; in imitation of the Jewish custom, which was followed by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound [weight].

The body they wound “in linen clothes with the sweet spices, as the manner of the Jews is to prepare for burial” (John xix, 38, 40). Mark specifies that fine clothes were used (xxv, 45), and mentions that the women who came to the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him (xvi, 1). Luke relates that the women went to see the sepulchre. “And they returned, and prepared sweet spices and ointments” (xxiii, 59). Immediately after the use of their “sweet spices which the women had prepared” (xxiv, 1) on the second day after our Lord himself referred to the use of ointment in burial-ceremonies (προς το πνευματικόν) “for the preparation for burial,” when he commended the piety of the woman who had anointed his head with “precious ointment” (Matt. xxvi, 6-18), and spoke in like manner in the similar case of Mary, the sister of Lazarus (John xii, 3-8).

The customs at this time would seem to have been to anoint the body and wrap it in fine linen, with spices and ointments in the folds, and afterwards to pour more ointment upon it, and perhaps also to burn spices. In the case of our Saviour, the hurried burial and the following of the Sabbath may have caused an unusual delay. Ordinarily everything was probably completed at once.

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus speak of the use of myrrh in Egyptian embalming, but we do not find any mention of aloes. The wrapping in fine linen is rather contrary to the Egyptian practice than like it, when we remember that the coarser mummy-bandages are those which immediately enfold the body, and would be unnecessary if there were used only the finest.

The Jewish custom has therefore little in common with the Egyptian. It was, however, probably intended as a kind of embalming, although it is evident from what is mentioned in the case of Lazarus, who was regularly swathed (John xi, 44), that its effect was not preservation (ver. 50). The use of aromatic gums naturally have been a harmless relic of the Egyptian cus
Emblem, "a device or figure employed to represent some moral notion. There are various opinions as to the lawfulness and expediency of emblems in religious matters, some considering it to be both allowable and useful thus to represent spiritual ideas to the bodily eye; others, again, holding it to be both presumptuous and dangerous, if not superstitious, to use any emblems of sacred things not warranted and enjoined by Scripture. This, at least, is certain, that it is quite as likely to lead to idolatry (answering to that of the Hindoos, Egyptians, etc.) as pictures or images giving a simple resemblance. The golden calf was meant for an emblem, but it was the occasion of gross idolatry."

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

Embroider (אֶסְנָּדָה, ἐσσάνω, ἐσσάνα), to variegate, Exod. xxxv, 33; xxxvi, 28; elsewhere "needle-work," etc.; גָּלֶ֑ת, ἐκατωβά, to interweave, Exod. xxxviii, 39; "set," Exod. xxxviii, 20. See Broderied. If these passages are correctly rendered, the Israelites must have known the art of embroidery. In several passages, also, an equivalent expression is used—needle-work—and used so as to imply that not plain sewing, but ornamental work, was evidently meant (Exod. xxvi, 36; Judg. v, 30; Psalm xlv, 14, etc.). The Hebrew women were undoubtedly indebted to their residence in Egypt for that perfection of finish in embroidery which was displayed in the service of the tabernacle, and in the preparation of the sacerdotal robes directed to be worn by the high-priest (Exod. xxviii, 29). The colored figures in the cloth of the Hebrews are thought by most authors to have been partly the product of the weaver in colors, whose art appears the superior, and partly that of the embroiderer in colors. The notices of Egyptian history, confirmed by the monumental remains, give reason for believing that at a comparatively early period they had made wonderful attai-
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Embury, Philip, the first Methodist minister in America, was born in Ballygarvan, Ireland, Sept. 21, 1728 or 1729. His parents were Germans of the Palatinate, and he was educated at a school near Ballygarvan. In 1752 he was converted, and in 1758 he was entered upon the roll of the Irish Conference as a preacher. In 1790 he emigrated to America, but it is not known whether he preached or not during the first few years of his life in New York. In 1766, stimulated by the advice of Barbara Heck, a pious Methodist, he organized a class, and commenced preaching, first in his own house, then in a hired room, and soon after his own home. As a birth-place of Methodism in New York. A chapel became necessary, and in 1788 the pioneer Methodist church was erected on the site of the present John Street Church. New York at this time had a population of twenty thousand. Embury continued to serve the Church in this chapel gratuitously until the arrival of the first missionaries sent out by John Wesley in 1769, when he surrendered the charge, and, with a party of fellow-Methodists, emigrated to Washington County. He there continued his labors as a "local preacher," and formed a society, chiefly of his own countrymen, at Ashgrove, the first Methodist organization within the bounds of the present Troy Conference, now numbering twenty-five thousand communicants, and more than two hundred travelling preachers. Embury died suddenly in August, 1775, in consequence of an accident in moving. He was buried on a neighbor's farm, but in 1882 his remains were taken up and deposited in Ashgrove church-yard, with funeral ceremonies, and an address by John N. Mafitin. In 1866, the centenary year of American Methodism, his remains were transferred, by order of the Troy Conference, to the Woodland Cemetery, Cambridge, Washington County, N. Y., with impressive services, conducted by Bishop James and the Rev. S. D. Brown. See a good sketch of his life by Saxe, Ladies' Repository, May, 1856; also Bangs, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, vol. I., Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, vol. II.; Wakeley, Heroes of Methodism; Stevens, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, vol. I.; Wakeley, Lost Chapters.

Emesek. See Beth-Emesek; Kezile.

Emerald ( "% 50, n"6p'k6, of uncertain signif.; Sept. ˹i`8pₐ, N.T. and Apoc. ATABASE, a precious stone, named first in the second row on the breast-plate of the high-priest (Exod. xxviii, 18; xxxix, 11), imported to Tyre from Syria (Ezek. xxviii, 16), used as a seal or signet (Eccles. xxx, 8), as an ornament of clothing and bed of one of the foundations of Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 19; Tob. xiii, 15). The rainbow round the throne is compared to emerald in Rev. iv, 6 (μάρσιος ὁ ἀσάμαρσιος ὁ ἀσάρσιος). The Sept., Josephus, and Jesus Targum understand by it the carbuncle. This name (in Greek denoting a live coal) the ancients gave to several glowing red stones resembling live coals (Pliny, Hist. Nat. xiii, 25; comp. Theophrast. De Lapid. 18), particularly rubies and garnets. See Carbuncle. The most valuable of the carbuncles seems, however, to have been the Oriental garnet, a transparent red stone, with a violet shade, and strong vitreous lustre. It was engraved upon (Theophrast. 31), and was probably not as hard as the ruby, which, indeed, is the most beautiful and costly of the precious stones of a red color, but is so hard that it cannot easily be subjected to the graving-tool. The Hebrew נָדָכ, in the breast-plate of the high-priest, was certainly an engraved stone; and there is no evidence that the ancients could engrave the ruby, although this has in modern times been accomplished (Rosenmüller, Biblical Mineralogy, p. 32, 33; Brauinius, De Test. Sacerdot. p. 523; Bellermann, Uber die Uran u. Thummel, p. 45). See Beryl.

The smaragdus of the New Test. was the generic name of twelve varieties of gems, some of which were probably true emeralds, while others seem to have been rather stones of the prasius or jasper kind, and still others nothing more than colored crystals and spars from copper mines. The statues, etc., of emerald mentioned by authors, as those of the Sibyls, appear to be made either of more or less transparent rock crystals, or even colored glass (Hill on Theophrast. de Lapid. 44; Moore's Anc. Mineral. p. 150). See Gem.

Emer. See Hemorrhois.

Emerson, John B., a Congregational minister and missionary, was born at Chester, N. H., in 1802; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1826, and studied theology at Andover. He had studied with special reference to the missionary work, and went, under the auspices of the American Board, to the Sandwich Islands, and was appointed to Waialua, Oahu, where he spent nearly the whole of his life, laboring with zeal and success. For four years he was professor in the Lahainaluna seminary, and while there he prepared (with other writers) an English-Hawaiian Dictionary. He died at Waialua March 23, 1867.—American Annual Cyclopaedia, vii, 559.

Emerson, Ralph, D.D., a Congregational divine and scholar, was born at Hollis, N. H., August 18, 1750, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1811 with the highest honors of his class. After studying theology at Andover until 1814, he was tutor at Yale for a short time, and in 1816 became pastor at Norfolk, Conn. In 1827 he was chosen professor of Church history and pastoral theology at Andover, which office he held until 1854. He lived for five years at Newportport, and then removed to Rockford, Illinois, where some of his children resided, and where he died, May 26, 1863. As a teacher, he maintained a high character during his long service at Andover.—Congregational Quarterly, July, 1868.

Emery, Jacques ANDRE, an eminent French Roman Catholic divine, was born at Gex, August 27, 1782, and studied in the Jesuits' College at Mâcon, and also at St. Sulpice, Paris. He was ordained in 1756; became professor of theology at Orleans 1759; and afterwards he held the chair of philosophy at Paris. In 1776, superintend of the seminary at Angers; 1784, head of the abbey of Boisragon, and also head of the congregation of St. Sulpice. In 1789 he founded a seminary of his congregation at Baltimore, Mary-land.

**'Emim** (Heb. *Eymim*, דֵּי-מִים, errors; Sept. *Oμαίοι* and *Oμίαι*; Auth. Vers. *Emim*s), a numerous and warlike tribe of the ancient Canaanites, of gigantism, who were defeated by Chedorlaomer in the plain of Kiriathaim; they occupied, in the time of Abraham, the country east of the Jordan, afterwards possessed by the Moabites (Gen. xiv, 5; Deut. ii, 10, 11). See CANAAN. An ingenious writer in the *Jour. of Soc. Lit.* (April, 1852, p. 55 sq.); Jan. 1853, p. 296 argues, but upon rather slender grounds, that their original title was *Shittim*, and identifies them with the Chetta so often referred to in the Egyptian inscriptions. It would appear, from a comparison of Gen. xiv, 5-7 with Deut. ii, 10-12, 20-23, that the whole country east of Jordan was, in primitive times, held by a race of giants, all probably of the same stock, comprehending the Rephaim on the north, next the Zuzim, after them the Emim, and then the Horim on the south; and that afterwards the kingdom of Bashan embraced the territories of the first; the country of the Ammonites, the second; that of the Moabites, the third; while Edom took in the mountains of the Horim. The whole of them were attacked and pillaged by the Eastern kings who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. See REPHAIM. The Emim were related to the Anakim, and were generally called by the same name; but the place of the Moabites, terrae Emim—that is, "Terrible men" (Deut. ii, 11)—most probably, on account of their fierce aspect. See ANAKIM.

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

**Emlyn, Thomas**, an English Nonconformist theologian, born in May 1615, at Cilcohan, in the county of Cardigan; made chaplain 1688 by the countess of Donegal. In 1691 he became assistant to Mr. Boyce in the congregation of Nonconformists in Wood Street, Dublin. Having imbibed and preached Arian doctrines, he was deprived of his functions, and fined and imprisoned for two years. Restored to liberty, he continued to preach and to write in favor of Arianism until his death, July 30, 1748. His Works were collected and published in London, 1746 (3 vols. 8vo). Waterland notices Emlyn's writings frequently (see the Index to his works, 6 vols. 8vo). See also Dornier, *P Von Christ* (Edinburgh, trans.), div. ii, vol. iii, 357.

**Emmian-nili** ('Emonianthi), a Gracianized form (Matt. i, 23) of the name IMMANUEL (q. v.).

**Emmaus** ('Emmavios, prob. from דֵּי שָׂם,.hot batha, see Gen. xxxvi, 24), the name of three places in Palestine.

1. A village (כֹּ֫וָ֣מְא) 60 stadia (A. V. "furlong") or 74 miles from Jerusalem, noted for Lord's interview with two disciples on the day of his resurrection (Luke xxiv, 13). The same place is mentioned by Josephus (War, vii, 6, 6), and placed at the same distance from Jerusalem, in stating that Vespasian left 800 soldiers in Judas, to whom he gave the village of *Amemmis* (Ἀμμαθίας). The direction, however, is not given in either passage. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v.) hold that it is identical with Nicopolis [see No. 2, below]; and they were followed by all geographers down to the commencement of the 14th century (Rudens, *Palæst.*, p. 578). Then, for some reason, it began to be supposed that the site of Emmaus was at the little village of Kubbeh, about 3 miles W. of Neby Sannwil, the eminence N.W. of Jerusalem (Maundeville, in *Early Travels in Palestine*, 1834, p. 176; Ludolf, *De Synchronia*, p. 179; Robinson, *Bib. Res*, iii, 66, note). Mr. Williams regards Keriat el-Enab as the true location (Journal of Philology, iv, 26), and Thomson inclines to the same position (Land and Book, ii, 808); but this view has little to recommend it, and the locality is otherwise appropriately the place of the miraculous multiplication of the loaves (John vi, 1—15). Eusebius does not mention it different from Nicopolis, and that it is mentioned in the Talmud as *Baruth Chapay* (בי"ת כפוא), i. e. "houses of the army" or Gibbor Chapay (בי"ת כפוא), i. e. heroes of the army, as being occupied by Roman veterans, a name that he finds in "some ruins which the Arabs call Barbaris, S. of Saris, 74 Eng. miles from Jerusalem" (Pallad. p. 117, 118); but no such name appears on Van de Velde's Map (which lays down Saris at 7 miles N. of W. from Jerusalem). In this uncertainty, the monkish identification with el-Kubeh ("the little dome") may for the present be acquitted in. This corresponds sufficiently in distance from Jerusalem (Rauner, *Palæst.*, p. 169), being 7800 paces (Cæsarea, p. 315), or 2h 40m to the N.W. (Van de Velde, *Memoriae*, p. 289, containing the ruins of the village, church and chapel (Tobler, *Topograph. von. Jerusalem*, ii, 340), although Dr. Robinson describes it (Bib. Res., ii, 394) as "a village built up by the government of Gaza on a stony, barren hill, without anything to mark it particularly as an ancient site." On the evangelical incident at this place there are treatises in Latin by Harenberg; in his *Ovia Gandersch*, p. 41-60; (Jub. 1774). Zachoko (Das neuest. Emmaus beleuchtet, Schafft, 1865) argues at length in favor of the modern traditional site; and the chief building on the spot, known as the "castrum Arnoldi," has lately been bought by some zealous Catholics as a "holy place" (Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1886, p. 517).

2. **Emmaus** (Ἐμμαυε, 1 Macc. iii, 40, etc.; ἀμμαυε, Josephus, War, ii, 20, 4) or NICOPOLIS, a town in the plain of Philistia, at the foot of the mountains of Judah (Jerome, in *Deor.*, vii), 22 Roman miles from Jerusalem, and 10 from Lydda (Jos. Hieros. ed. Hassel, p. 600; Reland, *Palæst.*, p. 309). The name does not occur in the O. T.; but the town rose to importance during the later history of the Jews, and was a place of note in the wars of the Asmonaean. It was fortified by Beccabites, the general of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was engaged in the war with John Hyrcanus and Maccabæus (Josephus, Anti., xiii, 1, 8; 1 Macc. ix, 50). It was in the plain beside this city that Judas Maccabæus so signally defeated the Syrians with a mere handful of men, as related in 1 Macc. iii, 57; iv, 5; 5, 50. Under the Romans, Emmaus became the capital of a toparchy (Josephus, War, iii, 8, 8; Pliny, v, 14). It was burned by the Roman general Varus about A.D. 4. In the 8th century (about A.D. 220) it was rebuilt through the exertions of Julius Africanus, the well-known Christian writer, and then received the name Joppolo. Eusebius and Jerome frequently refer to it in defining the positions of neighboring towns and villages (Chron. Pales. ad A.C. 228; Reland, p. 759). Early writers mention a fountain at Emmaus, famous far and wide for its healing virtues (Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. v. 21); the cause of this Theophanes ascribes to the fact that the people made offerings of water in it (Chron. p. 41). The Crusaders still called it Nicopolis, but confounded it with a small fortress farther south, on the Jerusalem road, now called Latron (Will. Tyr. Hist. vii, 24). A small, miserable village called *Amade* still occupies the site of the ancient city. It stands on a small hill on the highest ground commanding the plain, and contains the ruins of an old church a little south of the village, also two copi-
was fountains, one of which is doubtless the ancient medicinal spring (Robinson, Researches, ii. 363; Later Res. p. 146, 147; Thomson, Land and Book, ii. 290).

Dr. Robinson has recently revived the old theory that the Emmaus of Lake is identical with Nicopolis, and has supported it with his wonted learning, but not with that assurance which befits it. (Rob. iii. 46; Later Res. p. 146). He endeavors to cast doubt on the accuracy of the reading Ἰερουσαὶ in Luke xxvii. 13, because several uncials MSS. and a few unimportant cursive MSS. insert Ἰεροῦ, thus making the distance 166 stadia, which would nearly connect the distance with that of Bethany. But the best MSS. have not this word, and the best critics regard it as an interpolation.

There is a strong probability that some copyist who was acquainted with the city, but not the village of Emmaus, tried thus to reconcile Scripture with his idea by borping a village of Galilee close to Jerusalem, and their followers, on a point such as this, are not of very great authority. When the name of any noted place agreed with one in the Bible they were not always careful to see whether the position corresponded in like manner. Emmaus-Nicopolis being a noted city in their day, they were led somewhat rashly to confound it with the Emmaus of the Gospel. The circumstances of the narrative are plainly opposed to the identity. The two disciples, having journeyed from Jerusalem to Emmaus in part of a day (Luke xxiv. 28, 29), left the latter again after the evening meal; the former at a village very red with wine (ver. 38, 42, 43). Now, if we take into account the distance, and the nature of the road, leading up a steep and difficult mountain, we must admit that such a journey could not be accomplished in less than from six to seven hours, so that they could not have arrived in Jerusalem till long after midnight. This fact seems conclusive against the identity of Nicopolis and the Emmaus of Luke (Reland, Palest. p. 427 sq.; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 599).

3. The name Emmaus, or Ammaus (Ἀμμαώος), was also given by a village of Galilee close to Tiberias, probably the ancient Ἰμμαθ (q. v.), i.e. hot springs —of which name Emmaus was but a corruption. The hot springs still remained in the time of Josephus, and are mentioned by him as given name to the place (War, iv. 1, 5; Ant. xviii. 2, 8).

Emmaus or Emmaam, a bishop of Poitiers in the 7th century. He left his see for the purpose of missionary labours in Hungary, but is said to have stopped in Bavaria three years, at the request of duke Theodol, to purify the Christianitv of that duchy, where it was sadly mixed with paganisni. After this he continued his journey to Rome, and was waylaid and murdered by a son of the duke (Sept. 29, 602), because the daughter of the latter, Uta, claimed to have been dishonored by Emmaus. After his death, a clergyman, Wulfalsch by name, maintained the innocence of Emmeram, saying that the lord, shortly before his death, had told him he would help Uta, he had followed her to name him as seducer, though the real culprit was Sieghart, the son of a judge. This statement of Wulfalsch is said to have induced Theodol to bury him with great honors, and to exile his son to Hungary. Emmeram was soon venerated as a saint, and became one of the patron saints of the city and diocese of Lech. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome on the 23rd of September. On pictures he is represented as a bishop with a ladder. The accounts of Emmaus are very confused and conflicting; the best one is given by Athanasius, Lactantius, Cassiodorus, and Procopius. His feast is Sept. 29; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iii. 779; Wetzer, Fl. Welle, Kirchen-Lez. iii. 558.

Emmeram, Nathanael, D.D., one of the founders of a new school in Calvinistic theology, was born April 20 (O. S.), 1745, at East Halden, Conn., a town which was also the birthplace of the missionary brothers David and John Brainerd, of President Edward Pierpont. Emmeram was the brother of George D. Griffin, Esq., of the lust Jeremiai Gault, Brainerd, and James Brainerd Taylor. He was the sixth son, and the twelfth and youngest child of his parents. He entered Yale College in 1768, and was graduated with honor in 1776. Among his classmates were Gov. John Treadwell, the poet John Trumbull, Judge Samuel Wiles, and Dr. Joseph Lyman, who, as long as they lived, exhibited a high degree of reverence for Dr. Emmeram. He studied theology first with Rev. Nathan Strong, of Coventry, Conn., and afterwards with Rev. Dr. John Smalley, of Berlin, Conn., a divinity who had been a pupil of Dr. Bellamy. He was more influence than perhaps any other man in shaping the theological opinions of young Emmerams. In 1769 Emmeram was appointed as a preacher, and on the 20th of April, 1773, was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Franklin, Mass. He remained sole pastor of the church twenty-four years, was the active member of it sixty-seven years and five months. Among the members of the council which ordained him were his two special friends, Rev. Dr. Hopkins, of Newport, R. I., and Rev. Dr. Hart, of Preston, Conn., a son-in-law of Dr. Bellamy. During his active pastorate he was honored at Franklin as a man of religion, one in 1784, one in 1794, and one in 1808-9. In the first of these revivals about seventy persons, in the second about thirty, and in the third about forty were thought to have consecrated themselves to Christ. One of his aphorisms was, "The seed of a faithful laborer soars is apt to be seen when he denies from the field;" and as soon as Dr. Emmeram was relieved of his sole pastorate at Franklin, he was gladdened by a fourth revival, in which thirty-six persons were added to his church, and after nine or ten years he rejoiced in a third of the fruit which he had planted. He lived to see nearly four hundred of his parishioners profess their faith in Christ. One of them, Rev. Dr. Blake, has recorded: "Hardly a case of defection from the truth has ever occurred among those who were turned unto God under Dr. Emmeram's ministry." His administration of candidates for ordination and of discipline were very rigid.—A large part of his influence on the churches has been exerted through his theological pupils. Between eighty-six and a hundred young men were guided by him in their studies preparatory to the Christian ministry. Of these pupils several have been successful as professors in seminaries and theological seminaries; many, as sound and strong preachers. Forty-six of them are noticed in the biographical dictionaries of eminent men. His impress upon them was decided and permanent. They were often called Emmeronians.—Although he was an adept in metaphysical abstractions, yet he aimed to be a practical man, not only in his influence on his pupils, but also in the general affairs of the Church and the State. He was the first president, and a father, if not the father of the Massachusetts Missionary Society, which was the parent of many philanthropic institutions. He was also one of the original editors of the Massachusetts Missionary Magazine, which was the gern of the present Missionary Herald. He was among the foremost in starting various trains of influence which have now become parts of our history. When the American Revolution took its rise, he was a zealous anti-mason. When anti-slavery was most generally denounced, he was an active abolitionist. It was often his lot to be an advocate of the weaker party. He was a decided Federalist in politics, and produced a great excitement in some of his political writings. He seldom visited his parishioners, still he was remarkable for his knowledge of their
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EMPEROR (Eagwio v. r. Eqwio), a Grecized form (Acts vii, 16) of the name of HAMOR (q. v.), the father of Shechem (Gen. xxxiv, 2).

Emperor (Lat. imperator, general), a title common (in its Latin form) to all governors who had paramount jurisdiction within a given province (Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Imperator), but technically to a Roman general of the first rank, a Praetor Secundus, as a praenomen first by Julius Caesar (Sueton. Jul. 76), as affecting supreme power, and historically to his successors, the heads of the so-called Roman Empire (q. v.). They were also designated as Cesar (q. v.). We are here chiefly concerned with them as they came in contact with the Christian religion in the character of persecutors or patrons. See Persecution. (See Baldwin, Edicta veti. principum Roman. de Christianis, Hal. 1727 [also in Heinicci Jurispr. Rom. i, 1874 sq.]; Cruse, De Romanorum imperatorum historia, Ziz. 1754; Hebenustri, De priscis Christianis imperatoribus, Ziz. 1779; Heinecci, Historiae ministris Caesarum Christianis, Hal. 1772; also Hirt, De imperatorum ante Constant. eras Christianos favere, Jen. 1778; Keespe, De statu Christianorum sub imp. Berol. 1829.)

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

B.C. 1 A.D. 66.

R. A.D.

1. Augustus. 1. Andrew.

2. Tiberius. 2. Andrew.

3. Claudius. 3. Andrew.


5. Trajan. 5. Andrew.


7. Antoninus. 7. Andrew.


10. Commodus. 10. Andrew.


15. Severus. 15. Andrew.


27. Florianus. 27. Andrew.


32. Constantius. 32. Andrew.


34. Vezenarvadus. 34. Andrew.

35. Maximi. 35. Andrew.


38. Constantius. 38. Andrew.


41. Constantius. 41. Andrew.

42. Constantius. 42. Andrew.

43. Constantius. 43. Andrew.

44. Constantius. 44. Andrew.

45. Constantius. 45. Andrew.

46. Constantius. 46. Andrew.

47. Constantius. 47. Andrew.


49. Constantius. 49. Andrew.

50. Constantius. 50. Andrew.


52. Constantius. 52. Andrew.


54. Constantius. 54. Andrew.


56. Constantius. 56. Andrew.

57. Constantius. 57. Andrew.


60. Constantius. 60. Andrew.

61. Constantius. 61. Andrew.


63. Constantius. 63. Andrew.

64. Constantius. 64. Andrew.

65. Constantius. 65. Andrew.


68. Constantius. 68. Andrew.

69. Constantius. 69. Andrew.

70. Constantius. 70. Andrew.

71. Constantius. 71. Andrew.

72. Constantius. 72. Andrew.

73. Constantius. 73. Andrew.

74. Constantius. 74. Andrew.

75. Constantius. 75. Andrew.

76. Constantius. 76. Andrew.

77. Constantius. 77. Andrew.

78. Constantius. 78. Andrew.

79. Constantius. 79. Andrew.

80. Constantius. 80. Andrew.

81. Constantius. 81. Andrew.

82. Constantius. 82. Andrew.

83. Constantius. 83. Andrew.

84. Constantius. 84. Andrew.

85. Constantius. 85. Andrew.

86. Constantius. 86. Andrew.

87. Constantius. 87. Andrew.

88. Constantius. 88. Andrew.

89. Constantius. 89. Andrew.

90. Constantius. 90. Andrew.

91. Constantius. 91. Andrew.


94. Constantius. 94. Andrew.

95. Constantius. 95. Andrew.

96. Constantius. 96. Andrew.


98. Constantius. 98. Andrew.


100. Constantius. 100. Andrew.


102. Constantius. 102. Andrew.

103. Constantius. 103. Andrew.


111. Constantius. 111. Andrew.

112. Constantius. 112. Andrew.
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EMORY

A.D.
1283. Andronicus II.
1294. Michael IX.
1294. Andronicus II.
1294. Andronicus II.
1322. Andronicus II.
1354. Manuel II.
1325. John VII.
1341. John V.
1347. John VI.
1347. John VI.
1347. John VI.
1347. John VI.

Emory, John, D.D., a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Queen Anne County, Maryland, April 11, 1789. After completing his academic education at Washington College, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar at nineteen years of age. His great ability was soon manifest; he came rapidly into practice, and had every prospect of early success. He passed through his religious experience before his admission to the bar, and soon after decided, in opposition to the will of his father, to enter the ministry. In 1810 he was received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He soon established a reputation for pre-eminence in all the qualities of a true Christian minister. From 1813 to 1824 he filled the most important pastoral stations in the Methodist Connection in America, his appointments being as follows: 1811, Cambridge Circuit; 1812, Talbot Circuit; 1813-14, Elgin, Illinois; 1815, Wilmington Church; 1818-19, Philadelphia; 1820-21, Annapolis; 1822, Hagerstown; 1823, Baltimore. In 1816 he was elected to the General Conference, and he was a member of every subsequent General Conference until his death, except that of 1824. In 1826 he was sent by the General Conference to the British Conference, and discharged the delicate duties of his mission to the entire satisfaction of the churches. From 1824 to 1832 he was book-agent and editor for the Methodist Episcopal Church at New York. In this post his rare combination of intellectual power and culture with business habits was pre-eminent displayed. To none of the eminent men who have held this office is the Methodist Book Concern more indebted for its present greatness than to Dr. Emory. In the language of Bishop Vaughn, "The two great objects which Dr. Emory aimed to accomplish were, first, the exaltation of the debt from the rank and second, the actual sale of the stock on hand, and especially that part of it which was daily depreciating, because of the injuries which were constantly being sustained by it, in the scattered and exposed state in which most of it was found. The ability, skill, 1816-17, and perseverance which he displayed in the measures devised by him for the accomplishment of these objects have seldom been equaled, and perhaps never surpassed by the most practiced business man. His success was complete. Before the meeting of the General Conference in 1826 he sold all the obligation of the institution which had been so opportunely intrusted to his superintendence. He had greatly enlarged the annual dividends to an increased number of conferences. He had purchased several lots of ground for a more enlarged and eligible location of the establishment, and had erected a large four story brick building as a part of the improvements intended to be put on them, for the whole of which he had paid. It was his high honor, and also his enviable satisfaction, to report to the General Conference, for the first time, that its Book Concern was no longer in debt." He originated the "Publishing Fund" and "The Methodist Quarterly Review," and abolished entirely the sale of books on commission.

In 1822 he was elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered upon his duties at once, not only by attending the annual Conferences, but also by his influence in the interest of the Church. He was especially active with regard to education, and had a large share in the organization of Dickinson College. In addition to this, he drew up the outline of a plan for an education society in the Methodist Episcopal Church, which he designed to aid ministers and others in educating their sons. Soon after his election to the episcopacy Dr. Emory devised a course of study for candidates for deserts and elders, in which, with his usual discretion, he did not hazard everything by attempting too much. The Troy Conference of 1836 was the last which he attended. On the 16th of December in that year he was thrown from his carriage, about two miles from his own house (Reisterstown, Md.) by a team of five black A.M., and at half past seven in the evening he died.

Bishop Emory was a man of great talent and large cultivation. As a scholar, he was accurate and profound; as a preacher, he was clear and convincing; as an administrative officer, he hardly had a superior in any church. His conspicuous success was distinguished for logical directness and for fairness to his adversaries. In 1817 he published two pamphlets in reply to bishop White's 'Objectives against Personal Assurance by the Holy Spirit'; and in 1818, another, entitled 'The Divinity of Christ vindicated against the Comma of Mr. John Wright.' The period from 1818 to 1830 was one of great excitement in the Methodist Episcopal Church on various points of Church polity, and in all the controversy Dr. Emory bore a distinguished part. A large party wished to have the office of presiding elder held by the elect; he fell in that party, and, at the General Conference of 1820, he opposed vigorously a theory which gave the bishops a right to veto the acts of the General Conference. In the later conferences as to lay representation he was the principal writer, publishing, in 1824, The Defence of our Fathers, a three hundred and fifty-page volume, written with clearness and powerfully written after. After his death there appeared from his pen The Episcopalian Controversy Resolved (New York, 1888, 8vo), edited by his son, Robert Emory, from an unpublished manuscript; it is a luminous sketch, in reply to bishop Onderdonk's Episcopacy tested by Reason. Most of the original articles in the first two volumes of the Methodist Quarterly Review were written by him.-Life of Bishop Emory, by his eldest son (N. Y. 1840, 8vo); McClinton, in Methodist Quarterly Review, 1842, p. 62 sq.; Sprague, Annals, vii, 495; Stories and events, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, vol. iv.

Emory, Robert, D.D., son of the preceding, an eminent Methodist minister and scholar, was born in Philadelphia, July 29, 1814. His early education was superintended by his father. In 1827 he entered Columbia College, where he was graduated in 1828 with the highest honors and medals of his class. He then entered upon the study of law, first in the law school of Yale College, and afterwards in the office of the Hon. Beverley Johnson, of Baltimore. In 1834 he was elected professor of ancient languages at Dickinson College, Carlisle, and entered upon his duties there with great zeal. In 1839 he was admitted on trial in the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1841 he was appointed to the Baltimore city station; and in 1842 he was appointed acting president of Dickinson College, during the absence of the president (Dr. Durbin). In 1844 he was appointed president of Dickinson College, and in the same year the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Columbia College. In 1847 he attended the session of the Evangelical Alliance, and was in the front view of the deliberations of that body. His health showed signs of failure during this year, and he spent the winter following in the West Indies. But he continued to decline, and on his return homeward he died in Baltimore, May 18, 1848. Dr. Emory was one of those rare men in whom the human faculties, both moral and intellectual, seem to approach perfection, and to reach almost complete harmony of action. His classical scholarship was thorough and accurate; his mind was at once logical and comprehensive, and his general culture was wide and generous. His religious experience was, in many re-
spects, similar to that of President Edwards, and ripened into similar fulness and serenity. As a preacher he was luminous, earnest, and successful. As a college officer he was seldom rivaled. "His power of government was unsurpassed: he seemed born to command. In him prudence and independence met to form that rare combination so essential to one who rules. This remark finds its illustration and proof in his government of the college, to whose interests he devoted so much of his brief earthly life. While he shrank from no responsibility of his position, he was still careful to maintain that position by devising the best form of government. Responsibility he felt the weight of the sceptre in his hand, yet the conviction that it was wielded by a strong man, and in the fear of the Lord, conciliated esteem. As president of the college, as in every other position, he rose rapidly, both before the public and in the college; and the last year in which his name appeared in connection with that office was the most prosperous in the history of the institution. The students honored him even to reverence, and regarded him as standing on a moral and intellectual eminence toward which the indolent and unworthy must not even look, and to which the modestly backward, then ought to aspire." He died in 1841.

In 1841 he published A Life of the Rev. John Emory, D.D. (N. Y. 8vo); in 1843, an elaborate History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (N. Y. 12mo). He left unfinished an Analysis of Butler's Analogy, as recommended by G. R. Crooks, D. D. (N. Y. Harper, 1856, 8vo), and which is the best analysis of the Analogy that has ever appeared.—Minutes of Conferences, 1849; Sprague, Annual, vii, 828.

Emotion (emovere, to move out) is often used as synonymous with feeling. Strictly taken, it means a 'state of feeling which, while it does not spring directly from an affection of body, manifests its existence and character by some sensible effect upon the body.' An emotion differs from a sensation by its not originating in a state of body; and from a cognition, by its being pleasantly or unpleasantly felt. Emotions, like other states of feeling, imply knowledge. Something beautiful or deformed, sublime or ridiculous, is known and contemplated; and on the contemplation springs up the appropriate feeling, followed by the characteristic expression of countenance, or attitude, or manner. In itself, emotion may be called springs of action. 'The feelings of beauty, grandure, and whatever else is comprehended under the name of taste, do not lead to action, but terminate in delightful contemplation, which constitutes the essential distinction of the moral sense. To which, in some points of view, they may doubtless be likened' (MacKintosh, Discours, p. 288). Emotions tend rather, while they last, to fix attention on the objects or occurrences which have excited them. In many instances, however, emotions are succeeded by desires to obtain possession of the objects which awaken them, or to remove ourselves from the presence of such objects. When an emotion is thus succeeded by some degree of desire, it forms, according to Lord Kames, a passion, and becomes, according to its nature, a powerful and permanent spring of action. Emotions, then, are awakened through the medium of the intellect, and are varied and modified by the conception we form of the objects to which they refer. Emotions manifest their existence and character by sensible effects upon the body. Emotions, in themselves and by themselves, lead to quiescence and contemplation rather than activity; but they combine with springs of action, and give to them a character and a coloring. What is said to be done from surprise or shame has its proper spring—the surprise or shame being concomitant' (Dr. Chalmers, Sketches of Mental and Moral Philosophy, p. 86).

Empedocles, an ancient philosopher of Agrigentum, distinguished himself by his knowledge of natural history and medicine, and his talents for philosophical poetry. It is generally believed that he perished in the crater of Etna. Some suppose him to have been a disciple of Pythagoras or Archytas (Diog. Laert. viii, 54 sq.); others, of Parmenides. He cannot have been the speculative scholar of the first, inasmuch as Aristotle (Met., i, 3) represents him as conversant with, but younger than Anaxagoras, and because he appears to have been the master of Gorgias. His philosophy, which he described in a didactic poem, of which only fragments have come down to us, combines the doctrine of valvular blindness (which may have been approached by of Pythagoras and Heraclitus, but differing from the latter, principally, 1. Inasmuch as Empedocles more expressly recognizes four elements, earth, water, air, and fire: these elements (compare his system, in this respect, with that of Anaxagoras) he affirms not to be simple in their own, and signed the most important place to fire. Besides the principle of concord (μηδίαν, opposed to that of discord (φιλοκρίνης) (the one being the source of union and good, the other of their opposites), he admitted into his system necessity also, to explain existing phenomena. To the first principle, the third and fourth are as the original composition of the elements. The material world (εύφιλος, πολύ) he believed, as a whole, to be divine, but in the sublunar portion of it he detected a considerable admixture of evil and imperfection. He taught that at a certain period of time a cosmic change took place. He advanced a subtle and scarcely intelligible theory of the active and passive affections of things (comp. Plato, Menon, ed. Steph. p. 76, C. D.; Arist. De Gener. et Corr., i, 8; Fragm. op. Staur. v, 117), and drew a distinction between the world as presented to our senses (εἴδοσις), and that which he presumed to be the type of it, the intellectual world (εύφιλος νοημα). He looked for the principle of life in fire, admitting, at the same time, the existence of a Divine Being pervading the universe. From this superior intelligence he believed the demons to emanate, to whose nature the human soul is allied. Man is a fallen demon. There will be a return to unity, a transmigration of souls, and a change of forms. The soul he defined to consist in a combination of the four elements (because cognition depends upon the similarity of the subject and object), and to his seat he pronounced to be the pineal bone (Tennent's location is 'Tunica fibrosa: Pol. § 106). Lewes differs from all other historians respecting the place occupied by Empedocles, making his system to include elements from the Pythagorean, Eleatic, Heraclitic, and Anaxagorean systems (History of Philosophy, 1867, p. 310). Sturz, Empedocles Agrigentanus, De Vita et Philosophia eius expositor, Carinum Reliquias ex Antiquis Scriptoribus collegit, recensuit, illustravit Fr. Guili. Staur. (Lips. 1806, 8vo); J. G. Neumann Progr. de Empedocles Philo- sopho (Vieb. 1796, fol.); Lommatzsch, Die Weisheit des Empedocles. (Berlin, 1807); Stein, Empedocles. Aegypt. fragments (Bonn, 1852); Winnefeld, Die Philosophie des Empedocles. (Rastadt, 1857); Steinhart, in Ersch and Gruber, Allgm. Enzyklop. s. v. Empedocles.

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

The relation of experience to science, and to art
or practice, is precisely exhibited by Aristotle in the opening chapter of his Metaphysics; but the peculiar terseness of the Aristotelian phraseology renders expansion and restatement of his positions necessary, in order to adapt them to modern views.

Art, or systematic action, is founded upon observation, but upon observation reduced to theory, or to conclusions. That is to say, observation furnishes the facts, but they must be co-ordinated and interpreted in order to constitute valid knowledge (science), or a reliable rule of action (art). If the observations be indistinct or perplexed, or if they be not sufficiently numerous to establish a general conclusion, the argument by induction is deceptive, and obnoxious to the censure passed by Lord Bacon upon the simple enumeration of examples (New. Org. i, aph. lxxix. cv; Instaur. S. I. Int. tom. ix, p. 146; Distri. Op. p. 157, ed. Montague). The true nature of the induction required is briefly stated by Campanella: "Inducit est argumentatio a partibus suffusus enumeratissim ad sumum totam universale." What is a sufficient exposition of the particulars may be learned from the Second Book of the Novum Organum, or more satisfactorily from What is Called Induction by Francis Bacon, Comte's Political Philosophy, and Mill's Logic.

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

This accumulation, collation, and appreciation of instances is disregarded by undisciplined and impatient minds. A few recurrences loosely noted, or a single undigested observation, is made the foundation for a universal conclusion, with which more refined and rational principle. The designation derived from experience and inquiry is still retained, but, in consequence of want of validity in the process, and of method, reliability, and rationality in the corresponding practice, it receives an unfavorable import, and empiricism commonly denotes that mode of reasoning which is based upon hasty and inadequate observation, and which neglects scientific principle and scientific precision. This exposition of the derivation and deflection of the meaning is illustrated and confirmed by the history of the term. In the middle of the 18th century before Christ a revolution in medical practice was inaugurated by Philius of Cos and Serapion of Alexandria. They revolted against the maxims of the Dogmatics, and repudiated the course pursued by the Methodists of treating all cases of disease according to fixed theoretical rules. They observed the symptoms of disease and the effects of symptoms, and inquired into; they considered the idiosyncrasies of their patients as affected by climates and localities; and they employed the therapeutics which had been found effectual in analogous instances. They recognized three kinds of symptoms: some that do not admit of analysis, and which must be governed by the suggestions of unanalyzed experience, or there is a large discordance between the scientific conclusions and the observed facts. In these cases the indications of experience cannot be disregarded, and the procedure, to be adopted, must be in greater or less measure empirical. History, politics,
social organization, agriculture, and many of the applications of physical science to human requirements demand, in a greater or less degree, this subordination of scientific results to observed facts. But the insufficiency of the procedure should be recognized; for empiricism, even in its most favorable form, is tentative and problematical. It is the understanding of the guidance of the reason, and the acceptance of imperfectly or imperfectly-digested observation for the prescriptions of ascertained and immutable law. Empiricism is available only in consensum causae; and, as this exists, it is only when the observation runs into wild and pernicious fantasies when not illuminated by speculative discernment. The two must be combined and conciliated in order to afford any absolute confidence in the verdicts of its conclusions, and the procedure founded thereon. If they be separated, and the observation is made without due discernment, experience is valid only in matters of mere routine; theory or science is always required under novel combinations. Theory, unregulated by experience, is as arbitrary and capricious as experience unlightened by reason, and, unless hopelessly, but it never awakens any suspicion of the possibility of error. But theory, which systematizes the conclusions drawn from an adequate range and degree of observation, furnishes guidance under all changes of circumstance; while empiricism only misleads and betrays in every case when it is necessary to deviate in any respect from a procedure already adopted and approved.

Empiricism is thus at all times an irrational procedure, though it may furnish a practical rule within a very limited sphere. Theory may beguile, in consequence of its imperfect constitution or rash applications. The facts we have to investigate are of established law, and obedience to the immutable prescriptions of reason is capable of thorough scientific organisation. In these we must continue to be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entirely trustworthy. Many departments of practical knowledge are not yet, and may never be, admitted of thorough scientific organization. In these we must continue to be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entirely trustworthy. Many departments of practical knowledge are not yet, and may never be, admitted of thorough scientific organization. In these we must continue to be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entirely trustworthy. Many departments of practical knowledge are not yet, and may never be, admitted of thorough scientific organization. In these we must continue to be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entirely trustworthy. Many departments of practical knowledge are not yet, and may never be, admitted of thorough scientific organization. In these we must continue to be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entire
EMSER burned Emser's writings along with the papa
bull and the decreta. As Emser's works were al-
most wholly personal invectives, the interest in them
soon ceased, and in the history of the Reforma-
tion they are of little significance. As duke George for-
bade Luther's translation of the Bible, Emser, in 1527,
published another German translation made from the
Vulgata. Emser branded Luther's version as a horri-
bile corruption; but it present, even the Roman Cat-
olic writers of Germany acknowledge that Emser's
version is of no value, and, in a literary point of view,
greatly inferior to that of Luther. Emser died Nov.
8, 1527, where and how is not known. The titles of
the works of Emser were: "Adversus paupertatibus
hominum, Nachrichten von Emser's Leben und Schriften
(Ans-
pach, 1783). See Neudecker, in Herzog, Real-Encycl.
(A. J. S.)

En- (Heb. Egm. 'en*; constr. of 'en, a fountain), a
prefix to many names of places in Heb. (e. g. En-gedi,
En-gammin, En-dor, En-haddah, En-hazor, En-harod,
En-mishap, En-agaim, En-emesh, En-rogel, En-
tammin (Heb. 'i, En-tappah); all so called from a
living spring in the vicinity; and corresponding to
the Arabic prefix 'ain (Robinson, Researches, iii, 225),
in which language, as also in the Syriac and Ethiopic,
it has the same signification; in two instances (Joh.
xxii, 16; Num. xxxiv, 11) it stands alone as the name
of a place (q. v.); also in the dual, Enasa (q. v.), as,
and plural Atin (q. v.), the latter likewise in the
Aramaic form Enon (q. v.). See AIN.

Ena'm. See ENAM.

'Bnam (Heb. with the art. ha-Egmam', 'bn, doubltless a contraction for 'bn Egmam', the two springs; Sept. H'rais h. r. H'rais and Masaui, Vulg. Enam), a city in the lowlands of Judah, mentioned between Tappahn and Jarmuth (Josh. xv, 34). From its mention with towns (Jarmuth and Eshtol for instance) which are known to have been near Timnath, this is very probably the place in the "entrance of which (perhaps at a fork of the road) Tamar sat to intercept her father-in-law on his way to Timnath (Gen. xxxviii,
14, (24) הַבְּנָא, pe'tach Egm'im, i. e. doorway of
Enam, or the double spring; Sept. ai 'adon hivon, Vulg. bimium ibneria, A. V. "an open place"; comp. Reland, Paolo, p. 761), Eusebius and Jerome (Onom-
ast. n. 293) also make it a spring. The village Bethemim (Beth-evai) near the terebinth, "meaning probably "Abraham's oak." 22 miles S. of Jerusalem
(St. b. v. 'Amor, Arboc), near Hebron (Robinson, Res.
ii, 443). Schwarz in like manner identifies Enam with
the village Beth-Ami, distant 25 English miles
from Sardis, and the "eastern gate" of Jerusalem (p. 192); meaning apparently Beit-anur, which is laid down on Van de Velde's Map at
distance of S.W. of Bir es-Zafraneh, in the region
N.E. of Hebron. But this site is appropriated to
Beth-anoth (q. v.), with which the similarity of names
has doubtless caused these authors to confuse Enam.
The place in question lay in the group of cities situated
N.W. of Hebron, on the border of the tribe of Dan
(Keil, Comment, on Josh, in loc.). It is perhaps the present Deir el-Butun, with a well adjoining, laid down
by Van de Velde (Map) a little beyond Deir Dobbun,
N. of Hebron.

'Bnam (Heb. Egmam', 'bn, born at a fountain, q.
d. fontanus; Sept. Aivon), the father of Ahira, which
latter was phylarch of the tribe of Naphtali at the
Exile (Num. i, 15; ii, 29; vii, 78, 85; x, 27). B.C.
ante 1657. See also HAZAR-ENAN.

E'mansibus ('E'mansius, Vulgate Elissab), given (1
Esdri ix, 34) as the name of one of the "sons of Moan"
who had married a Gentile wife after the exile, in
place of the Eliathib (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Exa-
2 x, 86).

Encaenia (E'kana). (1.) When beaten temple
were converted to Christian use, they were purified by a solemn dedication, called Encornia, and by the sign of the cross; they also received new and appropriate names (Riddle, Antiq. vi, 2). (2) At a later period encornia denoted festivals kept in memory of the dedication of churches. In the church of Jerusalem, built by Constantine on the site of Calvary in honor of the Saviour, it was customary to observe an anniversery festival which lasted eight days, during which divine service was performed. The practice was soon adopted by other churches. In England the first Saxon bishops allowed the people liberty on the annual fast of the dedication of their churches, to hold themselves booths round the church, and to entertain themselves with eating and drinking. In Germany such a feast is called Kirchweide, church consecration, whence the English name Church Wake. The ceremonies and solemnities instituted at Oxford in honor of colleges, and benefactors of colleges are called encornia.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. xx, ch. viii, § 1. See Dedication.

Encamp (אֵנְכִּם, channah, 'to decline, e. g. of the day, Judg. xix. 9, i. e. evening; hence to "pitch" a tent, Gen. xxvi, 17, especially to "camp" down at night, as often rendered), among the Hebrews, primarily denoted the resting of an army or company of travelers at night (Exod. xiii, 20; Num. i, 80; comp. Exod. xvi, 22, xxv, 21), and hence in a passive sense (מַנָּחַל, manaḥel, camp, once מַנְחָלָה, manchnoṭh, 2 Kings vi, 9) is applied to the army or caravan when on its march (Exod. xiv, 19; Josh. x, 5; xi, 4; Num. xxxii, 7, 8). See MAHANAIM. Sometimes the verb refers to the usual arrangement of a siege (Ps. xxix, 3) or campaign (1 Sam. iv, 1), and occasionally it is attached to the establishment of a permanent abode (Isa. xxiv, 1). Among nomadic tribes war never attained the dignity of a science, and their encampments were consequently devoid of all the appliances of more systematic warfare. See War.

1. The description of the camp of the Israelites, on their march from Egypt (Num. ii, iii), supplies the greatest amount of information on the subject: whatever else may be gleaned is scattered hints. The tabernacle, corresponding to the chieftain's tent of an ordinary encampment, was placed in the centre; and around and facing it (Num. iv, 1), arranged in four grand divisions, corresponding to the four points of the compass (but not necessarily in the strict quadrangular form usually represented, since modern Arab caravans are ranged at night in a nearly circular manner), lay the host of Israel, according to their standards (Num. xxvi, 2). In the east (Gen. xxvii, 1) were assigned to the tribe of Judah, and round its standard railed the tribe of Issachar and Zebulun, descendants of the sons of Leah. On the south lay Reuben and Simeon, the representatives of Leah, and the children of Gad, the son of her handmaid. Rachel's descendants were encamped on the western side of the tabernacle, the chief place being assigned to the tribe of Ephraim. To this position of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin, allusions are made in Judg. v, 14, and Ps. lxxix, 2. On the north were the tribes of Dan and Naphtali, the children of Joseph, and the tribe of Asher, Gad's younger brother. All these were encamped around their standards, each according to the ensign of the house of his fathers. In the centre, round the tabernacle, and with no standard but the cloudy or fiery pillar which rested over it, were the tents of the priests and Levites, the holy vessels of the sanctuary. The Gershonites were on the west, and when on the march carried the tabernacle and its lighter furniture; while the Merarites, who were encamped on the north, had charge of its heavier appurtenances. The order of encampment was preserved on the march (Num. ii, 17), the signal for which was given by a blast of the two silver trumpets (Num. x, 5). The details of this account supply Prof. Blunt with some striking illustrations of the undecided coincidences of the books of Moses ('Unetics. Cordial p. 208).

In this description of the order of the encampment no mention is made of sentinels, who, it is reasonable to suppose, were placed at the gates (Exod. xxxiii, 28, 27) in the four quarters of the camp. This was evidently the case in the camp of the Levites (comp. 1 Chron. v, 6). The sanitary regulations of the camp of the Israelites were enacted for the twofold purpose of preserving the health of the vast multitude, and the purity of the camp as the dwelling-place of God (Num. v, 3; Deut. xxiii, 14). With this object the dead were buried without the camp (Num. xxi, 19), and the camp for seven days (Exod. xxxiii, 19). Captives taken in war were compelled to remain for a while outside (Num. xxxi, 19; Josh. vi, 23). The ashes from the sacrifices were poured out without the camp at an appointed place, whither all uncleanness was removed (Deut. xxiii, 10), where the entrails, skins, horns, etc., and all that was not offered in sacrifice, were burnt (Lev. iv, 11, 12; vi, 11; viii, 17).

The execution of criminals took place without the camp (Lev. xxv, 14, 15; Num. xv, 35, 36; Josh. vii, 24), as did the burning of the young bullock for the sin-offering (Lev. iv, 12). These circumstances combined explain Heb. xiii, 12, and John xix, 17, 20.

2. The encampment of the Israelites in the desert left its traces in their subsequent history. The temple, so late as the time of Hezekiah, was still "the camp of Jehovah" (2 Chron. xxxii, 2; comp. Psalm lxviii, 26); and (Lev. x, 4, 5), where were excluded till their leprosy departed from them (Lev. xiii, 46; xiv, 3; Num. xii, 14, 15), as were all who were visited with loathsome diseases (Lev. xiv, 3). All who were defiled by contact with the dead, whether these were slain in battle or not, were kept within the camp for seven days (Num. xxxix, 19). Captives taken in war were compelled to remain for a while outside (Num. xxxi, 19; Josh. vi, 23). The ashes from the sacrifices were poured out without the camp at an appointed place, whither all uncleanness was removed (Deut. xxiii, 10), where the entrails, skins, horns, etc., and all that was not offered in sacrifice, were burnt (Lev. iv, 11, 12; vi, 11; viii, 17).

High ground appears to have been unirnaturally selected for the position of a camp, whether it were on a hill or mountain side, or in an inaccessible pass (Judg. vii, 16). So, in Judg. x, 17, the Ammonites encamped in Gilead, while Israel pitched in Mizpeh. The very names are significant. The camps of Saul and the Philistines were alternately in Gilead, the "height" of Benjamin, and the pass of Michmash (1 Sam. xiii, 20, 26; 16, 23), and the former (the host of Gilead) being on the east side, the contending armies were encamped on hills on either side of the valley of Elah (1 Sam. xvi, 8); and in the fatal battle of Gibeon Saul's position on the mountain was stormed by the Philistines who had pitched in Shunem (1 Sam. xxviii, 4), on the other side of the valley of Jezreel. The carelessness of the Midianites in encamping in the plain exposed them to the night surprise by Gideon, and resulted in their consequent discomfiture (Judg. vi, 33; vii, 8, 12). But another important consideration in fixing upon a position for a camp was the propinquity of water; hence it is found that in most desertic camps were pitched near spring or well (Judg. vii, 3; 1 Macce. ix, 38). The Israelites at Mount Gilboa pitched by the fountain in Jezreel (1 Sam. xxix, 1), while the Philistines encamped at Aphon, the name of which indicates the existence of water. In Canaan, where the rivers and lakes are numerous, it is not unreasonable to consider it a favorite place of encampment (1 Sam. iv, 1; 1 Kings xx, 26; 2 Kings xiii, 17). In his pursuit of the Amalekites David halted his men by the brook Besor, and there left a detachment with the camp furniture (1 Sam. xxx, 9). One of Joshua's decisive engagements with the nations of Canaan was fought on the banks of the waters of Merom, where he surprised the confederate camp (Josh. xi, 5, 7; comp. Judg. v, 19, 21).
on, before attacking the Midianites, encamped beside the well of Harod (Judg. vii. 1), and it was to draw water from the well at Bethlehem that David’s three mighty men cut their way through the host of the Philistines (2 Sam. xxii, 16).

The camp was surrounded by the הָּרָּרה, magalāh (1 Sam. xvii, 20), or הָּרָּרה, magal (1 Sam. xxvi, 5, 7), which some, and Thesius among them, explain as an earthwork thrown up round the encampment, others as the barrier formed by the baggage-wagons. The etymology of the word points more to the circular shape of the inclosure formed by the tents of the soldiers pitched around their chief, whose spear marked his resting-place (1 Sam. xxvi, 5, 7; see Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 20 sq.), and it might with propriety be used in either of the above senses, according as the camp was fixed or temporary. We know that, in the case of a siege, the attacking army, if possible, surrounded the place attacked (1 Macc. xiii, 48), and drew about it a line of circumvallation (םיִּה, dytek, 2 Kings xxv, 1), which was marked by a breastwork of earth (םיִּה, meseillah, Isa. xiii, 10; הָּרָּרה, sõdelah, Ezek. xxii, 27 [22]; comp. Job xix, 12), for the double purpose of preventing the escape of the besieged and of protecting the besiegers from their rallies. But there was not so much need of a formal intrenchment, as but few instances occur in which engagements were fought in the camps themselves, and these only when the attack was made at night. Gideon’s expedition against the Midianites took place in the early morning (Judg. vii, 19), the time selected by Saul for his attack upon Nahash (1 Sam. xi, 11), and by David for surprised the Amalekites (1 Sam. xxx, 17; comp. Judg. ix, 38). To guard against these night attacks, sentinels (םיִּה, skemerim) were posted (Judg. vii, 20; 1 Macc. xii, 27) round the camp, and the neglect of this precaution by Zelah and Zalmunna probably led to their capture by Gideon and the ultimate defeat of the Midianites (Judg. vi, 19).

The valley which separated the hostile camps was generally selected as the fighting ground (םיִּה, sadeh, "the battle-field," 1 Sam. iv, 2; xiv, 15; 2 Sam. xviii, 6), upon which the contest was decided, and hence the valleys of Palestine have played so conspicuous a part in its history (Josh. viii, 13; Judg. vi, 33; 2 Sam. v, 22; viii, 13, etc.). When the fighting men went forth to the place of marshaling (םיִּה, maazarakh, 1 Sam. xvii, 20), a detachment was left to protect the camp and baggage (1 Sam. xvii, 22; xxx, 24). The beasts of burden were probably tethered to the tent pegs (2 Kings vii, 10; Zech. xiv, 15).

The הָּרָּרה, machanēk, or movable encampment, is distinguished from the בּמָלְא, mastabah, or בּמָלְא, nasib (2 Sam. xxiii, 14; 1 Chron. xi, 16), which appears to have been a standing camp, like those which Jehoshaphat established throughout Judah (2 Chron. xvii, 2), or an advanced post in an enemy’s country (1 Sam. xiii, 17; 2 Sam. viii, 6), from which skirmishing parties made their predatory excursions and ravaged the crops. It was in resisting one of these expeditions that Shammah won himself a name among David’s heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 12). Machanēk is still farther distinguished from הָּרָּרה, mithbar, "a fortress" or "walled town" (Num. xiii, 19).

Camps left behind them a memorial in the name of the place where they were situated, as among ourselves (comp. Chester, etc., from the Lat. castellum). Mahaneh-Dan (Judg. xiii, 25) was so called from the encampment of the D. nites mentioned in Judg. xviii, 12. The more important camps at Gilgal (Josh. v, 10; ix, 6) and Shiloh (Josh. xviii, 9; Judg. xxi, 12, 19) left no such impress; the military traditions of these places were eclipsed by the greater splendor of the religious associations which surrounded them. (See Ker Porter, Travels in Persia, ii, 147 sq., 396 sq.; Rhodes, Tent-Life and Encampment of Armies in ancient and modern Times, Lond. 1868.)

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

Enchantment stands in the Auth. Vara. as the representative of several Heb. words: usually some form of נאכש, nakhash (2 Kings xvii, 17; xxvi, 6; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6; Lev. xix, 26; Deut. xvii, 10; Num. xxiii, 28; xxxiv, 1), literally to whisper a spell, hence to practice divination in general; נקוח, nakhash (Eccles. x, 11), of cognate form and signification, especially incubation, כַּלַּתו, kalato, literally to muffle up, hence to use magic arts (Exod. vii, 11; 29; 7, 19); מָשַׁל, masal, literally to cover with a cloud, hence to practice sorcery (Jer. xxvii, 9); and רְכַּב, rakhab, to bind, i.e. with a spell, to charm (Isa. xlv, 9, 12). The following are the specific forms which the black art assumed among the Hebrews. See also Amulet; Divination.

1. מַלְכָּה, malcha, or מַלְּכָה, melka, Enam. vii, 12; viii, 7; Sept. אָמֵל אֶרֶב, amel'ere'eb; to cover; though others incorrectly connect it with מַלָּה, to cover, a flame, or the glittering blade of a sword, as though it implied a sort of dazzling charmequin which deceives spectators. Several versions render the word by whisperings, דִּנְשָׁרִיתוֹת, dinnashritohoth, but it is a mere guesswork. In general, it is interpreted as meaning various means (some of them no doubt of a quasi-scientific character) by which the Egyptian charitumim imposed on the credulous of Pharaoh. See MAGICIAN.

2. מַכָּה, makha, Enam; Sept. φαραγιαί, pharagia, (2 Kings ix, 22; Mic. v, 12; Nah. iii, 4); Vulg. renfista, maleficia; "malefic artes," "præstigiæ," "mutua sunt generalia; hence it is opposed by kriocin, incantations, as in Isa. lxv, 9, 12. The belief in the power of certain formulas was universal in the ancient world. Thus there were carminine to evoke the tutelary gods out of a city (Macrobi. Sat. mar. iii, 9), others to devote hostile armies (Id.), others to raise the dead (Maimon. De idol. xi, 15; Seneca. Epist. lxxxvii); or bind the gods (κυσανθοῖς) and men (Ephra. Fur. 331), and even influence the heavenly bodies (Ovid. Met. vii, 207 sq; xii, 263; "Te quoque Luna trahs," Virg. Eccl. vii; Ax. iv, 489; Hor. Epod. v, 43). They were a recognised part of ancient medicine, even among the Jews, who regarded certain sentences of the law as efficacious in healing. The Greeks used them as one of the five chief resources of pharmacy (Pind. Pbyk. iii, 8, 9; Soph. Af. 582), especially in obstetrics (Plat. Theat. p. 145) and mental diseases (Galen. De Suntacet. tornad. i, 8). Homer mentions them as used to check the flow of blood (Od. xix, 456), and Cato even gives a charm to cure a disjointed limb (De Re Rrut. 160; comp. Plin. H. N. xlviii, 3). The belief in charms is still all but universal in uncivilized nations; see Lane's Modern Egyptians, i, 300, 306, etc.; ii, 17; Oudem. Besbooter van Nieuw Neederland; Herder's Congo (in Pinkerton's Voyages, xvi, p. 221, 278); Huc's China, i, 223; ii, 92; Taylor's New Zealand, and Livingstone's Africa, passim, etc.; and hundreds of such remedies still exist, and are considered efficacious among the uneducated. See Incantation.

3. מֶשֶׁל, meshel (Exod. x, 11; Sept. Φαραγιαί, pharagias, is especially used of the charming of serpents, Ex. xvii, 9; comp. Ps. lvi, 5; Exclus. xii, 18; Ex. x, 11; Lu-can, ix, 901—"a parallel to "cantando rumpitur aruanu" and "Viperes rumpo verbis et carneae fauces," Op. Metem. i. c.). Maimonides (De idol. xi, 2) expressly defines an enchant as one "who use strange and magical words, order the spirits of the fily of the credulous. They say, for instance, that if one utter the words before a serpent or sorcery it will do no harm" (Carpenz. Annot. in Godsagymum, iv, 11). An account of the Marsi, who excelled in this art, is given by Augustine (ad Gen. ix, 9), and of the Pyalli by Arnobius (ad Nat. ii, 32); and they are alluded to by a host of other authorities (Pliny, vii, 2; xxvii, 6; Eus- a. E. A. i, 57; Virg. Eccl. vii, 759; Str. Ital. viii, 658. They were also practised, it is said, by the Blemmyes, understood in the East (Lane, i, 106). See Charm.

4. The word מֶשֶׁל, meshel, neckachai, is used of the enchantments sought by Balaam (Num. xxiv, 1). It properly alludes to ophiomancy, but in this place has a general meaning of endeavoring to gain omens (Sept. τοιούτους πυρηνάς νομεύειν). See SOOTHSAKER.

5. מַכָּה, makha, is used for magic (Isa. xlvii, 9, 12). It means generally the process of acquiring power over some distant object or person, but this word seems also to have been sometimes used expressively of serpent charms, for R. Sol. Jarchi, on Deut. xvii, 11, defines the מַכָּה עָלָיו to be one who congregates serpents and scorpions into one place. See Magic.

Any resort to these methods of imposture was strictly forbidden in Scripture (Lev. xix, 26; Isa. xlvii, 9, etc.), but to this is opposed the tendency to infantile credulity (2 Kings xvii, 17; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6), and we find it still flourishing at the Christian era (Acts xiii, 8, 9; viii, 11, yeixia; Gal. v, 20; Rev. ix, 21). See Witchcraft.

The chief sacræmenta demoniacæ were a rod, a magic circle, dragon's eggs, certain herbs, or "insane roots," like the hembane, etc. The fancy of poets, both ancient and modern, has been exerted in giving lists of them (Ovid and Hor. l. c.; Shakespear's Macbeth, Act iv, 1; Kirke White's Gondoliers; Southey's Curse of Kehama, cant. iv, etc.). See Sorcery.

Enclusa. See Enclusa.

Enolopium. See Reliquary.

Enracites (Egyp. Papyri, Continentes), a name given by several Church fathers (Irenæus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret) to a particular Gnostic sect, but which, in the opinion of most of the modern Church historians (Neander, Hase), either designates collectively several Gnostic sects, or, in general, the tendency of Gnostic asceticism in the ancient Church. The Enracites condemned marriage, forbade the eating of flesh or drinking of wine, and used even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper water instead of wine, on which account they were called κατάρισσαι, aquarii. They were, generally, prescriptionists, and even adopted the new heresies based upon the principle of Dualism, in opposition to the asceticism of the Ebionites, Montanists, and others which kept within the limits of the Church. The Church fathers who regarded the Enracites as one sect of Gnostics, called Tatian (q. v.) its founder; but it is certain that there were Enracites before Tatian, and that subsequently there were Enracites who in some points differed from Tatian. Prominent men among the Enracites were, besides Tatian, Saturninus, Marcion, Julianus, Cestianus, and Severus, who is called the author of the Gospels. He was the first who made himself known as a violent opponent of the apostle Paul and of the Pauline epistles. In the 12th century the name of the Enracites was used, together with the names of several other ancient heresies, to designate and condemn the Bogomiles. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. xxv; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. xiii, 149, 282; Mosheim, Comment. i, 482; Hase, Ch. Hist. p. 64, 83; Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 42; Lardner, Works (10 vols. 8vo), ii, 148 sqq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. i, 245; Herzog, Real-Encycl. iv, 67; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 575. See SACCOURIOT; TATIAN.

Encyclia, Enyclic Letters (from the Gr. Εὐκλείης, euclheis, one which has to be on the rounds of a certain number of men—litera episcopis, litera episcopales), in the ancient Church, letters sent by bishops to
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all the churches of a particular circuit. At present the name is exclusively used for letters addressed by the Pope to all the bishops of the Roman Catholic world. In the encyclicals the Pope lays down his views of the general wants of the Church, or of some prevailing demands and sentiments; he warns against dangerous movements, and attempts to pull together all divided fragments of the Church from abroad. He urges the bishops to be watchful, and points to the proper antidotes for existing evils. Among modern encyclicals, none attracted greater attention than that issued by Pope Pius IX, in Dec., 1864, against modern civilization. Vettor and Welte, Kirche und Lehren, vi, 540. See LITERA ENCICLIC.

Encyclopedia of Theology, a branch of theological science of comparatively recent origin. Its aims are to furnish (1) a sketch of the different branches of theology in their organic connection and outline, and also to the fitness of the various branches to theological science as a whole, and the relative importance of these branches; and (2) a plan of theological study, showing the order in which the topics should be taken up, and indicating the best methods for the study of each and the helps of all the works. This second branch, including the practical application of encyclopaedia, is generally called Methodology, and the whole science taken together is called by the double name Encyclopedia and Methodology. Of these, Encyclopedia is the objective side, the outline of the science itself; Methodology is the subjective side, having reference to the work of the student of the science.

I. History of the Science. In form, this branch of science is modern. When theology as a science was in its infancy, theological encyclopaedias as such were impossible. But at an early period, when such were prepared, was the treatise by Chrysostom, De Sacerdotio, the De officiis ministrorum of Ambrose, De doctrina christiana of Augustine, and a work of the same kind as the latter, De disciplina scholasticorum, attributed to Boethius (525), but probably written after his time. Cassiodorus (562) wrote De Institutione Divinorum Literarum, an introduction to the profitable study of Scripture, for the use of monks. In the 7th century Isidor of Seville wrote a larger work, a kind of general encyclopaedia, wherein he places great stress on the study of Scripture and the use of books, but it is more in the shape of pastoral theology, as is the De institutione clericorum of Rabanus Maurus in the 9th century. The latter contains, however (vol. iii), a sketch of the different branches of information necessary to a minister. The Didascalia (c. 145), a kind of manual for clergy, was at this time a complete manual of the character of a theological encyclopaedia—its 1st, 2d, and 3d books treating on the preparatory studies, and the others, 4th to 9th, on the exposition of Scripture and the study of the fathers (Liebner, Hugo e. st. Victor, p. 96). In the 19th century, Vincent of Beauvais (1224) in his Speculum doctrinale, gave a scientific exposition of several subjects, including theology. After these we find the writings of Nicolas de Cléanges (De studio theologico, d'Achery, i, 473), and Jean Charlier Gerson (De reformaciones theologice, and Epistola de Reformatione Seminarys Novarum, quod et quilibet studere debeat novus theologica auditor). But the real origin of the theological encyclopaedia is to be found in the time when the Reformation, in the 16th century, breaking through the bonds of scholastic divinity, brought in a new era for science, particularly in the field of Law. The new movement was marked by his Ratio s. methodus compendio pernissandi ad erarn theologiam (1519-1522), giving to theological studies a solid philosophical foundation, promoting the study of the Scriptures, and requiring from the theologian a knowledge of natural sciences. In the Lutheran Church we find first Melanthon giving a short guide to theological studies in his Brevis ratio discentum Theologice (Opp., Bas., 1541, i., 297). This was followed by a work of his pupil, Theobald Thamer, Adhortatio ad theologica studia in academias Marburgens, 1548. After this we find the Oratio de studio theol. recte inchoando, 1577, and Regnum studiosi sermon seu de ratione discendi in philosophos subbus reticulis instituti, 1589, both by Dr. Chrysopulos, the Constitution of theologice studio recte constitutum (Nurem., 1665), by Hieronymus Weller, the pupil and friend of Luther; the systematicus Methodus studii theologici publicis promotionibus in academia Jenaensi a. 1611 exposita (1629, 1622, 1624), by John Gerhard; and also the works of Jacob Andreae, de Stud. Stor. Litt. (Lips., 1657); Nicholas Selmecker (Notitio de Stud. Theologici (Lips., 1659); and Abr. Calov (Ingoege ad Theologiam). First in the list of encyclopedic works of the Reformed Church stands Bullinger's Ratio studii theologici, and the latter in the Seminarium doctrinae universalem liber ultimus. But more important than either of these is the work of Andreas Gerhard of Ypern (Hyperus), professor at Marburg (1649), Theologi, seu de ratione studii theologici (Basel, 1572, 1582), in which we find a first attempt to arrange the matter of the Encyclopaedia, the arranging of departments, exegetical, dogmatical, historical, and practical, though the extent of limits of each are not yet well defined. The writers on dogmatics often prefixed an encyclopedic essay to their works, as did J. H. Alsted in his Methodus sacrosanctae Theologiae (Hannover, 1629), which contains the necessary books of the different departments of theology. From the school of Saumur came Steph. Gauvin's Dissertationes de studiis theologici ratione, (1678, 6th ed., by Rambach, Hal., 1726). Calixtus (1665) wrote a copious Apparatus Theologicus (Helmst., edited by his son, 1681); and Spener (1705) gave grave and exact advice and discriminations in several of his writings:

The term encyclopedia, in its present meaning, we find for the first time in the title of a work by the Reformed theologian S. Mursinna, Prima lineae ENCyclopedia THEOLOGIII (Basel, 1742). But this, like all the works heretofore mentioned, has now only a historical interest. Herder's Briefe u. d. Studium d. Theologie (1785, 4 vols.) is on the other hand, even now of value in this field. A new era in the history of the theological encyclopaedia was inaugurated by Schleiermacher's Divisionen des theologischen Verstehens (Berlin, 1811; but the full effect of the book was not felt until its 2d edition appeared in 1819, although Bertholdt (Theol. Wissenschaften) and Francke (Theol. Encyclopädie, 1819), and Danz (Encyclopädie u. Methodologie der Theologie, 1822) have largely been guided by Schleiermacher's remarkable sketch. The powerful grasp of the whole science, and the luminous statement of the relations of all the parts, given by Schleiermacher, gives his Darstellung the foremost place in this branch of science. (There is an English translation by Farrar, not very well done, under the title Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, Edinb. 1860, 12mo). Its practical fault lies in the divisions made of the whole science (see below). It was followed by Hagenbach's Encyclopädie u. Methodologie der Theologie (Leips., 1833, 8vo), a work of great practical value, which has maintained its position as the most useful manual on the subject (7th edition, Leips. 1864, 8vo). The Encyclopædia d. theol. Wissenschaften of K. Rosenkranz (Halle, 1845) is thoroughly speculative and Hegelian. Hartung's Encyclopädie d. Naturwissenschaften (in the new direction by his Ratio s. methodus compendio pernissandi ad eram theologiam (1519-1522), giving to theological studies a solid philosophical foundation, promoting the study of the Scriptures, and requiring from the theologian a knowledge of natural sciences. In the Lutheran Church we find first Melanthon giving a short guide to theological studies in his Brevis
ment, broad in range, and accurate in literature. Holland has produced a valuable compendium in Clarisse, Encyclopedie Theologica Episcopi (2d ed. Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), which has a copious literature, especially full in reference to English books, a matter in which the German writers on the subject are all signal dy deficient.

Among Roman Catholic books in this field are to be mentioned Possesinus, Bibliotheca selecta de ritu ministrorum (Colom. 1697); Ellis of the Pin, Method for studier la theologie (1716), translated into several languages, by Gray, Donnelly, Geeritt (1764), Braun (1777), Brandmeier (1783), and specially Ochterth, labored in this field. The influence of the later Protestant writers is manifest in such works as Drey, Kurze Ein, in das Stud. d. Theologie (Tibingen. 1819); Roe, Encyclopaedia (Mains, 1822); and also the Domesticus der Theol. Wissenschaft von dem System d. gesammten Theol'ge (Menzt, 1834 1840); Gengler, D. Ihle d. Wissenschatz. o. d. Encyclopaedie d. Theologiae (Bamb. 1834); Buchner, Enc. u. Method. (Sulzb. 1887); A. von Sieger, De natura fidei et methodo theologica ad ecclesiasticos educanda (Wurzburg, 1844); and also the complete Encyclopaedia of the Church.

No book properly to be called Encyclopaedia of Theology has appeared in English, and no book is more needed, as the English theological literature is almost wholly neglected by the Germans. (We are glad to see, as this article goes to press, 1868, an Encyclopaedia and Manual of Practical Theology in print (by Dr. H. B. Smith.) But there are many excellent remarks in English books of practical theology on the best methods of study, and some special treatises which deserve notice. Among them are Dodwell, Advice on Theological Studies (Lond. 1861); Bennet, Directions for Students (Lond. 1827, 3d edit. 8vo); Cotton Mather, Menss in Ministerium (Boston, 1726, 12mo, republished, with additions, as Mather's Student and Preacher, by Ryland (Lond. 1781); Mason, Student and Pastor (Lond. 1755); Marsh, Course of Lectures on Divinity (Cambridge, 1808, 8vo), which gives good practical hints; and also attempts an encyclopaedic outline; Doddridge, Lectures (Works, Lond. 1803, 215 sq.); Bickersteth, Christian Student (Lond. 4th edit. 1844), contains much information and good advice, but is destitute of scientific form or spirit. There are many compendia, such as (Protestant) Theological Manual (1860), Smith's Compendium (1886), etc., which are superficial sketches of theology, designed to aid students in cramming rather than in thorough work. Many good hints are given in books of pastoral theology, for which see Practical Theology. There is also a list of books in Lowndes's British Librarian, p. 818 sq.

II. Method of Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology.—1. Some writers hold that encyclopaedia should be treated entirely apart from methodology: so Kien- len, Encyclopaedia (Strass. 1842), confines the former to the exposition of the relation of the several branches of theology to the science as a whole; making methodology a separate work, aiming, not to set forth the science at all, but to show how it should be studied. This view is correct, if encyclopaedia be taken in its broadest sense, merely an introduction to the subject. taking the beginner by the hand at the portals of the science, and showing him the way to enter, and the plan of the edifice, but also as forming the conclusion of the course of study, in which all the branches are exhibit ed in their natural relations to the central trunk. But in the practical use, most of the recent writers blend methodology with encyclopaedia in one connect ed whole.

2. We give here the methods of the chief writers on the subject. (1.) Schleiermacher (§ 31) divides theology as science into three branches, Philosophical, Historical, and Practical. Philosophical theology includes, 1. Apologetics; 2. Polemics. Historical theology includes, 1. Exegetics, or the knowledge of primitive Christianity; 2. Church history, or the knowledge of the earthly career of Christianity; 3. the knowledge of the present condition of Christianity (a) as to doctrine (Dogmatic theology), (b) as to social condition and extension (Ecclesiastical statistics). Practical theology includes, 1. Liturgy (service in church, Homiletics, Pastoral care); 2. Church government. (2.) Hagenbach adopts the old and useful division of theology into four parts, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical. Exegetical theology includes a knowledge of the sacred books, as the primary source of all the facts of the religion. Systematic theology gives an account of the general facts of the religion. This knowledge presumes a knowledge of the languages of the sacred books, and requires also an apparatus (1) of criticism; (2) of history, viz. archeology, geography, etc.; (3) of interpretation (hermeneutics). Historical theology includes Bible-history of Old and New Test: Bible, Church history, Doctrine history, Patristics, Symbolics, Archeology, Statistics. Systematic theology includes Dogmatics, Apologetics, Polemics, and Ethics. Practical theology embraces Catechetics, Worship, Homiletics, Pastoral care, Practical knowledge of the Church; the Church, (a) as its base, (b) as to its organization, (c) as to its active working.—Dr. W. F. War ren, of the Boston Theological Seminary, gives a philosophical but luminous outline in Joh. Partner. f. Deutschke Theologie (I. 1867, p. 218 sq.); Thomas (Bullet. Thol. Sept. 1868) proposes a scheme as follows: 1. Apologetics (historical and philosophical); 2. Historical theology (Biblical science, Church history, Statistics); 3. Systematic theology (Dogmatics, Polemics, Speculative theology); 4. Practical theology (the individual, the family, the church, the nation, the church, (a) as to its base, (b) as to its organization, (c) as to its active working.—Dr. W. F. Warren, of the Boston Theological Seminary, gives a philosophical but luminous outline in Joh. Partner. f. Deutschke Theologie (I. 1867, p. 218 sq.); Thomas (Bullet. Thol. Sept. 1868) proposes a scheme as follows: 1. Apologetics (historical and philosophical); 2. Historical theology (Biblical science, Church history, Statistics); 3. Systematic theology (Dogmatics, Polemics, Speculative theology); 4. Practical theology (the individual, the family, the church, the nation, the church, (a) as to its base, (b) as to its organization, (c) as to its active working.)
and carried through, in the midst of difficulties, chiefly by his indomitable industry and perseverance. The name of D'Alembert (q. v.) added lustre to the publication; and these two called to their aid all the sceptical and free-thinking talent of France. A great aim of the Encyclopédists was to establish what they called philosophy as a substitute for religion, and the intellectual spirit of France seemed to become thoroughly imbued with their views, social, moral, and political. The Encyclopédie was a product of the same causes which generated the Revolution, but the publication itself doubtless greatly hastened the catastrophe. It was only one among a host of the works of that revolution which commenced with Locke; expanded into the deism of England; and, crossing over to France, found a powerful advocate in Condillac. The progress of this development was very rapid. Among the Encyclopédists a single lifetime produced startling changes. Diderot, the editor and leading philosophic spirit of the Encyclopédie, "was at first only a doubter, next he became a deist, lastly an atheist. In the first stage he only translated English works, and even condemned some of the English deists. His views matured and hardened, probably under the influence of Voltaire's writings and of the infidel books smuggled into France, and he thenceforth assumed a tone bolder and marked by positive disbelief. Diderot's atheism is a still farther development of his unbelief. It is expressed in few of his writings, and pronounced so as not to inhibit; it seeks to invalidate the arguments for the being of God drawn from final causes" (Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, p. 179). D'Alembert, the scientific editor of the Encyclopédie, was the author of the celebrated Discours Prélinaire des Éditeurs, which was issued in separate form and became the book of infidelity not only in France, but also in England. D'Alembert's reputation in the department of science was very great over the entire continent of Europe, and he gave to the Encyclopédie its high scientific character and value. (See ALEMBERT, n. v.) There has been much discussion as to whether the Encyclopédie proper really was issued in the interests of atheism. Many of the articles are entirely Christian in their tone and spirit. Others are as definitely atheistic, while the Discours Préalable can hardly be called so. One of its chief characters, Diderot, perhaps under the view seems to be that the Encyclopédists endeavored clandestinely to accomplish what more honest infidels had long attempted openly. They endeavored to undermine both religion and the state, while seeming to be in favor of them. Voltaire doubtless stands at the head of those who furnished the basis for the Encyclopédie, although he wrote little for it himself. More than any other man he was the educator of the Encyclopédists. His principles are too well known to need statement. Helvétius derived his philosophy from Locke. "He was the moralist of the sensational philosophy, one who applied the philosophy of Condillac to morals. His philosophy is expressed in two works: the one on the spirit, the other on man; the former a theoretical view of human nature, the latter a practical view of education and society. His primary position is, that man owes all his superiority over animals to superior organization, and that natural moral law is the only good, and self-interest the true ground of morals, and the frame-work of individual and political right" (Farrar, History of Free Thought, p. 180). Next come the authors of the Systeme de la Nature, a work issued by the Encyclopédists. It has been attributed to Baron d'Holbach, his tutor Lagrange, Diderot, Grimm, Helvétius, and Robinet. It was doubtless a joint work, and expressed the views of all these men, or was a compromise creed to which they could all subscribe, for they held widely different opinions in other respects. The great object of the System of Nature was to banish God from the universe. It is devoted to the boldest materialism. "There is, in fact, nothing but matter and motion, says this book. Both are inseparably connected. If matter is at rest, it is only because hindered in motion, for in its essence it is not a dead mass" (Schwegler, History of Philosophy). The first part of this work undertakes to disprove the existence of God, the second part is devoted against religion. This System of Nature was the boldest achievement of infidelity, a work which even Voltaire pronounced "Bilogetical in its deductions, absurd in its physics, and incomparable in its morality." To those already named we may add Rousseau, whose Poëtique has been a standard work in the literature of the Revolution. He did for the state what the others had done for the Church. Such, then, were the views of those who projected and carried forward the Encyclopédie. If in the Encyclopédie itself we find those views covered up, or at least offset by thoroughly Christian ones, we are justified in believing that they were, so to say, balanced and reconciled by contrary opinions only to make the Encyclopédie acceptable to the unthinking masses of the French nation. "The fact, as some hold, that the French nation was ripening for a revolution both in Church and State, and was under the influence of Voltaire's writings and of all the hazards, proves nothing respecting the motives of the encyclopédists; and the terrible quickening which their great popular work gave to infidelity is perhaps the best test by which to judge the purposes of its authors." Let us look more closely at the Encyclopédie itself, and its spirit can perhaps be best read from the Discours Préalable. D'Alembert was its author, although he probably secured both the approval and assistance of Diderot in its form and contents. The object of this Discours is to set forth the philosophy underlying the Encyclopédie, and this is a discussion of the sensationalism of Locke. D'Alembert declares that "all our abstract knowledge may be reduced to what we receive through our senses." Showing that this may be the case, he hence argues that it is so. Sensation: are the only things about which we can have knowledge. With regard to ethics, the following is his underlying principle. Our ideas of good and evil "arise from the oppression which, by nature, the stronger practices upon the weaker, and the latter bears more reluctantly the more violent it is, because he feels that there is no reason why he should submit to it; the evils which befall us through the vices of our fellow-men lead to the indirect knowledge of antagonistic virtues." These are the grounds upon which his philosophy is based. And yet this Discours is made infidelity more popular to the unthinking masses than the Encyclopédie itself. Helvétius, De la Mettrie, or Holbach had done. Such is the sensational materialism contained in the Discours Préalable, containing the ethical principle that we feel a sense of oppression only because we can see no reason why we should submit to it. And yet, by the side of this, the same Discours we find the following statement: "Nothing, therefore, is more necessary than a revealed religion, which instructs us concerning so many things. Designed for the completion of our natural knowledge, it shows us a portion of what was concealed from us; but confines itself to the individual. This is an useful and necessary thing, but it remains forever hidden. A few points of faith, and a small number of practical precepts, is all to which the revealed religion refers; yet, thanks to the light which it communicates to the world, since then the people are more firm and decided concerning a great number of interesting questions than the philosophers of any school ever were." In this way infidelity and religion were woven into the same system, religion being always held subordinate, a something to accomplish an end which science and philosophy could not quite reach. This being once admitted, it was not difficult to persuade the French people that, when philosophy
could accomplish all that is necessary, religion might be set aside.

In the body of the Encyclopedia itself, many of the articles upon religious subjects are apparently in full sympathy, and even harmony. For instance, the article "Trinité" defends the orthodox dogma from attacks of Socinians, Jews, and infidels of all kinds. In the article "Dieu" the arguments for the existence of God are ably summed up, and objections are refuted. Quotations are made from Christian writers and the writer of the work seems to have been in full harmony with the Christian view of the subject.

The existence of angels and devils is recognised. The article "Christiâme" pronounces Christianity the only true revealed religion, and the Old and New Testaments are recognised as divine. It declares that the severest criticism has not been able to invalidate their authenticity. Reason and philosophy must accord to them the honor of setting forth facts beyond their reach. The hand of God is seen in the style of the sacred writings. Articles on Protestantism contain nothing in derogation of divine trine; every departure from the established creeds of the various denominations. The errors of the Roman Church are pointed out and severely castigated. It is not necessary to suppose these articles written in a spirit of hypocrisie. Their authors doubtless held the view that it was the duty of men to examine the truth that it was not in their power to invalidate the opinion that the Encyclopedia was secretly issued in the interests of atheism. Its authors could well afford to give Christian men a voice within its pages, when there was so much to counteract all they might say. It was not that Christianity had no advocates in the Encyclopedia, but that it was allowed only a feeble defence, and was often defended on principles which directly tended to its overthrow. Its very defenders, in many cases, were its worst enemies, and only erected fortifications on the side of religion to super easily be carried away by infidelity. The defence is made chiefly to rest on these.

Christianity should be upheld because it brings us more good than any other system of religion. Whatever system is most advantageous for man in his worldly relations is the system to which he should adhere. Whatever men can be made to believe that Christianity fails to do this, then it must be set aside. For example, in the article "Christianisme," Christ is placed side by side with the other lawgivers, his only superiority being that, while they kept the useful in view, he aimed at the true as well as the useful. All the other things of life, earth, and heaven, were considered as necessary to be made happy in this world. In other places morality is preferred to faith, "because he who does good and makes himself useful to the world is in a better condition through moral than through faith without morality." This is better than atheism, because it is more advantageous for nationals to admit the existence of God than to reject it.

The work began to appear in 1751, and was concluded in 1765, in 17 vols. fol., besides 11 vols. of plates. A supplement, in 5 vols., appeared at Amsterdam, 1776-1777, under the title La Table des matières, in 2 vols., at Paris, in 1780. The publication was stopped before two or three times by the government, and the last volumes were distributed privately, though the king himself was one of the purchasers. Didon, the author of the work, endeavouring to please all, he had not "neither time nor means of being particular in the choice of his contributors, among whom some were excellent, but most of the rest were very inferior; moreover the contributors, being badly paid, worked carelessly; in short, it was a patch-work composed of very ill-sorted materials, some masterpieces by the side of school-boys' performances; and there was also considerable neglect in the arrangement of the articles, and especially in the references."

In spite of all its defects, the Encyclopedia was the pride of France, and is in many respects a very able production. See Le Porte, Esprit de l'Encyclopédie (Paris, 1788); Voltaire, Questions sur l'Encyclopédie (Paris, 1770); Van Millert, Boyle Lecture, 1, 578; Kurzt, Church History, 296; Farrer, Hist. of Roman Thought, p. 166-178; Tenennam, Manual Hist. Philosophy, p. 578; Schweger, Hist. Philosophy, translated by Seytée, p. 206; Chambers, Encyclopédia; Herzog, Real-Ency
dlop. iv, 1; Moreil, Hist. Phil. p. 111. (H.G.)

End of the World. See ESCHATOLOGY.

Endeavor, Christian. See p. 1043 of this vol.

Bn'dor (Heb. Eyn'Dor; יְנֵבֹד fountain of Dor, i.e. of the age, I Sam. xxviii, 7, Sept. 'Ewâp v. r. Ayâv; but defectively יְנֶבָד in Josh. xxi, 11, Sept. דַּוַּא v. r. 'Ewâp; and יְנֶבָד in I Sam. xlviii, 10 [11], Sept. 'Ayâv; Josephus 'Ewâp, Ant. vi, 4, 12], a place which, with its daughter-towns (יְנֶבָד), was in the territory of Issachar, and yet possessed by the Philistines (Josh. xvi, 27). This was the case with five other places which lay partly in Asher, partly in Issachar, and seem to have formed a kind of district of their own, called "the three, or the triple Nepheh" (q. v.). The Israelites were unable to expel the Ca
nanites from it until a late period. Endor was long after the defeat of the Philistines (I Sam. xxviii, 7). Endor is not again mentioned in the Scriptures; but it was known to Eus
tebius and Jerome, who described it (by the same name, 'Ewâp and 'Ewâp, "Endor and Endor") as a large village in the plain of Jezeel or Edreelon, 4 miles S. of Tabor (Ouomant. s. v. 'Ewâp, "Endor"); near Nain and Sichonessa (Josh. xvi, 27). Tabor is the name given to the mound (Jer. iii, 19); Endor (v. r. 'Ewâp, Endor and Endor) seems to have been one of the villages recognized during the Crusades (Brocardus, c. vi, p. 176; Marin. Sanut. p. 248), but was then partially lost sight of till the 17th century (Doubdan, p. 580; Nau, p. 639; Maundrell, Apr. 19). On the bleak northern slope of Mount Hebel Da'aur ("Jeel Da"our of travellers) the name still lingers, attached to a desolate and deserted village (Burchardt, Trans. p. 342; Robinson, Res. iii, 218; Schwartz, Palest. p. 149). The rock of the mountain, on the slope of which Endor stands, is hollowed into caves, one of which, containing a little fountain, the entrance narrow, between rugged rocks, and partly covered with a fig-tree, may well have been the scene of the incantation of the witch (Van de Velde, Narratives, ii, 382). The distance from the slopes of Gilboa to Endor is 7 or 8 miles, over difficult ground (Porter, Άπατος, ii, 532).

B'n'ss. See Baca.

Enc-gla'lin (Heb. Eyn-egl'olin) [Heb. Eyn Egl-'ol
e'i-n, יְנַבְּאֹלִין fountain of two calxes, unless for יְנַבְּאֹלִין fountain of two pools; Sept. 'Ewâylâi'în v. r. Ewâylâlî'î, a place named by the Hebrews (xlvii, 10). This place is mentioned as on the Dead Sea, but wheth
er near to or far from Engedi, on the west or east side of the sea, it is impossible to ascertain from the text: "The fishes shall stand upon it from Engedi even to Enc-gla'lin: they shall be a place to spread forth nets." In his comment on the passage, Jerome places it at the extremity of the northern piece of the Dead Sea, opposite to the Jordan. M. de Saulcy thinks it identical with Aškâbâ, situated towards the northern point of the Dead Sea, between Jericho and the Jordan (Narratives, i,
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183). See BETH-HOGHLAM. En-eglam is probably another name for the Eglaim (q. v.) of Isa. xxv, 8.

Enemes sar (Ἐνημέσσαρ and Ἐνεμέσσαρος) is the name under which Shalmaneser (q. v.) appears in the book of Tobit (1, 2, 13, 15, 16). The change of the name is a corruption; the first syllable Skl̄ being dropped (therefore the Bpall̄, which represents Nibopolosar), and the order of the liquids as and being reversed. The author of Tobit makes Enemessar lead the children of Israel into captivity (1, 2), following the apparent narrative of the book of Kings (2 Kings xvii, 3-6; xviii, 9-11). He regards Sennacherib not only as his successor, but his son (1, 15), for which he has probably no authority beyond his own speculations upon the text of Scripture. See TOMB.

Ennisus (Ἐννίσος ν. ι. Εννίος, Valg. Enma-
siar), one of the leaders of the people who returned from captivity with Zorobabel (1 Esdr. v, 8); corresponding to the Naamani (q. v.) of Nehemiah (vii, 7).

Energici, a sect in Germany in the 16th century, so called because they held that the Eucharist was the energy of Jesus Christ—not his body; nor a representation thereof.—Buck, Theol. Dictionary, s. v.

Enercokomuans (ἐνερκομούνας), persons possessed, and, in the narrow sense and more strictly, persons possessed by an evil spirit. In the early Church such persons constituted a distinct class, bearing some relation to the catechumens and the faithful, but differing from them in this, that they were under the special care of exorcists, while they took part in some of the religious exercises of both classes. Catechumens were become disordered in mind during their term of probation were not baptized until thoroughly recovered, except in cases of sickness. Should any among the baptized become thus afflicted, they were excluded from the Christian assembly during the worst stages of their disease, being compelled to remain in the area of the church. From this circumstance they were called χειμοτόμοι, exposed to the weather. When partially recovered they were permitted to join in public worship, but were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper till they were properly restored, except in the immediate prospect of death.—Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. iii, ch. iv, § 8, 6.

Enfanti, BARTHÉLEMY PROSPER, more commonly called father Enfantin, one of the founders of Saint Simonism (q. v.), was born at Paris Feb. 8, 1796. He received his education at a lyceum, and subsequently (1812) entered the monastery of a Benedictine nun of the order. After a short time he engaged in commercial and industrial pursuits. Towards the close of the year 1825 Enfantin became intimately acquainted with Olinda Rodriguez, and through him with Saint Simon, who converted him to his theories of an industrial and religious reformation. He accepted from his dying master the mission to spread and develop his doctrines. The work was begun with the establishment of a journal called Le Producent (1825-26, 5 vols.), which closed its career with the celebrated epistle, The golden age, which a blind truth has here formerly placed in the past, is still before us. The Liberal party at first saw in this periodical the application of its own ideas to the material order, and supported it; but the support was withdrawn when Benjamin Constant denounced it as atheistic. In 1828 Enfantin had about a dozen collaborators, among whom were Blanqui, Duveyrier, Buchez (in 1848 president of the Constituent Assembly), and Pierre. The revolution of 1830 filled Enfantin with enthusiastic hopes. He signed, on the 30th of July, a proclamation, in which he demanded community of goods, abolition of inheritance, and the emancipation of workers. This was followed by a political agitation, Enfantin occupied himself only with ethics, art, religion, and social reform. He desired first of all to regulate individual relations, to emancipate woman and the pauper, and to sanctify the flesh by labor and pleasure. He expected to obtain by this system the dislocation of the structure of the state. In November, 1831, he issued a manifesto to the forty thousand adherents of the new doctrine in France, that Bazard and Rodrigues had separated from him, and that the new dogmas had become incarnate in him alone, as the living head of the messiahs. But his attempt to establish communitarian colonies failed, and the researches made for finding a female messiahs, to share with him the leadership of the communion, made the whole movement ridiculous. The Globe, which was gratuitously distributed, had to be discontinued.

In the recent government suppressed the sect of Saint Simonism; Enfantin, followed by about forty of his disciples, among whom were Michael Chevalier (subsequently a member of the senate), Duveyrier, and Gustave d'Eichtal, retired to an estate which he possessed on the coast of Menilmontant, and there organised a model communitarian society. There the new brothers, divided into groups of laborers, wore a peculiar garb, and passed the day in work, religious conferences, and mystical ceremonies. The "father" (Enfantin) had this name conspicuously inscribed upon his breast, superintended, preached, encouraged; he wrote articles for Le Peuple, addressed the Liévre Nouveau, composed mystical hymns, and developed some mystical pantheism. It cost him great efforts to refute the attacks of Carnot, J. Reynaut, and others. He was then summoned before the assises of the Seine, being charged with having held forbidden meetings, and outraged public morality, and was condemned to a year of imprisonment (August 28,1882). The Saint Simonians now dispersed. Enfantin, who after a few months was set at liberty, left with about a dozen of his disciples for Egypt. Most of them, turning Mohammedan, in 1846 published a tract on the principles of the Saint Simonians; but Enfantin refused to profess Mohammedanism, and after remaining in Egypt for two years, returned to France. He was for a time postmaster, and in 1841, through the influence of his friends, some of whom had obtained high offices, was appointed member of a commission to administer the finances of Napoleon. In 1848 he received the chief direction of the Lyons railroad. In November, 1848, Enfantin, conjointly with Duveyrier, established a daily paper, Le Crédit, which was continued until 1850. Subsequently Enfantin became connected with the administration of the railroad from Lyons to the Mediterranean. He died May 31, 1864. Shortly before his death he appointed Arles Dufour head of the sect.

Enfantin developed the socialist views of his master and his own in the works Economie politique et St. Simonienne (Paris, 1831) and Morale (Paris, 1832). The latter work has been translated into English as Cour d'amiéne. Another work of the same class, Le Liévre nouveau (completed in 1832), has never been printed. His philosophical and theological views were set forth at length in the Correspondance philosophique et religieuse (Paris, 1847), of which the Correspondance politique (Paris, 1838-39) has been a sequel. He was the Jesuit curat, father Rémi (L'Étoile du Père Rémi, Paris, 1856). His last work was La Vie Eternelle passée, présente, future (Paris, 1861; also republished in the Bibliothèque utile, Paris, 1864). In 1865 a collective edition of his socialist works was published at Tournai. The more important of his works were: Vapereau, Dictionnaire des idées et des mots; V.; Hocot, Nouv. Biogr. Génér. xxvi, 37. (A. J. S.)

ENFIELD, WILLIAM, LL.D., an English Dissenter.
and voluminous writer, was born at Sudbury March 29, 1741, and was educated at Daventry under Dr. Ashworth. On leaving the seminary he became pastor to a congregation at Liverpool. He afterwards became resident tutor and lecturer at Warrington Academy. In 1785 he became minister of the Unitarian Church at Norwich, where he died Nov. 8, 1787. Among his numerous publications were (1) A History of Philosophy, drawn up from Brucker (Lond. 1781, 2 vols. 8vo).(2) The Preachers' Directories (2 Eds. 1811, 1to),(3) Family Register (Lond. 1778, 2 vols. 12mo).(4) The English Preacher (Lond. 9 vols. 12mo). He was a frequent contributor to periodicals, and shared with Dr. Aikin in the preparation of the General Biographical Dictionary.

En-gaddî (in aiyîgalîs v. r. 'En-gaddî and in qaddî, or in qâdûs, Vulg. in Codex), Ecclus. xxiv. 14. See EN-GEDDI.

En-gamnim (Heb. Egm Gennim), "fountain of gardens," the name of several places in Palestine, for, besides those mentioned below, there was said, according to Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. 'Hyaryvi, Engananim), then to be a third village called Engananim ('Hyaryvi, Enganami) near Gerasa, beyond the Jordan. (3) Sept. ('Hyaryvi v. r. unrecognizable; Vulg. Ecclus. xxiv.) A town in the plains of Judah, mentioned between Zanoah and Tappuah (Josh. xv. 84). Eusebius and Jerome state (Onomast. s. v. 'Hyaryvi, Engananim) that it was still extant in their day near Bethel; but there must have been some mistake in this, as the place in question lay in the group N.W. of Jerusalem (Keel, Comment. on Josh. in loc.), possibly at the site of the present agricultural village Rama, north of Eleutheropolis (Robinson, Researches, ii. 354). Schwartz, however, thinks (Pallast. p. 102) that "Engananim is certainly identical with the village of 'En-gamnim, 5 miles S.E. of Engananim," but this is not in the quarter indicated by the associated names, and is, moreover, with greater probability still connected to another ancient locality. See ZEAM.

2. A city on the border of Issachar (Josh. xix. 21; Sept. 'ewr eel TYpOyvi, Alex. 'ewr Garvii; Vulg. En-gamnim). To the south of this town is a few miles the village of Leje Levites (xxi. 29; Sept. Piwy 'yyryâwmu; Vulg. En-genanim); probably the same (see Roland, Palest. p. 812) as the Geansia (Ivania) or Geans (Iyaniav) of Josephus, on the borders of the great plain toward Samaria (Ant. xx, 5; 1 War, iii, 5, 4; comp. ii, 12, 9). According to the Bible, Josephus identifies the town with the present Jenin, a town 16 miles south of Mount Tabor, and which he and others describe as still a place of gardens and abundant water (Wilson, Land of Jhbeil, ii, 84; Van de Velde, Narratio, ii, 539; Schwartz, Pallast. p. 167). In the lists of Levitical cities in 1 Chron. vi, AENIK is substituted for Engananim, apparently by contraction. The position of Jenin is in striking agreement with the requirements of BTH-NA-GAN (A. V. "the garden-house;" Sept. BâthAvi) in the direction in which Ahaziah fledJehu (2 Kings ix, 27). The rough road of the ascent was probably too much for his chariot, and, keeping the more level ground, he made for Megiddo, where he died (Stanley, Palest. p. 842). The place is several times noticed by Arabian writers in connection with the march of Saladin, and has been visited by many modern travellers (Robinson, Researches, iii, 156). The only remains of the ancient town are a few walls close to the mosque of the present town (De Sauley, Narratio, i, 78, 79). The town is high enough to overlook the broad plain, and low enough to have its houses enclosed by its verdure. The hills rise steeply behind the town, and here and there are clothed with the sombre foliage of the olive. Rich gardens, hedged with prickly pear, extend along their base, and a few palm-trees give variety to the scene. The "fountain," from which the town took part of its Scripture name (En), is in the hills a few hundred yards distant; and its abundant waters flow over and fertilize the "gardens" (Gennim) from which the second and chief part of the name is derived. The leading road from Jerusalem goes north to Samaria, and Jerusalem passes Jenin. It contains about 2000 inhabitants, and is the capital of a large district (Porter, Handbook, p. 381; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 189).

En-ge'dî [many En-gedi, some En-gedi'] (Heb. Egm Gedî, "fountain of the kid;" Sept. in Jos. 'Hyaryvi v. r. 'Ayânsh, in Sam. 'Eyânedî, in Chron. and Cant. 'Eyânedî v. r. 'Hyaryvi and in Pâdî, in Ezek. 'Eymnudî v. r. 'Iyshvîn, Apor. Engan- nimi; Josephus 'Eyânedî; Pulfey 'Ganami and Ayman; Stephanus Byx. 'Eyânedî, p. 383; Eusebius 'Hyaryvi, Onomast. s. v.; Pliny, Engaddi, Hist. Nat. v. 17), a town in the wilderness of Judah (Josh. xv, 62), on the western shore of the Dead Sea (Ezek. xlvii, 10), which gave its name to a part of the desert whither David withdrew with his followers (I Chron. xxi, 16; Josh. xvi, 1-4). Its more ancient name was Hazezon-Tamar (q. v.), and by that name it is mentioned before the destruction of Sodom, as being inhabited by the Amorites, and near the cities of the plain (Gen. xiv, 7); a title ("the pool of the palm") does not appear from the past-springs that surrounded it (Ecclus. xxiv, 14). It was immediately after an assault upon the "Amorites, that dwelt in Hazezon-tamar," that the five Mesopotamian kings were attacked by the rulers of the plain of Sodom (Gen. xiv, 7; comp. 2 Chron. xx, 2). Saul was told that David was in the "wilderness of En-gedi," and he took "3000 men, and went to seek David and his men upon the rocks of the wild goats" (1 Sam. xxiv, 1-4). These animals still frequent the cliffs above and around the fountain; the Arabs call them Badk. At a later period Engedi was the garrison referred the Moabites and Ammonites who went up against Jerusalem, and fell in the valley of Bersachah (2 Chron. xx, 2). It is remarkable that this is the usual route taken in the present day by such predatory bands from Moab as make incursions into Southern Palestine. They pass round the southern coast of the Dead Sea, 62 miles from the road along its western shore to the pass at Ain-Jidy ("the ascent by the cliff Ziz," 2 Chron. xx, 16), and thence toward Hebron, Tekoa, or Jerusalem, as the prospects of plunder seem most inviting. The vineyards of En-gedi were enriched by the Sidonian soil (Gen. xiv, 10); its name is summed by Josephus (Ant. ix, 1, 2). Stephanus of Byzantium places it near Sodom; Jerome at the south end of the Dead Sea (Commen. in Ezek. xlvii); but Josephus more correctly upon the Lake Asphaltites, at the distance of 800 stadia from Jerusalem (Ant. ix, 1, 2; comp. xvii, 14, 4; War, iii, 5, 5). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome, Engedi was still a large village on the shore of the Dead Sea, but it must have been abandoned very soon afterwards, for there is no subsequent reference to it in history, nor are there any traces of recent habitation (Porter's Handbook, p. 384). There is understood to mean the Mandrakes, or the Mandrake Tree, (Prov. 179), who says that the district between Jericho and the Dead Sea is the "land of Dangadda" (Fr. d'Engadda), and that the balm-trees were "still called vines of Gady." Engedi has always, until recently, been sought for at the south end of the Dead Sea (Roland, Palest. 449); but in 1806 Sutter rediscovered the ancient name in the Ain-Jidy of the Arabs, and lays it down in its map at a point on the western shore nearly equidistant from both extremities of the lake. This spot was visited by Dr. Robinson, and he confirms the idea that the village was ancient, but the site lies among the mountains, a considerable way down the descent to the shore. Here is a rich plain, half a mile square, sloping very gently from the base.
of the mountains to the water, and shut in on the north by a lofty promontory. About a mile up the western scarp, and at an elevation of some 400 feet above the plain, is the fountain of Ain-Jidy, bursting forth at once in a fine stream upon a sort of narrow terrace or shelf of the mountain, having an abrupt margin towards the lake. The water is sweet, but warm, and strongly impregnated with lime. The stream rushes down the steep descent of the mountain below, and its course is hidden by a luxuriant thicket of trees and shrubs belonging to a more southern clime. Near this fountain are the remains of several buildings, apparently ancient, although the main site of the town seems to have been farther below. The whole of the descent below seems to have been once terraced for tillage and gardens, and near the foot are the ruins of a town, exhibiting nothing of particular interest, and built mostly of unworked stone. This we may conclude was the town which took its name from the fountain. On reaching the plain, the brook crosses it in nearly a straight line to the sea. During a great part of the year it is absorbed in the thirsty soil. Its banks are now cultivated by a few families of Arabs, who generally pitch their tents near this spot. The soil is rich and fertile, and in the climate it might be made to produce the rarest fruits of tropical climates; but vineyards no longer clothe the mountainside, and neither palm-tree nor balsam is seen on the plain.

The Wilderness of En-Gedi is doubtless the immense peninsula of the wild region of the Dead Sea, which must be traversed to reach its shores. It was here that David and his men lived among the "rocks of the wild goats," and where the former cut off the skirts of Saul's robe in a cave (I Sam. xxi., 1-4). "On all sides," says Dr. Robinson, "the country is full of caverns, which might then serve as lurking-places for David and his men, as they do for outlaws at the present day." He adds that, as he came in sight of the ravine of the Gibraltar, a mountain-goat started up and bounded along the face of the rocks on the opposite side of the river (Revel. i., 209). M. de Saulcy imagines that he has identified the particular cave in question with one in that vicinity now called Bir el-Mahbikah (Narrative, i., 163).

Engelbert, abbot of Admont, of the Benedictine order in Styria, was born of noble parents about 1250. He became abbot of Admont about 1297, and died 1320, leaving a great number of works, of which the principal are: De oris, progressus et fine imperii Romani, published by Gaspar Brusche (Basle, 1568, 8vo; Mentz, 1609, 8vo); — Tractatus super passionem secundum Matthæum; de statu defensorum; de Providentia; de causis longinquitatis hominum ante biblæum; — Speculæum virtutum. Several of his works were published by the learned Benedictine monk Pes, partly in the Theaurus Anecdotorum Novissimorum (Augsb., 1721), partly in the Bibliotheca austriaca antiquo-nova (Ratisbon, 1729-25). A biography of Engelbert, and a complete list of all his works, are given by Puh, in an introductory essay in the 1st volume of the Theaurus, and in the preface to the 8th volume of the Bibliotheca.— Hoefn., Novae. Biog. Géner. xvi, 48; Wetzer u. Wettel, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 590. (A. J. S.)

Engelhardt, Saint, archbishop of Cologne, was a son of count Engelbert I of Berg-Geldern, and was born in 1185. When he was twenty-two years old the king of France offered him the archbishopric, but he declined it on the ground of youth and inexperience. In 1215 he was elected archbishop of Cologne. With great energy he reorganized the electorate, which, under the administration of his predecessors, had become quite disordered. He extinguished its debt, recovered those portions of its territory which had been lost, and acquired new ones. When the emperor Friedrich II was called to Italy, Engelbert was appointed head of the regency to which he was intrusted in the interest of the empire. As archbishop, Engelbert made the utmost endeavors to reform the corrupt habits of the clergy, and to repel the interference of the nobility in ecclesiastical affairs. The rigor with which he carried through his principles made him many enemies, and on the 19th of August, 1237, he was murdered at Gevelsburg by his nephew, count Friedrich von Isenburg. The murderer was captured and broken on the wheel; the bishops of Münster and Osnabrück, who were charged with complicity, were excommunicated; and Engelbert, on account of his zeal for ecclesiastical reform, was elevated to the rank of number of saints. A life of Engelbert, by Caesar of Heisterbach (q. v.), was, in 1680, edited by Gelenius, with many learned remarks and additions (Vindelius libertatis ecclesiæ et martyris St. Engelberthi, Colonie, 1630); see also Ficher, Engelbert der Heilige, Cologne, 1858; Wetzer u. Wettel, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 590. See also COLOGNE. (A. J. S.)

Engelbrecht, Johann, a visionary theologian, was born in Brunswick 1696. He was sickly from his youth, and suffered dreadfully from melancholy, caused by physical pain as well as by mental disturbance. He believed himself (after 1628) the subject of revelations and visions, and went from house to house preaching and narrating his supernatural acquisitions and knowledge of heaven and hell. Some preachers, like Paul Egard, in Holstein, gave very favorable testimonials of his character and his preaching; but the larger number took offence at his pretended revelations, and persecuted him. In Hamburg, where he spent several years, he was imprisoned, during the last years of his life he lived in great retirement in his native city. He died in 1644. Though unlettered, he wrote several books, especially a View of Heaven (Brunswick, 1618); and they were collected in 1640, and again in 1697, in editions of his Works and Offenbarungen (Brunsw. and Amsterd.). Some of his writings have been translated into French and English.—Hersch, Real-Encyklop., iv, 32.

Engelhardt, Johann Georg Veit, a German theologian, was born at Neustadt on the Aich, Nov. 12, 1791. After studying for three years at the University of Erlangen, and being for several years a tutor in his own family, he was, in 1815, consecrated deacon at a church in Erlangen and professor at the gymnasium. In 1820 he became lecturer at the University of Erlangen, and obtained the degree of doctor of divinity; the next year he was advanced to an extraordinary, and in 1822 to an ordinary professorship at the university. The latter position he held until his death, Sept. 13, 1855. For several years he held the office of university preacher, and five times he was elected rector of the university. From 1848 to 1848 he was a deputy of the university in the Bavarian diet. The king of Bavaria conferred upon him the title of ecclesiastical councillor and the order of St. Michael, and the city of Erlangen the right of honorary citizenship. In the history of theological literature, Engelhardt has secured a lasting place by his manuals of Church history and history of doctrines (Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 4 vols., Erlangen, 1838-34; Dogmengeschichte, 2 vols., Neustadt, 1889). He gave special attention to the study of the history of mystic theology. His intention to write a comprehensive history of this theology he did not find time to carry out. On Nov. 7, 1826, he was a witness at a deposed canoness on the subject. Among the most important of this class of his works are those on Dionysius Areopagita (Disertatio de Dionysio platonice, Erlangen, 1820; De origine scriptorum Areopagiticorum, Erlang. 1823; Die angehl. Schriften des Areopagitus, Liberar., 1829; Dionysius Areopagita, Erlang. 1829, 2 vols.); on Plotinus (Plotinii Enneades, libri, et mitt
were of much inferior strength. Darts varied similarly from small beams to large arrows, and the range they had exceeded a quarter of a mile, or about 450 yards. All these engines were constructed upon the principle of the sling, the bow, or the spring, the last
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1. The Hebrew חשקון, chisshakhon (2 Chron. xxvi, 15), lit. invention (as in Eccles. vii, 29), is its counterpart in etymological meaning, each referring to the ingenuity (engine, from ingenium) displayed in the contrivance. The engines to which the term is applied in 2 Chron. were designed to propel various missiles from the walls of a besieged town; one, like the balista, was for stones, consisting probably of a strong spring and a tube to give the right direction to the stone; another, like the catapult, for arrows, an enormous stationary bow. The invention of these is ascribed to Uzziah's time—a statement which is supported both by the absence of such contrivances in the representations of Egyptian and Assyrian warfare, and by the traditional belief that the balista was invented in Syria (Pliny, vii, 56). Of the balista and catapult it may be proper to add that they were of various powers. For battering walls, those were some that threw stones of fifty, others of one hundred, and some of three hundred weight; in the field of battle they

Ancient Assyrian War-engine.

2. Another military engine with which the Hebrews were acquainted was the battering-ram, described in Ezek. xxvi, 9, as רכש כבל, rmksh' kobolo', lit. a beating of that which is in its front, hence a ram for striking walls; and still more precisely in Ezek. iv, 2, xxvi, 22 as רכש, r'mk, a ram. The use of this instrument was well known both to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. i, 339) and the Assyrians. The references in Ezekiel are to the one used by the latter people, consisting of a high and stoutly-built framework on four wheels, covered in at the sides in order to protect the men moving it, and armed with one or two pointed
England. Church of. The proper designation of this church since the Act of Union in 1801 is "The United Church of England and Ireland." The Reformed Church of England dates from the 16th century; but it is convenient to treat in this article of the rise of Christianity in England, and of its growth under the protection of the State. (The free churches of England are given under several of these titles in this work.)

I. HISTORY.—(1) Early Period (to the mission of Augustine, A.D. 596). 1. To the Saxon Invasion, A.D. 449. It is generally believed that Christianity was introduced into Britain before the end of the 2nd century. Tertullian (+ about 220) speaks of places in Britain not reached by the Romans, but yet subject to Christ (Britannorum inassae Romanis loca, Christo vero subditae). Eusebius, indeed, declares that some of the apostles preached in Britain (Act. xvi, 6; xxix, 24; Ezek. xxvi, 8) is incorrect. An engine for battering the wall is mentioned in the reign of King David (2 Sam. xx, 15); but the instrument itself for throwing it down may have been that above noticed, and not the battering-ram. The ram was, however, a simple machine, and capable of demolishing the strongest walls, provided access to the foot was practicable, for the mass of cast metal which formed the head could be fixed to a beam lengthened sufficiently to require between one and two hundred men to lift and impel it; and when it was still heavier and hung in the lower floor of a movable tower, or helopeista, it became a most formidable engine of war—one used in all great sieges from the time of Demetrius, about B.C. 306, till long after the invention of gunpowder. Towers of this kind were largely used at the destruction of Jerusalem (q. v.) by the Romans. See BATTERING-rams.
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Little is accurately known of the real state of Christianity in this period. Pelagianism took root in Britain (the native country of Pelagius), and the British bishops called in Germanus and Lupus from Gaul, who refuted Pelagius at the conference of Verulam (A.D. 408). They were followed by a learned clergy from Llandaff, making Dubricius bishop, with extensive jurisdiction. The monastery of Bangor (Bangor), near Chester, was founded at about the same time.

2. From the Saxon Invasion, 449, to the Invasion of the Anglo-Saxons, 596. — Hengist and Horsa, retained by Vortigern as a war leader, were followed by those who survived the war, and whose language became the Scotch and Picts from Britain, remained in the island as conquerors. The greater part of Britain was again plunged into barbarism, and Christianity kept its ground only in Wales and Cornwall. (Its history in Ireland and Scotland is given in separate articles.) The patron of Wales, St. David (died 589), is said to have been consecrated a bishop at Jerusalem; he held a synod against Pelagianism at Brevy, and became archbishop of Caerleon (see David, St.). In Cornwall the British rites and usages were preserved until near the close of the 8th century. Iona, where Columba (q. v.) established his monastery in about 565, was a centre of light not only for Scotland, but also for north Britain (see Iona).

(II.) Middle Age: Era of Submission to the Popacy (6th to 12th century). — Up to the 6th century British Christians had been discontented with their ecclesiastical rulers. But at that time Gregory the Great determined to seek the conversion of the English Saxons to Christianity. Ethelbert, king of Kent, had married a Christian wife, Bertha, daughter of Chilbert, king of the Franks. She induced her husband to favor Christianity, and then persuaded the monarch to invite Augustine (sent by Gregory), who, with a number of monks, landed in 596. They converted Ethelbert, who was not only king of Kent, but Bretwalda, or chief of the Saxons. His example was soon followed by the kings of Essex and East Anglia, and gradually by the whole of England. It is said that 10,000 English were baptized within the year of Augustine's arrival. In 597 Augustine went over to Aries, in France, where he was consecrated by bishop virgilius, and on his return he became the first bishop of Canterbury, and was immediately endowed by king Ethelbert, who likewise established the dioceses of Rochester and London. Another portion of the Anglo-Saxons were converted by Aidan and other Scottish missionaries. But the ecclesiastical system set up by the Roman missionaries was entirely of the Roman type, and was in many cases introduced, if the term can be used, out of the Church of England. The old British Church in various points, e. g. the reckoning of Easter, the clerical tonsure, chasms, etc. More important were the questions of the marriage of the clergy and of the papal jurisdiction. Wherever the Roman influence prevailed, the Roman view of course was adopted. But Scottish and Irish missionaries were also at work in the kingdom, and up to the 7th century the converts of the latter were probably in the majority. In 664, king Oswy of Northumberland held a conference at Whithby, where Colman (q. v.) of Lindisfarne maintained the old British and Irish views, and Wilfrid the case for the mission of Augustine. The king was persuaded by Wilfrid (or perhaps by his queen, who was a Romanist), and went over to the Roman party. Colman and all his clergy then went to Ireland. In 686 the pope sent over Theodore to be priest of England, and under his administration (688-698) the Roman and British Churches (whence remained of them) were fused into one body. See Theodore. But for many ages we hear little of any exercise of jurisdiction by the popes in England: the English bishops and kings did not permit appeals to Rome. When Wilfrid, bishop of York, appealed, A.D. 680, against an English synod which had deposed him from his diocese, and obtained a decree in his favor from the pope, that decree was disregarded in England, even Theodore himself refusing to obey it. From this period England was in formal connection with the see of Rome up to the time of the Reformation. A few great names shine amid the general gloom, e. g. Bede (c. 720), Alfred, king of Wessex, the Anglo-Saxon, from the time of Alfred, grew more and more Romish. "At length, from the time of Gregory VII (A.D. 1073), the papal jurisdiction was pushed into England, as it was into other countries; legates made frequent visits, held councils, exacted taxes, and so on. All the other iniquities of papal usurpation, followed each other in rapid succession; and for four centuries no country in Europe suffered more, and with greater reluctance, than England. But the popes and the kings of England had, after much struggle, to yield the supremacy. The Church was their prey" (Palmer, Ch. History, ch. xxii).

The Norman Conquest took place A.D. 1066. From this period, for several centuries, the history of England is full of struggles between the ecclesiastical and royal power for supremacy. William the Conqueror refused to recognize the pope as spiritual ruler, and declared his right to retain in his own hands the investiture of bishops and abbots which the early Saxon kings had possessed. He prohibited the publishing of papal bulls and letters of advice till they were translated into English. He removed the ancient tithes and revenues of the Church, and declared him, deprived the clergy of the right of excommunication of any of his nobles except with his express permission. On the other hand, he confirmed by charter a law of Edward the Confessor, granting to the clergy tithe of cattle and profits, in addition to the ancient tithe of corn; and committed a still greater error in establishing ecclesiastical courts, to which alone clerical persons were thenceforth to be amenable. The "spiritual courts" became an enormous power in supporting the Roman domination. In 1075 celibacy was first made imperative on the English clergy. "Under Henry I., besides, a synod met at Westminster, 1102, which passed various reforming measures, the nature of which attests the existing depravity and degradation of the Church. This synod prohibited simony, and the pope ruled that lay investiture was simony; and on this question a rupture between the pope and the English king, and the latter's efforts to maintain the rights of investiture, which he had received with the crown, Henry felt himself compelled to relinquish them to the pope, and only got permission from the pope for bishops to do hagmace to ordain without him, but the latter was removed from their sees. None of the proposed measures of reform accomplished any result. The morals of the clergy were thoroughly relaxed; murder by a person in holy orders was quite a usual occurrence; against such offenders there was no resort to common law, and ecclesiastical courts rarely intercessed with them. A case of this kind gave rise to the protracted struggle between Thomas à Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, on the side of the pope, and Henry II. for himself and people" (Raddel, Cyclopedia, s. v.). The "Constitutions of Clarendon" (see Clarendon) were intended to prevent the power of the Church of England from growing to the extent of breathing the ecclesiastical power; but the resistance of Becket (q. v.), his murder, and the repentant fears of the king, caused their speedy revocation in all the points to which the pope objected. "It was not, however, till the reign of John, that England, and the king resigned his crown to the pope, that the papal encroachments rose to their height; and the weak reign of Henry III. which followed, did nothing to abate them. Edward I. gave a check to the power of the clergy, subjected them to taxation, and passed the statute of of provisions, which prohibited the transfer of land without the king's consent. There is little to be said as to innovations in doctrine
during these three centuries; but it may be noted that about the middle of this period, viz. 1218, the Council of St. John Lateran declared transubstantiation, or the bodily presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, to be a tenet of the Church" (Chambers, s. v.).

In 1380 the important statute of Provisions was passed. It was designed, so far as it could, to ensure that English benefices were reserved to the pope or to alien clergy, and it provided that the pope should confer no English benefice on any one without consent of the king. The statute of Provisions (1389; enlarged 1380) forbade any interference of the Church with the state. It was an act of the English civil courts to the pope. The statute of Mortmain (in Magna Charta), and the various amendments and additions to it, all aimed to prevent the accumulation of property in the Church. See Mortmain.

In the reign of Henry II certain German Church reformers found their way to England—probably Walensian Christians; and, though they were bitterly persecuted, all the good seed did not perish. In 1227 John Wycliffe was born. He preached against the supremacy of the pope, and against the doctrine of the sacraments. In 1371 he was arrested for heresy, but no harm came to him. His translation of the Scriptures, and other writings, made a great impression upon the more educated classes, but his labors had little effect upon the mass of the people. After his arrest he was imprisoned, and many of his followers were numerous enough to form a party and to get the designation of Lollards (q. v.), and for a century persecution for Lollardism was common in England.

"Henry IV thought it necessary to fortify his usurped position by assisting the bishops against the Lollards, and from this time to the Reformation there was an uninterrupted succession of confessors and martyrs. Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, was the most illustrious of these sufferers. Fox gives a detailed account of nearly twenty individuals burned for heresy between the death of lord Cobham and 1509, when Henry VIII ascended the throne. To some extent, the blood of these martyrs was the seed of the Reformed Church; but we must not overlook the 'hidden seed,' which was growing secretly from the time that Wycliffe gave to his countrymen a translation of the Scriptures in their own tongue. There were many among them who entered the study of Greek, led to a better understanding of the sacred books, whilst the invention of printing (1442) caused a wider circulation of them" (Chambers, s. v.). See Wycliffe; Lollards.

(III.) From the Reformation to the present time. The Reformation, however, was not outwardly apparent fairly established in England at the time of the accession of Henry VIII in 1509 [see Henry VIII], and his minister, cardinal Wolsey, maintained the splendor of the Church to a degree unexampled in England. Nevertheless, the great edifice was already undermined. In view of the facts cited in the last paragraph, it is absurd to say, as Roman writers do, that the source of the English Reformation is to be found in the vices of Henry VIII. However, it was not till the reign of that monarch that the Reformation in England and France was pronounced. The Lutheran declaration of war against the pope, Henry wrote his treatise on the seven sacraments against Luther's book, Of the Common of Babylon, and was repaid by the pontiff with the title of "Defender of the Faith" (1521). The king had married his brother's widow, Catharine of Aragon, and for marrying her, and for her, he had divorced a divorce, "to revenge himself on Charles V for having disappointed him of the papacy; but after the king began to look with favor on Anne Boleyn, one of a house from whom Wolsey had everything to fear, he adopted a covert policy of opposition to the divorce he had suggested. When at last he was pressed on every side, with no open way before him, and his own ruin imminent, his course became tortuous, and was marked by a constant endeavor to procrastinate the proceedings, and delay any sentence being pronounced on this question by the pope. The issue was, in consequence of the advice of Cranmer, an appeal to the universities, and to the learned men of Christendom, for their opinion; and this was the only valuable service of the whole of Cranmer's history; and for the most part, of Henry. The disgrace of Wolsey followed thence. See WOLSEY. Henry's marrel with the pope daily became more palpable. Convocation was summoned in 1531, and charged with breaking the statutes of provisions and premonstrance. They had no effect upon the pope, for their diatribe was turned into a schism was made by this Convocation, but it was under the pressure of the court. They proclaimed the king of England 'only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ permits, even the supreme head of the Church of England.' In 1535, on the elevation of Cranmer, the see of Canterbury, he pronounced sentence of divorce between Henry VIII and Catharine; and the marriage of Anne Boleyn to Henry was publicly notified. The pope declared this illegal, and threatened, unless these doings were undone, that he would proceed to excommunicate the king. To prevent any such proceedings affecting the stability of his throne and his succession, in the following year Henry caused Parliament to abolish all papal authority in England, and to stop all payments to the Roman exchequer. After this came, under Thomas Cromwell, all the changes and rearrangements that were to be made. All the changes in England from which it never recovered—namely, first, a visitation, and then, as a consequence, the suppression of the monasteries, because 'they had long and notoriously been guilty of vicious and abominable living.' Among the bishops there were two parties; one whose sympathies were with Rome, and another with reform; to the former belonged Bonner and Gardiner, to the latter Cranmer and Latimer. But it was necessary to have some authoritative declaration of what the Church of England held since it had rejected the pope; and hence, in 1586, the king, as head of the Church, issued a declaration on this subject, and in 1589 Parliament passed an act for establishing the Creed, under the rather characteristic title, 'An act for abolishing diversity of opinions.' By this the doctrine of transubstantiation was taught, and the word of doctrine, burning with zeal on Henry's death, of it. All who stood out for the necessity of the communion in both kinds, or for the marriage of priests, or against the observance of vows of chastity, or the propriety of private masses, or the fitness of auricular confession; all priests who shall marry after having saving views of church renewal, with the pains of death as felons; and all those who maintain the same errors under any other manner may be imprisoned during the king's pleasure" (Mackintosh). Henry felt compelled to go on and increase the distance which separated him from Rome. There was in the Church a powerful party (Cranmer, Latimer, and many others of less note) that were of progressive tendencies, and to this party Thomas Cromwell, during his continuance in power, lent all his influence. His favor shown to the Protestant cause was one ground of his fall. About this time, two editions of the English Bible were printed and circulated with the permission of Henry. They were based upon Coverdale's translation. To Cranmer and Cromwell the permission to circulate them is due, and the command to place them in the cathedrals for public use, and for ministers to instruct these people in their reading. But the tide of political power now turned in favor of the Romanist party, and these permissions were withdrawn: the Bible became again for a time a prohibited book, and many who had received enlightened views of truth suffered bitter persecution. In 1640 Cranmer persuaded Henry to appoint a commission, of which he was made a member, to draw up a formal
confession. This appeared under the title, The Eru

dition of a Christian Man. It indicates some progress,
since it only recommends prayers for the dead as 'go
gods'; but became, I know, what condition departed souls are in, we ought only to
recommend them to the mercy of God.' It affirms
justification by faith, though it modifies this declara-
tion so far as to add, 'Yet man, prevented by grace,
is by his free consent and obedience a worker toward
the full realization of the justifications of God in the
worship of images, though it allows their use to excite
devotional feeling. It altered some minor matters
also in the service. Such was the character of the
Church of England's first confession. The Reformers
were gaining strength, and under Edward VI and the
Presbyterians were victors in both triumphs; in 1559, the
Thirty commissioners were sent through the country to
abolish superstitious practices. Cranmer drew up
thirteen homilies, which were appointed to be read in
the churches where the ministers could not preach.
This was one of the provisions made of the diffusion of
some religious knowledge. This step, and the ser-
mons themselves, elicited the unqualified approbation of
the Continental Reformers. Cranmer wrote also a
catechism, which was generally circulated. Such the-
ologians as Bucer and Peter Martyr were invited to
 come. COMMON PRAYERS. In 1549, at Cranmer's instigation, the
English universities, and the most strenuous exertions were made to provide preac-
ching; 'one sermon every quarter of the year at least'
in every church being imperative. But such was the
state of the Romish clergy that even this much they
could hardly accomplish. In 1547 Parliament repealed
the laws of Henry VIII and earlier reigns, levelling against the new opinions, as they are
often called. As Convocation was inclined in favor of
the Romish party, Parliament assumed to itself the task of reforming the Church. It passed that year
acts 'concerning the sacrament,' ordaining the com-
munion to be in both kinds, as undoubted, the
priest to communicate alone, and requiring him to
prepare the people for worthily communicating by an
exhortation on the day preceding its celebration. In
1548 there was a commission appointed for the revision
of the offices of public worship. While the first fruits
were a new communion service. Confession was no
longer made imperative. At the same time a new
liturgy was compiled. At the end of it occurs the peti-
tion—'From the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and
all his detestable enormities, good Lord, deliver us.' See
ARTICLES, THIRTY-NINE. The commission
appointed in 1532 to prepare a canon law, in con-
sequence of the death of Edward, was discontinued
before its work was done. Under his reign the pro-
gress of reformation had been rapid, but it was to be
sorely tried. Mary ascended the throne (1553) and re-
established Romanism. Bonner and Gardiner were
restored; the Book of Common Prayer and Catechism
were declared heretical; the king's authority was restored
to the see of Rome; a persecution of the chief reform-
ners commenced—Roger was burned at Smithfield,
Hooper at Gloucester, Saunders at Coventry, Taylor
at Hadley. The prisons were filled with 'heretics;'
many fled beyond sea; some purchased safety by an
outward show of submission. Latin was the language
they perished in the flames at Oxford. Cardinal Pole
was made primate. One benefit was conferred on the
Church by Mary—she surrendered all the Church
lands, as well as the first-fruits and tenth, which had
been seized by Henry. At last the death of Mary (1558),
with which that of the cardinal was all but simultaneous, delivered the Church from its oppress-
ors. Under Elizabeth (1558-1603) Protestantism was
again in the ascendant; and by the various measures
which were taken, the Reformation in England
was completed. The Convocation of 1562, besides drawing
up the Thirty-nine Articles, published two volumes of
Latin Commentaries, and Latimer and Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, to draw up a catechism for
general use. See NOWELL.

"About this time the more extreme reforming party
began to appear (see PURITANS), and to exert their in-
fluence specially in all the questions which arose about
the quality of the various services; and the extreme jealousy of her supreme authority often ob-
structed the plans for reform which the more zealous
clergy contrived—a jealousy which brought her into
collision with the primate himself, as on the subject of
'the prophecies.' The works of the great Conti-


the famous Savoy Conference (q. v.) met, with Baxter as leader of the Presbyterian party, and Sheldon as that of the bishops, to try, if possible, to unite both sides. As might have been expected, the plan failed. In 1662 the Act of Uniformity was passed; and, rather than take the test it prescribed, 1900 Puritan clergy left the Church, and were ordained. The boldest stroke of persecution, followed those persecuting acts, the Corporation, Convocative, and Five-Miles Acts. Still further grievances were inflicted by the Test Act of 1672. Next arose another school of divines—"Christian philosophers rather than divines." Their lives were moral, but their metaphysics were grossly stupid. It was characterized by the word "philosophy." When a plan for "comprehension" was revived in 1668, the House of Commons prohibited such a measure being introduced. When James, duke of York, professed Roman Catholicism, Charles at once proclaimed complete toleration. This was in 1672; but the Commons the year following denied him to withdraw his indulgence. Popery they were determined to resist. When James came into power he proclaimed similar indulgencies, and forbade preaching against Romanist errors; say, in defiance of the enactment, that he would not admit the office of Commis- sion. These measures the clergy resisted. In consequence of his resistance, the bishop of London was suspended for a time. The University of Cambridge came into collision with the king, and also Magdalen College, Oxford. Rather than do what might advanta- ge the Church and the State, the University of Cam- bridge resolved to resist. But James renewed his declaration, and commanded that it should be published in the churches. Eighteen out of twenty-five bishops refused to do so, and nearly all the clergy. The bishops were compelled to cite the recusants, but they refused. Seven of them—Lloyd, Ken, Turner, Lake, White, and Trelawney—even drew up a remonstrance, and, as a consequence, were sent to the Tower. Their committal to it had rather the appearance of a triumphal entry, from the enthusiasm displayed by the people on their behalf. They were tried at Westminster Hall, and the name of their acquittal was received with rapturous delight on all hands, for all felt that they were committed to a struggle against an insidious attempt to restore Popery. The royal career of James was now ending, and his further school of Puritanism was not created, four of razing years in his reign. The Prince of Orange landed (5th of November, 1688). One of William's earliest acts was the passing of a tolera- tion bill in 1689; but an act of comprehension was rejected in the Commons. In September of that year a commission was appointed to revise the liturgy and canon law of the Church. Protestant proposals were rejected by Convocation. Three of the seven bishops mentioned above refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. They headed the party known as the Nonjurors, which ceased to exist as an independent Episcopalian Church in 1780; but many of them became attached to the Scotch Episcopalians" (Chambers, s. v.). See NONJURORS.

During the period just described a school of divines was formed who, in seeking to avoid Puritanism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other, became Lateranists of a sort. They became Christian philosophers rather than divines; and in an occasional dissertation on the Trinity or a Whitsunday sermon, in which the work of the Holy Spirit was carefully guarded against mystical abuses, they scarcely interfered with matters of Christian doctrine. Still they were a new element in the Church, and in their learned age remarkable for pastoral diligence. Amongst the leaders were Whitchothe, Cudworth, Wilkins, and Worthington; some of these were known to be men of emi- nent piety, but it was more apparent in their lives (and, since their deaths, by their private diaries) than in their preaching. They were equally afraid of super- stition on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the other. They loved the constitution of the Church, and were well satisfied with the liturgy; but they did not think all other forms unlawful. They wished to see a spirit of greater moderation. They continued on good terms with Nonconformists, and allowed great freedoms, not only in philosophical speculations, but in religious doctrine. The most radical of them were content with the reasonableness, rather than the scriptural warrant of the truths of religion, led them to be regarded as Socinians. They were all zealous against Popery; and the Papists cried them down, in return, as Atheists, Deists, or, at best, Socinians, and men of no principle at all. The sect of the sect was called by those who opposed them Socinians. Patrick, Lloyd, and Stillingsfleet were the greatest divines of the next generation, but still with the faults of the school in which they had been educated. They received, and long bore, the title of the Latitudinarian divines; and, in the sense in which we have explained it, the charge was just. They attended a divorce between evangelical doctrine and Chris- tian practice. The former they at first neglected, and at length lost out of sight; the latter they displayed with admirable clearness, and, if any other principles than those of the Gospel concomitant to it, they would not have so completely failed. But the founders of the school made no deep impression in the days of Charles II., and their still more gifted pupils saw religion in the Church of England almost expiring in spite of all their efforts" (Marsden, Churches and Churchmen, 1706-1806, sect. I. 1802). But the birth to two noble philanthropic schemes—the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which circulates Bibles, Prayer-books, and Tracts; and in 1701 the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was chartered. In 1747 Convocation was dissolved.

"That the Church of England, after fighting for its very existence against Popery on the one hand, and against Puritanism on the other, should have sub- sided into inactivity during the dull reigns of the Georges, is less a matter of surprise than of regret. The minds of men, even in a God-forsaken, not to say infidel age, may easily account for, though it cannot excuse, her idleness. But that in the rise of John Wesley, 1730, she should have fail- ed to see a grand opportunity for herself, is a matter both of regret and blame. For if, with all her resources, she cannot hope that such another will ever present itself. See Methodism; Wesley. The ut- most that can be hoped is that she has seen her error. The next important event in the history of the Church is the Act of Union, which came into effect on the 1st of May, 1801, as between all their altars. The effects of the Union of England and Ireland in all matters of doctrine, worship, and discipline. The Reformation had made some progress in Ireland under Edward VI. Five Protestant bishops were appointed in 1559, and the English Bible and Liturgy were introduced in 1551; but, from a variety of causes, the Reformed doctrines have never found much acceptance with the native population, and, although a Protestant Church was established by law, it was and is the Church of the minority. See IRELAND. In 1635 the English Articles were received, and in 1662 the English Book of Common Prayer was adopted. Before the political union of the countries, the two churches were in full communion. By an act of the imperial Parliament in 1833, ten of the Irish bishops were suppressed, and the funds thus obtained were applied to the augmenta- tion of small livings, and the building and repair of churches (Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s. v.). It is now proposed (1868) to "disestablish" the Episcopal Church in Ireland, and the proposal will doubtless be carried into effect.

In the progress of the 19th century great changes have passed over the Church of England. The forma- tion of the Church Missionary Society (see Mi-
ROMAN SOCIETIES), of the Bible Society, etc., and especially the influence of Methodism, awakened the long dormant spirit of aggressive Christianity. Since 1800 more than 3000 churches have been erected. About 1890 several earnest young men in the Universities adopted as a profession the study of the Bible, and of deep interest in Church questions. In reaction, perhaps, from the latitudinarianism of the 18th century, their studies lay chiefly in the fathers and mediaval writers, and in 1838 they began the publication of the Oxford tracts, calling for a revival of obsolete usages, and bringing an end to what had been called rationalism in views in theology. A brief history o. this movement is given under PUSEYISM; it must suffice to say here that many young clergymen, as the result of the movement, went over to Rome; and those of the school who remained gave rise to modern PUSEYISM (q. v.), which tends to import the spirit, doctrines, and practices of the Church of Rome into the Church of England. In the autumn of 1867 a conference of bishops of the Church of England, and of the churches in communion with the English, was held at Lambeth. The object of this assembly was to establish a closer union between all branches of the Anglican Church. A resolution censuring bishop Colenso, of Natal, for his deviation from the doctrine of the Church, was adopted by all save three votes. The pastoral letter, signed by the bishops, warned the people against bishops who have not been of the same mind in the controversies within the Church. A Greek translation of the pastoral letter was officially transmitted by the archbishop of Canterbury to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church. See PAN-ANGLICAN SYMPOSIUM. In order to promote the interest of intelligent laymen in the affairs of the Church, a "Church Congress" was called in 1860, which from that time has held annual sessions. See CHURCH CONGRESS. Several attempts were made by the High-Church party to introduce monastic institutions. Thus the Rev. Mr. Mac- kenzie, in 1867, published apon Asphanit of the Holy Cross, of which he was the first master. But thus far (1868) all these attempts have met with but little success. See MONASTICISM. The High-Church party exhibited a great desire to bring on a closer union with the bishops of the Church of England, and the Eastern Church, and, as the result, the Eastern Church Association (see below, STATISTICS), was established to promote the cause, and the Convocations of Canterbury and York gave their official approval of the scheme. See EASTERN CHURCHES, GREEK CHURCH, AND PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. Official communications for the same purpose were also opened with the Church of Sweden, but this step was strenuously opposed by one portion of the High-Church party on the ground that the Swedish Church held some heretical doctrines.

Governments and Government.—1. Church and State.—The constitution of the Reformed Church of England is that of an authorized and paid establishment, which is not allowed to persecute those who dissent from it" (Short). The union of Church and State was completely secured by the statutes that followed the union up to the Reformation. The English Church constitution remained nearly unchanged by the Reformation, only that the crown took the place of the pope. The course of subsequent legislation brought in, however, many important modifications of detail. The old statutes, though rarely enforced by law, except provisions for the incorporation and excommunication of Dissenters, have been generally respected. One of the most important of these was the Provisors (see above). The statute 25 of Henry VIII (1534), ch. xxi, declares entire independence of Rome, and calls the king supreme head of the Church of England, according to the recognition of its prelates and clergy. This statute abolishes Peter's pence, and provides for the visitation of monasteries by royal commission.

During the reign of Mary Poerpy was restored, but all the statutes to that effect were repealed by stat. 1 of Elizabeth (1558-9), which transfers the headship of the Church from the pope to the English crown, and declares the royal supremacy perpetual. Every form of spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction and preconocative is included in the declaration. The crown can exercise this authority through such officers as it may select, provided they be British subjects appointed by letters-patent. The act prescribes the oath of supremacy, to be taken by all civil and Spiritual officers. See OATH OR SWEAR TO THE CROWN. The coronation oath of Henry VIII (1559) restored the Common Prayer, and required the clergy to conform strictly to it. The statute 15 Eliz. c. 11 (1571), incorporated the 39 articles which had been agreed upon by the Convocation of 1562 into the law of the land. This act, with the laws of supremacy and state church and the coronation oath, gave a close control over the church, the government, the worship, and the doctrines of the Church. The queen, though subject to the Church order and doctrines, was invested with full power to govern the Church, and to fill the highest ecclesiastical offices. Church and State were fused together, for all citizens of the State were made members of the Church. The officers of the Church were officers of the State, and the head of the State was made head of the Church. The Revolution made several changes in the constitution of the Church. By stat. 1 William and Mary, c. vi (April, 1689), the coronation oath was modified. In it the king swore not merely to govern according to the old laws and customs, but also to maintain the laws of God and the true confession of the Gospel, and of the Protestant Reformed religion as by law established; and to "preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm and the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them." The 8th chapter substituted a new form of the oath of allegiance, in which the recognition of the king's ecclesiastical supremacy is left out, and in its place stands a promise to obey the king only in matters of the temporal government that princes excommunicated by the pope should be deposed and executed, and that a foreign potentate can have ecclesiastical authority within the realm. The same statute (ch. xviii) removed some penalties from the laws passed from Disenters, but considerably widened they took the oath of allegiance personally, or by proxy, in case of conscientious objection to taking the especial oaths of office. During the present century a number of acts have been passed annulling disabilities of Papists and Dissenters; and it is now the case that Dissenters and Romanists have religious freedom, are eligible to civil office, and are admitted to Parliament.

2. Government.—(1) The king is the supreme head of the Church of England on earth, in name and form. Formerly the clergy made the following subscription: "That the king of the Quean's) majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his highness' dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as ter- rapolal, etc.; but by an act of Parliament of July 5, 1665 (26th and 27th Vict. cap. 48), by which those bishops, ordained deacons or priests are required (1) to make a "Declaration of Assent" to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer, and to the Ordo of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; (2) to take the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy (21st and 22nd Vict. cap. 48) by which the bishop is to be faithful and bear true allegiance to the queen, and declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power,
superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. "The highest Church offices are filled by the ministry in the name of the crown. The Privy Council, in which only temporals vote, is the highest court of appeal." (2.) The management of the Church is in the hands of a hierarchy of archbishops and bishops, subject to the authority of the King and Parliament. The United Church of England and Ireland is divided into four provinces: two English, Canterbury and York; two Irish, Armagh and Dublin. These are four mutually independent archbishops. The bishops, as well as the archbishops, are spiritual rulers. Excluding the bishop last consecrated, and the bishop of Sodor and Man, who does not sit in the House of Lords unless he happens to be a peer in his own right. Archbishops are chosen by the crown from among the bishops. The sovereign also nominates the archbishops. The Church is governed, "under her majesty, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same" (Can. vii.). Archbishops and bishops alone have the power to ordain clergy; and these ordinations take place, according to canon law, at "allotted certain times," and ordained in their dioceses. The following are "regulae, or constitutions of churches;" and are commonly called "Ember weeks." Candidates for the ministry are usually graduates of Cambridge or Oxford, or Trinity College, Dublin, or else of Durham, Lampeter, or St. Bees; but the bishops are not bound to restrict ordinations to graduates of the universities. Rejected and unproved candidates take "the oath of supremacy," sign a declaration that they will conform to the liturgy, and subscribe three articles: the first affirming the supremacy of the sovereign in the Church; the second assenting to the Thirty-nine Articles; the third, that there is nothing contrary to the word of God, and that the ordained person will use the form of the said book; and the third, that they hold all "the Thirty-nine Articles." The candidate is first ordained a deacon, and so continues for one year. At the expiration of this term he is examined by a court, and when this is satisfactory, he is admitted by the bishop to the order of priest, or presbyter. Several of the presbyters, as well as the bishop, lay their hands simultaneously on the head of every candidate, while the bishop repeats the form prescribed in the ordination service. When once ordained, the candidate is permitted to take any duty or to hold any preferment in the Church. (3.) The country is divided into parishes, and many of these have been of late years subdivided. See PARISH. The property of the Church of England is obtained through many different channels, and is very valuable: the total revenue as estimated being not under seven millions a year; and yet so unequal is the distribution, that there are, out of 10,500 benefices, not less than 6000 with incomes under £300 a year; and of these there are 3460 livings whose annual value is under £150. The curates have a very inadequate compensation, the ordinary pay ranging, in large towns, from £70 to £150. The total number of benefices in 1890 was 14,200. Of late some reforms have been effected by the Parliament. There is a special board of "ecclesiastical commissions for England, to administer the state patronage of ecclesiastical benefices. In their twenty-ninth report, issued in 1868, they state that in the current year they expect to complete the scheme which, in their report of 1864, they proposed to accomplish within five years. Every living with less income than £300 a year which then existed, and contained, according to the census of 1861, a population of 4000 persons, will, on the Ist of March, 1869, have had its income raised to £300 a year, except those cases in private patronage where the one half of the augmentation which the patrons were required to provide from non-ecclesiastical sources has not been forthcoming. In their report of 1853 the commissioners referred to an arrangement which had been entered into with the dean and chapter of York, whereby the caputal estates (subject to subsisting leases) had become vested in the commissioners, and in lieu thereof the dean and chapter were to receive an annuity until the commissioners should restore to them real estates in possession calculated to produce an income equal to such annuity; and it was estimated that the arrangement would at a future date yield a considerable surplus for the augmentation of small livings. At the close of 1832 the chapter of Carlisle effected a similar commutation with the archbishop. By this commutation it was agreed that all the improved revenue derived from the better management of caputal property should be appropriated to the augmentation of caputal incomes, and to the improvement of cathedral institutions. In 1856 a committee of the House of Commons sat to consider the proceedings of the ecclesiastical commissaries, and in their third report set out the details of the York chapter commutation, and obverse, Such agreements tend to facilitate enfranchisement, and to provide funds for the endowment of poor livings, as well as to afford a ready means of providing estates in possession for the augmentation of the clerical incomes following the reforms of 1845. The chapters of Peterborough and Chester; in 1855, the chapter of Gloucester; in 1856, St. Asaph; in 1857, Worcester; in 1860, Chichester; in 1861, Winchester and Salisbury; in 1862, Bristol, Canterbury, and Exeter; in 1865, Wells, Rochester, and St. David's; at the above dates. At the time, therefore, the chapter of York, the two largest in England, had been, or were in the process of, or had adopted, or were adopting, such arrangements. All these arrangements have been successively sanctioned by orders in council. Commutations have thus been effected with no fewer than eighteen chapters. Under these commutations the chapters gave up their ancient estates in consideration of annual money payments to be received by them, pending their re-endowment with real estates in possession; and in 1862 the permanent estate of the chapter of York; in 1863, that of Peterborough; in 1865, those of Carlisle and Chichester; in 1866, those of Chester, Gloucester, and Canterbury; and in 1867, that of Winchester, were reassigned. As a consequence, the commissioners, in the period between 1861 and 1868, considered the local claims of the parochial curates upon the estates of the chapters of York, Peterborough, Carlisle, Chester, and Chichester, as far as the value of the parochial curates would permit, the requisite grants were made to such parochial curates." See below, Patronage and Statistics. (4.) The only ecclesiastical assembly of the English Church is Convocation (q. v.), which is a convention of the clergy to discuss Church affairs in time of Parliament. As the church consists of two distinct houses, so does this Convocation; the one called the upper house, where the archbishops and bishops sit severally by themselves; the other the lower house, where the rest of the clergy are represented by their deputies. The power of the Convocation is limited by a statute of Henry VIII. They are not to make any canons or ecclesiastical laws without the royal license; nor, when permitted to make any, can they put them in execution but under severe restrictions. In the year 1661 the English Convocation granted a subsidy to the king Charles II., which in the state of the church was paid by the English clergy; for, by an arrangement made between archbishop Sheldon and lord chancellor Clarendon in 1664, the Convocation of the clergy thenceforward gave up the privilege of taxing themselves to the House of Commons, in consideration of being allowed to vote at the election of members of that house (Eden). Of late, the Convocations, both of Canterbury and York, have again been permitted to meet, talk, vote addresses to the crown, etc., but they have no real power. See Convocation. (5.) Comm.—In the Convocation which met at the time of the Parliament of 1601, the canons by which
the Church of England is still governed were passed. They are said to have been collected by Bancroft from the canons of the ancient Church, and the articles, inclusions, and acts of Convocation during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. They received the royal sanction, but were not carried through the two houses of Parliament, and are not, therefore, of the present day. They bind the clergy only, and by virtue of their promise of canonical obedience. Many of them have been virtually repealed by subsequent enactments, especially the Toleration Act. Many of those that remain look ill. Many wise and winsome members of the Church would gladly see them repealed. See Canons of the Church of England.

(6.) Patronage.—The theory of the Church of England is that whoever originally built a church is entitled to choose his minister in perpetuity—i.e. the patron of a living. What is inconsistent with this is from a Church of England writer (Marsden, Churches and Sects, i, 332): "In a few instances this right is still vested in the descendants of the original patron, but these must be rare. The right of patronage is now a salable commodity, transferred, or sold by auction; and the successor, like any other real property, and the patronage of the Church of England is consequently disposed wherever wealth has found its way: 1144 benefices are in the gift of the crown; 1853 in that of the bishops; 938 in that of cathedral chapters and other dignitaries: 770 in that of the universities; 695 in that of the deanery, and 631 in the different vicarages of perpetual curacies in the incumbent of the mother church. The good and evil of this system are so nearly balanced that thoughtful and wise men are to be met with every day who, as they look at this mutable order of things, like any other real property, are disposed to cherish it as the nearest approach that is ever likely to be made in practice to a perfect theory; or, on the other hand, to reject it as unjust and full of danger. Its evils lie upon the surface, and they are by no means slight. It has a tendency to promote a system of disputes among the clergy respecting the propriety of subscribing to any human formulary of religious sentiments. Parliament, in 1772, was applied to for the abolition of the subscription by certain clergymen and others, whose petition received the most ample discussion, but was rejected by a large majority. It is by no means an unusual fact that almost all Calvinists, both in and out of the Church, that the doctrinal parts of the articles are Calvinistic. This opinion, however, has been warmly controverted. It is no doubt nearer the truth to conclude that the articles are framed with comprehensive latitude, and that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism was in any way deliberately established (Watson, s. v. Church). See Fuller's Moderation of the Church of England considered, 1679 (new edit. Lond. 1843, 8vo); and also see Arminianism, vol. i, p. 416, 417; Articles Lambeth, vol. i, p. 441. The articles contain, however, what the Church of England holds to be a fair scriptural account of the leading doctrines of Christianity, together with a condemnation of what she considers to be the principal errors of the Church of Rome and of certain Protestant sects. As far as they go (and there are many things unnoted by them), they are a legal definition of the doctrines of the Church of England and Ireland, though the members of that communion look to the Prayer-book as well as to the articles for the genuine expression of her faith. The articles are far more thoroughly Protestant than the Prayer-book, taken as a whole. Although the articles expressly assert that the Church of Rome has erred, attempts have repeatedly been made by the High-Church party of the Church of England to show that there is no irreconcilable difference between the Thirty-nine Articles and the decrees of the Councils. Other methods of construing the articles and the Councils may be put upon them fully harmonizing them. To show this was, in particular, the object of
Dr. Newman's celebrated tract (Tracts for the Times, No. 90, Oxf. 1888), and more recently of Dr. Pusey's Eirenicus (Lond. 1865; N. Y. 1866). See also Christ. Remembrancer, Jan. 1866, art. vi.

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

(3.) In practice there is no definite creed or system of theology in the Church of England. The term "Liturgy" has always been divided into two parts. There has always been a Sacramentary party, approximating in doctrine to the teachings of Rome, though it has never had great influence since Laud's time until the recent rise of Puseyism (q. v.). And, on the other hand, there have never been strong objections to the doctrines of the Puritan or Evangelical school. The latter party finds its stronghold in the Articles, the former in the Liturgy. At present a division prevails into three great sections, which are styled High-Church, Low-Church (or Evangelical), and Broad-Church. The first party holds to apostolical representation, the disputed rights of episcopacy, and generally adheres to the sacramentarian view of the Church's life. The Puseyites have been drawn chiefly from this party. The Low-Church, or Evangelical party, holds, in general, that episcopacy is not essential to the being of the Church, though some hold it can add to its high estime. The Low-Churchmen recognize the claims of Presbyterians and dissenters as members of Christ's body. In doctrine they are chiefly Calvinists. The Broad-Church party, though of recent origin, is the number of the most cultured men in the Church, such as Kingsley, Moxon, Sterley, and, in fact, most of Dr. Arnold's pupils and sympathizers. The tendency of this party is towards what is called liberal Christianity.

At the present time (1868) the Church of England is agitated by proposals of change on many sides. Archbishop Wilberforce, who went over to Rome some years ago, issued an "explanation," in which he inquires how far the popular principle of subscription to the English formularies is compatible with the rule of Church authority. The system he believes to be altogether new, while it has not even the merit of being able to settle the differences which exist among individual churchmen. He says: "The difficulty becomes greater when it is considered that the clergy are divided into various parties, who are widely opposed to one another in almost every particular. It may be allowable, perhaps, to employ the method of a recent reviewer, who has distributed them into three classes, which he designates as High, Low, and Broad. The last may be expected to be comparatively inattentive to matters of doctrine, regarding the Church as a "societas literaria," designed merely to raise the standard of morals and ameliorate the manners of men. But the High and Low agree in one point, if in nothing else, that to contend for the truth is the first duty of Christians. They differ, however, respecting almost every point of doctrine. One believes the Church to be the body of Christ, inhabited by his Spirit; the other supposes it to be little more than a religious club. One believes in the re-generation and the real presence; the other speaks of the sacraments as if they were only acted services. One affirms Christ to speak by the voice of his priests, and that this sin requires absolution; the other affirms that the priest's words are no more effectual than those of the judge or clerk. The former, in the most unerring fashion, points to the word the Broad, who lie between them, subscribe to the same formularies, which they interpret avowedly in contradictory senses, and from which they deduce the most opposite results. If this all does not arise from the laxity of those who subscribe, but from the ingenuity of their lapses and from the certainty of the gospels, it is the most perfect instance of the sacrilegious expression whem the world has known." Subscription to the English formularies, he says, was originally imposed, and is still rendered by High-churchmen, on the principle that the Church's judgment should guide his conscience; and precisely the same spirit with which the Church of England has transferred the decision respecting doctrines to the civil power, and that the most opposite statements respecting matters of faith are taught under her sanction. See Goodwin Case.

There are also in England relations to the Church, "as the members of the same society," "five words of Declaration of Principles and Objects" we extract the following: "The members of this society are moved by such 'weighty and important considerations' as arise from the 'exigencies of these present times, to seek farther 'changes and alterations' in the Church-book, as of which, as the most necessary, they now proceed to specify: 1. The Rubric: the word priest to be changed. 2. The Ordination Service: words abused to the purposes of sacerdotal assumption to be altered. 3. The Visitation of the Sick: the absolution to be omitted or qualified. 4. The Baptismal Office: words asserting the spiritual regeneration of each recipient to be altered. 5. The Catechism to be revised. 6. The Burial Service: general language to be employed in expressing hope for the departed. 7. The Aethanasian Creed: the dammatory clauses to be omitted. 8. The Apocryphal Lessons to be substituted." Some of these changes have been adopted. It is chiefly the English Church and its constituent bodies which have been affected.

At present (1868) Romanizing tendencies are plainly on the increase in the Church of England, and there is apparent danger of a total separation of many ministers and members of this Church from the common faith of the reformed churches organized in the 16th century. The High-Church party has several schools, one of which (the Old School), while gladly conciliating in all efforts for widening the breach between the Church and the sects, yet continues in earnest opposition to the errors of Rome. Others, looking more at what is common to the Church of Rome and the Church of England, recognize the necessity of hoping that the Church of Rome, by means of an "Episcopal" movement, will gradually come over to the Anglican ground. This party builds great hopes especially upon the movements in Italy of such men as cardinal Andrea and Passaglia. There is, finally, an extreme party, which makes every other consideration subordinate to the desire to establish the union with Rome, and which has of late proceeded farther in this direction as a party than has ever been done before. It is this party which in 1867 sent a letter to cardinal Fischi asking for some form of union from Rome. It also aims at re-establishing monastic orders, and is specially conspicuous by its "Ritualistic"
innovations in divine worship, endeavoring to conform the service altogether to that of the Roman and Eastern churches. Until recently this party was more noted for zeal and fervor than for intelligence and ecclesiastical standing, but the conversion of 1866 afforded immense advantage by the open declaration of Dr. Pusey in their favor. In his Eirenicon (1866, 12mo) he explains away the chief doctrinal differences between the Articles and the Catechism of Trent, though, at the same time, he treats severely the personal infallibility of the Church of Rome; and the Methodists of this branch of the Roman Church. Dr. Pusey also advocates the confessional and monastic life. The latest development of this school is to be found in the series of volumes entitled The Church and the World (edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley).

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


Eastเวรันนิชั่ม in 1799. Its work is chiefly among the natives of the countries in which its missions are established. Its Church income in 1866-67 was £13,927, and in 1868-69, £24,639. 18. The Colonial and Continental Church Society. Its leading object is to send clergymen, catechists, and teachers of the Church of England to settlers in the English colonies, and to British subjects in other parts of the world, at a yearly income for 1868-69 of £1,971, for 1867-68, £16,501. 14. The English Church Union was formed in 1859 for the purpose of "watching over the interests of the Church of England; of resisting, by a combination of its members, the attempts of dissenters and others to alienate the faith and injure the peace of the Church; and also for the purpose of developing its internal energies." It is intended to be the central organ of the High-Church party. The union is managed by a council of twenty-four elected and five ex-officio members, thirteen of these being clergymen and the remaining sixteen laymen. 15. The Association for the promotion of the Unity of Christendom was formed in 1857 for the purpose of uniting in a bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican communions. The members promise to use daily a brief prayer for the peace and unity of the Church. In 1865 the association numbered 8,827 members, divided as follows: Roman Catholics, 1,271; Orientals, including Servians and Armenians, 360; uncertain or miscellaneous, 75; Anglicans, 7,121. 16. The Eastern Church Association was founded in 1857. Its object was stated to be to inform the English public as to the state and position of the Eastern Christians; to make known the principles and doctrines of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East; to take advantage of all opportunities which the providence of God shall afford for intercommunication between the orthodox Church, and also for friendly intercourse with the other ancient churches of the East; to assist, as far as possible, the bishops of the orthodox Church in their efforts to promote the spiritual welfare and the education of their flocks. It counts among its members English, Scotch, American, colonial, and Greek bishops.

17. The Anglo-Continental Society has for its object to make the principles of the English Church known in the different countries of Europe and throughout the world, and to aid in the reformation of national churches and other religious communities. 18. The Church Association was established in 1868-69 as the central organization of Low-Churchmen. Its chief object is to counteract and prevent the spreading of High-Church and Romanizing tendencies in the Church. 19. The South American Missionary Society, established in 1859, is set to send missionaries to the native tribes of South America, to Englishmen in spiritual destitution there, and to take advantage of any opening for evangelization. Its means was in 1866-67, £7,431, and in 1867-68, £12,008. 20. Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics. According to the nineteenth annual report, published in May, 1868, the income was £25,577. The year before was £22,501. 21. The London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, established in 1809. The officers must be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, and, if foreigners, of a Protestant Church. Its income was in 1866-67, £33,927, and in 1867-68, £33,925.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Bodies</th>
<th>Places of Worship</th>
<th>Number of Sittings</th>
<th>Estimate of Church Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>14,077</td>
<td>5,317,926</td>
<td>5,411,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other religious denominations</td>
<td>29,590</td>
<td>4,084,648</td>
<td>3,247,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Besides the national universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Durham University and King's College, London, the Church of England has its theological institutions: St. Bees (Cumberland), with 80 students, and St. Aidan's (Birkenhead), with 63 students; also a training department at Birmingham College, the London College of Divinity at St. John's Wood, and Lampeter College, Wales.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Population of Diocese in 1881</th>
<th>Number of Clergy</th>
<th>Number of Parishes</th>
<th>Average Population to each Clergy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>474,603</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>930,316</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>8,579,049</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>11,418</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>530,006</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>3,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>1,367,794</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Asaph</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>196,890</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath and Wells</td>
<td>427,827</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>344,941</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>1,245,016</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>863,785</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Davids</td>
<td>359,879</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>450,710</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>585,183</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester and</td>
<td>424,610</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>342,401</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>313,414</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>584,204</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>406,092</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>413,356</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1,417,394</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>2,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>667,104</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>515,053</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>496,977</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>1,103,894</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>509,914</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>317,327</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodor and Man</td>
<td>56,499</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>557,755</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for England and Wales | 20,309,671 | 17,687 | 12,389 | 1,000 |

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

V. Literature.—The early historians are Gildas (6th century), De Britannice excidio, etc. (transl. by Giles, Lond. 1841, 1842); Bede, Hist. Eccles. Anglorum (Opera, ed. Giles, 12 vols. 1843, vol. ii); Gildas Cambrensis,

Historians: Stillingfleet, Origines Britannica (1710; new edit. Oxford, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); Usher, Brit. Ecclesiarum Antiquitatis (1586, 4to; Works, 16 vols. Dublin, 1725); Barlow, History of Britain (Lond. 1846, 12mo); Churton, Early English Church (Lond. 1858, 3d ed. 18mo); Soames, Anglo-Saxon Church (Lond. 1829, 2d edit. 8vo); ib. Doctrines of Anglo-Saxon Church (Hampton Lecture, 1830); ib. Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times (Lond. 1848, 8vo); ib. The English Religious History (Lond. 1834, 8vo); ib. Reformations (Lond. 1852-5, 4 vols. 8vo); Fuller, Church History of Great Britain (1655, fol.; new edit. Lond. 1837, 3 vols. 8vo; Warner, Ecclesiastical History of England (1763, 2 vols. fol.); Inett, Origines Anglicæ, History from 6th century to death of King John, 13 vols. fol. (new edit. Oxford, 1855, 3 vols. 8vo); Carwihen, History of the Church of England (Oxford, 1849, 2d edit. 2 vols. 12mo); Grant, Summary of the History of the English Church and of the Sects, etc. (Lond. 1811-1821, 4 vols. 8vo); Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain (1736, fol.; new ed. by Barber, Lond. 1840, 9 vols. 8vo); Arundel, Compendious History of the British Churches (Edinb. 1820, 2d edit. 1823, 2 vols. 8vo); Baxter, Church History of England (2d ed. Lond. 1849, 8vo); Short, Sketch of the History of the Church of England to 1688 (Lond. 1840, 3d edit. 8vo); Anderson, History of the Church of England in the Colonies (Lond. 1856, 2d edit. 3 vols. 8vo); Annual American Cyclopedia, 1863, and all the following volumes, art. Anglican Church.

On the history of the English Reformation, see REFORMATION. For general statistics of Christianity in the British islands, see GREAT BRITAIN; IRELAND; SCOTLAND.

Engles, Joseph Patterson, D.D., was born in Philadelphia Jan. 3, 1793. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, and graduated in July, 1811. In 1818 he was appointed co-master of the grammar-school in the same institution with Rev. Dr. S. B. How. In 1817, Rev. Dr. S. B. Wylie and Mr. Engles founded an academy, under the name of the Christian, at Mr. Dyer's, which Mr. Wylie rejoined until February, 1845, when he was elected publishing agent of the Presbyterian Board of Publication. He continued in this position until his death. Mr. Engles was a member and elder of the Scots Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, having joined that church at the age of twenty, and very soon after having been chosen an elder of the same. Besides writing several smaller volumes for children and youth, he edited an edition of the Greek Testament, with various readings. He died suddenly on the night of April 14, 1861, of a disease of the heart from which he had been suffering for about a year.

Engles, William Morrison, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia Oct. 12, 1797, and was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated A.B. in 1815. After studying theology under the Rev. Dr. S. B. Wylie (q. v.), he was licensed to preach in 1818, and in 1820 became pastor of the Seventh Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, which office he filled faithfully until his health failed in 1834, when he became editor of The Presbyterian. He edited that journal for over thirty years. In 1838 the Presbyterian Board of Publication made him their editor of books and tracts, and he continued in that work with great success till 1863. In one of their publications, it is stated that "the Board of Publication is probably more largely indebted to Dr. Engles than to any other one man for its existence and its usefulness, especially during the first twenty years of its history." Besides his constant editorial work, he wrote a number of small books on practical religion, many of which had a wide circulation. Of one of them, the Soldier's Pocket-book for Boys and Girls, is said to have been circulated among our soldiers during the civil war. He died in Philadelphia Nov. 27, 1867.—American Annual Cyclopaedia, vii. 296.

English Versions of the Bible. Passing over the Latin in the Roman Church, which, long struggling with the indifference or opposition of men in power, the religious condition of the people as calling for, or affected by, the appearance of the translation, the time, and place, and form of the successive editions by which the demand, when once created, was supplied—all of which is given under more appropriate titles—we shall here aim to give an account of the several versions as they appeared; to ascertain the qualifications of the translators for the work which they undertook, and the principles on which they acted; to form an estimate of the final result of their labours; and, in the account which we give of this, of the necessity or desirability of a new or revised translation; and, finally, to give such a survey of the literature of the subject as may help the reader to obtain a fuller knowledge for himself. In doing this we shall substantially adopt so much of Prof. Plumptre's A History and Character of English Translations, as relates to the subject. The present article has been carefully revised by the Rev. T. J. Conant, D.D., of Brooklyn.

1. Early Translators. — It was asserted by Sir Thomas More, in his dialogue with a point against Tyndal, that he had seen English translations of the Bible which had been made before Wylye, and that these were approved by the bishops, and were allowed by them to be read by laymen, and even by devout women (Dialogues, ch. vii.-xiv, col. 82). There seem good grounds, however, for denying the accuracy of this statement. No such translations—versions, i. e. of the entire Scriptures—are now extant. No traces of them appear in any contemporary writer. Wylye's great complaint is that there is no translation (Foshall and Madden, Wylye's Bible, Pref. p. xxii). The Constitution and Covenants (1648), which Arundel (A.D. 1408) mention two only, and these are Wylye's own, and the one based on his and completed after his death. More's statement must therefore be regarded either as a rhetorical exaggeration of the fact that parts of the Bible had been previously translated, or as arising out of a mistake as to the date of MSS. of the Wylye version. The history of the English Bible will therefore begin, as it has begun hitherto, with the work of the first great reformer. One glance, however, we may give, in passing, to the earlier history of the English Church, and connect some of its most important times with the great work of making the truths of Scripture, or parts of the books themselves, if not the Bible as a whole, accessible to the people. We may think of Cædmon as embodying the whole history of the Bible in the alliterative metre of Anglo-Saxon verse, Bede, Heliand, and Alcuin. Alnold, bishop of Sherborne, in the 7th century, as rendering the Psalter; and Bede, as translating in the last hours of his life the Gospel of John (Epist. Cuthberti); of Alfred, setting forth in his mother tongue, as the great ground-work of his legislation, the four chapters of Exodus (xx.-xxiii) that contained the first code of the laws of Israel (Paul's Life of Alfred, chap. v). The wishes of the great king extended further. He desired that "all the free-born youth of his kingdom should be able to read the English Scriptures" ("En- glish writt"), which, however, may merely denote English literature in general (Ebd.). Portions of the
Bible, some of the Psalms, and extracts from other books, were translated by him for his own use and the use of his family. A tradition of the time, not now generally believed, is that the translator was not watching over his work in the presence of his master, but that he was translating the whole Bible (ibid., supp. to chap. v). The work of translating was, however, carried on by others. One Anglo-Saxon version of the four gospels, made by the abbot of Jutlington, and known as the Durham book, is found in the Cottonian MSS. of the British Museum, and is referred to the 9th or 10th century. Another, known as the Rushworth Glos, and belonging to the same period, is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Another, of a somewhat later date, perhaps the best text of the whole book, is in a manuscript in the library of Corpus-Christi College, Cambridge. The name of Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, is connected with a version of the Psalms; that of Aelfric with an epitome of Scripture history, including a translation of many parts of the historical books of the Bible (Lewis, Hist. of Transl. pp. 363-376). The influence of the Norms, ecclesiastics, in the reigns that preceded and followed the Conquest, was probably adverse to the continuance of this work. They were too far removed from the practices of the Bible, and were less likely to educate in their own tongue. The spoken dialects of the English of that period would naturally seem to them too rude and uncouth to be the channel of divine truth. Pictures, mysteries, miracle plays, rather than books, were the instruments of education for the ignorant. The Norman and Norman, or Italian, superstition, devoted themselves to the study of theology or law. In the remoter parts of England, however, where their influence was less felt, or the national feeling was stronger, there were those who carried on the succession, and three versions of the Bible, the Latin of the Bodleian, the French of Cambidge, in the Bodleian, and in the British Museum, belonging to the 11th or 12th century, remain to attest their labors. The metrical paraphrase of the Gospel history known as the Ormulum, in alliterative English verse, ascribed to the latter half of the 12th century, is the next conspicuous monument, and may be looked upon as indicating a desire to place the facts of the Bible within reach of others than the clergy. The 13th century, a time in England, as throughout Europe, of religious revival, witnessed renewed attempts. A prose version of the Bible in the Latin of the French, circ. A.D. 1260, indicates a desire for devotional reading within the circle of the court, or of the wealthier merchants, or of convents for women of high rank. Farther signs of the same desire are found in three English versions of the Psalms—two—towards the opening of the 13th century; another by Scroby, in the O.T., and N.T., by Richard Rolle, of Hampole, circ. 1489; the last being accompanied by a devotional exposition— and in one of the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and of all Paul's epistles (the list includes the apocryphal epistle to the Laodicenes), in the library of Corpus-Christi College, Cambridge. The fact stated by archbishop Arundel in his funeral sermon on Anne of Bohemia, wife of Richard II, that she habitually read the Gospels in the vulgar tongue, with divers expositions, was probably true of many others of high rank. It is interesting to note that the facts may be distracting from the glory of the great reformer of the 14th century, but as showing that for himself also there had been a preparation; that what he supplied met a demand which had for many years been gathering strength. It is almost needless to add that these versions started from nothing better than the copies of the Vulgate, more or less accurate, which every translator had before him (Lewis, ch. i; Forshall and Madden, Preface). II. Wycliffe (born 1324, died 1384).—1. It is singular, and without significance, that the first translation from the Bible connected with the name of Wycliffe should have been that of part of the Apocalypse. The last argument for 'pre-Christian' or 'pure Christian' interpreters of the Gospel, with the comyn sentence of the old holie doc- tores' ('Preface'). Wycliffe, however, though the chief, was not the only laborer in the cause. The circle of English readers was becoming wider, and they were not content to have the book which they honored at Cambridge in a tongue that was not, that is, in a tongue of translation and commentary appear to have been made about the same time, in ignorance of Wycliffe's work, and for the 'manie widuw men that gladde would kon the Gospels, if it wer draughten into the English tong.' The fact that many MSS. of this period are extant, English in English, a Monmouthian, or Har- mony of the Gospels, accompanied by portions of the Epistles, or portions of the O.T., or an epitome of Scripture history, or the substance of Paul's epistles, or the Catholic Epistles at full length, with indications more or less of Wycliffe's interest, shows how widespread was the feeling that the time had come for an English Bible (Forshall and Madden, Pref. p. xiii-xvii). These preliminary labors were followed up by a complete translation of the N. T. by Wycliffe himself. The O.T. was undertaken by his coadjutor, Nicholas de Hereford, but the work was completed only by a citation to appear before archbishop Arundel in 1382, and ends abruptly (following so far the order of the Vulgate) in the middle of Baruch. Many of the MSS. of this version now extant present a different recession of the text, and it is probable that the work of Wycliffe was revised and expurgated by the hand of Purvey, circ. A.D. 1388. To him also is ascribed the interesting Prologue, in which the translator gives an account both of his purpose and his method (Forshall and Madden, Pref. p. xxv). 2. The former was one of Wycliffe that had been, to give an English Bible to the English people. He appeals to the authority of Bede, of Alfred, and of Gros- tete, to the examples of 'Frenshe, and Beemers (Boh- hemians), and Britons.' He answers the hypocritical objections that men were not holy enough for such a work; that 'it was not right for the great doctors of the Church had left undone. He hopes 'to make the sentence as trewe and open in Englishe as it is in Latine, or more trewe and open.' It need hardly be said, as regards the method of the translator, that the version was based upon the Vul- gate (comp. Gen. iii. 15: 'Ske she trede thy head'). If, in the previous century, scholars like Grostete and Roger Bacon, seeking knowledge in other lands, and from men of other races, had acquired, as they seem to have done, some knowledge both of Greek and He- brew, the succession had, at all events, not been per- petuated. The war to be waged at a later period with a different issue between scholastic philosophy and 'humanity' ended, in the first struggle, in the tri- umph of the former, and there was probably no one at Oxford among Wycliffe's contemporaries who could have helped him or Purvey in a translation from the original. Bearing in mind the complaint that 'learned doctors taken litle heed to the letter,' the recognition that the Vulgate was not all sufficient, that 'the texte of oure bokis' (he is speaking of the Psalter, and the difficulty of under- standing it) 'is discreet from much from the Ewren' (which knowledge is, however, at second hand, 'bi witness of Jerom, of Lire, and other expositurors'). The diffi- culty which was thus felt was increased by the state of the Vulgate text. The translator complained that what the Church had in view was not Jerome's ver-
sion, but a later and corrupt text; that "the common Latynne Bibles han more neede to be corrected as manie as I have seen in my life, than hath the English Bibo ble late translated." To remedy this he had recourse to collation. Many MSS. were compared, and out of this comparison the true reading ascertainment as far as possible. The next step was to consult the Glossa Ordinaria, the commentaries of Nicholas de Lyra, and others, as to the meaning of any difficult passages. After this (we recognise here, perhaps, a departure from the right order) grammars were consulted. Then came the actual translation, which he aimed at making idiomatic rather than literal. As he went on, he submitted his work to the judgment of others, and accepted their suggestions. It is interesting to trace these early strivings after the true excellence of a translator; yet more interesting to take note of the spirit in which the _Peregrine's Tudem Englished_ are put into the English, in which the work was done. Nowhere do we find the conditions of the work, intellectual and moral, more solemnly asserted. "A translator hath greate need to study well the sentence, both before and after," so that no equivocal words may mislead his readers or himself. He hath to make of the language of the country a clear medium of modern life, and be full devout in preiers, and have not his wit occupied about worldly things, that the Holy Spirity, author of all wisdom, and cunning, and truth, dresse (=train) him in his work, and suffer him not for to err" (Forshall and Madden, _Pr. p. 69_).

9. The quotation translated by this version may be estimated from the fact that, in spite of all the chances of time, and all the systematic efforts for its destruction made by archbishop Arundel and others, not less than 150 copies are known to be extant, some of them purposely made for persons of wealth and rank, others apparently for humbler readers. It is significant as bearing, either on the date of the two works or on the position of the writers, that while the quotations from Scripture in Langton's _Vision of Piers Plowman_ are uniformly given in Latin, those in Tyndale's are given in English, which for the most part agree substantially with Wycliffe's translation.

4. The following characteristics may be noticed as distinguishing this version: (1) The general holiness of its style. The language of the court or of scholars, as it then was, he hath not used and that of the people followed. In this respect the principle has been acted on by later translators. The style of Wycliffe is to that of Chaucer as Tyndale's is to Surrey's, or that of the A.V. to Ben Jonson's. (2) The substitution, in many cases, of English equivalents for quasi-sacred terms. We find instead of "Raca" (Matt. v. 22), "they were washed" in Matt. iii. 6; "richesse" for "mammon" (Luke xvi. 9, 11, 13); "bishop" for "high-priest" (papst). (3) The extreme literalness with which, in some instances, even at the cost of being unintelligible, the Vulgate text is followed, as in 2 Cor. i. 17-19.

III. TYNDALE.—The work of Wycliffe stands by itself. Whatever power it exercised in preparing the way for the Reformations of the 16th century, it had no perceptible influence on later translations. By the reign of Henry VI. its English was already obsolete, and the revival of classical Scholarship led men to feel dissatisfied with a version which had avowedly been made at second-hand, not from the original. With Tyndale, on the other hand, we enter on a continuous succession. He is the patriarch, in no remote ancestry. He was the first to introduce the Vernacular Version, unsuavating purpose, he devoted his whole life to this one work, and, through dangers and difficulties, amid enemies and treacherous friends, in exile and loneliness, accomplished it. More than Cranmer or Ridley, he is the true hero of the English Reformation. While they were slowly moving onwards, ballotting between two opinions, watching how the court-winds blew, or, at the best, making the most of opportunities, he set himself to the task without which, he felt sure, reform would be impossible, which, once accomplished, would render it inevitable. "Ere many years," he said, at the age of thirty-six (A.D. 1520), he would cause "a boy that driveth the plough" to know more of Scripture than the Latin clerics. The clergy then knew (Foxe, in Anderson's _Annals of English Bible_, i. 30). We are able to form a fairly accurate estimate of his fitness for the work to which he thus gave himself. The change which had come over the English Universities since the time of Wycliffe had affected those of England as it had been taught in Paris in 1458. The first Greek Gram mar, that of Constantine Lascaris, had been printed in 1476. It was followed in 1480 by Crastan's _Lexicon_. The more enterprising scholars of Oxford visited the universities for the sake of the new printed books. Grocyn (d. 1519), Linacre (d. 1524), Colet (d. 1519), had, in this way, from the Greeks whom the fall of Constantinople had scattered over Europe, or from their Italian pupils, learned enough to enter, in their turn, upon the work of teaching. When Erasmus visited Oxford in 1501 he found in it a clear network of University schools which even he could admire. Tyndale, who went to Oxford cir. 1500, must have been within the range of their teaching. His two great opponents, Sir Thomas More and bishop Tongstal, are known to have been among their pupils. It is significant enough that, after some time in Cambridgetyndale left Oxford to go to Cambridge. Such changes were, it is true, common enough. The fame of any great teacher would draw around him men from other universities, from many lands. In this instance, the reason of Tyndale's choice is probably not far to seek (Walker, _Bieg. Notice to Tyndale's Decretal Trecnsites_; Erasmus was in Cambridge from 1500 to 1514. All that we know of Tyndale's character and life, the fact especially that he had made translations of portions of the N.T. as early as 1502 (Offer, _Life of Tyndale_, p. 9), leads to the conclusion that the presence of one who was emphatically the scholar and philologist of Europe. It must be remembered, too, that the great scheme of cardinal Ximenes was just then beginning to interest the minds of all scholars. The publication of the Complutensian Bible, it is true, did not take place till 1514, but it was the means of stimulus, and other preparations for it began as early as 1504. In the mean time Erasmus himself, in 1516, brought out the first published edition of the Greek Testament, and it was thus made accessible to all scholars. Of the use made by Tyndale of these opportunities we have evidence by his correspondence; and there is no reason to doubt that in the vain hope of persuading Tongstal (known as a Greek scholar, an enlightened Humanist) to sanction his scheme of rendering the N.T. into English, and bringing a translation of one of the orations of Isocrates as a proof of his capacity for the work. The attempt was not successful. "At the last I understood not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the N.T., but also that there was no place to do it in all England" (Prof. _Frc. Books of Moses_).
Roger Bacon knew enough to pass judgment on the Vulgate as incorrect and misleading. Then, however, came a period in which linguistic studies were thrown into the background, and Hebrew became an unknown speech even to the best-read scholars. The first signs of a revival meet us towards the close of the 15th century. The remarkable fact that a Hebrew Psalter was printed at Venice in 1472 (from Erasmus's Greek Testament), the Pentateuch in 1482, the Prophets in 1486, the whole of the O.T. in 1488, by which 1496 four editions had been published, and by 1596 not fewer than eleven (Whitaker, *Nat. and Crit. Inquiry*, p. 22), indicates a demand for Hebrew books in Christendom, especially in the Latin countries of Europe, not less than on that of the more learned Jews. Here also the progress of the Complutensian Bible would have attracted the notice of scholars.  

The cry raised by the "Trojans" of Oxford in 1519 (chiefly consisting of the friars, who from the time of Wycliffe had all but swamped the education of the place) against the first Greek lectures—that to study that language would make men pagans, that study Hebrew would make them Jews—shows that the latter study as well as the former was the object of their dislike and fear (Anderson, i, 24; Hallam, *Life* of Bacon, i, 26). Whether Tyndale had in this way gained any knowledge of Hebrew before he left England in 1524 may be uncertain. The fact that in 1530-31 he published a translation of Genesis, Deuteronomy, and Jonah (see a letter by the ven. lord Arthur Hervey to the Pope, sent by the Venetian legation) affords no evidence in his favor. His knowledge of Hebrew was acquired, it would seem, by means of the Spanish Bible, which he had very likely at his disposal in the monastery of St. Jerome in Amiens, and that he had come in contact with. As to the question whether Tyndale, the last prayer, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes," He was tied to the stake, then strangled to death, and finally burnt. (See O'far's memoir prefixed to his edition of Tyndale's *New Testament.*  

The work to which a life was thus nobly devoted was as much as the only thing which occupied the only one of having given the first example of a translation based on true principles, and the excellence of later versions has been almost in exact proportion as they followed his. Believing that every part of Scripture had its own meaning and significance, and that the whole of the writer (*Observations*, p. 304), he made it his work, using all philological helps that were accessible to attain that sense. Believing that the duty of a translator was to place his readers as nearly as possible on a level with those for whom the books were originally written, he looked on all the later theological discussions that had gathered round the words of the N. T. as hindrances rather than helps, and sought, as far as possible, to get rid of them. Not "grace," but "favor," even in John i, 17 (in edition of 1526); not "charity," but "love;" not "confessing," but "acknowledging," not "priest," but "senior" or "elders;" not "salvation," but "health;" not "church," but "congregation," are instances of the changes which were then looked on as startling and heretical innovations (Sir T. More, *l. c.*). Some of them we are now familiar with. In others the later versions bear traces of reaction in favor of the older phraseology. In this, as in other things, Tyndale was in advance, not only of his own age, but of the age that followed him. To him, however, it is owing that the versions of the English Church have been throughout both popular, and not sclerotic. The exquisite grace and simplicity which have adorned the A. V. to the men of the most opposite tempers and contrasted opinions—to J. H. Newman (*Dublin Review*, June, 1853) and J. A. Froude—is due mainly to his clear-sighted truthfulness. The testimony of a Roman Catholic collector is instructive: "In point of perspicacity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom and purity of style, no English version has as yet surpassed it*" (Goddes, *Prospectus for a new Translation*, p. 89). The desire to make the Bible a people's book led Tyndale in one edition to something like a provincial rather than a national translation; but, on the other, it kept him free from the besetting danger of the time, that of writing for scholars, not for the people; of a version full of "in-khorn" phrases, not in the spoken language of the English nation. And throughout there is the pervading stamp, so often wanting in other like works, of the
most thorough truthfulness. No word has been altered to court a king's favor, or please bishops, or make out a case for or against a particular opinion. He is working freely, not in the fetters of prescribed rules. With the most entire sincerity he could say, "I call God to record, against the day we shall appear before our Maker, and there give an account of doing things, that I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in the world, whether it be pleasure, honor, or riches, might be given me." (Anderson, i, 349).

2. A complete translation of the Bible, different from Tyndale's, bearing the name of Miles Coverdale, printed probably at Zürich, appeared in 1535. The undertaking itself, and the choice of Coverdale as the translator, were probably due to Cromwell. Coverdale's controversial treatises, and the polemical character of his prefaces and notes, has irritated the leading ecclesiastics, and embittered the mind of the king himself against him. All that he had written was publicly condemned. There was no hope of obtaining the king's sanction to anything that bore his name. But the idea of an English translation began to find favor among the secular, who, in the marriage with Anne Boleyn, had been so helpful to adopt what was urged upon him as the surest way of breaking forever the spell of the pope's authority. The bishops even began to think of the thing as possible. It was talked of in Convocation. They would take it in hands, and with the work did not meddle further, make much progress. The great preliminary question whether "venerable" words, such as hostia, penance, paschata, holocaust, and the like, should be retained, was still unsettled (Anderson, i, 414). Not till "the day after doomsday" (the words are Cranmer's) were the English people likely to get their English Bible from the bishops (ib. i, 577). Cromwell, it is probable, thought it better to lose no further time, and to strike while the iron was hot. A divine whom he had patronized, though not, like Tyndale, feeling himself called to that special work (Fred. Cosway, Note, p. 136), was willing to undertake it. To him accordingly it was intrusted. There was no stigma attached to his name, and, though a sincere Reformer, neither at that time nor afterwards did he occupy a sufficiently prominent position to become an object of special persecution.

3. This was the work which was thus executed, as might be expected, in a very different fashion from Tyndale's. Of the two men, one had made this the great object of his life; the other, in his own language, "sought it not, neither desired it," but accepted it as a task assigned him. One prepared himself for the work by years of labor in Greek and Hebrew; the other is content to make a translation at second hand "out of the Douche (Luther's German Version) and the Latinate." The one aims at a rendering which shall be the truest and most exact possible; the other loses himself in weak commonplaces as to the advantage of using many English words for one and the same word in the original, and in practice oscillates between "penance" and "repenance," "love" and "charity," "priests" and "elders," as though one set of words were as true and adequate as the other (Preface, p. 1). In spite of these faults, however, there is much to esteem in the spirit and temper of Coverdale. He is a second-rate man, laboring as such contentedly, not ambitious to appear other than he is. He thinks it a great sin that there should be a diversity of translations. He acknowledges, though he dare not name it, the existence of the excellence of Luther's version, and regrets the misfortune which left it incomplete. He states frankly that he had done his work with the assistance of that and of five others. The five were probably: (1) The Vulgate; (2) Luther's; (3) The German Swiss version of Zürich; (4) The Latin of Paganus; (5) Tyndale's. Others, however, have conjectured a German translation of the Vulgate earlier than Luther's, and a Dutch version from Luther (Whitaker, Hist. and Crit. Inquiry, p. 49). If the language of his dedication to the king, whom he compares to Moses, David, and Josiah, seems to be somewhat fulsome in its flattery, it is, at least, hardly more offensive than that of the Dedication of the A.V., and there was more to commend in the A.V. than in the coverdale.

3. An inspection of Coverdale's version serves to show the influence of the authorities he followed. The proper names of the O.T. appear for the most part in their Latin form, "Elia," "Eliseus," "Ochonias;" sometimes, as in "Essay" and "Jeremy," in which was famous a certain English. Some of the correspondences with Luther's version are not without interest. Thus "Cush," which in Wycliffe, Tyndale, and the A.V. is uniformly rendered "Ethiopia," is in Coverdale "Morians' land" (Ps. lxviii, 31; Acts xvii, 27, etc.), after the "Mohrenlande" of Luther, and appears in this form accordingly in the P.-B. version in the Psalms. The proper name Rabshekhah passes, as in Luther, into the "chief butler" (2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. xxxvi, 11). In making the sons of David "priests" (2 Sam. viii, 18) he followed both his author and the Authorized Version, "Ebrews" and "memons" in Acts xx, 28 ("overseers" and "elders") and "Shiloh," in which the name of Gen. xxii, 10, becomes "the worthy," after Luther's "der Held." They "houghed oxen" takes the place of "they digged down a wall," in Gen. xlix, 6. The singular word "Lamia" is taken from the Vulg., as also "the land of Canaan" (Gen. xlv, 15) and "the land of Egypt" (Gen. xlvii, 6). In Isa. xxxvii, 14. The phrase "tabernacle of witness," where the A.V. has "congregation," shows the same influence. In spite of Tyndale, the Vulg. "plena gratia," in Luke i, 28, leads to "full of grace"; while we have, on the other hand, "congregation" throughout the N. T. for "ekklésia," and "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Cor. xiii. It was the result of the same indecision that his language as to the Apocrypha lacks the sharpness of that of the more zealous reformers. "Baruch" is placed with the canonical books, after "Lamentations." Of the rest he says that they are "placed apart," as "not held by ecclesiastical doctors in the same repute" as the other Scriptures, but this is only because there are "dark sayings" which seem to differ from the "open Scripture." He has no wish that they should be "deeped or little set by." "Patience and study would show that the two were agreed." 4. Wills, who thus exonerated Coverdale, does not make the claim which has sometimes been made for this version of Coverdale's, as though it had been made from the original text (Anderson, i, 564; Whitaker, Hist. and Crit. Inquiry, p. 58). It is not improbable, however, that as time went on he added to his knowledge. The letter addressed by him to Cromwell (Rem. p. 629; Parker Soc.) obviously asserts, somewhat ostentatiously, an acquaintance "not only with the standing text of the Hebrew, with the interpretation of the Chaldean and the Greek," but also with "the diversity of reading of all sects." He, at any rate, continued his work as a painstaking and accurate translator. Fresh editions of his Bible were published, keeping their ground in spite of rivals, in 1537, 1539, 1550, 1553. He was called in at a still later period to assist in the Geneva version. Among smaller facts connected with this edition may be mentioned the appearance of Hebrew letters—of the name Jehovah—in the title-page (1777), and again in the margin of the alphabetic poetry of the Psalms. The plural form "Biblia" is retained in the title-page, possibly, however, in its later use as a feminine singular (comp. Biblia). There are notes, no chapter-headings, no divisions into verses. The letters A, B, C, D in the margin, as in the early editions of Greek and Latin authors, are the only headings given in places. Many of the annotations point to parallel passages. The O.T., especially in Genesis, has the attraction of wood-cuts. Each book
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has a table of contents prefixed to it. A careful reprint, though not a fac-simile, of Coverdale's version has been published by Bagster (Lond. 1838).

V. MATTHEW.—1. In the year 1537, a large folio Bible appeared as edited and dedicated to the king, by Thomas Matthew. No one of that name appears at all prominently in the religious history of Henry VIII, and Matthew's relations, from his being a learned and pseudonymous, adopted to conceal the real translator. The tradition which connects this Matthew with John Rogers, the protomartyr of the Marian persecution, is all but undisputed. It rests (1) on the language of the preface and dedication, which describe him (Foxe, Acts of Matt., 1599, 1568; Chisholm, History of Rogers, p. 418-423) as Joannes Rogers, alias Matthew, as if it were a matter of notoriety; (2) the testimony of Foxe himself, as representing, if not personal knowledge, the current belief of his time; (3) the occurrence, at the close of a short exhortation to the study of Scripture in the preface, of the initials J. R.; (4) internal evidence. This last subdivides itself. (a) Rogers, who had graduated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1525, and had sufficient fame to be invited to the new Cardinal's College at Oxford, accepted the invitation to go to Antwerp, and there became acquainted with Tyndale two years before the latter's death. Matthew's Bible, as might be expected, if this hypothesis were true, reproduces Tyndale's work, in the N. T. entirely, in the O. T. as far as 2 Chron., the rest being taken, with license and improvement, from the Gospels and Psalms. (b) In the language of the Dedication is that of one who has mixed much, as Rogers mixed, with foreign reformers—"the godlie in strange countries".

2. The printing of the book was begun apparently about, and was carried on as far as the end of Isaiah. At that period a new printer appeared, the name of one of the London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, appears. The history of the book was probably something like this: Coverdale's translation had not given satisfaction—least of all were the more zealous and scholar-like reformers contented with it. As the only complete English Bible, it was, however, as yet, in possession of the field. Tyndale and Rogers, therefore, in the year preceding the imprisonment of the former, determined on another, to include O. T., N. T., and Apocrypha, but based throughout on the original. The work was carried on at the expense of the same Antwerp merchant who had assisted Tyndale (Poyntz), and thus got as far as Isaiah. The enterprising London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, then came in (Chester, Life of Rogers, p. 29). It would be a good speculation to enter the market with this, and send out Coverdale's with the advantage in which they had no interest. They accordingly embarked a considerable capital, £500, and then came a stroke of policy which may be described as a miracle of audacity. The name of Rogers, known as the friend of Tyndale, is suppressed, and the surnames of Thomas as Matthew disarms suspicion. The book is sent by Grafton to Cranmer. He reads, approves, rejoices. He would rather have the news of its being licensed than a thousand pounds (Chester, p. 425-427). Application is then made both by Grafton and Cranmer to Cromwell. The king's license is granted, but the publisher wants more. Nothing less than a monopoly for five years will give him a fair margin of profit. Without this, he is sure to be undersold by piratical, inaccurate editions, badly printed on inferior paper. Failing this, he trusts that the king will order one copy to be bought by every incumbent, and six by every abbey. If this was too much, the king might, at least, impose that obligation on all the popish-inclined clergy. That will bring in something, besides the good it may possibly do them (Chester, p. 430). The application was to some extent successful. A copy was ordered, by royal proclamation, to be set up in every church, the cost being divided between the clergy and the parishioners. This was, therefore, the first Authorized Version. It is scarcely conceivable, however, that Henry could have read the book which he thus sanctioned, or known that it was substantially identical with what had been publicly stigmatized in his Acts of Parliament (cf. supra). What had before been given more or less to the bosom character of Tyndale's annotations, and here were notes bolder and more thorough still. Even the significant "W. T." does not appear to have attracted notice.

3. What has been said of Tyndale's version applies, of course to this. There are, however, a number of modern advanced technical words connected with the Psalms, Neginloth, Shiggaion, Sheminith, etc., are elaborately explained. Ps. xi. is printed as a dialogue. The names of the Hebrew letters are prefixed to the verses of Lamentations. Reference is made to the Chrest Pharsense (Job vii.), to Rabbi Abraham (Job xix.), to Kimchi (Psa. iii.). A like range of knowledge is shown in the N. T. Strabo is quoted to show that the magi were not kings, Macrobius as testifying to Herod's ferocity (Matt. ii.), Erasmus's Paraphrase on Matt. xviii., xv. The population of the peoples mentioned in Matt. iii. is given. "the woman that was a sinner" is discussed, and rejected (Luke x.). More noticeable even than in Tyndale is the boldness and fulness of the exegetical notes scattered throughout the book. Strong and earnest in asserting what he looked upon as the central truths of Christianity, the Gospel, as he believed it to be interpreted in other things which has not appeared again in any authorized translation or popular commentary. He guards his readers against looking on the narrative of Job i. as literally true. He recognizes a definite historical standpoint, for Ps. xlv. ("Jehovah praise Solomon for the beauty, eloquence, power, and nobleness, both of himself and of his wife"). Ps. xxxii. ("David declareth Christ's dejection . . . and all, under figure of himself"). And the Song of Solomon ("Solomon made this balade for himself and his wife, the daughter of Pharaoh, under the shadow of himself, scouring Christ, etc."). The chief duty of the Sabbath is "to minister the folder of the Word to simple souls," to be "pittif over the weariness of such neighbors as labored sore all the week long." "When such occasions come as turn our rest to occupation and our work to recreation, is not Christ Himself a new man made for man, and not man for the Sabbath?" (Jer. xvii.). He sees in the prophesia of the N. T. simply "exponents of Holy Scripture" (Acts xv.). To the man living in faith, "Peter's fishing after the resurrection, and all deeds of matrimony are pure spiritual," to those who are not, "learning, doctrine, temptation of high things, preaching, study of Scripture, founding of churches and abbeys, are works of the flesh" (Pref. to Romans). "Neither is outward circumcision or outward baptism worth a pin of themselves, save the thing put us in remembrance to keep the covenant" (1 Cor. iii.). "He that desireth honor gapest after luce . . . castles, parks, lordships . . . desireth not a work, much less a good work, and nothing less than a bishop's" (1 Tim. iii.). Ezek. xxxiv is said to be "against bishops and curates that despise the flock of Christ." The Psalm of the mercies of God and li. and lii appears (as in Tyndale) as "the messenger of the congregation." Strong proofs against Puritany are found in notes to Ezek. xviii and 1 Cor. iii., and in the "Table of Principal Matters" it is significantly stated under the word Puritany that "it is not above the Bible, but the purging and remission of our sins is made us by the abundant mercy of God." The Preface to the Apocrypha explains the name, and distinctly asserts the inferiority of these books. No notes are added to them, and the translation of them is taken from Coverdale, as if it had not been worth while to give much labor to it.
ENGLISH VERSIONS 214 ENGLISH VERSIONS

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

VI. TAVERNER (1539).—1. The boldness of the pseudo-Matthew had, as has been said, frightened the ecclesiastical world from its propriety. Coverdale's version was, however, too inaccurate to keep its greater dullness stable; to find another, and at the same time to find a printer applied to Richard Taverner. But little is known of his life. The fact that, though a layman, he had been chosen as one of the canons of the Cardinal's College at Oxford indicates a reputation for scholarship which this is confirmed by the character of his translation. It proseizes, in the title-page, to be "newly recognized, with great diligence, after the most faithful exemplars." The editor acknowledges "the labors of others (i.e. Tyndale, Coverdale, and Matthew, though he does not name them) who have neither been toiled under, nor harmed, in their attempts to translate, or own that the work is not one that can be done "absolutely" (i.e. completely) by one or two persons, but requires "a deeper conferring of many learned wittes together, and also a juster time and longer leisure:" but the thing to be done; he had been asked to do it. He had "used his talent" as he could.

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

VII. CRANMER.—1. In the same year as Taverner's, and coming from the same press, appeared an English Bible, in a more stately folio, printed with a more costly type, carrying a higher name than any previous edition. The title-page is ornamented with elaborate engraving, the spirit and power of which indicate the hand of Holbein. The king, seated on his throne, is giving the "Verbum Dei" to the bishops and doctors, and they distribute it to the people, while doctors and people are all joining in cries of "Vivat Rex!" It declares the book to be "truly translated after the verity of the Hebrew and Greek texts" by "divers excellent learned men, expert in the foresaid tongues." A preface, in April, 1540, with the initials "T. C.," implies the archbishop's sanction. In a later edition (Nov., 1549) his name appears on the title-page, and the name of Richard Tottel is confused with that of Thomas, bishop of Durham, and Nicholas (Sheath), bishop of Rochester; but this does not exclude the possibility of others having been employed for the first edition.

2. Cranmer's version presents, as might be expected, many points of interest. The prologue gives a more complete idea of what a translation ought to be than we have as yet seen. Words not in the original are to be printed in a different type. They are added, even when "not wanted by the sense," to satisfy those who have "missed them" in previous translations, i. e. they represent the various readings of the Vulgate where it differs from the Hebrew. The sign * indicates diversity in the Chaldee and Hebrew. It had been intended to give all these, but it was found that this would have taken too much time and space, and the editors purposed therefore to print them in a little volume by themselves. The frequent hands (\(\sigma\)) in the margin, in like manner, show an intention to give the "godly-learned in Christ Jesus." The preface, however, is cautious and, as there had not been time for the "king's council to settle them," they were omitted, and no help given to the reader beyond the marginal references. In the absence of notes, the lay-reader is to submit himself to the "godly-learned in Christ Jesus." The books of the Pentateuch have their Hebrew names given, Bereshith (Genesis), Vede Schemot (Exodus), and so on. 1 and 2 Chron. in like manner appear as Dibre Haizadin. In the edition of 1541, many proper names in the O. T. appear in the smaller Hebrew form, as e. g. Amaziah, Jeremiahu. In spite of this parade of learning, however, the edition of 1569 contains, perhaps, the most startling blunder that ever appeared under the sanction of an archbishop's name. The editors adopted the preface which, in Matthew's Bible, had been prefixed to the Psalms, and this is accompanied by a preface of the common traditional explanation of the name was concisely given. They appear, however, to have shrunk from offending the conservative party in the church by applying to the books in question so damnatory a term as Apocrypha. They were at last out for a word more neutral and respectful, and found one that appeared in some MSS. of Jerome so applied, though in strictness it belonged to an entirely different set of books. They accordingly substituted that word, leaving the preface in all other respects as it was and in the text of the book. The central character of Cranmer's policy, was doubtless that which enabled it to keep its ground during the changing moods of Henry's later years. It was reprinted again and again, and was the authorized version of the English Church until 1568. The translation folio of Matthew, the translation folio of Cranmer, the translation folio of Tyndale, and the translation folio of the Psalms, accordingly, were taken most, if not all, the portions of Scripture in the Prayer-books of 1549 and 1552. The Psalms as a whole, the quotations from Scripture in the Homilies, the sentences in the Communion services, and some phrases elsewhere, are "worthy fruits of penance," still preserve the remembrance of it. The oscillating character of the book is shewn in the use of "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Cor. xiii; and "congregation" instead of "church" generally, after Tyndale; while in 1 Tim. iv, 14, we have the singular rendering, as if to gain the favor of some, of "the body of Christ," instead of "the body of God," The plan of indicating doubtful texts by a smaller type was adhered to, and was applied, among other passages, to Ps. xiv. 5, 6, 7, and the more memorable text of 1 John v, 7. The translation of 1 Tim. iii, 16, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God," anticipated a construction of that text which has sometimes been boasted of, and sometimes attacked as an innovation. In this, however, Tyndale had led the way.

VIII. GENEVA.—1. The experimental translation of the Gospel of Matthew by Sir John Cheke into a purer English than before (Stype, Life of Cheke, vii,
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had so little influence on the versions that followed that it hardly calls for more than a passing notice, as showing that scholars were as yet unsatisfied. The reaction under Mary gave a check to the whole work, as far as England was concerned; but the exiles who fled to Geneva entered upon it with more vigor than ever. Cranmer's version did not come up to their ideal. Its size made it too costly. There were no explanatory or dogmatic notes. It followed Coverdale too closely; and where it deviated, did so, in some instances, in a retrograde direction. The Genevan refugees—among them Whittingham, Goodman, and Coverdale—were the chief promoters of a new version, "for two years or more, day and night." They entered on their "great and wonderful work" with much "fear and trembling." Their translation of the N. T. was "diligently revised by the most approved Greek examples" (MSS. or editions?) (Preface). The N. T., translated by Whittingham, was printed by Conrad Badius in 1557, the whole Bible in 1560.

2. In point of general correctness in expressing the true sense of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, the Geneva version shows a very marked advance on all that preceded it, and for more than sixty years it was the most regarded of the English translations. Large numbers were brought over from the Continent in the early years of Elizabeth, it was printed in England in 1561, and a patent of monopoly was given to James Bodley. This was transferred in 1576 to Barker, in whose family the right of printing Bible translations for upwards of a century. Not less than eight editions of the Bible were, in addition, reprinted between 1538 and 1611. It kept its ground for some time even against the later version of King James, and gave way, as it were, slowly and under protest. In the Soldiers' Pocket Bible, published in 1643, fifty verses of the 11th Psalm were the only selections of Scripture taken from the Geneva version. The causes of this general acceptance are not difficult to ascertain. The volume was, in most of its editions, cheaper and more portable—a small quarto, instead of the large folio of Cranmer's Great Bible. It was the first Bible which laid aside the adolescent black letter, and appeared in Roman type. It was the first which, following the Hebrew example, recognised the division into verses, so dear to the preachers or hearers of sermons. It was accompanied, in most of the editions after 1578, by a Bible Dictionary, and the Table of Contents was immensely helpful in dealing with the difficulties of Scripture, and were looked upon as spiritual and evangelical. It was accordingly the version specially adopted by the great Puritan party through the whole reign of Elizabeth. If a lesser person of that lineage of James might be expected, it was based on Tyndale's version, often returning to it where the intermediate renderings had had the character of a compromise.

3. Some peculiarities are worthy of special notice: (1) It professes a desire to restore the "true writing" of many Hebrew names, and we meet accordingly with forms like Izak (Isaak), Jakob, and the like. (2) It omits the name of Paul from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and, in a short preface, leaves the authorship an open question. (3) It avows the principle of putting all words not in the original in italic. (4) It was the chief promoter of the practice of separating words by capital letters, something like a declaration of war against the established order of the Church's lessons, commemorating Scripture facts, and the deaths of the great reformers, but ignoring saints' days altogether. (5) It was the first English Bible which entirely omitted the Apocrypha. (6) The notes were characterized as different, almost as much an alien style, and almost as much a foreign accent, as the language of the Bible was as different, not only in their theology, but in their politics. They made allegiance to kings dependent upon the soundness of their faith, and in one instance (note on 2 Chron. xvi, 16) at least seemed, to the easily startled James I., to favor tyrannicides.

4. The circumstances of the early introduction of the Geneva version are worth mentioning, if only as showing in how different a spirit the great fathers of the English Reformation, the most conservative of Anglican theologians, acted from that which has too often animated their successors. Men talk now of different translations and various readings as likely to undermine the faith of the people. When the application was made to archbishop Parker, in 1565, to support the Bodleigh's application for a license to reprint the Geneva version in 12mo, he wrote to Cecil in its favor. He was at the time looking forward to the work he afterwards accomplished, of "one other special Bible for the church to be set forth," of the faculty who took the time and leisure should permit, "but in the mean time it would "nothing hinder, but rather do much good, to have diversity of translations and readings" (Strype, Life of Parker, iii, 6). Many of the later reprints, instead of the Geneva version from the Greek, have Tomson's translation of Beza's Latin version; and the notes are said to be taken from Joas. Cramer, P. Leeser, Villierus, and Fr. Junius. The Geneva version, as published by Barker, is that popularly known as the Breeches Bible, from its rendering of Gen. iii, 7.

It had, however, been preceded in this by Wycliffe's. The Vulgate and the Latin version will account for the wish of archbishop Parker, in spite of his liberal tolerance, to bring out another version which might establish its claims against that of Geneva. Great preparations were made. The correspondence of Parker with his suffragans presents the points of interest to us. The notes of the Vulgate were adopted the text as to the true theory of a translation. Thus, while Sands, bishop of Worcester, finds fault with the "common translation" (Geneva?), as "following Munster too much," and so "swerving much from the Hebrew," Gorse, bishop of Chester, and all the others, the Psalms, acted on the principle of translating them so as to agree with the N.-T. quotations, "for the avoiding of offence;" and Cox, bishop of Ely, while laying down the sensitive rule that "inkhorn terms were to be avoided," also went on to add "that the usual terms were to be retained so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear" (Strype, Parker, iii, 6). The principle of pious frauds, of distorting the truth for the sake of edification, has perhaps often been acted on by other translators. It has not often been so explicitly avowed as in the first of these suggestions.

2. The English Bible was read in number, together with some deans and professors, brought out the fruit of their labors in a magnificent folio (1568 and 1572). Everything had been done to make it attractive. A long erudite preface vindicated the right of the people to read the Scriptures, and (quoting the authority of bishop Fisher) admitted that the poet was as to be avoided, "also went on to add that "the usual terms were to be retained so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear" (Strype, Parker, iii, 6). The principle of pious frauds, of distorting the truth for the sake of edification, has perhaps often been acted on by other translators. It has not often been so explicitly avowed as in the first of these suggestions.

2. The English Bible was read in number, together with some deans and professors, brought out the fruit of their labors in a magnificent folio (1568 and 1572). Everything had been done to make it attractive. A long erudite preface vindicated the right of the people to read the Scriptures, and (quoting the authority of bishop Fisher) admitted that the poet was as to be avoided, "also went on to add that "the usual terms were to be retained so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear" (Strype, Parker, iii, 6). The principle of pious frauds, of distorting the truth for the sake of edification, has perhaps often been acted on by other translators. It has not often been so explicitly avowed as in the first of these suggestions.
cere and True Translation, etc.). The charges are mostly of the same kind as those brought by Sir T. More against Tyndale. "The old time-honored words were discarded. The authority of the Septuagint and Vulgate was set at naught when the translator's view of the meaning of the Hebrew and the Latin text of all that he found in them." The new model translation was to avoid these faults. It was to command the respect at once of priests and people. After an incubation of some years, it was published at Rheims in 1582. Though Martin was competent to translate from the Greek, he was not able to be literalistic. There was not the same idea of the N.T. produced some rather curious combinations. The Gospels, the catholic Epistles, and those to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, are grouped together as legal, St. Paul's other epistles as apocalyptic; the Acts appear as the one historical, the Revelation as the one prophetick book. (2) It is the only Bible in which many passages, sometimes nearly a whole chapter, have been marked for the express purpose of being omitted when the chapters were read in the public service of the Church. (3) In the editions of the Bible version, now the only being the one used in the Book of Common Prayer, the books not included therein were omitted altogether, and that of Cranmer is substituted in its place. (4) The initials of the translators were attached to the books which they had translated, and not merely the word of the work was done on the plan of limited, not joint liability. Here, as in the Genev, there is the attempt to give the Hebrew proper names more accurately, as e.g. in Heva, Isbace, Uziah, etc.

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

X. RHEMS AND DOUY.—1. The successive changes in the Protestant versions of the Scriptures were, as might be expected, matter of triumph to the controversialists of the Latin Church. Some saw in it an argument against any translation of Scripture into the spoken language of the people. Others pointed desirous to the want of unity which these changes displayed. There were some, however, who took the line which Sir T. More and Gardiner had taken under Henry VIII. They did not object to the principle of an English Bible. The only complaint was that the versions hitherto made with being false, corrupt, heretical. To this there was the ready retort that they had themselves done nothing; that their bishops in the reign of Henry had promised, but had not performed. It was felt to be necessary that they should take some steps which might enable them to turn the edge of this reproach. Accordingly, the English refugees who were settled at Rheims—Martin, Allen (afterwards cardinal), and Bristow—undertook the work. Gregory Martin, who had graduated at Cambridge, had signalized himself by an attack on the existing versions, and had been answered in an elaborate treatise by Fulke, master of Catharine Hall, Cambridge (A Defence of the Disput.
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ten raised since. "If every man's humor were to be followed, there would be no end of translating" (Card-owell, Conferences, p. 188). Cranner's words seemed likely to be fulfilled again. Had it been left to the bishops, we might have waited for the A.V. "till the day after doomsday." Even when the translator was done, and the translator acknowledged that the Hampton Court Conference had been the starting-point of it, they could not resist the temptation of a fling at their opponents. The objections to the Bishops' Bible had, they said, been nothing more than a shift to justify the refusal of the Conference to adopt the Commonwealth's version without modification (Preface to A.V.). But the king disliked the politics of the Geneva Bible. Either repeating what he had heard from others, or exercising his own judgment, he declared that there was as yet no good translation, and that the Geneva was the worst of all. Nothing, however, was said at the Conference beyond the hope thus held out.

2. But the king was not forgetful of what he thought likely to be the glory of his reign. The work of organizing and superintending the arrangements for a new translation was one specially congenial to him, and he had no qualm about the decision. Accordingly The selection of the fifty-four scholars to whom it was intrusted seems, on the whole, to have been a wise and fair one. Andrews, Saravia, Overal, Montague, and Barlow represented the "higher" party in the Church; Broughton, Basset, and Bawdwin, the "puritanical" party. Scholarship unconnected with party was represented by Henry Savile and John Boys. One name, that of Broughton, is indeed conspicuous by its absence. The greatest Hebrew scholar of the age—the man who had, in a letter to Cecil (1593), urged this very plan of a joint translation—had already been related to the Commonwealth books of the O.T. (Job, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Lamentations), was ignominiously excluded. This may have been, in part, owing to the dislike with which Whitgift and Bancroft had all along regarded him. But in part, also, it was owing to Broughton's own character. An unmanageable temper, showing itself in violent language, and the habit of stigmatizing those who differed from him, even on such questions as those connected with names and dates, as heretical and atheistic, must have made him thoroughly impracticable to one of the men whose presence throws a committee or conference into chaos. Only forty-seven names appear in the king's list (Burnet, Reform, Records). Seven may have died or declined to act; or it may have been intended that there should be a final committee of revision. A full list is given by Fuller (Ch. Hist. v. 154) for those who dwelt with the six puritanical scholars, by Todd and Anderson. The Puritan side was, however, weakened by the death of Reincle and Lively during the progress of the work.

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

4. The instructions thus given will be found in Fuller (ii. c.), and with a more accurate text in Burnet (Reform, Records). It will not be necessary to give them in detail here, but it will be a part of the duty which the translator has undertaken to note the bearing of each clause upon the work in hand, and its relation to previous versions. (1) The Bishops' Bible was to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit. This was probably intended to be a check so as to quiet the misgivings of those who wished to view the new version a condemnation of that already existing. (2) The names of prophets and others were to be retained as nearly as may be in the form vulgarly used. This, however, was to guard against forms like Zabak, Jeremiah, etc., which had been introduced in some versions, and which was not thought to be more copiously. To it owe probably the forms Jeremy, Eliah, Osee, Core, in the N.T. (3) The old ecclesiastical words were to be kept, as the word "church" not to be translated "congregation." The rule was apparently given for the sake of this special application in I. Corinthians 12:28. An exception, however, due to it. The earlier versions, it will be remembered, had gone on the opposite principle. (4) When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, both ancient and modern. This, like the former, tends to confound the functions of the preacher and the translator, and substitutes ecclesiastical tradition for philological accuracy. (5) The division of the chapters to be altered neither at all, or as little as possible. For after all, even several attempts to make a vernacular version in view than truth and accuracy, and the result is that divisions are perpetuated which are manifestly arbitrary and misleading. (6) No marginal notes to be affixed but only for the explanation of Hebrew and Greek words. This was obviously directed against the Geneva notes, as the special objects of the king's aversion. Practically, however, in whatever feeling it originated, we may be thankful that the A.V. came out as it did, without note or comment. The open Bible was placed in the hands of all readers. The work of interpretation was left free. Had an opposite course been pursued, we might have had the tremendous evil of a whole body of exegesis imposed upon the Church by authority, reflecting the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, the absolutism of James, the highflying presacracy of Bancroft. (7) Such quotations of places to be given only as are sufficiently marked. (8) All power given to the reader to reference of one Scripture to another. The principle that Scripture is its own interpreter was thus recognised, but practically the marginal references of the A.V. of 1611 were somewhat scanty, most of those now printed having been added in later editions. (9) and (9) State plan of translation. Each company of translators is to take its own books; each person to bring his own corrections. The company to discuss them, and, having finished their work, to send it on to another company, and so on. (10) Provides for differences of opinion between two companies by referring them to the general meeting. (11) Gives power, in cases of difficulty, to consult any scholars. (12) Invites suggestions from any quarter. (13) Names the directors of the work: Andrews, dean of Westminister; Barlow, dean of Chester; and the regius professor of Hebrew at the University of Oxford. The names are to be followed when they agree more with the original than the Bishops' Bible, namely, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Whitchurch's, (Cranner's), and Geneva. (15) Authorizes universities to appoint three or four overseers of the work.

5. It is not known that any of the men who were connected with this work, or any minute of the meetings for conference, is still extant. Nothing is more
striking than the silence with which the version that was to be the inheritance of the English people for at least two centuries and a half was ushered into the world. Here and there we get glimpses of scholars coming from their country livings to their old college haunts to work diligently at the task assigned them (Pusey, i. 15; 25). At the meet-
ing of translators, one man reading the chapter which he had been at work on, while the others listen, with the original, or Latin, or German, or Italian, or Spanish versions in their hands (Selden, Table Talk). We may represent to ourselves the differences of opinion, and the sometimes acrimonious spirit in which the translators worked, the strong overbearing temper of a man like Bancroft, the minority comforting themselves with the thought that it was no new thing for the truth to be outvoted (Gell, Essay towards Amendment of last English transl. of Bible, p. 321). Dogmatic interests were in some cases allowed to bias the translation; and the Calvinism of one party, the premillennial views of another, were both represented at the expense of accuracy (Gell, l. c.). The following passages are those commonly referred to in support of this charge: (1.) The rendering of "saved" is "saved" in Acts 47. (2.) The insertion of the words "any man" in Heb. x. 88 ("the just shall live by faith, but if any man draw back," etc.), to avoid an inference unfavorable to the doctrine of Final Perseverance. (3.) The use of "bishop," in Acts i. 20, of "oversight," in 1 Pet. v. 2, of "pastor," in Heb. iii. 1, etc., in the New Testament, rather than in Acts xx. 28, in order to avoid the identification of bishops and elders. (4.) The chapter-heading of Ps. cxlix in 1611 (since altered), "The prophet exhorteth to praise God for that power which he hath given the Church to bind the consciences of men." Blunt (Duties of a Parish Priest, lect. i.) appears, in this respect, on the side of the prosecution, Trench (On the A. V. of the N. T. chap. x) on that of the defence. The charge of an undue bias against Rome in 1 Cor. xi. 27; Gal. v. 6; Heb. xiii, 4, is one on which an acquisitive may be pronounced with little or no hesitation. For three years the work was on; on the separate companies comparing notes as directed. When the work drew towards its completion, it was necessary to place it under the care of a select few. Two from each of the three groups were accordingly selected, and the six met at London to superintend the publication. Now, for the first time, we find any more definite remuneration than the shadowy promise held out in the king's letter of a share in the 1000 marks which deans and chapters would not contribute. The matter had now reached its business stage, and the Company of Stationers was involved in it. Six editors had to be engaged, and in less than three months' work, thirty pounds each, in weekly payments, for their nine months' labour. The final correction, and the task of writing the arguments of the several books, was given to Bilson, bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Miles Smith, the latter of whom also wrote the Dedication and the Preface. Of these two documents, this is probably unfortunately familiar enough to us, and is chiefly conspicuous for its servile adulation. James I is "that sanctified person," "enriched with singular and extraordinary graces," that had appeared "as the sun in his strength." To those appeal against the judgment of those whom they describe, in somewhat peevish accents, as "popish persons or self-conceited brethren." The Preface to the Reader is more interesting, as throwing light upon the principles on which the translators acted. They "never thought that they should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one." Their "endeavor was to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one." They claim credit for steering a middle course between the Puritans who "left the old ecclesiastical words," and the obscurity of the Papists "retaining foreign words of purpose to darken the sense." They vindicate the practice, in which they indulge very freely, of translating one word in the original by several English words, partly on the intelligible ground that it is not always possible to find one word that will express all the meanings of the Greek or Hebrew, partly on the somewhat childish plea that it would be unfair to choose some words for the high places and leave the uglier and clod-dered stones of God's truth, and to pass over others as unworthy.

7. The version thus published did not all at once supersede those already in possession. The fact that five editions were published in three years shows that there was a good demand. But the Bishops' Bible remained the English Bible in most places, and in many parishes he used his texts from it in preaching before the king as late as 1621), and the popularity of the Geneva version is shown by not less than thirteen reprints, in whole or in part, between 1611 and 1617. It is not easy to ascertain the impression which the A. V. made at the time it appeared. Probably, as in most new works, it was far less good for evil or threat than friends or foes expected. The Puritans, and the religious portion of the middle classes generally, missed the notes of the Geneva book (Fuller, Church History, x. 50, 51).

The Romanists spoke, as usual, of the unsettling effect of these frequent changes, and of the uncertainty in the writings of leaving men in doubt what was the truth of Scripture. Whitaker's answer, by anticipation, to this charge is worth quoting: "No inconvenience will follow if interpretations or versions of Scripture, when once established, are kept as they have been, and not afterwards changed or corrected" (Disser. on Script., p. 322, Parker Soc. ed.). The wiser divines of the English Church had not then learned to raise the cry of finality. One frantic cry was heard from Hugh Broughton, the rejected (Works, p. 651), who would "rather be torn in pieces the tide of conservative feeling. no book in the world has been so widely read as the Bible is, word for word, with no regard to the difference of idioms. This is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it, but when it comes among the common people, Lord! what gear do they make of it!" (Table Talk). The feeling of which this is a reflection led, even in the midst of the agitations of the Commonwealth, to proposals for another revision, which, after being brought forward in the Grand Committee of Religion in the House of Commons in January, 1656, was referred to a sub-committee, acting under Whitelocke, with powerful and positive results. Six editions of the manuscripts were accordingly held frequently at Whitelocke's house, at which we find, mingled with less illustrious names, those of Walton and Cudworth. Nothing, however, came of it (Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 564; Collier, Ch. Hist. ii. 9). No report was ever made; and with this all respect for the side of conservative feeling, in this as in other things, checked all plans of further alteration. Many had ceased to care for the Bible at all. Those who did care were content with the Bible as it was. Only here and there was a voice raised, in the R. G. fell reign, of the side of change. It was on the panegyric set in. It would be easy to put together a long catalogue of praises stretching from that time to this present. With many, of course, this has been only the routine repetition of a traditional boast. "Our unrivalled Translation" and "our incomparable Liturgy" have been equally praise of course. But there have been witnesses of a far higher weight. In pro-
pension as the English of the 18th century was infect-
ed with a Latinized or Gallicized style, did those who
had a purer taste look with reverence to the strength
and purity of a better time as represented in the A.V.
Thus Addison dwells on its ennobling the coldness of
modern languages with the glowing phrases of He-
brew (Spectator, No. 405), and Swift confesses that
"the translators of the Bible were masters of an Eng-
lish style which now is gone, wherever there is any
sense of the face of the earth and of the whole man.
The most solemn and tender of individual memories are,
for the most part, associated with it. Men leav-
ing the Church of England for the Church of Rome
turn regretfully with a yearning look at that noble
well of English undefiled which they are about to
exchange for the uncouth monstrosities of Rhelms
and Douay. In this case, too, as in so many others, the
position of the A.V. has been strengthened, less by the
skill of its defenders than by the weakness of its as-
sailants. While from time to time scholars and di-
vinity low, and according to the Lord's will (believed)
have admitted the necessity of a revision, those who
have attacked the present version and produced new
times have been, for the most part, men of narrow
knowledge and defective taste (Purver, Harwood, Bel-
lamy, Conquest, Sawyer), just able to pick out a few
obvious faults, and committing others equally glaring.
They have also generally entered on the work of trans-
slating or revising the whole Bible single-handed.
One memorable exception must not, however, be passed
over. Hallam (Lit. of Europe, iii, ch. ii, art. fin.)
remarks that "the most valuable work in the best of the
"enthusiastic praise" which has been lavished on this
translation. "It may, in the eyes of many, be a bet-
ter English, but it is not the English of Daniel, or
Raleigh, or Bacon... It abounds, in fact, espe-
cially in the O.T. with obsolete phraseology, and
with single words long since abandoned, or reserved
only in provincial use. The statement may, how-
ever, in some sense be accepted as an encomium. If
it had been altogether the English of the men of let-
ters of James's reign, would it have retained, as it has
done for two centuries and a half, its hold on the mind
of the memory, the affections of the English peo-
ple?

XII. Schemes for a Revision.—1. A notice of the at-
ttempts which have been made at various times to
bring about a revision of the A.V., though necessarily
brief in this place, may not be without its use for
future learners. The first half of the 18th century
was not favorable for such a work. An almost solitary
Essay for a New Translation by H. R. (Ross), 1702,
tracted little or no notice (Todd, Life of Walton, i,
184). A Greek Testament, with an English transla-
tion, singularly vulgar and offensive, was published
in 1729, of which extracts are given by Lewis (Hist.
of Trans. c. v). With the slight revival of learning among
the scholars of the latter half of that period the subject
was again mooted. Lowth in a visitation ser-
mon (1758), and Becker in a Latin speech intended for
Congress (1771) recommended it. Most Pitkin-
ton, in his Remarks (1759), and Dr. Thomas Brett, in an
Essay on Ancient Versions of the Bible (1760), dwell
on the importance of consulting them with reference to
the O.T. as well as the N.T., with a view to a more
approximation of that which was above the Masoretic
Hebrew, the former italing also on the obstacles which
are scattered in the A.V., and giving a useful alpha-
betic list of them. A folio new and literal translation
of the whole Bible by Anthony Purver, a Quaker
(1764), was a more ambitious attempt. He dwells at
some length on the "obsolete, uncouth, clownish" ex-
pressions which disfigure the A.V. He includes in
his list such words as "joyous," "solace," "lament," "day-ap-
"he hearkened to his voice;" "it eats" for "it eats" the "in
favor with" for "found" grace in the eyes of; "wise" for "angry" for his wrath was kindled. In spite of this defective taste, how-
ever, the work is considered by many of the best
scholars as a careful study of the original and of many of the best
commentators, and may be contrasted favorably with most of the
single-handled translations that have fol-
lowed. It was, at any rate, far above the depth of
degradation and folly which shone in Hazlitt's
Liturig Translations of the N.T. "with freedom, spirit,
and elegance" (1786). Here, again, a few samples are
enough to show the character of the whole. "The
Young lady is not dead" (Mark v, 35), "A gentleman of splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons" (Luke xv, 11). "The clergyman said, You have
given him the only right and proper answer" (Mark xii, 35). "We shall not pay the common debt
denature, but by a soft transition," etc. (1 Cor. xv, 51).

2. Biblical revision was happily not left entirely in
such hands as these. A translation by Worsley "ac-
nounced on the name of an expedient" (1770) was at least, less offensive. Durell (Preface to Job), Lowth (Pref. to Isaiah), Blayney (Pref. to Jere-
msia, 1784), were all strongly in favor of a new or re-
vised translation. Durell dwells most on the arbitra-
ary additions and omissions in the A.V. of Job, on the
total absence of all significations in the A.V., on the
"enthusiastic praise" which has been lavished on this
translation. "It may, in the eyes of many, be a bet-
ter English, but it is not the English of Daniel, or
Raleigh, or Bacon... It abounds, in fact, espe-
cially in the O.T. with obsolete phraseology, and
with single words long since abandoned, or reserved
only in provincial use. The statement may, how-
ever, in some sense be accepted as an encomium. If
it had been altogether the English of the men of let-
ters of James's reign, would it have retained, as it has
done for two centuries and a half, its hold on the mind
of the memory, the affections of the English peo-
ple?"

A more ambitious scheme was started by the Roman
Catholic Dr. Geddes, in his Prospectus for a New Transla-
tion (1786). His remarks on the history of English
translations, his candid acknowledgment of the excel-
len ces of the older and especially of the Masoretic
text, as perversing it, his critical notes on the true principles
of translation, on the A.V. as falling short of these,
may still be read with interest. He too, like Lowth,
finds fault with the superstitious adherence to the Ma-
soreic text, with the undue deference to lexicons, and
disregard of versions shown by our translators. The
proposal was well received by many Biblical scholars,
Lowth, Kennicott, and Barrington being foremost
among its patrons. The work was issued in parts,
according to the terms of the Prospectus, but did not get
further than 2 Chron. In 1793, when the death of the
translator was near, it was laid aside. Partly, perhaps, owing
to its incompleteness, but still more from the extreme
boldness of a Preface, anticipating the conclusions of
a later criticism, Dr. Geddes's translation fell rapidly
into disfavor. A sermon by White (famous for his
pamphlets) (1779), a pamphlet by Lord Stanhope (1779),
A. Symonds, professor of modern history at Cam-
bidge—the first on the Gospels and the Acts, in 1789;
The second on the Epistles, in 1794—though attacked
in an Apology for the Library and Church of England
(1790), helped to keep the discussion from oblivion.

3. The revision of the A.V., like many other edu-
siy reforms, was hindered by the French Revolution.
In 1792, archbishop Newcome had published an elabo-
rate defence of such a scheme, citing a host of author-
ties (Doddridge, Wesley, Campbell, in addition to those
already mentioned), and taking the same line as Lowth
Revised translations of the N.T. were published by Wakefield in 1795, by Newcome himself in 1796, by Scarlett in 1798. Campbell's version of the Gospels appeared in 1788, that of the Epistles by Macknight in 1795. But in 1786 the note of alarm was sounded. A few years earlier the French Revolution had begun. In the midst of its looming advance Bishop of Ely took the ground that "the present period was unfit," and from that time conservatism, pure and simple, was in the ascendancy. To suggest that the A.V. might be inaccurate was almost as bad as holding "French principles." There is a long interval, not a very great time, before controversialist, still more during this, between the establishment of the new prominence, and then there is a new school of critics in the Quarterly Review and elsewhere, ready to do battle vigorously for things as they are. The opening of the next campaign was an article in the Classical Journal (No. 86). The King's English, holding up to the people a new translation, followed soon afterwards by its publication under the patronage of the prince regent (1819).

The work was poor and unsatisfactory enough, and a tremendous battery was opened upon it in the Quarterly Review (Nos. 87 and 88), as afterwards (No. 46) Upward, an employee of the English Bible Society, who came forward with a pamphlet in its defence (Remarks in favour of a new Translation, 1819). The rash assertion of both Bellamy and Burgess that the A.V. had been made almost entirely from the Septuagint and Vulgate, and a general deficiency in all accurate scholar- ship, was anathema to many with a special interest. The natural elements of this controversy may well be passed over, but three less ephemeral works issued from it, which any future laborer in the same field will find worth consulting. Whitaker's Historical and Critical Inquiry was chiefly an able exposition of the exaggerated statement just mentioned. H. J. Todd, in his Notes on the Authorized Translation (1819), entered more fully than any previous writer had done into the history of the A.V., and gives many facts as to the lives and qualifications of the translators not easily to be met with elsewhere. The most masterly, helter-skelter, of the many criticisms against all change was a pamphlet (Remarks on the Critical Principles, etc., Oxford, 1820), published anonymously, but known to have been written by archbishop Laurence. The strength of the argument lies chiefly in a skilful display of all the difficulties of the text, and in the beautiful style. It is not a perfect restoration of the Hebrew of the O.T., or any settlement of the Greek of the N.T.; the expediency, therefore, of adhering to a Textus receptus in both. See Various Readings. The argument, if conclusive, would unsettle our confidence in the text of the Holy Scriptures altogether. It is thoroughly thought out. The last portion of the book is fully refuted by the archbishop's positions. But the scholarship and acuteness with which the subject is treated make the book instructive, and any one entering on the work of a translator ought at least to read it, that he may know what difficulties he has to face. About this period, also (1819), a new edition of Newcome's version was published by Belsham and other Unitarian ministers, and, like Bellamy's attempt on the O.T., the effort to stiffen the resistance of the great body of the clergy to all proposals for a revision, was at an end.

4. A correspondence between Herbert Marsh, bishop of Peterborough, and the Rev. H. Walter, in 1829, is the next link in the chain. Marsh had spoken (Lectures on Biblical Criticism, p. 258) with some contempt of the A.V. as based on Tyndale's, Tyndale's on Luther's, Luther's on Hebrews, Hebrews on the Vulgate itself, the Vulgate itself being based on the Vulgate. There was, therefore, on the view, no real translation from the Hebrew in any one of these. But it is evident that the Christian Hebraists of the period of the Reformation depended quite as much on the traditional learning of their Jewish teachers, often thoroughly so indeed, as the work of the earliest Christian tradition preserved in the Latin Vulgate, and that they followed, as far as they were able, the Masoretic punctuation, a much surer guide than the ancient versions, or the later rabbinic interpretation.

5. The last five-and-twenty years have seen the question of a revision from time to time gaining fresh prominence. If men of second-rate power have some- times been the originators of these times to come, the time to be, the time of the Roman Catholic Church (Dr. Barrow, Dr. Moberly, dean Alford, Mr. Humphry, and Dr. Ellicott) represents the same school of conservative progress, has the merit of adhering to the clear, pure English of the A.V., and does not deserve the censure which Dr. Beecher passes on it as "promising little and performing less" (p. 78). It includes only the Gospel of John, and the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. The publications of
American Bible Union are signs that there also the same want has been felt. The translations given respectively by Alford, Stanley, Jewett, and Conybeare and Howson, in their respective commentaries, are in like manner at once admissions of the necessity of the work and contributions towards it. Mr. Sharpe (1840) and Mr. Godwin (1867) were the exception. The work of translations of the entire N.T. Mr. Sawyer (1858) has done the same, and proposes to continue the task over the whole Bible; but he lacks both the scholarship and the judgment necessary. Mr. Cooksey has published the Gospel of Matthew as Part I of a likewise undertaking. It might almost seem as if at last there was something like a consensus of scholars and divines on this question. That assumption would, however, be too hasty. Partly the via inertere, which, in a large body like the clergy of the Church, is always great, partly the fear of ulterior consequences, partly also the indifference of the majority of the laity, would probably, at the present moment, give at least a numerical majority to the opponents of a revision. Writers on this side are naturally less numerous, but the feeling of conservatism, pure and simple, has found utterance in recent revisions, especially as Newberry, and of different calibers—Mr. Scrivener (The N.T.: An English Version), Dr. McCaul (Reasons for holding fast the Authorized English Version), Mr. C. S. Malan (A Vestigial, etc.), and Dr. Cumming (Revision and Transliteration). A high American authority, Mr. Geo. P. Marsh, also has evinced a desire to weight his judgment into the scale against any revision at the present moment (Lectures on the English Language, lect. xxviii).

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

2. The translation of the N.T. is from a text confessedly imperfect. What editions were used are a matter of inference. Theprototype, however, was published with a Latin version by Beza between 1565 and 1598, and agreeing substantially with the Textus receptus of 1638. It is clear, on principle, that no revision ought to ignore the results of the textual criticism of the last hundred years. To shrink from noticing any variation, to go on prating as the inspired Word that which there is a preponderant reason for believing to be an interpolation or a mistake, is neither honest nor reverential. To do so for the sake of greater edification is simply to offer to God the unclean sacrifice of the A.V. at any rate, in favor of the practice of not noticing variations. In Matt. i. 11, xxvi, 26; Luke xvii, 36; John viii. 6; Acts xiii, 18; Ephes. vi, 9; Heb. ii, 4; James ii, 18; 1 John ii, 28; 1 Peter ii, 21; 2 Peter iii, 11, 18; 2 John, 8, different readings are given in the margin, or, as in 1 John ii, 28, indicated by a different type. In earlier versions, as has been mentioned, 1 John v. 7 was printed in smaller letters. The degree to which this should be done will, of course, require discernment. An apparatus like that in Tischendorf or Alford would obviously be out of place. Probably the useful Greek Testament edited by Mr. Scrivener might serve as an example of a middle course.

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

4. All scholars worthy of the name are now agreed that as little change as possible should be made in the Authorized Version. Dr. V. Hunger, who was assistant to an emasculated elegance such as might have infected a new version in the last century. The very fact of the admiration felt for the A.V., and the general vival of a taste for the literature of the Elizabethan period, are safeguards against any like tampering now. Some words, however, absolute or superfluous, are altogether obsolete; others, more numerous, have been slowly passing into a different, often into a lower or a narrower meaning, and are therefore no longer what they once were, adequate renderings of the original. The self-imposed law of fairness, which led the A.V. translators to admit as many English words as possible to the honor of representing one in the Hebrew or Greek text, has, as might be expected, marred the perfection of their work. Sometimes the effect is simply that the literal rendering is the true meaning of the word, as in the rendering of the repetion of the same word; sometimes it is more serious, and affects the meaning. While it would be simple pedantry to lay down unconditionally that but one and the same word should be used throughout for one in the original, there can be no doubt that such a limitation is not only unwarranted by the principle of the translation yet others to the contrary should be dealt with as exceptional necessities. Side by side with this fault there is another just the opposite of it. One English word appears for several Greek or Hebrew words, and thus shades of meaning, often of importance to the right understanding of a passage, are lost sight of. Taken together, the two forms of error, which meet us in well-nigh every chapter, make the use of an English Concordance absolutely misleading. Technical terms especially should be represented in as exact and uniform a manner as possible.

6. Grammatical inaccuracy must be noted as a defect pervading, more or less, the whole extent of the present version of the N.T. Instances will be found in abundance in Trench and Scholefield (passim), and in any of the better Commentaries. Such Gallicisms as "the Israel of God," "Amen is Babylon fallen," etc., to say nothing of outright French words, e. g. "bruit" for noise (Nah. iii, 19), have often escaped detection. The true force of tenses, cases, prepositions, articles, is continually lost, sometimes at the cost of the finer shades which give vividness and emphasis, but sometimes also entailing more serious errors. In justice to the translators of the N.T., it must be said that, situ-
ated as they were, such errors were almost inevitable. They learned Greek through the medium of Latin. Lexicons and grammars were alike in the universal language of scholars; and that language was poorer and less infected than the Greek, and failed utterly to represent, e.g., the force of its article, or the difference of its sorites. Thus the idea in a man of this nature as were used by the translators were necessarily based upon a far scantier induction, and were therefore more meagre and inaccurate than those which have been the fruit of the labors of later scholars. The scholar may in many things fall short of that of an earlier day, but he does not directly present the sense of the original, then there is no reason for treating them as if they were added at the discretion of the translators. If they go beyond that, they are of the nature of a gloss, altering the force of the original, and have no right to be there at all, while the fact that they appear as additions frees the translator from the sense of responsibility. (8.) Good as the principle of marginal references is, the margins of the A.V., as now printed, are somewhat inconveniently crowded, and the references, being often merely verbal, tend to obscure rather than to aid the reader weary of referring. They need, accordingly, a careful sifting; and though it would not be desirable to go back to the scanty number of the original edition of 1611, something intermediate between that and the present overabundance would be an improvement.

4. Many renderings, retaining this or that precise value of Hebrew words. The grammars, also in Latin, were defective. Little as Hebrew professors have, for the most part, done in the way of exegesis, any good commentary on the O.T. will show that here also these errors are serious as in the A.V. In one memorable case, the inattention, real or apparent, of the translators to the force of the Hiphil form of the verb (Lev. iv. 12) has led to a serious attack on the truthfulness of the whole narrative of the Pentateuch (Colenso, JEHOSHUA critically Examined, pt. i., ch. vii.).

5. The division into chapters and verses is a matter theVersions of which may be revised in any future revision. The former, it must be remembered, does not go back further than the 18th century. The latter, though answered, as far as the O.T. is concerned, to a long-standing Jewish arrangement, depends, in the N.T., upon the work of Robert Stephens. Neither in the O.T. nor in the N.T. did the verse-division appear in any earlier edition than that of Geneva. The inconvenience of changing both are probably too great to be risked. The habit of referring to chapter and verse is too deeply rooted to be got rid of. Yet the division, as it is, is not seldom artificial, and sometimes absolutely misleading. No one would think of printing any other book, in prose or poetry, in short clauses like the verses of our Bibles, and the tendency of such a division is to give a broken and discontinuous knowledge, to make men good textuaries but bad divines. An arrangement which is of the paragraph Bibles of our own time, with the verse and chapter divisions relegated to the margin, ought to form part of any authoritative revision.

6. Other points of detail remain to be noticed briefly: (1.) The chapter-headings of the A. V. often go beyond the limits, as the great majority do. If it is intended to give an authoritative commentary to the lay reader, let it be done thoroughly. But if that attempt is abandon-
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with the high-priest's dress—the two onyx-stones, the twelve jewels, and the mitre-plate having inscriptions on them (Exod. xxviii, 11, 21, 36). The previous notices of signets (Gen. xxxix, 18; xii, 32) imply engraving. The art was widely spread throughout the kingdom of Egypt (Books of the Dead, xxvi, 32; xxvii, 40), particularly among the Egyptians (Diod. i, 78; Wilkinson, iii, 378), the Ethiopians (Her. vii, 69), and the Indians (Von Bohlen, Indien, ii, 122). See GRAVING.

En-had' dāh (Hebrew Eyn Cheddah), הָעֶבֶדָה, a city on the border of the tribe of Issachar, mentioned between Engannim and Mefid (Num. xxxii, xix, 30; Josh. xxvii, 15); its site is uncertain. Zefran, i, 815 and Thomson (Land and Book, ii, 248) would identify it with Ain-Houd, on the western brow of Carmel, and about two miles from the sea; but this is out of the limits of the tribe of Issachar. Its site is possibly to be sought in the formula of the ancient village Ain-Makhi, not far N.E. of Nazareth (Robinson, Researches, iii, 209).

En-hak' kōrē (Heb. Eyn hak-korē), הָעֶבֶדָה, fountain of the gather; Sept. ἡ πηγή τοῦ φυλακτοῦ, a name given by Samson to the spring that burst forth in answer to his prayer in a dell of Lehi, when he was exhausted with the slaughter of the Philistines (Judg. xv, 19). The word לִבְנַחַל, nakhal, which in the narrative denotes the "hollow place" (literally the "mortal" or "socket in the jaw", and also that for the "jaw" itself, lekhi, are both names of places. See LEXI. Van de Velde (Mém. p. 489) endeavors to identify Lehi with Tell el-Lekhiyeh, 4 miles N. of Beer-sheba, and En-hakkore with the large spring between the tell and Kheweldeh. But Samson's adventures appear to have been confined to a narrow circle, and there is no ground for extending them to a distance of some 50 miles from Gaza, which Lekiyeh is, even in a straight line. It appears to have been the same place later known (Neh. xi, 29) as En-Rimon (q. v.).

En-hā' rod (Heb. Eym Harod), הָעֶבֶדָה, fountain of Harod; Sept. τῆς πηγῆς Ὀρόπης, a spring in the vicinity of the town of Harod (Judg. vii, 1), where the name is translated "well of Harod". See HADAR.

En-hā' sōr (Heb. Eym Chatzer), הָעֶבֶדָה, fountain of Hazor; i. e. of the village; Sept. τῆς πηγῆς Ὁζορίου, a fortified city of the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned between Edrei and Iven (Josh. xix, 37), and distinguished from the older city of Hazor, the site of which is unknown (Exod. xiv, 7). It has been identified by Schwartz (Palest. p. 180) and Thomson (Land and Book, i, 515) with the Ain-Hosar not far N.W. of Tell-Hosar (between Rameh or Ramash and Yakub or Hukkob), which latter (being marked as a ruined site by Van de Velde, although Dr. Robinson, who visited it, denies that there are any traces of structures on the summit; Later Researches, p. 81), was probably the location of the city itself. See HAZOR.

Enlightenment. See ILLUMINATI.

En-mish’ pat (Heb. Eym Mishpat), הָעֶבֶדָה, fountain of judgment; Sept. ἡ πηγῆ τὸς στόχου, the earlier name (Gen. xiv, 7) for Kadesh (q. v.), in the borders of Idumea (comp. Num. xx, 13, 14). According to Schwartz (Palest. p. 216), there has been found, about 10 miles south of Petra, a large spring, still called tentatively by the Bedouins Ain-ul-Sufa, or spring of justice, which he holds to be the same as the ancient En-mishpat; but this would be very far south for the required locality [see EXOD.]; and the spot he names is doubtless the Ain-ul-Safaka marked on Robinson's Map as identical with the Zoqotha of the Roman post-routes (Re land, ii, 313).

Enmity: "opposition; very bitter, deep-rooted, irrecocilable hatred and variance. Such a constant enmity there is between the followers of Christ and
Satan; nay, there is some such enmity between mankind and some serpents (Gen. iii. 15). Friendship with this world, in its wicked members and lusts, is enmity with God—is opposed to the love of him, and amounts to an actual exerting of ourselves to diabolon and death. The word ἐνμίαν, is explained in 1 Cor. i. 29, 30. The carnal mind, or minding of fleshly and sinful things, is enmity against God—is opposed to his nature and will in the highest degree, and, though it may be removed, cannot be reconciled to him, nor he to it (Rom. vii. 8). The ceremonial law is called enmity. It marked God as enmity against sin by demanding atonement for it; it occasioned men's enmity against God by its burdensome services, and was an accidental source of standing variance between Jews and Gentiles: or perhaps the enmity here meant is the state of variance between God and men, whereby he justly loathed and hated them as sinful, and condemned them to punishment; and they wickedly hated him for his holy excellence, retributive justice, and sovereign goodness: both are slain and abolished by the death of Christ (Eph. ii. 15, 16).

Ennodius, Magnus Felix, one of the Latin fathers, was born about A.D. 473, at Arles (according to others at Milan), of a noble Gallic family, having such names as Germanicus and Boethius on his mother's side. His parents dying early, he was sent, on the invasion of the Visigoths, to an aunt in Milan, who took good care of his education. Soon after her death (A.D. 489) he married a rich wife, and lived very freely until a severe illness brought him to reflection; and on his restoration he was ordained deacon, and later became a nun. (One account says that he had been ordained deacon before, and lived a bad life as deacon. In 494 he accompanied Epiphanius of Pavia on a mission to Burgundy to ransom some Italian prisoners. In 496 he went to Rome, where he soon gained great reputation. In 502 he wrote in vindication of Pope Symmachus against his rival, Pope Laurentius. In this defence he first asserted that the bishop of Rome is subject to no earthly tribunal (Gieseler, i, § 115). He was the first to give the bishop of Rome exclusively the name of "Papa" (pope), and was, in general, very eager to enlarge the papal authority. After he had been chosen, about A.D. 511, to succeed Maximus as bishop of Pavia (Ticinium), he went, under direction of pope Hormisdas, on two missions (515 and 517) to the emperor Anastasius with reference to the union between the Eastern Greek and Western churches. Both missions failed. Ennodius died at Pavia July 17, 521. Among his writings are, Epistolae ad Dianum lib. iv.:—Liber alv. ev. fil., contra Symmodem scrivere præsumerunt, containing the defence of Symmachus named above; Vita Epiphanii Episcopi; Vita Antonii Monachiariumus:—Eucharistia in vitis mnis, an autobiography:—Præcursus didascalca ad Ambrosium et Beatum:—Orations:—Carmina. His writings were published in Basle, 1580, fol.; Tournay, 1610; and by Simond (best ed.), Paris, 1811. They are also in Migne, Patro. Lat. vol. 139. Eunapius wrote strongly in favor of free will, and has therefore styled a Semipelagian. — Cave, Hist. Lit. (Geneva, 1720), i, 322; Cellarius, Auctores Sacris (Paris, 1861), x, 473 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 68; Wetzer u. Wele, Kirch. Lex. iii, 595.

'Enoch (Heb. Chovack), לוח סינע, inscribed; according to Philo, De poet. Cans, i, 11, from יוחנן, with the suffix יוחנן (יווחנן), יוחנן, the name of several men. 1. Moses, the seventh son of Cain (Gen. iv. 17), who called the city which he built after his name (Gen. iv. 18). B.C. post 4041. It is there described as being east of Eden, in the land of Nod, to which Cain retired after the murder of his brother. See Nod. Ewald (Gesch. i, 356, note) fancies that there is a reference to the Phrygian Iconium, in which city a legend of Ἀνανος was preserved, evidently derived from the biblical account of the father of Methuselah (Gen. iv. 24, 25; Gen. vii. 4; Nivianis). Other places have been identified with the city of Enoch with little probability; e. g. Anaucht (Ptolemy, vi, 8, 5) in Susiana, the Hemochni (Ptolemy, v, 9, 25; Strabo, i, 492; Pliny, vi, 10, 12) in the Caucasus, etc. (Huetius, De Paranaico, c. 17; Hasso, Entdeckungen, ii, 35; Gotter, De Tenho opsalta, 1727, [of little value]; Sticht, De ber. Hemochni, Jen. 1727). 2. Another antediluvian patriarch, the son of Jared and father of Methuselah (Gen. v. 21 sq.; Luke iii, 28: in 1 Chron. i, 8, the name is Anglicized "He-noch"). B.C. 8550-3185. He was born when Jared was 162 years old, and after the birth of his eldest son in his 66th year he lived 800 years. From the period of 856 years assigned to his life, Ewald (ib. Gesch. i, 356), with very little probability, regards him as "the god of the new year," but the number may have been without influence on the later traditions which assigned to Enoch the discovery of the science of astronomy (ἀστρολογία, Σεισπολομασ, in Euseb. Prep. Ev. iv, 17, where he is identified with Atlas). After the birth of Methuselah it is said (Gen. v, 22-24) that Enoch "walked with God 300 years . . . and he was not; for God took him" (Nipsh). The phrase "walked with God" (δια αύτου ἀλληλούγησεν) is elsewhere only used of Noah (Gen. vi, 9; comp. Gen. xvi, 1, etc.), and is to be explained of a prophetic life spent in immediate converse with the spiritual world (Book of Enoch, xii, 2, "All his actions were with the holy ones, and with the watchers during his life"). There is no farther mention of Enoch in the O. T., but in Ecclesiastus (xlix, 14) he is brought forward as one of the peculiar glorys (οὐκ εἰς ἱεραρχίαν ἔριθος ἐς τῶν Ἰβραίων, he was taken up (ἀνεσχέθη, Alex. μεταφέρεται) for each second person. He pleased the Lord and was translated (Vulg. into Paradise), being a pattern of repentance" (Reclus. xlii, 14). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the spring and issue of Enoch's life are clearly marked. "By faith Enoch was translated (μεταφέρεται), that he should not see death . . . for before his translation (μεταφέρεται) he had this testimony, that he pleased God." The contrast to this divine judgment is found in the constrained words of Josephus: "Enoch departed to the Deity (ἰδρυμένος τῷ θεῷ) . . . whose (the sacred writers) have not recorded his death" (Awt. i, 5, 4). In the Epistle to the Hebrews (xv, 14) comp. Enoch, is described as the second from Adam; and the number is probably noticed as conveying the idea of divine completion and rest (comp. August. c. Faust. xii, 14), while Enoch was himself a type of perfected humanity, "a man raised to heaven by pleading God, whose angels fell to earth by transgression" (Irenaeus, iv. 16, 2). Elijah was in like manner translated; and thus was the doctrine of immortality palpably taught under the ancient dispensation.

The biblical notices of Enoch were a fruitful source of speculation among the ancients. Some theologians disputed with subtlety as to the place to which he was removed, whether it was to Paradise or to the immediate presence of God (comp. Feuardentius, ad Iren. v, 5), though others more wisely declined to discuss the question (Thilo, Cod. Apor. N. T. p. 746). On other points they fall into universal unanimity. Enoch and Greek fathers commonly couple Enoch and Elijah as historic witnesses of the possibility of a resurrection of the body and of a true human existence in glory (Iren. iv, 5, 1; Tertull. de Resurr. Carm. p. 58; Jos. c. Apoll. c. 11). The voice of early ecclesiastical tradition is almost unanimous in regarding them as "the two witnesses" (Rev. xi, 3 sq.) who should fall before "the beast," and afterwards be raised to heaven before the great
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judgment (Hippol. Fragm. in Dom. xxii.; de Antichr.
xilii, Cosmas Indic. p. 25, sq. Thilo, exta rati lexis-

castivitatis paradisum; Tertull. de Animâ, p. 59; Am-

bros. in Psalm, xlv. 4; Evang. Nicol. c. xxv, on which

Thilo has almost exhausted the question, Cod. Apoc.
N. T. p. 756 sq.). This belief removed a serious diffi-
cult which was supposed to attach to their testa-
mentation, for it was maintained that they would at

last discharge the common debt of a sinful humanity,

from which they were not exempted by their glorious

removal from the earth (Tertull de Animâ, i. c.; Au-


had become the inventor of writing, arithmetic, and

astronomy (Euseb. Prop. En. i. 17). He is said to

have filled 300 books with the revelations which he

received, and is commonly identified with Edrisi (i. e.

the learned), who is commemorated in the Koran (cap.

19) as one "exalted [by God] to a high place" (comp.


and prophecies were commonly ascribed to him, which

he is said to have arranged in a book. This book was

delivered to his son, and preserved by Noah in the

ark. After the Flood it was made known to the world,

and handed down from one generation to another (see

Yarchei, Ths. 172, 175; Dant, in Meuschen's N. T. Tids.
p. 722; Schmieder, Comment. in Gal. iii. 19 (Nurnb. 1866).
p. 23; Buddel Hist. Eccles. v. T. I, 162; Drusius, De

Hence, in the Crit. Sacri, i, ii; Pfeiffer, Decus select.

cer. p. 12; D'Herbelot, Bibliothe. Or. i. 624; Robert-

son. The Prophet Enoc (Lond. 1866); Paff, De regno

Enochi (Lond. 1789); Hall, Works, i. 360; Alexander.

Hist. Eccles. i, 142; Calmet, Commentary, viii. 10, 27;

i, 1; Judge, Lect. on Gen. i. 72; Evans, Script. Bibl.
iii, 1; Kitto, Bible Illustr. i. 128; Bell, Enoch's Walk (Lond.
1862); Newtagger, Hist. Patriarchorum; 1; Saurin,

Disc, i. 65; Boston, Sermon, i. 230; Dodge, Works,
iii, 329; Slade, Sermons, ii, 447; Williams, Sermons,
ii, 367.

3. The third son of Midian, and grandson of Abra-

ham by Keturah (Gen. xxxv. 4, A. V. "Hanoch;" 1

Chron. i. 25, "Mench"). B.C. post-2005.

The eldest son of Reuben (A. V. "Hanoch," Gen.

xvi. 9; Exod. vi. 14; 1 Chron. v. 3), from whom came

"the family of the Hanochites" (Num. xxxvi. 5). B.C.

1873.

5. In 2 Eor. vi, 49, 51, "Enoch" stands in the Lat.

(Eng.) version for one of the two famous amphibi-

ous monsters, doubtless correctly Bekemok in the

Ethiopic.

ENOC, BOOK OF, one of the most important re-

mains of early apocryphal literature. The interest

that once attached to it has now partly subsided: yet

a document quoted, as is generally believed, by an

inspired apostle (Jude, ver. 14, 15), can never be wholly

devoid of importance or utility in sacred literature.

Concerning its vigorous style and wide range of specula-

tion, the book is well worthy of that attention which it re-

ceived in the first ages, and recent investigations have

still left many points for further inquiry.

I. History of the Book.—The first trace of its exis-
tence is generally found in the epistle of Jude (14, 15;

comp. Enoch, i. 9), but the words of the apostle leave

it as an unexplained allusion to the book he denied to

have derived from tradition (Hoffmann, Schriftenreise, i, 420) or from writ-

ring (Koepfler, ...). Enoch's liyam), though the

wide spread of the book in the 2nd century seems al-

most decisive in favor of the latter supposition. In

several of the fathers mention is made of Enoch as the

author, not only of a prophetical writing, but of various

productions. Some such work appears to have been

known to Tertullian (Apoc. ii, 3); to Eusebius (Hist. Ec-

cles. i. 16, 2), and Anatolius (Euseb. H. E. vii. 82). Clemen-

t of Alexandria (Hegel. p. 801) and Origen (yet comp. c.

Cels. v, p. 257, ed. Spenc.) both make use of it, and

numerous references occur to the "writing," "books," and

"words" of Enoch in the Testament of the XII Patri-

archs (Apoc. i. 16, 17). The authorship of the work is

belong to the latter part of the 1st century or the be-

ginning of the second, and which presents more or less

resemblance to passages in the present book (Fabrici


275 sq.). Tertullian (De cultu fem. i. 3; compare De

Idol. 4) expressly quotes the book. It was "not received by some, nor admitted into the Jewish

canon" (in armarium Judaeum, but defends it on ac-

count of its reference to Christ ("legimus omnem scripturam sedificiacionis habilem divinum inspirari").

Augustine (De Civ. xv. 20, 4) and an anonymous writ-

er, who speaks of the "first book of Enoch," refers to it

(Psalm. cxxxii. 2; compare H. ad Psalm. i. c.), were

both acquainted with it; but from their time till the

revival of letters it was known in the Jewish Church

only through the quotation in Jude (Dillmann, Zimm.

i, 327). In the 5th century, the Church of Alexandria

began to use it. In the 8th century, Georgius Syncellus, in a

work entitled Chronographia, that reaches from Adam
to Diodocian, made various extracts from "the first

book of Enoch." In the 9th century, Nicephorus, pa-

triarch of Constantinople, at the conclusion of his Chron-

ographe (Chronicarion); and in the early part of the

century, his "asconioul books, refers to the book of Enoch, and

assigns 4800 eiriouS as the extent of it. After this time

little or no mention appears to have been made of the

production until Scaliger printed the fragments of the

Syncellus regarding it, which he inserted in his notes to

the Chronicarion. In consequence of such extracts, the

book of Enoch excited much attention and awakened

great curiosity. At the beginning of the 17th century an idea prevailed that it ex-

isted in an Ethiopic translation. A Capuchin monk from Egypt assured Pierre that he had seen the book

in Ethiopic, and the then Patriarch, as a descendant of

the scholar of Pisa so much that he never rested until he obtained the tract. But when Job Ludolph

went afterwards to Paris to the Royal Library, he found it to be a fabulous and silly production. In conse-

quence of this disappointment, and securing in Ethiopia it was abandoned. At length, in 1778, Bruce brought home three copies of the book of Enoch from Abyssinia in MSS., containing the Ethi-

opic translation complete. "Amongst the articles," he states, "I consigned to the library at Paris was a very

beautiful and magnificent copy of the prophecies of Enoch in large quarto. Another is amongst the books of

Scripture which I brought home, standing immediately

before the book of Job, which is its proper place in the

Abyssinian Canon; and a third copy I have pre-

sented to the Bodleian Library at Oxford by the hands

of Dr. Johnes, of the University of Carlow." It is

known in England that such a present had been made to

the Royal Library at Paris by Dr. Wolde, librarian of the British Museum, set out for France with letters from

the secretary of state to the ambassador at that
court, desiring him to assist the merchant in pre-

paring the work. Dr. Wolf accordingly transcribed it, and brought back with him the copy to

England. The Parisian MS. was first publicly noticed by the eminent Orientalist De Sacy in 1800, who

translated into Latin ch. i, ii, iv, xvi; also xxii and

xxxvi. These also he published in the Mopnos Zeug-

clopideique (VI, i, 382 sq.). Mr. Murray, editor of
Bruce's Travels, gave some account of the book from the traveller's own MS. The Ethiopic text, however, was not published till the edition of archbishop Laurence from the Bodleian MS. in 1838 (Libri Enoch versionis Ethiopici ... Oxon.). But in the interval Laurence published an English translation, with an introduction and notes, which passed through three editions (The Book of Enoch, etc., by R. Laurence; Oxford, 1821, 1823, 1836). The translation of Laurence formed the basis of the German edition of Hoffmann (Das Buch Henoch ... A. E. Hoffmann, Jena, 1833-38); and Gfrörer, in 1840, gave a Latin translation constructed from the editions of Laurence and Hoffmann (Prophetae veteres Pseudepigrapphi ... ed. A. F. Gfrörer, Stuttgart, 1840). According to Angelo Mai, there is a MS. copy of the book of Enoch among the Ethiopic codices of the Vatican, which must have been brought to England by Erasmus in 1514. In 1834 Dr. Rüppell procured another MS. of Enoch from Abyssinia, from which Hoffmann made the second part of his German version. All these editions were superseded by those of Dillmann, who edited the Ethiopic text from five MSS. (Libri Henoch, Ethiopici, Lipsiae, 1853). He gave a German translation of the book with a good introduction and commentary (Das Buch Henoch ... von Dr. A. Dillmann, Leipzig, 1853). The work of Dillmann gave a fresh impulse to the study of the book. Among the essays which were called out by it, the most important were those of Reuss, who published a German translation of the book (Entstehung, etc., Göttingen, 1856) and Hilgenfeld (D. Jüdische Apokalypse, Jena, 1857). The older literature on the subject is reviewed by Fabrius (Cod. Pseudep. V. T., I, 199 sq.).

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

II. Identity of the extant forms.—There can be no doubt that the Ethiopic translation exhibits the identical book which, as most belles lettres of the Jews, they composed; their use of them in the original, not the Greek translation of the Septuagint; their Hebrew etymologies of names, especially the appellations of angels and archangels; the fact that all words and phrases can easily be rendered back into Hebrew and Aramaic; the obscure quipus, which can only be explained by the Hebrew שָׁמַע, הָעֵדַת, "the second is called the south, because the Most High there descends," i.e. שָׁמַע, הָעֵדַת (Dillmann, Das Buch Henoch, p. 235, 296). The names of the conductors of the month are also Hebrew (lxvixii, 13), as Murray (p. 46) and Hoffmann (p. 690) remark. See Joseph b-Lewi, in the Journal Asiatique, 1867, p. 302 sq.

At what time the Greek version was made from the original can only be conjectured. It could not have been long after the final redaction of the whole, probably about the time of Philo. Having appeared in Greek, it soon became widely circulated. The Ethiopic version was made from the Greek probably about the same time as the Ethiopic translation of the other parts of the Bible with which it was afterwards connected, or, in other words, towards the middle or close of the 4th century. See ETHIOPIAN VERSIONS.

V. Contents.—The book of Enoch is divided in the Ethiopic MSS. into twenty sections, which are subdivided into 108, and numbered, but copies of them have not seen a classification of chapters. Dillmann has properly departed from the MSS., and endeavored to make divisions of sections, chapters, and verses which may represent the text pretty nearly as it is preserved among the Abyssinians. In its present shape the book consists of a series of revelations supposed to have been given to Enoch and Noah, which extend to the most varied aspects of na-
tude and life, and are designed to offer a comprehensive vindication of the action of Providence. See Enoch.

It is divided into five parts. The first part (chaps. i.-xxxvi. Dillm.,) after a general introduction (characterizing the book to which it belongs as a revelation of the hidden wisdom and mystery of the world, and its results both towards the righteous and rebellious sinners, written to console the pious in the times of final tribulation), contains an account of the fall of the angels (Gen. vi, 1), and of the judgment to come upon them and upon the giants, the nations, and races of mankind. The second (xxvii.-liv.) describes the description of the journey of Enoch through the earth and lower heaven in company with an angel, who showed him many of the great mysteries of nature, the treasure-houses of the storms, and winds, and fires of heaven, the prison of the fallen, and the land of the dead (xxviii.-xxxv.). The third part (xxxvii.-xxxviii.) is styled "a vision of wisdom," and consists of three "parables," in which Enoch relates the revelations of the higher secrets of heaven and of the spiritual world which were given to him. The first parable (xxxviii.-xl.) gives chiefly a picture of the future bliss of the redeemed. The fourth part (xliv.-lv.) describes in splendid imagery the coming of Messiah, and the results which it should work among the "elect" and the gainers; the third (lviii.-lxix.) describes the vision of the "sacred things," of "the elect and holy," and the confusion and wretchedness of the sinful rulers of the world. The third part (lxxii.-lxxxiii.) is styled "the book of the course of the lights of heaven," and deals with the motions of the sun and moon, and the changes of the seasons; and with this the narrative of the revelations of the book of Enoch ends.

The fourth part (lxxxiv.-xxci.) is not distinguished by any special name, but contains the record of a dream which was granted to Enoch in his youth, in which he saw the history of the kingdoms of God and of the world up to the final establishment of the throne of Messiah. The visions of the great monarchies of the ancient world, as well as the nations of the church, are dwelt on as the prelude of the final kingdom of the Redeemer, which is the subject of the final book.

The fifth part (xxci.-xxxvi.i) contains the last address of Enoch to his children, in which the teaching of the former chapters is made the groundwork of earnest exhortation. The signs which attended the birth of Noah are next noticed (cvii.-cviii.); and another short "writing of Enoch" (cviii.) forms the close to the whole of the Apocryphal Book of Enoch. See Enoch.

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

VII. Doctrines.—In the doctrine of the Book of Enoch exhibits a great advance of thought within the limits of revelation in each of the great divisions of knowledge.

The teaching combines and repeats the thoughts of the scattered images of the O. T. to a physical system. The view of society and man, of the temporary triumph and final discontinuance of the oppressors of God's people, carries out into elaborate detail the pregnant images of Daniel. The figure of the Messiah is invested with majestic dignity, and is described as "the Son of God" (cv, 2 only), "whose name was named before the sun was made" (xlvi. 8), and who existed "after the time in the presence of God" (lxii. 6; comp. Laurence, Prec. Dial. l sq.). At the same time, his human attributes are declared as "the Son of Man" (cxiv., 1 only), "the elect one," "the righteous one," "the anointed," are brought into conspicuous notice. The mysteries of the spiritual world, the connection of angels and men, the classes and ministries of the hosts of heaven, the power of Satan (xl. 7; lxxv. 6), and the legions of the dead, and the doctrine of retribution, and eternal punishment (xxxi.; comp. Dillm. p. xix.), are dwelt upon with growing earnestness as the horizon of speculation was extended by intercourse with Greece. But the message of the book is emphatically one of "faith and truth" (comp. Dillm. p. 52), and while the writer combats and repeats the thoughts of Scripture, he adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His errors spring from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from a proud exultation in present success. For the great characteristic by which the book is distinguished from the later books of the Bible (see Esdras) is the tone of triumphant expectation by which it is pervaded. It seems to repeat in every form the great principle that the world, natural, moral, and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God. Hence it follows that the sternest terms are used for sinners, and the glorious kingdom prepared for the righteous, and Messiah is regarded as the divine mediator of this double issue (xc. xci.). Nor is it without a striking fitness that a patriarch translated from earth, and admitted to look upon the divine majesty, is chosen as "the herald of wisdom, righteousness, and judgment to a people who, even in suffering, saw in their tyrants only the victims of a coming vengeance."

As in the canonical prophecies of the O. T., so here, the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom is preceded by wars and desolations. In the eighth of the ten weeks in which the work of destruction divided, the sword executes judgment upon the wicked, at the end of which God's people have built a new temple, in which they are gathered together. The tenth week closes with the eternal judgment upon angels (xc. xci.). With respect to the doctrine of a general resurrection, it is certainly implied in the work, but the mode of the resurrection of the wicked and the righteous is differently presented. The spirits of the former are taken out of Sheol and thrown into the place of torment (xxvili. 3; ciii. 8; civil. 2.5); whereas the spirits of the righteous remain holy, dwell with their bodies, and share the blessedness of Messiah's kingdom on earth (lxii. 5; cxii. 10; xci. 3; c, 5). The
reunion of their bodies with their spirits appears a thing reserved for the righteous.

As various sects in Jerusalem were tolerably developed at the time of some of the writers, it has been a subject of inquiry whether the peculiar doctrines of any apostolic writer could be ascertained. According to Litt. (Zeitschrift der deutsch.-morgenländ. Gelehr., vii, 249), the work originated in the sphere of Esseniøm. We learn from Josephus that the Essenes preserved as sacred the names of the angels; and put up certain prayers before sunrise, as if they made supplication for that phenomenon. Now there is a very developed angel-doctrine in the work before us, and we also find the following passage: "When I went out from below and saw the heaven, and the sun rise in the east, and the moon go down in the west, a few stars, and everything as he has known it from the beginning, I praised the Lord of judgment and marveled him, because he has made the sun go forth from the windows of the east," etc., i.xxxiii, 11). This certainly reminds one of Esseniøm showing its influence on the mind of the writer. The 108th chapter is more plainly Esseniøm. The pious upholders of the Essenes, as described as having lived a life of purity, self-denial, and asceticism like that of the Essenes. Yet Dillmann appears disinclined to find any reflection of Esseniøm in 1 lixiii, 11, or elsewhere (Das Buch Henoch, Althrus. Eingebung, p. lll). We admit that the other parts of the Scripture have influence on the writer. It is obvious, however, that the writer did not belong to the school of the Pharisees. He was tolerably free from the sects of his people; rising above the narrow confines of their distinctive peculiarities, which were not then fully developed.

VIII. Style.—It is obvious that the author was a poet of no mean order. His inspiration was high, his ideas elevated and pure. He had a creative fancy which could body forth new forms and shapes. Speaking out of the midst of his own time, he could throw himself back into the past, and mould it suitably to his purpose. His language, too, has the living freshness of a companion with the book of Daniel, as is obvious from the spirit of his production.

Not that he was an imitator of that book—far from it; his mind was too powerful and independent. It is characteristic of him that he calls Jehovah Lord of Spirits, that he speaks of angels, spiritual beings that stand before God the four highest angels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, Phanuel; and the three highest hosts, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim; that he speaks of the Elect by way of eminence, the Son of Man, i.e. the Messiah. The charm of the writing is so inscrutable that an inexperienced reader into the highest regions of the spiritual world. With a genuine glow of feeling, and the elevation of purest hope, he carries us away, till we are lost in wonder at the poetic inspiration of one living at a period comparatively so late. His work must have created a new branch of writing at the time, leading to numerous imitations.

IX. Authorship.—The general unity which the book possesses in its present form marks it, in the main, as the work of one man. The several parts, while they are complete in themselves, are still connected by the development of a central purpose. But formally, the work might have been divided in various ways. Each of the different fragments is as complete in itself as it could be made to appear; it is a case of the principle: "When a body is divided, it is divided into parts of itself." Thus a work of this kind is a collection of partial writings, and it is impossible to give a precise date for each.

The book of Enoch is a collection of many writings, some of which are of earlier date than the book itself, and some of which are later. The book is not a single composition, but a collection of various writings, some of which are more ancient than others. The book is divided into two parts: the first part is called "The Book of Enoch," and the second part is called "The Book of the Giants." The first part is a collection of sayings and visions of Enoch, the brother of Jubal, and the second part is a collection of sayings and visions of the Biblical patriarchs.

The book of Enoch is a collection of many writings, some of which are of earlier date than the book itself, and some of which are later. The book is not a single composition, but a collection of various writings, some of which are more ancient than others. The book is divided into two parts: the first part is called "The Book of Enoch," and the second part is called "The Book of the Giants." The first part is a collection of sayings and visions of Enoch, the brother of Jubal, and the second part is a collection of sayings and visions of the Biblical patriarchs.
because they occur in the Ethiopic O. T. as the representatives of Hebrew-Greek ones. All that can be truly deduced from the Christology is that it is highly developed, and very elevated in tone, yet fairly derivable from the O. T. in all its essential and individual features. Nor is there anything in the eschatology or angelology to bring any enlightening touch of the Johannine tradition. We allow that the Messiah is spoken of in very exalted terms. His dignity, character, and acts surpass the descriptions presented in other Jewish books. But they are alike in the main, colored by the highly poetical and majestic style of the writers with the sublimity and animation of their creations. We must therefore reject Stuart's opinion of a Jewish-Christian origin. All the arguments adduced on its behalf are easily dissipates, since Dillmann's editio and Ewald's criticisms have led to a better acquaintance with the text of the extant origin. Nor is Hagensfeld's attempt to show that the so-called first Enoch book (xxxvii-xxxiii) proceeded from Christian Gnostics more successful, as Dillmann has remarked (Pseudopigraphien der A. T. in Herzog's Encyclopädie, xii. 309, 310). Equally futile is Hoffmann's endeavor to show that the book did not appear till the completion of the construction of Jerusalem in the first century, when both Jude's epistle and the Apocalypse had been written (Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellschaft, vi. 87 sq.). Not very dissimilar is Böttcher's view, that the book, like the Syllinic Apocalypse, was written in the second century after Christ of pieces belonging to different times (De Inferno, i. 500). Nothing is more certain than that the work belongs to an ante-Christian world; and therefore the only problem is how to distribute the different books incorporated, and when to date them collectively. Up to the apostolic age the prophecy had received no attention, yet who ever supposed that by such references he sanctions the productions from which his citations are made, or renders them of greater value? All that can be reasonably inferred from such a fact is, that if the inspired writer cites a particular sentiment with approval, it must be regarded as just and right, irrespective of the remainder of the book in which it is found. The apostle's sanction extends no farther than the passage to which he alludes. Other portions of the original document may exhibit the most absurd and superstitious notions. It has always been the current opinion that the work is the production of the first century, and there is nothing to disprove it. It is true that there is some variation between the quotation and its original, but this is usual even with the N. T. writers in citing the Old Testament.

The Place where it was written—The place where the author lived and wrote is Palestine. This alone seems to be the case. The book is, in fact, a work in which is largely pervaded by the spirit of persons whose power, religion, and independence had been overborne by foreign interference. Launoue, however, endeavors to show from the 27th chapter (71 lost lines) that the author of the book has the kingdom of the 12th of the various periods of the year is given, that the locality must have been between the 46th and 49th degrees of north latitude, in the northern districts of the Caspian and Euxine seas. Hence he conjectures that the writer was one of the Jews who had been carried away by Shalmaneser and did not return. After Krieger supposed (Brittrage, p. 53) that Enoch, the imaginary writer, drew from the astronomical traditions or writings of northern Asia, regardless of the difference of Palestine's geographical position. Murray has shown (p. 60 sq.) that one passage favors the idea that the author lived in Abydsinia; whence he sees that the production proceeded from, various persons belonging to countries removed from one another. But De Sacy has remarked that as the authors' astronomical system is partly imaginary, their geography may also be visioned. Neither Egypt, nor Chaldea, nor Palestine, suits the astronomy of the book. The scientific knowledge of the Israelites was imperfect. It is therefore idle to look for accuracy in geography or astronomy. The writer or writers systematized such knowledge as they had of natural phenomena after their own fashion, as the case of the 12th month and the thirty-five days, and the allusions to the Oriental theophany and the opinions of Zoroaster do not necessarily commend a Chaldean origin, at least of the astronomical part, since the images of fire, radiance, light, and other Oriental symbols may be rationally accounted for by the Jews' intercourse with other nations, and their residence there for a time. The Oriental philosophy of Middle Asia was evidently not unknown to the authors, and they are embodied in the work because Persian influences had been felt by the Israelites since the Babylonian captivity.

Did Jude really quote the Book of Enoch?—A simple comparison of the language of the apostle's text that found in the corresponding passage of the extant book seems to settle this question conclusively in the affirmative, especially as the Scripture citation is preceded with the direct acknowledgment of quotation: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these things." The following are the words respectively:

EPISTLE OF JUDE, VER. 14, 15; BOOK OF ENOCH, CHAP. II; LAURENCE'S VERSION, LAURENCE'S VERSION.

"Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his thousands of saints, to execute judgment on all," etc. The language is so personal that the apostle's words are not ten thousand words to the same effect that are ungodly among them, reprove all the carnal for evils of all their ungodly deeds (which the sinful and wicked do) and they are ungodly have done, and all of their hard-milked against him." Speeches which ungodly sinners have condemned him."

Some, however, are most unwilling to believe that an inspired writer could cite an apocryphal production. Such an opinion destroys, in their view, the character of his writing, and reduces it to the level of an ordinary composition. But this is preposterous. The current opinion that the so-called apocryphal books are ungodly has been made without proof or clear rational evidence, and who ever supposed that by such references he sanctions the productions from which his citations are made, or renders them of greater value? All that can be reasonably inferred from such a fact is, that if the inspired writer cites a particular sentiment with approval, it must be regarded as just and right, irrespective of the remainder of the book in which it is found. The apostle's sanction extends no farther than the passage to which he alludes. Other portions of the original document may exhibit the most absurd and superstitious notions. It has always been the current opinion that the work is the production of the first century, and there is nothing to disprove it. It is true that there is some variation between the quotation and its original, but this is usual even with the N. T. writers in citing the Old Testament. The current opinion, Simon, Witsius, etc., suppose that Jude quoted a traditional prophecy or saying of Enoch, and we see no improbability in the assumption. Others, again, believe that the words apparently cited by Jude were suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. But surely this hypothesis is unnecessary. Until it can be shown that the book of Enoch did not exist in the time of Jude, or that his quoting it is unworthy of him, or that such knowledge was not handed down traditionally so as to be within his reach, we abide by the opinion that Jude really quoted the book. While there are probable grounds for believing that he might have become acquainted with the extremest ideas independently of inspiration, we ought not to have recourse to the hypothesis of immediate suggestion. On the whole, it is most likely that the book of Enoch existed before the time of Jude, and that he latter really quoted it, in accordance with the custom with which the prophecy ascribed to Enoch was truly ascribed to him in a question of no importance in this connection. See Jude.

Literature.—Bange, De libro Henochi (in his Catam Orientis, Hafn. 1657, 4to, p. 16-19); and Exercit. (Leiden, 1681, 4to); Dillmann, Butt, Genuesis of Enoch (London, 1837, 8vo); Dillmann, Liber Henoch Ethnikos (Lips. 1851, 8vo); Id.,

ENOCH, CITY OF. See Enoch, i.

ENO. See Enoch.

E'non (Heb. Enoâth,Ν Ν, poct. a man. Sept. and N.T. Ewâth; Josephus ‘Ewōth, Ant. i, 8, 2), the son of Seth, and grandson of Adam (Gen. v, 6-11; Luke iii, 38). He lived 955 years (B.C. 3325-2370), and is remarkable on account of a singular expression used respecting him in Genesis iv, 26. "Then began men to call on the name of the Lord." This is not to be taken absolutely, as it would be absurd to suppose that none called on the name of the Lord before that time, and accordingly there are two interpretations given of the passage: one is the marginal reading of the A.V. "Then began men to call themselves by the name of the Lord," in order, it would seem, to distinguish themselves from those who were already idolaters, and were termed children of men; the other, "Then men profanely called on the gods of other nations, the name of the Lord," intimating that at that period idolatry began to be practised among men. The latter is the interpretation adopted by the Jewish expositors generally, but the former has more currency among Christian commentators. It may be observed that both unite in the common idea of the widening difference between the pious and the wicked. In either case the passage may be regarded as implying that divine worship which till that time had been confined to private families, now became public—and that is, religious services were held on fixed days and in public places. In Chron. 1, i, the name is Anglicized Enoch.

E'noth, a more correct mode of Anglicizing (1 Chron. i, 1) the name Enoch (q. v.).

En'rim'ōn (Heb. Eyn Rimmon, Ν Ν, fountain of Rimmon; Sept. iv Peopov υ Ν, iv Peopov, Val. MS. omits, Vulg. et in Erimmon), a place occupied by the descendants of Judah after the Exile (Neh. xi, 29). It appears from the associated places of Erimmon (Erimmon) and Rimmon near to it or originally from the non-Levitical Rimmon and indicated by a remarkable reservoir still extant in the vicinity. See RIMMON.

En-ro'gel (Heb. Eyn Rogel, Ν Ν, found of the river, q. d. foot-fountain; constructed by Furst, after the Targums, with the Arabic and Septuagint, "Fuller's Spring," because fullers trode the clothes in the water; but Gesenius renders "fountain of the eyes" Sept. πυγής Πύγας, Vulg. fontis Rogel), a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the boundary-line between Judah and Josh. xvi, 7) and Benjamin (xvii, 16). It was the point next to Jerusalem on this level, as is evident from the use of the words "ascended" and "descended" in these two passages. Here, apparently concealed from the view of the city, Jonathan and Abinadab remained, after the flight of David, awaiting intelligence from within the walls (2 Sam. xvii, 17), and here, by the stone Zoheleth, which is "close to it (293) En-rogel," Adonijah held the feast, which was the first and last act of his attempt on the crown (1 Kings i, 9). By Josephus, on the last occasion (Ant. vii, 14, 4), its situation is given as "without the city; it was not in the royal garden," and it is without doubt referred to the same garden, in the same connection, as the description of the earthquake which accompanied the sacretes of Uzziah (Ant. ix, 10, 4), and which, "at the place called Eroce" (Ἐρούς v. Eroûs), shook down a part of the Eastern hill, "so as to obstruct the roads, and the royal gardens." In more modern times, a tradition, apparently first recorded by Quatremère de Quincy, would make En-rogel identical with what is now called by the Franks the well of Nehemiah, and by the nates that of Job (Bir-Eqyôn). Robinson describes it as "a deep well situated just below the junction of the valley of Hinemon with that of Joppah and Bethhoraph. The small oblong plain there formed is covered with an olive-grove, and with the traces of former gardens extending down the valley from the present gardens of Siloam. Indeed, this whole spot is the prettiest and most fertile around Jerusalem. The well is very deep, of an irregular quadrilateral form, walled up with large squared stones, terminating above in an arch on one side, and apparently of great antiquity. There is a small rude building over it, furnished with one or two large troughs or reservoirs of stone, which are kept partially filled for the convenience of the people. The well measures 125 feet in depth, 50 feet of which is now full of water. The water is sweet, but not very cold, and is at the present day drawn up by the hand. In the rainy season the well becomes quite full, and sometimes overflows at the mouth. Usually, however, the water runs from the surface of the ground, and finds an outlet some forty yards below it; hence it is said to flow for sixty or seventy days in winter, and the stream is sometimes large" (Researches, i, 490).

In favor of this identification is the fact that in the Arabic version of Josh. xv, 7 the name of Ain-Fuž, "spring of Job," is given for En-rogel, and also that in an early Jewish Itinerary (Uri of BIEL, in Hottinger's Ciprii Hebraici, p. 48) the name is given as "well of Job," as retaining the memory of Job's connection with Adonijah—a name which it still retains in the province of the Greek Christians (Williams, Holy City, ii, 490). Against this general belief the following strong but not conclusive arguments are urged by Bonar in favor of identifying En-rogel with the present "Fountain of the Virgin," "Ain Ummed-Duray (spring of the mother of steps)—the perennial source of water which is supplied (Land of Promise, App. v). 1. The Bir-Eqyôn is well and not a spring (En), while, on the other hand, the "Fountain of the Virgin" is the only real spring close to Jerusalem. This objection, however, as the above description shows, but partially applies. 2. The situation of the fountain of the Virgin agrees somewhat better with the course of the boundary of Benjamin.
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than that of the Bir Eyub, which is rather too far south. This objection, however, does not apply to the original boundary of Benjamin, which necessarily followed the valley of Sилоam. See Thrie. 3. Bir Eyub does not altogether suit the requirements of 2 Sam. xvii, 17. It is too far off from the city, and from the road over Olivet to the door of Sion, and is in full view of the city (Van de Velde, i, 475), which the other spot is not. But we may readily suppose that a more retired route and a secluded spot would have been chosen for concealment. 4. The martyrdom of St. John (Q. v.) was effected by casting him down from the temple wall into the valley of Kerdon, where he was finally killed by a fuller with his washing-stick (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. ii, 23). The natural inference is that the martyrred apostle fell near where the fullers were at work. Now Bir Eyub is too far off from the site of the temple to allow of this, but it might very well have happened at the Fountain of the Virgin. (See Stanley's Sermons on the Apost. Age, p. 333-4). But this is too remote and indirect an agreement, and one based upon a vague tradition. 5. Dorey and Rogel are both from the same root, and therefore the modern names may be derived from the ancient one, even though at present it is taken to allude to the "steps" by which the reservoir of the fountain is reached. 6. The Fountain of the Virgin is still the great resort of the women of Jerusalem for washing and treading their clothes. 7. The basin of the king's gardens must have been the Bir Eyub, even when the water is at the mouth of the well, and it is generally seventy or eighty feet below; while they must have been lower than the Fountain of the Virgin, which thus might be used without difficulty to irrigate them. The last considerations, however, have little weight (see Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 695). See Jerusal.

Enrolment or ἀρισταγάγη (Luke ii, 1, "taxing"). See Census.

Ena is "either ena real or ena raticionis. Ena raticio is that which has no existence but in the idea which the mind forms of it, as a golden mountain. Ena real, in philosophical language, is taken latet et stricte, and is distinguished as ena potestale, or that which may exist, and ena actuale, or that which does exist. It is sometimes taken as the concrete of essentia, and signifies what has essence and may exist—as a rose in winter; sometimes as the participle of esse, and it then signifies what exists. Ena without intellect is ena a thing."—Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosop, s. v.

Enample. See Example.

En-a-shemesh ( Heb. En-a-shemesh אֶ-נָּ-שֶּה-מֶּשֶּׁזֶּ; kursh pa'ah, "fountain of the sun"); Sept. ἐν η ἤ κη χαλίου orη ἤ κη Χανί; Vulgate, Eunomias, id est, Ponta Solis, a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the north boundary of Judah (Jos. xv. 7) and the south boundary of Benjamin (xiv. 17). From these notices it appears to have been between the "ascent of Adummim,"—the road leading up from the Jordan valley south of the wady Kelt,—and the spring of En-rogel, in the valley of Kerdon. It was therefore east of Jerusalem and of the Mount of Olives. The only spring at present answering to this position is the Ain-Husayn or Ain-C红色 "Well of the Apostles"—about a mile below Bethany, the traveller's first halting-place on the road to Jericho (Tobler, Topog. von Jerus. ii, 400). The aspect of this spring is such that the rays of the sun are on it the whole day. This is not inappropriate in a fountain dedicated to that luminary. Dr. Robinson thinks that En-shemesh must have been either this spring or the fountain near St. Saba (Researches, i, 498).

Ensign is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. for two Hebrew words: פֶּרֶשׁ, oth (the flag of a single tribe, Num. ii, 2), a sign or token, as elsewhere rendered; פֶּרֶשׁ, a lofty signal, e. g. a "pole," Num. xxii, 8, 9), a ship's standard or flag ("sail," Isa. xxxiii, 25; Ezek. xxvii, 7), a beacon or signal on a hill, chiefly on the irrigation of an enemy, in order to point out to the people a place of rendezvous. There is a third and more emphatic word relating to the subject, namely, כְּפָדָה (from כְּפָדָה, to cover), which, however, is invariably rendered "standard" (except Cant. ii, 10. "banner"). The distinction between the Hebrew terms is sufficiently marked by their respective uses:

Nas is a signal; Doreg, a military standard for a large division of an army; and Orth, the same for a small one. Neither of them, however, expresses the idea which "standard" conveys to our minds, viz. a flag. The standards in use among the Hebrews probably resembled those of the Egyptians and Assyrians—a figure or device of some kind elevated on a pole.

1. The notices of the nas or "ensign" are most frequent; it consisted of some well-understood signal which was exhibited on the top of a pole from a mountain top (Isa. xiii, 7, xliii, 5)—the very emblem of conspicuous isolation (Isa. xxx, 17). Around it the inhabitants mustered, whether for the purpose of meeting an enemy (Isa. v, 26; xviii, 3; xxxi, 9), which was sometimes notified by the blast of a trumpet (Isa. xxv, 7); or as a token of rescue (Psa. lx, 4; Isa. xi, 10; Jer. iv, 6); or for a public proclamation (Jer. i, 2); or simply as a gathering point (Isa. xxxix, 22; lix, 10). The nature of the signal was we have no means of stating; it has been inferred from Isa. xxxiii, 28, and Ezek. xxxvi, 7, that it was not a wave, but if we do not observe a flag depicted either in Egyptian or Assyrian representations of vessels (Wilkinson, iii, 211; Bononi, p. 166, 167); but, in lieu of a flag, certain devices, such as the phoenix, flowers, etc., were embroidered on the sail, whence it appears that the device itself, and perhaps also the device bearing the device, was the nas or "ensign." It may have sometimes been the name of a leader, as in Michaelis (Suppl. p. 1686) suggests, a blazing torch. The impression points of it, however, to be a war cry, was that the nas was an occasional signal, and not a military standard, and that elevation and conspicuousness are implied in the use of the term: hence it is appropriately applied to the "pole" on which the brazen serpent hung (Num. xi, 4), which was indeed an "ensign" in varieties. (Ezek. i, 13-14); and again the censors of Korah and his company, which became a "sign" or beacon of warning to Israel (Num. xvi, 30). See Signal.

2. The term degel is used to describe the standards which were given to each of the four divisions of the Israelite army at the time of the Exodus (Num. i, 2); ii, 2 sq.; x, 14 sq.). Some doubt indeed exists as to its meaning in these passages, the Sept. and Vulgate regarding it not as the standard itself, but as a certain military division annexed to a standard, just as a seclud is sometimes used for a body of soldiers (Tacitus, Hist. v, 8). The sense of compact and martial array does certainly seem to lurk in the word; for in Cant. vi, 4, 10, the brilliant glances of the bride's eyes are compared to the destructive advance of a well-arrayed host, and a similar comparison is employed in reference to the bridegroom (Cant. v, 10); but, on the other hand, in Cant. ii, 4, no other sense than that of a "banner" will suit, and we therefore think the rendering in the A. V. correct. No reliance can be placed on the term in Psa. xx, 5, as both the sense and the text are matters of doubt (see Oehler and Hengstenberg, in loc.). A standard implies, of course, a banner; but the supposed notice to that officer in Isa. x, 18, is incorrect, the words meaning rather "as a sick man perished away;" in a somewhat
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parallel passage (Isa. lix, 19) the marginal version is to be followed rather than the text. The character of the Hebrew military standards is quite a matter of conjecture; they probably resembled the Egyptian, which consisted of a sacred emblem, such as an animal, a boat, or the king’s name (Wilkinson, i, 284). Biblical writers state the devices to have been as follows: for the tribe of Judah, a lion; for Reuben, a man; for Ephraim, an ox; and for Dan, an eagle (Carpzov, Crit. Ap. p. 667); but no reliance can be placed on this. As each of the four divisions, consisting of three tribes, had its standard, so had each tribe its “sign” (odh) or “ensign,” probably in imitation of the Egyptians, among whom not only each battalion, but even each company, had its particular ensign (Wilkinson, l, c.).

We know nothing of its nature. The word occurs figuratively in Ps. lxxxiv, 4, apparently in reference to the images of idol gods. See Standard.

Various Forms of Ancient Egyptian Ensigns.

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

En-Tannim (Heb. Eym hat-tannim, אֶנוֹת נְתָנִים, “fountain of the dragons or jackals; Sept. πηγὴ τῶν χασάθων”), a reservoir on the west side of Jerusalem ( Neh. ii, 13), probably the present upper pool of Gihon; Anglicized Dragon-well (q. v.).

En-tappuh (Heb. Eym Tappu’ach, אֶנוֹת תַּפָּעַח, “fountain of Tappuah; Sept. πηγὴ Αἰασσοῦ v. r. Ἀσσώς”), a spring near the city Tappuah (q. v.), put for that place in Josh. xvii, 7 (comp. ver. 8).

Entelechy (ιντελέχ, from ἰντελέχ, perfect; and ἱκλω, to have; in Latin perfectibilis). “In one of the books of the Pythagoreans, viz. Outila. Lucan, Παντι παντινος, the word συντάξεις is used in the same sense. Hence it has been thought that this was borrowed from the Pythagoreans” (Mombod- do, Ancient Mysteries, i, chap. v). Cicero (Tusc. Quest. lib. i, quest. 1) interprets it to mean quaedam quaestis continuatam motionem et perennem. Melancthon (Opera, xiii, 12-14, ed. 1846) gives two interpretations of entelechy, as he writes it. He says that ἰντελέχεις signifies continuas, and ἰντελεχομαι continuare. Translating, he gives it as synonymous with ἐνίκησις. Hence Cicero translated it by continuous movement or agitation. Argyropo- lus blames Cicero for this, and explains it as meaning: “interior perfection,” as if it were τὸ ἐνίκησις ῥημάτων. But Melancthon thinks Cicero’s translation in accordance with the philosophy of Aristotle. According to others, ἰντελέχεις means continuance, and is a totally different word from ἰντελεχομαι, which means actually (Arist. Metaph. Bohn’s Libr. p. 68, 301; Donaldson, New Cyclopædia, p. 339-344). According to Leibnitz, “entelechies ce qui sort apparentement from the Greek demos, which signifies perfect, and therefore the celebrated Hermolaus Barbarus expressed it in Latin, word for word, by perfectibilas, for act is the accomplishment of power; and he needed not to have consulted the devil, as he did, they say, to tell him this much (Leibnitz, Theodicee, W. ii, p. 97). You may give the name of entelechies to all simple substances or created monads, for they have in them a certain perfection (γνώσατο τὸ ἐντελεχέω) they have a sufficiency (ἀξιόμαχθα) which makes them the source of their internal actions, and, so to say, incorporal automatae” (Monadologie, § 18). He calls a soul an external automaton, or first entele- chies, having life and force in itself. “Entelechy is the opposite to potentiality, yet would be ill translated by that which we often oppose to potentiality, actuality. Εἶδος expresses the substance of each thing viewed in respect to its form or constitution: ἰντελεχία its substance, considered as active and generative; ἰντελεχεία seems to be the synthesis or harmony of these two ideas. The Effectio of Cicero, therefore, represents the most important side of it, but not the whole” (Maurice, Mor. and Metaphysics. Philoso phy, p. 191, note). ἰντελεχεία ce qui sort apparentement from the Greek demos, which signifies perfect, and therefore the celebrated Hermolaus Barbarus expressed it in Latin, word for word, by perfectibilas, for act is the accomplishment of power; and he needed not to have consulted the devil, as he did, they say, to tell him this much (Leibnitz, Theodicee, W. ii, p. 97). You may give the name of entelechies to all simple substances or created monads, for they have in them a certain perfection (γνώσατο τὸ ἐντελεχέω) they have a sufficiency (ἀξιόμαχθα) which makes them the source of their internal actions, and, so to say, incorporal automatae” (Monadologie, § 18). He calls a soul an external automaton, or first entele- chies, having life and force in itself. “Entelechy is the opposite to potentiality, yet would be ill translated by that which we often oppose to potentiality, actuality. Εἶδος expresses the substance of each thing viewed in respect to its form or constitution: ἰντελεχία its substance, considered as active and generative; ἰντελεχεία seems to be the synthesis or harmony of these two ideas. The Effectio of Cicero, therefore, represents the most important side of it, but not the whole” (Maurice, Mor. and Metaphysics. Philosophy, p. 191, note).

Entertainment (εντέλειωσ, a “festival,” comp. Εἰν- τέλειωσ, to “entertain” a stranger, Heb. xiii, 2), this took place among the Hebrews sometimes in connection with a public festival (Deut. xvi; Tob. ii, 1) and accompanied by offerings [see SACRIFICAL FESTIV- AL.] (1 Sam. ix, 18; xvi, 5; i Kings i, 9; iii, 15; in token of alliance, Gen. xxvi, 50; xxxii, 54); sometimes with domestic or local occurrences and, so considered, as the latter reference is concerned, they were chiefly held at the weaning of children (Gen. xxvi, 8; comp. Rosenmuiller, Morgen, vi, 243 sq.), at weddings (Gen. xxix, 22; Judg. xiv, 10; John ii, 1, sq.); on birthdays (Job i, 4; Jer. xxxvi, 10; Judg. xvii, 20 [2 Hos. vii, 2]; Matt. xix, 6; comp. Herod. i, 138; ix, 109; Lucian, Gall. 9; Athen. iv, 143; see Dougftz. Analcets, i, 44; ii, 58; Laurent, De notaibus, conviviable-
ENTHUSIASM

... 

FEAST

... 

Enthusiasm (ενθουσασμός, from ἐνθοῦς, inspired; God-poised; ἐνθεος) is used both in a good and a bad sense.

1. In the first, which springs from its derivation, it signifies divine inspiration in general; or, secondarily, any extraordinary mental or moral exaltation. "The raptures of the poet, the deep meditations of the philosopher, the heroism of the warrior, the devotedness of the martyr, and the ardor of the patriot, are so many different phases of enthusiasm." In this sense it "is almost a synonyme of genius; the moral life in the intellectual light, the will in the reason; and without it, says Seneca, nothing truly great was ever achieved." (Coleridge).

2. The bad sense of the word was formerly in much more common use than now. According to it, an enthusiast is one who substitutes his own fancies for reason and truth, especially in matters of religion. "Every enthusiasm is properly a madness; yet he is not an ordinary, but a religious madness. The enthusiast is generally talking of religion, of God, or of the things of God, but talking in such a manner that any reasonable Christian may discern the disorder of his mind. Such enthusiasm may be described, in general, as a religious madness, arising from some falsely imagined influence or inspiration of God; at least, from interpreting something to God which ought not to be imputed to him, or expecting something from God which ought not to be expected from him" (Wesley).

...
"enthusiasm, in the bad sense, is a subtle device of Satan upon ill-meaning or unmeaning instruments, making use of their ambition, self-admiration, or other weakness, to draw them by some plausible suggestions into a vain conceit that they have something within them either of equal authority with Scripture, or superior to the opinions of others. In this their term enthusiasm by worldly men to designate true Christian life, see Wesley's sermon above, and also Taylor, Natural Hist. of Enthusiasm (N. Y. 1844, 4th ed. 12mo).

Entity (ēnītis), "in the scholastic philosophy, was synonymous with essence or form. To all individuals of a species there is something in common—a nature which they all have, but individually, all, but only specifically, different from each other. The term entity by worldly men to designate true Christian life, see Wesley's sermon above, and also Taylor, Natural Hist. of Enthusiasm (N. Y. 1844, 4th ed. 12mo).

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

Entwistle, Joseph, a Wesleyan Methodist minister, was born in Manchester, England, April 15, 1767. At sixteen he began to preach, and in 1769 Mr. Wesley called him to his ministry. He set himself to his work, studying theology, under many difficulties, and also the ancient languages. He filled acceptably a number of the most important appointments, and in 1812 was chosen president of the Conference. In 1844 he was made governor of the Wesleyan Theological Institution, in which office he remained until 1858, when his infirm health compelled him to retire. He died at Tadcaster in 1841. See Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Entwistle, by his Son (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Methodist Quarterly Review, April, 1851, p. 305.

Entsias (or Ensajas), Francisco de, a Spanish Protestant, was born at Burgos about 1590. He is commonly named Dryander, and also used the names Duchese, Van Eeyck, Ichschain, all of the same meaning (Οένιασ) as the Spanish name Entisias. After completing his academical studies in Italy, he went to Louvain, and studied there, and also spent some time with Melancthon at Wittemberg. Having wealthy relatives in the Netherlands, he fixed his abode there, and openly embraced the Reformed cause. He published a Spanish version of the N. T., dedicated to Count Cross. He was arrested and imprisoned at Brussels. He escaped in February, 1548, to Antwerp, thence to Germany and England (1548). He carried letters of commendation from Melancthon to Edward VI and to Cranmer, who received him warmly, and gave him a post at Oxford. After some time he returned to the Continent, and continued his literary labors at Strasburg, Basle, and Geneva. He died about 1570.—McCr. Reformation in Spain, ch. v; Hoefler, Nouv. Bih. Generaux, xiv, 379.

Ensias, Jayme de (or named John de Ensias, or eenius, qui vestituros est judicaut vieus et mortuos," and concluded, from the resemblance between the word Eunus and his own name, that he was the person who should judge the quick and the dead. His views seem to be connected with those of the Cathari. He is said to have taught that baptism was of no value only for believers; that the only true baptism was that of the Spirit by the imposition of hands; that the hierarchy had not been instituted by God; that the Church of Rome was not the true Church, because her priests did not lead a holy life. He denied the resurrection of the body, and rejected the sacrament. He went about preaching these doctrines, found many adherents, and was reported to possess the power of working miracles. In 1145 the cardinallegate Albericus came from Ostia to the Bretagne, and preached against Eon and his adherents at Nantes. He also induced archbishop Hugo of Rouen, to write a work against him, which is, however, rather a diffuse explanation of the doctrines of the Church of Rome than a refutation of Eon (Dogmatism Christianum fidei contro hereticos et temporaria libri tres; Bibl. Patrum Mar., tom. xxii). At the same time troops were sent out against these new sects, and in the county of Alet many were burned. Eon withdrew into the province of Guinée; in 1148 he repaired to Champagne, where his band was scattered, and he, together with some of his prominent adherents, was captured. He was taken before the council at Rheims, and asked whether he could believe what the Scripture and the ancient fathers said. The synod declared him to be insane, and charged the archbishop of Rheims to take care of him. Many of his followers were sentenced to be burned. After Eon's death the sect soon died out.—Schmidt, in Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie, 212; Weis- ter, Welte, Kirchen-Lex., iii, 602; Mosheim, CA. Hist. bk. iii, cent. xii, pt. iii, ch. v, § 16; Giesler, Ch. Hist. per. iii, div. iii, ch. vii, § 84. (A. J. S.)

Enon. See Gnosticism.

Enonian. See Eon.

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

Eopect. "in chronology, is the excess of the solar month over the lunar month in twelve months; or of the solar year above the lunar year of twelve synodical months; or of several solar months above as many synodical months; or of several solar years above as many periods, each consisting of 12 synodical months. The menstrual epact is the excess of the civil calendar month above the lunation month in the year of 51 days, this epact is 1 day 11 hours 15 minutes 57 seconds, if we suppose new moon to occur on the first day of the month. The annual epact is the excess of the
solar year above the lunar. As the Julian solar year is (nearly) 365 days, and the Julian lunar year is (nearly) 354 days, the annual epact is nearly 11 days. The epact for two Julian years is, therefore, nearly 22 days; for three years, 33 days; and so on. When, however, the epact passes 30 days, 30 falls to be deducted from it, making 0. For three years, then, the epact is properly 3; and for 4 years, adding 11 days, it is 14 days; and so on. Following the cycle, starting from a new moon on the 1st of January, we find that the epact becomes 0 or 0 in the 19th of February. The epact for the 20th year is again 11; and so on. These years in the cycle are marked by Roman numerals I, II, III, etc., called the Golden Numbers; and a table of the Julian epacts exhibits each year in the cycle with its golden number and epact. As the Gregorian year (see Calendar) differs from and is in advance of the Julian by 11 days (the number lost on the Julian account before the Gregorian computation of time was introduced in England), and as 11 is the difference between the solar and lunar years, it follows that the Gregorian epact for any year is the same with the Julian epact for the year preceding the Gregorian. Epænæus (Ἐπαναφόρος, commendable), a Christian resident at Rome when Paul wrote his epistle to the Church in that city, and one of the persons to whom he sent special salutations (Rom. xvi. 5). A.D. 55. In the received text he is spoken of as being "the first-fruits of Achaia" (ἀρχάγγελος Ἀχαίας); but "the first-fruits of Achaia" is not in the reading of the best MSS. (8 A B C D E F G 77), of the Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, Vulgate, the Latin fathers, and Origene (in Ep. ad Rom. Com. lib. x. Opera, v. p. 481; in Num. Com. xii. Opera, x. p. 109). This reading is preferred by Grotius, Mill, Bengel, Whitby, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Oehlhausen, and Tholuck; and admitted into the text by Griesbach, Knepp, Tittmann, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf; also by Brucker, in his edition of Schmidt's Concordance, Lips. 1842. Dr. Bloomfield, who also adopts it in his Greek Testament (2d ed. 1886), remarks that "the very nature of the term ἀρχάγγελος suggests the idea of one person only (see 1 Cor. xv. 20), and, as in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, Stephanus is called the ἀρχάγγελος Ἀχαίας, Epænæus could have no claim to the name." With respect to the former part of this statement, the learned writer has strangely overlooked such passages as James i. 18, "that we should be a kind of first-fruits" (ἀρχαγγέλου τῆς ἰσχύος). These are quoted from among men, being the first-fruits (ἀρχάγγελοι) and as to the latter part, not Stephanus alone, but his house, is said to be the first-fruits, and to have addicted himself (ὑπομενόντα ἐθέλετε) to the ministry of the saint. Macknight's remark in favor of the received reading, that if Epænæus was one of that house, he was a part of the first-fruits of Achaia, seems somewhat what forced. The synopsis of the pseudo-Dorothaeus makes him first bishop of Carthage, but Justinian remarks that the African churches do not recognize him. Epænæus, Synod of Concilium Episcoporum or Episcoporum was a general synod of the Catholic bishops of Burgundy, held in 517. A great change in the relation of the Catholic Church of Burgundy to the state government took place in 516, when the new king Sigmond, son of the Arian king Gundobald, joined it. The Catholic Church thus became the State Church, though it is said that Sigmond gave no trouble to his kings of his times, aspired to exercise a controlling influence upon Church affairs. The Council of Epænæus, which established Church discipline in the new Catholic kingdom upon a permanent basis, was not called by the king, but by Avitus, bishop of Vienne, and Hermegild, bishop of Paris, and their letters to the bishops of both bishops are still extant. That of Viventius is addressed to all bishops, clergymen, lords, and notables of the land, complains of want of discipline among the clergy, and invites every one who has to bring charges against the moral conduct of any clergyman to appear before the council. The clergymen are commanded to be present, and the laymen are permitted to attend if they wish. The synod proceeded to the formation of what the bishops will decree. The letter of Avitus complains that the Church law ordering the holding of two synods every year had entirely fallen into disuse, and states that he had been censured by the Pope on this account, and had been commanded to assemble a synod in order to reform the Church laws, as far as they were still applicable, and to add, if necessary, new ones. As no such censure can be found in a letter of the Pope to Avitus, written in Feb. 517, nor in any other papal letter extant, it has been inferred (Vogel, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s. v.) that Avitus, in order to secure the meeting, used a papal authority to a greater extent than he was authorized to do. In compliance with the letters of invitation, 24 bishops appeared personally at Epænæus, and one sent representatives. Their deliberations were of but short duration, and on the 14th of July, 517, the bishops signed the acts upon which, "under divine inspiration," they had agreed. The acts consist of a brief preface and 40 canons which concern the conduct of bishops, clergymen, monks, secular authorities, and laymen, the intercourse with the Arian heretics, and the property of the Church. The canons and the Church laws concerning the heretics are of special importance. Catholic clergymen, under severe penalties, are forbidden to sit at table with heretics. With a Jew no layman shall dine, under penalty of being never admitted to a clergyman's table. Heretics who wish to join the church in order to marry the bishops persons are allowed when they are on the death-bed they may be received by a priest. The church edifices of the heretics are declared to be objects worthy of special horror, and their purification is declared impossible. The 50th canon forbids marriages with near relatives, in particular with the sisters of a deceased wife. This canon directed concerning a prominent officer at the royal court, Stephanus, who was married to his sister-in-law Palladia. The bishops seem to have anticipated trouble from the opposition of Stephanus, for, after the dissolution of the Council of Epænæus, eleven bishops, among whom was Apollinaris, bishop of Valence and brother of Avitus, went to Lyons, where, under the presidency of Viventius, they agreed upon a line of conduct for the enforcement of the canon, providing even for the case that the king should leave the Church, and appoint Arian bishops for some of the episcopal sees. A part of the canons of Epænæus remained in force in Southern France, as canons of the Council of Agde (Agathensés). This council had been held in 504, and established 47 canons, to which subsequently, for the purpose of obliging to a complete code of discipline, 24 canons of other councils were added; of these 24, 13 were taken from the Council of Epænæus. The site of the Council of Epænæus cannot be established with certainty. According to some, it is the little town of Yenne, now a monastery, on the left bank of the Rhone; according to others, a little village, Portas, about half way between Lyons and Vienne.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv. 75; Wetsch und Weltge, Kirchen-Lex. iii. 603; Hefele, Concilien-Geschichte, ii. 680; Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 224; Manni, Coll. Conc. vili. 310; Labbe, Dissertations, de Conc. Ep. 4, 8. 18. Epænæus, Synod of Concilium Episcoporum, and Epænæus, usually considered a contraction of Epaphroditus, but the last syllable in this case is hardly regular), an eminent teacher in the Church at Colosse, denominated by Paul "his dear fellow-servant," and a "faithful minister of Christ" (Coloss. i. 7; iv. 12). A.D. 57. It has been inferred from Coloss. i., that he was the found-
er of the Colossian Church; and Dr. Neander supposes that the apostle terms him ἱντρη ἡμῶν δίκαιον· Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (a servant of Christ in our stead) because he committed to him the office of proclaiming the Gospel in the three Phrygian cities Colossae, Hierapolis, and Laodicea, as the head of the church himself (Hist. of Planting, 200, 873). This language might have no means decisive; yet most probably Epaphras was one of the earliest and most zealous instructors of the Colossian Church (see Alford's prolegomena to that epistle, 3r. Text. iii, 36 sq.). Lardner thinks that the expression represents his residence in Colossae (Hist. of the Apostles and Evangelists, c. xiv; Works, vi, 183). But in both cases the words in question seem intended simply to identify these individuals as the fellow-townsmen of the Colossians, and to distinguish them from others of the same name in Rome (see Macknight on Coloss. iv, 2). He was at that time with Paul at Rome (Coloss. iv, 12), and seems by the expression there used to have been at least a Colossian by birth. We find him again mentioned in the epistle to Philemon (ver. 28), which was sent at the same time as that to the Colossians. Paul there calls him ὁ συνίκητος μου, μνημονεύτω· μνημονεύτω μου, νώς φίλου μου; and somewhat the word there as only a tender and delicate expression of Epaphras' regard for the apostle was his imprisonment (comp. Rom. xvi, 13). The martyrlogies make Epaphras to have been first bishop of Colossae, and to have suffered martyrdom there. See ΕΠΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΟΣ.

Epaphroditus (Ἐπαφροδίτος, belonging to Aphrodite, or Venus), a messenger (ἀποστόλος) of the Church at Philippi to the apostle Paul during his imprisonment at Rome, who was intrusted with their contributions for his support (Phil. ii, 25; iv, 18). A.D. 57. Paul's high estimate of his character (see Evans, Script. Bibl. ii, 300) is shown by an accumulation of honorable epithets (τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ σωτήρα, καὶ σωτηρίτην μου), and by fervent expressions of gratitude for his recovery from a dangerous illness brought on in part by a generous disregard of his personal welfare in ministering to the apostle (Phil. ii, 20). Epaphroditus, on his return to Philippi, was the bearer of the epistle which forms part of the canon. Grotius and some other critics conjecture that Epaphroditus was the same as the Epaphras mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians (see Sirk, De Epaphroditício Philippiniis epistola, Lips. 1741; Strobach, De Epaphroditía Colossenés, Lips. 1710). But, though the latter name is by some connected with the former; and the fact that Epaphras was most probably in prison at the time, sufficiently marks the distinction of the persons. The name Epaphroditus was by no means uncommon (see Tacit. Ann. xv, 55; Sueton. Domit. 14; Joseph. Life, 76), as Wetstein has shown (Nov. Test. Gr. ii, 279).

Eparach (Ἐπάραχος, ruler over a district), a commander (σ. g. of vessels, Eschyulus, Ag. 1227), hence prefect (comp. Ἱππαρχος, Acts xxiii, 24; xxv, 1); applied as a title to Sisines (q. v.), the Persian satrap of Syria (1 Eadtr. vii, 11, "governor"). See ΤΟΠΑΡΧΗ, etc.

Eparch (ἐπαρχης) was the official term of a province in the administration of the Roman empire. It consisted of a number of counties or districts, and a subdivision of a diocese (διοικεσία). In the organization of the Church, the ecclesiastical heads of communities were called bishops, those of the capitals of eparchies, metropolitans; those of the dioceses, patriarchs. The term eparch is thus used in the council of Nice, and by Macarius of Ancyra (Stuicer, Theaur, Eccl. s. v.). The meaning of the term was subsequently changed in the Greek Church, so as to denote, in general, the diocese of any bishop, archbishop, or metropolitan. In Russia the eparchies are divided into three classes, the first of which comprised in 1866 the four metropolitans of Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Novgorod; the second twenty sees, the incumbents of which, with the exception of one, had the title archbishop; and the third, twenty-nine sees, of which had the title archbishop, while the others were merely bishops. Eparchies can be transferred at the pleasure of the czar from one class to the other.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 80; Wetzler u. Welte, Kirchenlex. iii, 157 ff.; Beyer, Geschichte der Griech. Church. 1868. See GRK CHURCH AND RUSSIA. (A. J. S.)

Ephes, Charles Michel de L', born in Versailles Nov. 25, 1712, was distinguished for his labors in behalf of the deaf and dumb. He entered into orders as a Roman Catholic priest, but, having been interdicted from the exercise of his functions, he devoted himself to the care of deaf children. Two young girls, mute, had been under the care of Father Vanin, at whose death L'Epee took charge of them. From this time his talents, time, and property were all consecrated to this cause. He framed a series of signs (the basis of the system of the school) and arranged the instruction of the two girls, the acolyde de Penthèvre and others to aid him. He organized an asylum, which, after his death, was taken under the protection of the French government, and placed under Sicard (q. v.), the worthy successor of L'Epee. He died at Paris Dec. 28, 1789. His writings give full account of his system and method; among them are Institution des Sourds et des Muetts, 1774, 12mo; enlarged edition, 1776, 12mo, and again improved, 1784, 12mo. See especially his Art d'enseigner à parler aux Sourds-Muetts, with notes by Sicard, and the Jogo de L'Epee by M. Bebian (Paris, 1820, 8vo).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. des Gén. xxii, 329.

Ephesians, a Russian sect, followers of a monk of Kyiv, who was ordained bishop through forged letters of recommendation. He died in prison, but is esteemed a martyr by his followers. Their sentiments are nearly the same as the Starobrediai, or Old Ceremonialists.—Pinkerton's Greek Church, p. 804. See RUSSIA; RUSSIAN ECCLES.

Epe'etus. See ΕΠΑΝΕΤΕΥΣ.

Eph'ah (טבז, כֹּכֶב, gloom), the name of a tribe (including that of the founder), also of a woman of and of a man. 1. (Sept. Γεφάς v. r. in Chron. Γεφαῖ, Isa. Γεφά). The first in order of the five sons of Midian (Gen. xxxv, 4; 1 Chron. vi, 1); a Benjamite. B.C. 1688; a man of importance. He is mentioned in Isaiah in the following words: "The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come; they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory" (Isa. 1x, 6, 7). This passage clearly connects the descendants of Ephah with the Midianites, the Returashite Sheba, and the Ishmaelites, both in the position of their settlements and in their wandering habits, and shows that, as usual, they formed a tribe bearing his name. But no satisfactory identification of this tribe has been discovered. The Arabic word Orqeh, which has been supposed to be the same as Ephah, is the name of a town in the Mecelle, near Pelusium, or Bulbeys (the modern Bilbeys), a place in Egypt, in the province of Sharkiyeh, not far from Cairo; but the tradition that Ephah settled in Africa does not rest on sufficient authority. See MECHEL.

2. (Sept. Πεφάδος). A concubine of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, by whom she had several sons (1 Chron. ii, 48). B.C. post 1856.
EPHESIANS

3. (Sept. Γεφις.) A son of Jahdai, who was apparently the grandson of the oldest of the former sons (1 Chron. ii. 47). B.C. long post 1566.

Ephah ( Heb. אפחה, rare Heb. אפוח, אפוחא), a measure of grain, containing "three shekels or ten omers," and equivalent in capacity to the bath for liquids (Exod. xvi. 36; 1 Sam. xxviii. 17; Zeph. v. 6; Judg. vi. 19; Ruth ii. 17; the "double ephah," Prov. xx. 10; Deut. xxv. 14; Amos v. 8), means two ephahs, the one just, the other false. According to Josephus (Ant. viii. 2, 9), the ephah contained 72 sextarii, equal to the Attic (liquid) metretes, or 1933.55 Paris cubic inches, about 183 bushels English (see Böckh, Metrolog. Untersuch., p. 259, 278). This is also confirmed by other sources, so that the latter ephah is an error in another passage of Josephus (Ant. vii. 9, 3), where the ephah seems to be equal to 96 sextarii, or the Attic medimnus. The origin of this word is to be sought in the Egyptian language, where it signifies a measure, especially of corn, from which comes the Sept. rendering avia (see Böckh, in Alph. Encyclop. s. v.; Gesenius, Thes. Ling. Hebr. in Appendix). See MEASURES.

Ephah (Heb. אפחה, נֹפָה; тαξ. כֹּפֶך לִפָה; סָפֶך לִפָה, О фехв, О фехв, Вулг. О фехв), a Netophathite, whose sons were among the "captains of the host" (I Chron. xx. 6) left in Judah after the deportation to Babylon, and who warned the Babylonian governor of the plots against him (Jer. xi. 8). B.C. 588. They submitted themselves to Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor, and were apparently massacred with him by Ishmael (all, 8; comp. xi. 15).

Ephah. See VIPER.

Epher (Heb. אפֶּר, the one of their number and his kinsman or kinswoman). The head of one of the families of Manasseh, the family of this tribe, and apparently of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv. 17). B.C. cir. 1618.

(3.) Ephah (Heb. אפֶּר, Vulg. Ephra.) The head of one of the families of Manasseh cast, who were carried away by Tiglath-pileser (1 Chron. vi. 24). B.C. ante 740. The name may be compared with that of Ephrah (v.), the native place of Gideon, in Manasseh, on the west of Jordan.

Ephes-dammim (Heb. אפֶּס דָּמִים, תניִּפֶר, akk. boundary of blood; Sept. Εφεσδαμμι είς Αμοίων, Εφεσδαμμῖον, Vulg. fere Damnum), a place in the tribe of Judah between Shocoah and Azekah, where the Philistines were encamped when David fought with Goliath (1 Sam. xviii. 1). The similar, but more ancient passage (1 Chron. xvi. 18), has the shorter form Pas-Dammim. The name was probably derived from its being the scene of frequent sanguinary encounters between Israel and the Philistines. On his way from Beith-Jibrin to Jerusalem, Van de Velde was attacked and slain in high northward-looking brow of wady Musar, about one hour E. by S. of Beith-Netif, called "Khirbet Damun," which he has no doubt represents the ancient Ephes-Dammim, and "which fixes the place of the camp of Goliath just at its foot, where the valley contracts, and may, indeed, be called the pass [or extremity] of Dammim" (Memoir, p. 290). In that case the narrative of 1 Sam. xvii., becomes plain: "the gorge" (καταβαίνειν) between the battle-lines of the two armies (ver. 8), and along which the first rout and pursuit occurred (ver. 29), was no less than the wady Musar itself, which is so narrow immediately at this spot. See ELAH (VALLEY OF).

Ephes'sian (Εφησίας), a native or resident of the city of Ephesus (q. v.), in Asia Minor (Acts xix. 28, 34, 35; xx. 29). The similar adj. Ephesian (Εφησίας, "of Ephesus") also occurs (Rev. ii. 1).

EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO, or Paul's letter addressed to the Christian Church at the ancient and fathers of the Church, and the elders of which he partook with such a warm-hearted and affectionate farewell (Acts xx. 18-35). See PAUL.

I. ADOPTION OF THE EPISTLE.

This epistle expressly claims to be the production of the apostle Paul (i. 1, iii. 1); and this claim the writer, in the latter of these passages, follows up by speaking of himself in language such as that apostle is accustomed to use in describing his own position as an ambassador of Christ (iii. 1, 3, 8, 9). The justness of this claim seems to have been generally acknowledged by the early Christians, and it is expressly sanctioned by several of the fathers and second and third centuries (Irenæus, adv. Haer. v. 2, 8; v. 14, 3; Clemens Alexandrin. Paedagog. i. 108; Protrept. i. 69, ed. Potter; Strom. iv. 6, p. 592; Origen, conf. Cels. iii. 20; iv. 21, ed. Spicq; Tertullian, Apol. v. 17; De Præser. Haer. ch. 86; Cyprian, Tetram. iii. 7, etc.); and after them the constant and persistent tradition of the ancient Church. Even Marcion did not deny that the epistle was written by Paul, nor did his critics refuse occasionally to cite it as confidingly due to him as its author (Irenæus, Haer. i. 8, 5; see Hug. Introd. Fodick's transal. p. 551; Hippolytus, Philos. Phænomena, vi. 54). In recent times, however, its genuineness has been somewhat vehemently called in question. The epistle is also cited as part of sacred Scripture by Jerome (Ep. ad Philipp. c. 1; c. 109), and it is probably to it that Ignatius refers in writing to the Ephesians (c. 12); compare Coteloriu Annot. in loc.; Pearson, Vind. Ignatium. pt. ii. p. 119; Lardner's Works, ii. 70, 8vo). De Wette has attempted, from internal evidence, to set aside this external proof of the Pauline auth. of the epistle; but this attempt has been so fully and satisfactorily answered by Schott (Ang. in N. T. p. 260), Guerike (Beiträge zur hist. crit. Einleitung ins N. T. p. 106), Hensen (Der Ap. Paulus, p. 180), Rückert (Der Br. Paul an die Epheser, p. 289), and others, that later De Wette himself, both in the introductory pages of his Commentary on this epistle (ed. 2, 1847), and in his Introduction to the N. T. (ed. 5, 1848), only labours to prove that it is a mere spirit: an expansion of the epistle to the Colossians, though compiled in the apostolic age. Schweiger (Nachst. Ztg. 382, 383; t. Paulus, p. 180), Ruyff (Paulus, p. 180), and others advance a step farther, and reject both epistles as of no higher antiquity than the age of Montanism and early Gnosticism. The objections adduced are chiefly the following: 1. The absence of any friendly greetings in this epistle, coupled with what are alleged to be indications of want of previous acquaintance on the part of the writer with the Ephesians, facts which, if it is asserted, are incompatible with the supposition that it was written by Paul, whose relations with the Ephesian Church were so intimate. 2. The occurrence of what are considered synonyms and other points indicate acquaintance with those Gnostic ideas which were familiar only at a period much later than that of
the apostle. 3. The close resemblance of this epistle to the epistle to the Colossians, suggesting that the former is only an enlargement of the latter. The first of these objections may be passed over here, as the allege-
gations on which it rests will be particularly consid-
ered when we come to the question of the destination
of this epistle; and, of the other two, the principal
remark of Reuss in reference to the unreasonableness
of such objections: "If Paul writes simple letters of
friendship, they are pronounced insignificant, and so
spurious, because there is a want of the didactic char-
acter of the others; and of the other he argues that
there is proof of the spuriousness of the writing in the
absence of the other. What! must both elements al-
ways be united according to some definite rule? is it
so with us? or are any two of Paul's epistles alike in
this respect?" (Die Geschicht. d. H. Schr., Neuen Text.
p. 104, ed.) The second of the two objections has
reference to such passages as i: 21; ii: 7; iii: 21,
where it is alleged the Gnostic doctrine of sexes is recog-
nised; and to the expression πληρωμα, i: 38, as con-
veying a purely Gnostic idea; and to such words as μορφος, σωφρον, γνώσις, φασις, συναίνεις, etc. On
this subject it may be observed that, as in other
things, the existence of Gnostic allusions in this epistle, that, on
the one hand, the objection assumes that, because
Gnostic schools and systems did not make their appear-
tance till after the age of the apostles, the ideas and
words used in the epistles were either antecedent at an
earlier period, a position which cannot be maintained
[see Gnostics]; and, on the other, that, because
the apostle uses phraseology which was employed also by
the Gnostics, he uses it in the same sense as they did,
which is purely gratuitous and indeed untrue, for to
confound the αἰωνιος and πληρωμα of the apostle with the
αἰωνιος and πληρωμα of the Gnostics, as Baur does,
only proves, as Lange has remarked, that "a man may
write whole books on Gnostics and Gnosticism without
detecting the characteristic difference between
the Christian principle and Gnosticism" (Apostol. Zeit-
ed. i, 124). With regard to the resemblance between
this epistle and that to the Colossians, it can surprise
no one that, written at the same time, they should in
many respects resemble each other (see Klöpper, De
origini Eph. ad Eph. et Col. Gryph. 1853); but it does
not require much penetration to discover the many
differences of difference between them, especially in
point of view from which the writer contemplates his
own subject, the Lord Jesus Christ, in each; in the
one as the prehistoric, pre-existent, supreme source of
all things; in the other as the incarnate, historical,
existent, social Saviour of the Church. But these things are subjected (comp. Eph. i: 30-33, with Col. i:
15-20; and Lange, Ap. Zeit., i, 118). As for the
above "copious expansion," that may be left to the
judgment of the reader, as ν.λ. is the counter notion of
Schneckenburger, that the epistle to the Colossians
is an epistle of that to the Ephesians made by Paul
himself. On such objections in general, we may say
with Reuss that "such hypotheses, whatever accept-
ance they may have received, tell by their deficiency or
strangeness, not against the epistle, but against them-
sevcls; and, in opposition to all, the many
traits which disprove the presence of the thoughts of a
deceptive imitation by a foreign hand stand as valid
arguments in its defence" (Gesch. p. 104). For a
detailed reply to the arguments of De Wette and Baur,
the student may be referred to Meyer, Einleitung, z. Eph.
p. 74 sqq.; at present it may be judged by the
handbook of the MSS., the cursive numbered 67, by Basil (expressly),
probable by Origen, and possibly by Tertullian. This,
combined with the somewhat noticeable omission of
all greetings to the members of a church with which
the apostle stood in such affectionate relation, and
some other internal objections, have suggested a doubt
whether these words really formed a part of the origi-
nal text. On the subject of the persons addressed,
therefore, two hypotheses have been entertained, the
first by Reuss, that the epistle is addressed to the
Church at Laodicea, and that there, in this epistle to that Church which is
commonly supposed to have been lost. The view of Gro-
tius, which has been followed by some scholars of emi-
nent name, gives no hint of any such tradition.
Veneza, Wetstein, and Paley, rests chiefly on two
grounds, viz. the testimony of Marcion, and the close
resemblance between this epistle and that to the Colos-
sians, taken in connection with Coloss. iv, 16.
With respect to the former of these grounds, it is alleged
by Wetstein, that, as Marcion was acquainted with
wifful falsehood in regard to the destination of this
epistle, he probably had the authority of the Church at
Laodicea, and, it may be, the tradition of the church-
es generally of Asia Minor, for the opinion which he
expressed in his Profeccion, etc., (Ad N. Test. p. 9, Oxon.
1702). But, without charging Marcion with designingly uttering what was false, we
can suppose that, like some critics of recent times,
this view was suggested to him by the apostle's allu-
sion, in Col. iv, 16, to an epistle addressed by him to
the Laodiceans or to Colossians. Nor is there the least ground for
supposing that Marcion spoke in this instance on the
authority of the Asiatic churches; on the contrary,
there is every reason to believe the opposite; for not
only do Origen and Clement of Alexandria, who were
fully acquainted with the views of the Eastern church-
ers on such matters, give no hint of any such tradition
being entertained by them, but Tertullian, to whom we
are indebted for our information respecting the
opinion of Marcion, expressly says that in that opin-
ion he opposed the tradition of the orthodox churches,
and imposed upon the epistle a false title, through
the conceit of his own superior diligence in exploring such
matters (adv. Marc. v, 17). With regard to the other
argument by which this view is advocated, admitting
the fact of a close resemblance between the epistle to
the Colossians and that before us, and the fact that
Paul has, in Col. i, addressed himself written one to the Church at Laodicea, which he
advises the Colossians to send for and read, how does it
follow from all this that the epistle to the Laodiceans
and that now under notice were one and the same?
It appears more probable that, seeing the two extant
epistles bear so close a resemblance to each other, had
the one now bearing the inscription "to the Ephes-
sians" been really the one addressed to the Laodic-
ians, the apostle would not have deemed it of so much
importance that the churches of Colossae and Laodicea
should interchange epistles. Such being the argu-
ments in favor of this hypothesis (for those which,
in addition, Wetstein alleges from a comparison of this
epistle with that to the Church at Laodicea, in the
Apocalypse, are not deserving of notice; see Michae-
iss., Introd. iv, 187), we may venture to set aside as
without foundation this argument also. It appears also,
that it seems incompatible with what the apostle
says, Col. iv, 15, where he enjoins the Church at Co-
lossae to send his greetings to the brethren at Laodi-
cea, etc. No one sends greetings by another except
when it is impossible to express them one's self. But
if Paul wrote to Laodicea before he addressed the
Colossae, and sent both letters by the same bearer, Tychi-
cus, there was manifestly no occasion whatever for his
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reading his salutations to the latter of these churches through the medium of the former; it was obviously as easy, and much more natural, to send his salutations to the Church at Laodicea in the epistle addressed to themselves. This seems to prove that the epistle to the Laodiceans had been written some considerable time after that to the Colossians; and therefore, it could not have been the same with that now under notice. See Laodiceans (Epistle to).

2. The opinion that this epistle was not specially addressed to any one church, but was intended as a sort of circular letter for the use of several churches, was first advanced by Bishop Usher, and is confirmed by the explanation of it given by Bishop Lowth. (Eccles. Hist. i. 110. 111. and ii. 199.) The bishop also seems to have supposed that it was written some time before the other epistles to the Ephesians and Philemon. He supposes, that the epistle was written about the year 61 A.D. (Bibliotheca, p. 680, Bremes, 1686.) To this opinion the great majority of critics have given their suffrage; indeed, it may be regarded as the received opinion of Biblical scholars in the present day. This may make it appear presumptuous in us to call it in question; and yet it seems to us so ill supported by positive evidence, and exposed to so many objections, that we cannot yield assent to it. (1.) In the first place, it is to be observed that this is a hypothesis entirely of modern invention. No hint is furnished of any such notion having existed at any time concerning the destination of this epistle by the early Church. With the solitary exception of Mancion, so far as we know, all parties were unanimous in assigning Ephesus as the place to which this epistle was sent, and Mancion's view is as much opposed to the supposition of its being a circular letter, as to that of the universal designation of this epistle by the ancient Church (Mancion standing alone in his assertion that it was written to the Laodiceans) as an epistle to the Ephesians. (2.) The extreme difficulty in giving any satisfactory meaning to the isolated participle (σὺν αὐτῶν, to them together) and the additional charge (v. 2) that the epistle was written in the apostle's writings, can scarcely fail to be considered as the properity of removing the brackets in which these latter are enclosed in the 2d and later editions of Tischendorf, and of considering them an integral part of the original text. If called upon to supply an answer to, or an explanation of these objections, we must record the opinion that none on the whole seems so free from objection as that which regards the epistle as also designed for the benefit of churches either conterminous to, or dependent on that of Ephesus. The counter-arguments of Meyer, though adly urged, are not convincing. Nor can an appeal to the silence of writers of the ancient Church on this further destination be conceived to be of much weight, as their references are to the usual and stular designation of the epistle, and do not and are not intended to affect the question of its destination. (3.) The epistle to the Ephesians will be considered afterwards; at present the question is, How do they favor the hypothesis that this was a circular letter? Now, supposing them to be unquestionable, and admitting that they are not irreconcilable with this hypothesis, it must yet appear to be certain, that the evidence in favor of the primary evidence in its support. It is not one which grows naturally out of these facts, or is suggested by them; it is plainly of foreign birth, and suggested for them. But when it is remembered that the first of these alleged facts is (to say the least) very doubtful; that the second is made to depend on this hypothesis only by means of another as doubtful as itself, and that, were its services admitted, it would prove too much, for it would go to show that, to the Laodiceans, the apostle not only sent a peculiar epistle, mentioned Col. iv. 16, but gave them a share also in this circular epistle written some time after their own; and that the third and fourth are both either partially or wholly questionable, it must be admitted that this hypothesis stands upon a basis which is little better than none. (3.) Had the epistle been addressed to a particular circle of churches, some designations would have been given, by which it might have been known that churches they were to which this letter belonged. When it is argued that this must be a circular letter, because there is no church specified to which it is addressed, it is easily to be forgotten that the designation of a particular set of churches is as necessary for a circular epistle as the designation of one church is for an epistle specially addressed to it. If we must leave out the words iv. Epigr in chap. i. 1, what are we to put in their place? for if we take the passage as it stands without them, it will follow that the epistle was addressed to all Christians everywhere, which is more than the advocates of the hypothesis now under notice can contrive to do. There is however a blank, which is equally gratuitous, unreasonable, and unnecessary. (4.) In chap. vi. 21, 22, Paul mentions that he had sent to those for whom this epistle was destined Tychicus, who should make known to them all things, that they might know his affairs, and that he might comfort them. The case of all the Ephesians was not only the bearer of this letter, but that he was personally to visit, converse with, and comfort those to whom it was addressed. On the supposition that this was a circular letter, this could hardly have been the case. 8. We return, then, to the question of the genuine of the suspected words "at Ephesus," iv. Epigr. At first sight the doubts against them seem plausible; but when we oppose to these (a) the preponderating weight of diplomatic evidence for the insertion of the words (which are wanting in the oldest, and worst, of Paul's epistles); (b) the universal designation of this epistle by the ancient Church (Mancion standing alone in his assertion that it was written to the Laodiceans) as an epistle to the Ephesians; (d) the extreme difficulty in giving any satisfactory meaning to the isolated participle (σὺν αὐτῶν, to them together) and the additional charge that the epistle was written in the apostle's writings, we can scarcely fail to see as the properity of removing the brackets in which these words are enclosed in the 2d and later editions of Tischendorf, and of considering them an integral part of the original text. If called upon to supply an answer to, or an explanation of these objections, we must record the opinion that none on the whole seems so free from objection as that which regards the epistle as also designed for the benefit of churches either conterminous to, or dependent on that of Ephesus. The counter-arguments of Meyer, though adly urged, are not convincing. Nor can an appeal to the silence of writers of the ancient Church on this further destination be conceived to be of much weight, as their references are to the usual and stular designation of the epistle, and do not and are not intended to affect the question of its destination. If the epistle to the Ephesians will be considered afterwards; at present the question is, How do they favor the hypothesis that this was a circular letter? Now, supposing them to be unquestionable, and admitting that they are not irreconcilable with this hypothesis, it must yet appear to be certain, that the evidence in favor of the primary evidence in its support. It is not one which grows naturally out of these facts, or is suggested by them; it is plainly of foreign birth, and suggested for them. But when it is remembered that the first of these alleged facts is (to say the least) very doubtful; that the second is made to depend on this hypothesis only by means of another as doubtful as itself, and that, were its services admitted, it would prove too much, for it would go to show that, to the Laodiceans, the apostle not only sent a peculiar epistle, mentioned Col. iv. 16, but gave them a share also in this circular epistle written some time after their own; and that the third and fourth are both either partially or wholly questionable, it must be admitted that this hypothesis stands upon a basis which is little better than none.
mystic building of which Christ was the corner-stone, the apostles the foundations, and himself and his fellow-Christians portions of the august superstructure (ii, 19-22), must have spoken with a force, an appro\n\n\niv. Contents.—These easily admit of being divided into two portions, the first mainly doctrinal (i-iii), the second katory and practical.

1. The spiritual portion opens with a brief address to the saints in Ephesus, and rapidly passes into a sublime ascription of praise to God the Father, who has predestinated us to the adoption of sons, blessed and redeemed us in Christ, and made known to us his eternal purpose of uniting all in him (i, 3-14). This not unnaturally evokes a prayer from the apostle that his converts may be enlightened to know the hope of God's calling, the riches of his grace, and the magnitude of that power which was displayed in the resurrection and transcendent exaltation of Christ—the head of his body, the Church (i, 15-20). Then, with a more immediate address to the converts, the apostle appoints them how, dead as they had been in sin, God had quickened them, raised them, and even enronzed them with Christ; and how all was by grace, not by works (ii, 1-10). They were to remember, too, how Christ, having abolished in his flesh the enmity (v, 11-14), was reconciled to God by the sacrifice of himself, and was put back in the middle of the old man, not brought nigh in the blood of Christ; how he has as their Peace, how by him both they and the Jews had access to the Father, and how on him as the corner-stone they had been built into a spiritual temple to God (ii, 11-22).

On this account, having heard, as they must have done the profound mystery of this call of the Gentile world, they were not to faint at his troubles (iii, 1-18): nay, he prayed to the great Father of all to give them inward strength, to teach them the love of Christ, and fill them with the fulness of God (iii, 13-19). The prayer is concluded by an exhortation (iii, 29-40), which, as in 

2. This apostle commences by entreating them to walk worthy of this calling, and to keep the unity of the Spirit: there was but one body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one God (iv, 1-6). Each, too, had his portion of grace from God (iv, 7-10), who had appointed ministering orders in the Church, until all come to the unity of the faith, and grow up and become united with the living Head, even Christ (iv, 11-16). Surely, then, they were to walk no more as darkness, but as light (v, 1-8). They were not toiate the deeds of the past (v, 3-14). Thus were they to walk exactly, to be filled with joy, to sing, and to give thanks (v, 18-21). Wives were to be subject to their husbands, husbands to love and cleave the wives (v, 28-33); children to honor their parents, servants to obey their masters (vi, 1-4); and masters to work for each other their reciprocal duties (vi, 5-9). With a noble and vivid exhortation to arm themselves against their spiritual foes with the armor of God (vi, 10-18), this epistle closes. Timothy was not yet with Paul (i, 1); Paul was then a prisoner (iii, 1; iv, 1), but had been allowed to pre\n\n\n
Colossians iv, 7, 8). The question of order in time between this epistle and that to the Colossians is very difficult to adjust. On the whole, both internal and external considerations seem to point to the conclusion that the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians was the same person as the apostle to the Colossians.


VI. Commentaries, etc.—The following is a full list of separate exegetical helps on this epistle, the more important having an asterisk (*) prefixed:

V. William, in Mai's Script. Vet. 311, i, 87; Jerome, Commentarius (in Opp. viii, 577; also in Opp. Suppl. xi, 995). Chrysostom, Homilæ (in Opp. vi, 1;注脚 Error: 191). Claudius Tarrenius, Expositio (in Mabillon, Vet. Anal. 91); *Calvin, Commentarius (in Opp. ; also tr. into English, Lond. 1854, 4to). Also Servomen (tr. by Golding, Lond, 1577, 4to; Ridley, Commentary (in Richmond's Fathers, ii, 14). Megander, Commentarius (Basile, 1584, 8vo; Sancius, Adnotationes (Cfrk. 1541, 5vo); Major, Exegetico (1552, 8vo; Nilant, Exegetarum (Vene. 1554; Lond. 1570, 8vo); Weller, Commentarius (Norimb. 1598, 8vo); Vellerus, Exegetarum (Norimb. 1598, 8vo). Bucer, Prelectiones (Basil. 1562, fol.; Musculus, Commentarius (Basil. 1564, fol.; Calvin, 1566, fol.); Binem, Expositio (Lond. 1581, 4to); Anon., Exposition (Lond. 1681, 4to); Stewart, Commentarius (Ingolst. 1593, 4to); Rollock, Commentarius (Edinb. 1590, 4to; Gen. 1599, 8vo); Zanchius, Commentarius (Newstd. 1594, fol.;) Weinrich, Explicatio (Lips. 1618, 4to; also tr. and prefixed by De Quiros, Commentarius (Hisp. 1622, fol.; Ingst. 1628, 4to; Meelhueter, Commentarius (Norimb. 1628, 4to); Hanneken, Explicatio (4to, Marp. 1681; Lips, 1718; Jen. 1731); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Reut. 1636, 4to). Cocceius, Commentarius (in Opp. v); Althofer, Annotatio (Altem. 1684); C. H. Preffer, Commentarius (Cassel, 1642, 8vo); Bayne, Commentary (Lond. 1648, fol.); Wandelin, Paraphrasis (Sisew. 1650, 8vo); Boyd, Prelectiones (fol., London, 1552; Gen. 1650). Anon., Annotationes (8vo, Camb. 1635; Amst. 1703; also in the Commentaries of Fergusson, 1659, 8vo); Croll, Commentarius (in Opp. i, 4); Lagon, Commentario (Gryph. 1664, 4to); Schmidt, Paraphrasis (Arg. 1684, 1698, 4to); Du Busc, Sermonia (Fr., Rotterd. 1699, 9 vols, 8vo); Goodwin, Exposition (Strasb. 1699, 4to); Spener, Erklär. (Hal. 1706, 1730, 4to); Gerhard, Editionis (Strasb. 1673, 4to); Freyling, Dissertations (Arg. 1711, 8vo). Also, De visitatione Pauli apud Ephesios (Arg. 1721, 4to); Rolf, Commentarius (Tr. ad Rh. 1715, 1731, 2. vols, 4to); Hazevoet, Erklärbar. (L. B. 1718, 4to); *Dinart, Commentarius (Rotterd. 1721, 4to; also in Low Dutch, ib. 1711, 22, 2 vols, 4to); Van Til, Commentarius (Amst. 1726, 4to; Fend, Erklär. (s. l. 1727, 4to); Ziegler, Einth. (in Henke's Magaz. iv, 22); Crussius, De statu Ephe\n
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haesen, Erklär. (Hanov. 1833, 8vo); Simcoe, Illustration
(Lond. 1833, 4to); *Meier, Commentar (Berl. 1834,
8vo); *Harless, Commentar (8vo, Erlen. 1834;
Stuttgart 1858); *Rückert, Erklär. (Lpz. 1834, 8vo); Matthias,
Berinner. (Grießw. 1834, 8vo); Löhlein, Syrinx inter-
altes (Lpz. 1835, 8vo); Pächt, Axleg. (Halle, 1880,
8vo); Lümmen, De op. ad Eph. authentica (Göt. 1842,
8vo); *De Wette, Handb. (Lpz. 1848, 8vo, vol. ii); *Stier,
Axleg. (Berl. 1848-9, 2 vols. in 8 parts; 8vo,
abridged, 1859, 8vo); Perceval, Lectures (Lond. 1848,
12mo); McGlyne, Lectures (Dublin, 1848, 2 vols. 8vo); *Bosanquet, Syrinx (Lond. 1865, 8vo); *Meyer,
Commentary (Göt. 1853, pt. ii); *Edie, Commentary
( Glasg. 1854, 8vo); Blaing, Erklär. (Münst.
1858, 8vo); Köhler, Predigten (Kiel, 1855, 8vo); Hodge,
Commentary (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); *Turner, Commentary
(N. Y. 1856, 8vo); *Bluemel, Commentar (Lond. 1856,
1859, 1864; Andov. 1860); Neuland, Neue Cautena
(Lond. 1861, 8vo); Clergymen (4), Revision (Lond. 1861,
8vo); Pridham, Notes (Lond. 1862, 12mo); Lath-
throp, Discourses (Phil., 1864, 8vo); Bleek, Forliemen-
gen (Berl. 1865, 8vo). See Epistles.

and country which the ancients from Attica had selected as their future abode surpassed, according to Herodotus (i, 142), all others in beauty and fertility; and, had the martial spirit of the Ionians corresponded to their natural advantages, they might have grown into a powerful independent nation. The softness, however, of the polite character of the people, the length of life, the necessities of life could be procured, transformed the hardy inhabitants of the rugged Attica into an indolent and voluptuous race; hence they fell successively under the power of the Lydians (B.C. 560) and the Persians (B.C. 557); and, though the revolt of His-
tiues and Aristogiton against the Persian power was for a time successful, the contest at length terminated in favor of the latter (Herod. vi, 7-22). The defeat of the Persians by the Greeks gave a temporary lib-
erty to the Ionian cities; but the battle of Mycale transferred the dominion of Athens. During the Peloponnesian war they paid tribute indifferently to either party, and the treaty of Antalcidas (B.C. 387) once more restored them to their old masters the Persians. They beheld with indiffer-
ence the exploits of Alexander and the disputes of his capulators, as if they were not conscious of the struggle for successive conquerors. Ephesus was included in the dominions of Lysimachus; but, after the defeat of Antiochus (B.C. 190), it was given by the Romans to the kings of Pergamus. In the year B.C. 129 the Romans formed their province of Asia. The fickle Ephesians took part with Mithridates against the Ro-
mans, and massacred the garrison; they had reason to be grateful for the unusual clemency of L. Cornelius
Sulla, who merely inflicted heavy fines upon the in-
habitants. Thenceforward the city formed part of the Roman empire. While, about the epoch of the intro-
duction of Christianity, the other cities of Asia Minor declined, Ephesus rose more and more. It owed its prominence to the richness of its trading prosperity, in which it vied with Tyre and Alexandria; to the wealthy town of Erythrai (also called Erythrepolis or Lysimachus named the city Arinœo in honor of his second wife, and Attalus Philadelphus furnished it with splendid wharves and docks; in part to the favor-
able position of the place, which naturally made it the emporium of Asia on this side the Taurus (Strabo, vii, 641, 692). Under the Romans, Ephesus was the capital not only of Ionia, but of the entire province of Asia, and bore the honorable title of the first and greatest metropolis of Asia (Böckh, Corp. Inscript. Græc. 2968-2992). The bishop of Ephesus in later times was the primate of the Asiatic dioceses, with the rights and privileges of a patriarch (Ep. Hist. Ec-
cles. iii, 6). Towards the end of the 11th century Ephesus experienced the same fate as Smyrna; and, after a brief occupation by the Greeks, it surrendered in 1088 to Sultan Saysan, who, to prevent future in-
surrections, sent most of the inhabitants to Tyri-
num, where they were massacred.

Early Silver Coin of Ephesus. From the British Museum. Actual Size. Weight 1753 grains.
natives of Asia (xx, 4), and the latter probably (2 Tim. iv, 12), the former certainly (Acts xxii, 29), natives of Ephesus. In the same connection we ought to mention Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i, 16-18) and his household (iv, 19). On the other hand must be noticed certain specified Ephesian antagonists of the apostle, the sons of Sceva and his party (Acts xix, 14), Hymeneus and Alexander (1 Tim. i, 20; 2 Tim. iv, 14), and Phygellus and Hermogenes (2 Tim. i, 15).

See Paul. Ephesus is also closely connected with the apostle John, not only as being the scene (Rev. i, 11; ii, 1) of the most remarkable of the churches of the Apocalypse, but also in the story of his later life as given by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. iii, 23, etc.). According to a tradition which prevailed extensively in ancient times, John spent many years in Ephesus, where he employed himself most diligently for the spread of the Gospel, and where he died at a very old age, and was buried. See John (The Apostle). Possibly his Gospels and Epistles were written here. There is a tradition that the mother of our Lord was likewise buried at Ephesus, as also Timothy. Some make John bishop of the Ephesian communities, while others ascribe that honor to Timothy. In the book of Revelation (ii, 1) a favorable testimony is borne to the Christian churches at Ephesus. Ignatius addressed one of his epistles to the Church of this place (τῷ ἑξάησθιῳ τῷ ὑδάτινῳ, τῷ οὖν ἐν Ἑσυσίῳ τῷ Αἰγήι, Ἡσαῖ, Pat. Ancylii p. 164), which held a conspicuous position during the early ages of Christianity, and was, in fact, the metropolis of the churches of this part of Asia.

3. Location.—Ephesus lay on the Ægean coast, nearly opposite the island of Samos. 320 stadia from Smyrna (Strabo, xiv, 682). The ancient town seems to have been confined to the northern slope of Corfuus (Herod. i, 26), but in the lapse of time the inhabitants advanced farther into the plain, and thus a new town sprang up around the temple (Strabo, xiv, 640). All the cities of Ionia were remarkably well situated for the growth of commercial prosperity (Herod. i, 142), and none more than Ephesus. With a fertile neighborhood (Strabo, xiv, 657) and an excellent climate, it was also most conveniently placed for traffic with all the neighboring parts of the Levant. In the time of Augustus it was the great emporium of all the regions of Asia within the Taurus (Strabo, xiv, 960); its harbor (named Panormus), at the mouth of the Cayster, was elaborately constructed, though alluvial matter caused serious hindrances both in the time of Attalus and in Paul’s own time (Tacitus, Ann. xvi, 25). The apostle’s life alone furnishes illustrations of its mercantile relations with Achaea on the W., Macedonia on the N., and Syria on the E. At the close of his second missionary circuit, he sailed across from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts xviii, 18), when on his way to Syria (Acts xviii, 21, 22): some think that he once made the same short voyage over the Ægean, in the opposite direction, at a later period. See Corinthians, First Ep. to.

On the third missionary circuit, besides the notice of the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (xix, 21; xx, 1), we have the coast voyage on the return to Syria given in detail (xx, xxxi), and the geographical relations of this city with the islands and neighboring parts of the coast minutely indicated (xx, 15-17). To these passages we must add 1 Tim. i, 3; 2 Tim. iv, 19, 20; though it is difficult to say confidently whether the journeys implied there were by land or by water. See likewise Acts xix, 27; xx, 1.

As to the relations of Ephesus to the inland regions of the continent, these also are prominently brought before us in the apostle’s travels. The “upper coasts” (ἐν δεξιάς τῆς ἀρχῆς, Acts xix, 1) through which he passed when about to take up his residence in the city, were the Phrygian table-lands of the interior; and it was probably in the same district that on a previous
occasion (Acts xvi, 6) he formed the unsuccessful project of preaching the Gospel in the district of Asia. Two great roads at least, in the Roman times, led eastward from Ephesus; one through the passes of Tmolus to Sardis (Rev. iii, 1), and thence to Galatia and the N.E., the other round the extremity of Pactya to Magnesia, and up the valley of the River to Ionia, whence the communication was direct to the Euphrates and to the Syrian Antioch. There seem to have been Sardian and Magnesian gates on the E. side of Ephesus corresponding to these roads respectively. There were also coast-roads leading northwards to the northeast, and southwards to the south. By the latter of these it is probable that the Ephesian elders travelled when summoned to meet Paul at the latter city (Acts xx, 17, 18). Part of the pavement of the Sardian road has been noticed by travellers under the cliffs of Galleus. (See Leake's *Asia Minor*, and *Map*.)

Among the more marked physical features of the peninsula are the two large rivers, Hermus and Meander, which flow from a remote part of the interior westward to the Archipelago, Smyrna (Rev. ii, 8) being near the mouth of one, and Miletus (Acts xx, 17) of the other. Not far from their valley lies a series of hills and plains where two of these rivers is the shorter stream and smaller basin of the Cayster, called by the Turks Kutschuk-Mendere, or the Little Meander. Its upper level (often called the Caystrian meadows) was closed to the westward by the gorge between Galleus and Palaemon, the latter of these mountains being a prolongation of the range of Messois, which bounds the valley of the Meander on the north, the former more remotely connected with the range of Tmolus, which bounds the valley of the Hermus on the south. Beyond the gorge and towards the sea the valley opens out again into the Myus Plain (Herod. ii. 10), with hills rising abruptly from it. The plain is now about 5 miles in breadth, but formerly it must have been smaller, and some of the hills were once probably islands. Here Ephesus stood, partly on the level ground and partly on the hills.

Of the hills, on which a large portion of the city was built, the two most important were Prion and Coreus, the latter on the S. of the plain, and being, in fact, almost a continuation of Pactya, the former being in front of Coreus and near it, though separated by a deep and defective valley. Further to the N.E. is another prominent eminence, known to us as Mount Yeleus (see generally Cellarius *Notit. ii, 80. 4. Government.—It is well known that Asia was a proconsular province; and in harmony with this fact we find proconsuls (ἀρχονταὶ, A.V. "deputies") specially mentioned (Acts xix, 38). Nor is it necessary to inquire here whether the plain in this passage is generic, or whether the governors of other provinces were present in Ephesus at the time. Again, we learn from Pliny (v, 81) that Ephesus was an assize-town (forum or conveniens); and in the N.T. narrative (Acts xix, 38) we find the count-days alluded to as actually being held (τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἄργον, A.V. "the law is open") during the uproar; though perhaps it is not absolutely necessary to give the expression this exact reference as to time (see Wordsworth in loc.). Ephesus itself was a "free city," and had its own assemblies and its own magistrates. The senate (Ἑλευσια, or Βουλή) is mentioned not only by Strabo, but by Josephus (Ant. xiv. 10, 25; xvi. 6, 4 and 7); and Luke, in the narrative before us, speaks of the δῆμος (ver. 30, 36, A.V. "the people") and of its customary assemblies (τοῦ χαιρετοῦ και ἐκκλησίαν, ver. 39, A.V. "a lawful assembly"). That the tumultuary meeting which was gathered on the occasion in question should take place in the theatre (ver. 29, 31) was nothing extraordinary. It was at a meeting in the theatre at Caesarea that Agrippa I received his death-stroke (Acts xii, 25), and in Greek cities this was often the place for large assemblies (Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 80; *Val. Max.* ii, 2). We even find conspicuous mention made of one of the most important municipal officers of Ephesus, the "town-clerk" (q.v.) (γραμματικὴς), or keeper of the records, whom we know from other sources to have been a person of great influence and responsibility. It is remarkable how all these political and religious characteristics of Ephesus, which appear in the sacred narrative, are illustrated by inscriptions and coins. An ἀρχοντας, or state-paper office, is mentioned on an inscription in Chisilull. The γραμματικὴς frequently appears; so also the λαός και ἀνθρώποι. Sometimes these words are combined in the same inscription; see, for instance, Boeckh, *Corp. Insers.* 1299, 2294, 2296. The later coins of Ephesus are full of allusions to the worship of Diana in various aspects. The word *ἀριστος* (warrant, A.V. "woothkeeper") is of frequent occurrence. That which is given last below has also the word ἀνθρώποι (proconsul, A.V. "deputy"); it exhibits an image of the temple, and, bearing as it does the name and head of Nero, it must have been struck about the time of Paul's stay in Ephesus. The one immediately preceding it bears the name (Cusinius) of the acting γραμματικὴς ("town-clerk") at the time. The bronze coin of Ephesus. 5. The *Asiarchs*—Public games were connected with the worship of Diana at Ephesus. The month
of May was sacred to her. The uproar mentioned in the Acts very probably took place at this season. Paul was certainly at Ephesus about that time of the year (1 Cor. xvi. 8), and Demetrius might well be peculiarly sensitive if he found his trade failing at the time of greatest concourse. However the case, the Asiarchs (Ἀσιαρχοι, A. V. "chiefs of Asia") were present (Acts xix. 31). These were officers appointed, after the manner of the ediles at Rome, to preside over the games which were held in different parts of the province of Asia, just as other provinces had their Galatarchs, Lycatarchs, etc. Various circumstances would require the presence of these officers in turn. In the account of Polycarp's martyrdom at Smyrna (Hesefle, Pat. Apost. p. 286) an important part is played by the Asiarch Philip. It is a remarkable proof of the influence which Paul had gained at Ephesus that the Asiarch took his side in the disturbance. See Dr. Wordsworth's note on Acts xix. 31. Comp. Asiaarch.

6. Religion.—Conspicuous at the head of the harbor of Ephesus was the great temple of Diana or Artemis, the tutelary divinity of the city. She was worshipped under the name of Artemis. There was more than one divinity which went by the name of Artemis, as the Arcadian Artemis, the Taurian Artemis, as well as the Ephesian Artemis. (See Dougall in Anotlct. ii. 91; Münter, Relig. d. Krbaty. p. 53.) Her worship in this instance was said to have originated in an image that fell from heaven (Acts xiv. 15). See also Clem. Alex. Protrep. p. 14; Wetzstein in loc.), and believed to have been an object of reverence from the earliest times (Pliny, xvi. 79). The material of which it was composed is disputed, whether ebony, cedar, or otherwise (see Spanheim, ad Cudin. Dian. vers. 228). She was represented as many-headed (poluamaño, multiformia, see Gronovii Thesaur. vii; Zorn, Bibl. Antig. i. 439 sq.); Creuzer, Symbol. ii. 176 sq.), although different explanations are given of her figure in this respect. The following is the description given by Mr. Falsen (Ephesus, p. 266): "The statue of the Ephesian Diana now in the Naples Museum: 'The circle round her head denotes the nimbuses of her glory; the griffins inside of which express its brilliancy. In her breast are the twelve signs of the zodiac, of which those seen in front are the ram, bull, twins, crab, and lion; they are divided by the hours. Her necklace is composed of 27 corns, the primal food of man. Lions are on her arms to denote her power, and her hands are stretched out to show that she is ready to receive all who come to her. Her body is covered with various beasts and monsters, as serpents, sphinxes, and griffins, to show she is the source of nature, the mother of all things. Her head, hands, and feet are of bronze, while the rest of the statue is of alabaster, to denote the ever-varying light and shade of the moon's figure. The altar was the work of Praxiteles. The famous sculptor Scopas is said by Pliny to have chiseled one of the columns. Apelles, a native of the city, contributed his strength, ease, and grace, and whose delights were in the pursuits of the chase. See Diana.' Around the image of the goddess was erected, according to Callimachus (Hyymn. in Dian. 248), her large and splendid temple. This building was raised (about B.C. 500) on immense substructions, in consequence of the swampy nature of the ground. The earlier temple, which had been begun before the Persian war, was burnt down in the night when Alexander the Great was born (B.C. 355), by an obscure person of the name of Eratostratus, who thus sought to transmit his name to posterity (Strabo, xiv. 560; Plutarch, Alex. 3; Solin, 43; Cicero, De Nat. Deor. ii. 27); and, as it seemed somewhat unaccountable that the goddess should permit a place which redounded so much to her honor to be thus recklessly destroyed, it was given out that Diana was so engaged with Olympias in aiding to bring Alexander into the world that she had no time nor thought for any other concern. At a subsequent period Alexander made an offer to rebuild the temple, provided he were allowed to inscribe his name on the front, which the Ephesians refused. Aided, however, by the whole of Asia Minor, they succeeded in erecting a still more magnificent temple, which the ancients have lavishly praised and placed among the seven wonders of the world. It took two hundred and twenty years to complete. Pliny (Hist. Nat. xxxvi. 21), who has given a description of it, says it was 425 feet in length, 220 feet wide, 40 feet high, each of which had been contributed by some prince, and were 60 feet high; 36 of them were richly carved. Chersiphron, the architect, presided over the undertaking, and, being ready to lay violent hands on himself in consequence of his difficulties, was restrained by the command of the goddess, who appeared to him during the night, assuring him that she herself had accomplished that which had brought him to despair. The altar was the work of Praxiteles. The famous sculptor Scopas is said by Pliny to have chiseled one of the columns. Apelles, a native of the city, contributed his strength, ease, and grace, and whose delights were in the pursuits of the chase. See Diana. It will be seen, from the figure given, that this last differed materially from the Diana, sister of Apollo, whose attributes are the bow, the quiver, the girl-up robe, and the hound; whose person is a model of fem-
A splendid picture of Alexander the Great. The rights of sanctuary, to the extent of a stadium in all directions round the temple, were also conceded, which, in consequence of abuse, the emperor Tiberius abolished. The temple was built of cedar, cypress, white marble, and gold, and was 130 feet high. (Stich. Obser. in Hymn. in Dian. 333.) Costly and magnificent offerings of various kinds were made to the goddess and treasured in the temple, such as paintings, statues, etc., the value of which almost exceeded computation. The fame of the temple, of the goddess, and of the man with the new capital, was not only felt in Asia, but throughout the world, a celebrity which was enhanced and diffused the more readily because sacred games were practiced there, which called competitors and spectators from every country. In style, too, this famous structure constituted an epoch in Greek art (Vitr. iv. 1), since it was here first that the graceful Ionic order was perfected. The magnificence of this sanctuary was a proverb throughout the civilized world (Philo Byz. Spec. Mund. 7). All these circumstances give increased force to the architectural allegory in the great epistle which Paul wrote in this place (1 Cor. iii. 16-17), to the passage: "... the edifice of this kind is said in the epistles addressed to Ephesus (Eph. ii. 19-22; 1 Tim. iii. 15; vi. 19; 2 Tim. ii. 19, 20), and to the words spoken to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 25). The temple was frequently used for the safe custody of sacred books. The character of the temple was the privilege which, in common with some other Greek temples, it enjoyed, as an asylum, within the limits of which criminals were safe from arrest (Strabo, xiv. 641; Plutarch, De sacr. c. 3; Apollon. Eph. epist. 65). By Alexander this asylum was extended to a stadium, and by Mithridates somewhat further. Mark Antony nearly doubled the distance; but the abuses hence arising became so mischievous, that Augustus was compelled to abolish the privilege, or at least restrict it to its ancient boundary. Among his other enormities, Nero is said to have despoiled the temple of Diana of much of its treasure. It continued to conciliate no small portion of respect till it was finally burnt by the Goths in the reign of Gallienus. (See Hirt, Der Tempel der Diana zu Ephesus, Berlin, 1809.)

The chief points connected with the upsurge at Ephesus in the case of Paul (Acts xix. 23-41) are mentioned in the articles Diana and Paul; but the following details must be added. In consequence of this devo- tion, the city of Ephesus was called ἴσημος (ver. 36) or "warden" of Diana (see Van Dale, Dissert. p. 309; Wolf, Ephes. ii. 16). The temple was the center of society; a recognized tithe was paid to it, and the books mentioned as being burned by its possessors in consequence of their teaching were doubtless books of magic. The temple was devoted to the worship of Diana and the cultus. The temple was regarded as a sanctuary by the people of Ephesus, and was visited by travelers from all parts of the world. In the time of Alexander the Great, the temple was a center of learning, and was visited by such famous scholars as Eratosthenes and Diodorus Siculus. (See Ephesus, 5.)

6. Magical Arts. Among the distinguished natives of Ephesus in the ancient world may be mentioned Apelles and Parrhasius, rivals in the art of painting. Heracleitus, the man-hating philosopher, Hippocrates, the satirical poet, Artemidorus, who wrote a history and description of the earth. The claims of Ephesus, however, to the praise of originality in the prosecution of the liberal arts about the temple of Diana must be content with the dubious reputation of having excelled in the refinements of a voluptuous and artificial civilization. With culture of this kind, a practical belief in and a constant use of those arts which pretend to lay open the secrets of nature, and arm the hand of man with the power of control, have been found conjoined. Accordingly, the Ephesian multitude were addicted to sorcery; indeed, in the age of Jesus and his apostles, adepts in the occult sciences were numerous: they travelled from country to country, and were found in great numbers in Asia, devoting the credulous multitude and profiting by their expectations. They were sometimes Jews, who referred their skill and even their forms of proceeding to Solomon, who is still regarded in the East as head or prince of magicians (Josephus, Ant. vili. 2, 3; Acts vili. 9, xili. 24, 3; xix. 14), nor is the reputation of magical arts (Ortolb. De Ephes. Libris context. Lib. 1708) this also comes conspicuously into view in Luke's narrative (Acts xix. 11-20). The peculiar character of Paul's miracles (ἐνεργεῖας αὐτοῦ τῆς ἱερατείας), ver. 11), would seem to have been intended as an antithesis to the practices of the books mentioned as being burned by their possessors in consequence of their teaching were doubtless books of magic. How extensively they were in use may be learned from the fact that "the price of them" was "fifty thousand pieces of silver" (more than $400,000). Very celebrated were the Ephesian letters (Επιστ. ἑπερατου), which appear to have been a sort of magical formula written on paper or parchment, designed to be fixed as amulets on different parts of the body, such as the hands and the head (Plut. Sym. viii; Luke. 336; Obser. viii. 336). Eusebius (Adom. Camb. ii. 576) says that they were certain signs or marks which rendered their possessor victorious in every thing. Eustathius (Adom. Odyss. x. 694) states an opinion that Creuses, when on his funeral pile, was very much benefitted by the use of them; and this when a Milesian and an Ephesian were wrestling in the Olympic games, the former could gain no advantage, as the latter had Ephesian letters bound round his heel; but, these being discovered and removed, he lost his superiority, and was thrown thirty times. The faith in these mystic syllabes continued, more or less, till the sixth century (see the Life of Alexander of Tralles, in Smith's Dict. of Class. Biog. v.). We should enter on doubtful ground if we were to speculate on the Gnostic and other errors which grew up at Ephesus in the later apostolic age, and which are foretold in the address at Miletus, and indicated in the epistles to the Ephesians, and more distinctly in the epistles to Timothy. See Curious Arts.
the plain are scattered fragments of masonry and detached ruins, but nothing can now be fixed upon as the great temple of Diana. There are some broken columns and capitals of the Corinthian order of white marble, there are also some ruins of a theatre, consisting of some circular seats and numerous arches, supposed to be the one in which Paul was preaching when interrupted by shouts of "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The ruins of this theatre present a wreck of immense grandeur, and the original must have been of the largest and most magnificent kind. The form alone can now be spoken of, for every seat is removed, and the prosenium is a hill of ruins. A splendid circus (Fellow's Report, p. 275) or stadium remains tolerably entire, and there are numerous piles of buildings, seen at a distance like Pergamos and Troy as well as here, by some called gymnasia, by others temples; by others again, with more propriety, palaces. They all came with the Roman conquest. No one but a Roman emperor could have conceived such structures. In Italy they have parallels in Adrian's villa near Tivoli, and perhaps in the piles of the present mosque. Many other walls remain to show the extent of the buildings of the city, but no inscription or ornament is to be found, cities having been built out of this quarry of worked marble. The ruins of the adjoining town, which arose about four hundred years ago, are entirely composed of these materials. There are few huts within these ruins (about a mile and a half from Ephesus), which still retain the name of the present city, Asulak—a Turkish word, which is associated with the same idea as Ephesus, meaning the City of the Moon (Fellows). ANumerous holes dug in the sand to these is a temple dedicated to St. John is thought to have stood near it, not on the site of the present mosque. Arundel (Discoveries, ii, 258) conjectures that the gate, called the Gate of Persecution, and large masses of brick wall which lie beyond it, are parts of this celebrated church, which was fortified during the great Almainn war, and therefore before the tomb of St. John. There was in or under his church, and the Greeks have a tradition of a sacred dust arising every year, on his festival, from the tomb, possessed of miraculous virtues: this dust they term manna. Not far from the tomb of St. John was that of Timothy. The tomb of Mary and the Seven Sleepers are found in an adjoining hill. At the back of the mosque, on the hill, is the sunk ground-plan of a small church, still much venerated by the Greeks. The sites of two others are shown at Asulak. There is at the back of the building, called the Prison of St. Paul, constructed of large stones without cement. The situation of the temple is doubtful, but it probably stood where certain large masses remain on the low ground, full in view of the theatre. The disappearance of the temple may easily be accounted for, by the rising of the soil, and partly by the incessant use of its materials for medieval buildings. Some of its columns are said to be in St. Sophia at Constantinople, and even in the cathedrals of Italy.

Though Ephesus presents few traces of human life, and little but scattered and mutilated remains of its ancient grandeur, yet the environs, diversified as they are with hill and dale, and not scantily supplied with wood and water, present many features of great beauty. Arundel (ii, 244) enumerates a great variety of trees, which he saw in the neighborhood, among which may be specified groves of myrtle near Ephesus. He also found an abundance of wild berries, and saw there the common fern, which he met with in no other part of Asia Minor. Dr. Chandler (p. 150, 4to) gives a striking description of Ephesus, as he found it in his visit in 1764: "Its population consisted of a few Greek peasants, also a large number of Tetrachae, dependent, and insensible, the representatives of an illustrious people, and inhabiting the wreck of their greatness—some the substratum of the glorious edifices which they raised; some beneath the vaults of the stadium, once the crowded scene of their diversions; and some in the abrupt precipice, in the sepulchres which received their ashes. Such are the present citizens of Ephesus, and such is the condition to which the ruins of a grand city, and the temples which it was a ruinous place when the emperor Justinian filled Constantinople with its statues, and raised the church of St. Sophia on its columns. Its streets are obscured and overgrown. A herd of goats was driven to it for shelter from the sun at noon, and a noisy flight of crows from the tombs appalled my fancy. Its form alone can now be spoken of, for every seat is removed, and the prosenium is a hill of ruins. A splendid circus (Fellow's Report, p. 275) or stadium remains tolerably entire, and there are numerous piles of buildings, seen at a distance like Pergamos and Troy as well as here, by some called gymnasia, by others temples; by others again, with more propriety, palaces. They all came with the Roman conquest. No one but a Roman emperor could have conceived such structures. In Italy they have parallels in Adrian's villa near Tivoli, and perhaps in the piles of the present mosque. Many other walls remain to show the extent of the buildings of the city, but no inscription or ornament is to be found, cities having been built out of this quarry of worked marble. The ruins of the adjoining town, which arose about four hundred years ago, are entirely composed of these materials. There are few huts within these ruins (about a mile and a half from Ephesus), which still retain the name of the present city, Asulak—a Turkish word, which is associated with the same idea as Ephesus, meaning the City of the Moon (Fellows). ANumerous holes dug in the sand to these is a temple dedicated to St. John is thought to have stood near it, not on the site of the present mosque. Arundel (Discoveries, ii, 258) conjectures that the gate, called the Gate of Persecution, and large masses of brick wall which lie beyond it, are parts of this celebrated church, which was fortified during the great Almainn war, and therefore before the tomb of St. John. There was in or under his church, and the Greeks have a tradition of a sacred dust arising every year, on his festival, from the tomb, possessed of miraculous virtues: this dust they term manna. Not far from the tomb of St. John was that of Timothy. The tomb of Mary and the Seven Sleepers are found in an adjoining hill. At the back of the mosque, on the hill, is the sunk ground-plan of a small church, still much venerated by the Greeks. The sites of two others are shown at Asulak. There is at the back of the building, called the Prison of St. Paul, constructed of large stones without cement. The situation of the temple is doubtful, but it probably stood where certain large masses remain on the low ground, full in view of the theatre. The disappearance of the temple may easily be accounted for, by the rising of the soil, and partly by the incessant use of its materials for medieval buildings. Some of its columns are said to be in St. Sophia at Constantinople, and even in the cathedrals of Italy.

Though Ephesus presents few traces of human life, and little but scattered and mutilated remains of its ancient grandeur, yet the environs, diversified as they are with hill and dale, and not scantily supplied with wood and water, present many features of great beauty. Arundel (ii, 244) enumerates a great variety of trees, which he saw in the neighborhood, among which may be specified groves of myrtle near Ephesus. He also found an abundance of wild berries, and saw there the common fern, which he met with in no other part of Asia Minor. Dr. Chandler (p. 150, 4to) gives a striking description of Ephesus, as he found it in his visit in 1764: "Its population consisted of a few Greek peasants, also a large number of Tetrachae, dependent, and insensible, the representatives of an illustrious people, and inhabiting the wreck of their greatness—some the substratum of the glorious edifices which they raised; some beneath the vaults of
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1890), which contains a good chapter on Ephesus: Biscoe, On the Acts (Oxf. 1829), p. 274-285; Mr. Aker-
man's paper on the Coins of Ephesus in the Trans. of the Numismatic Soc. 1841; Gronovius, Antiq. Graec. vii,
367-401; and an article by Amper in the Rev. des Des. Monum. for 1838. Of the other monographs may be
Anon. Acta Pauli cum Ephesius (Helmt. 1768); Epip-
nus, De deplavit bapt. discip. Ephesianor. (Altorf, 1719);
Benner. De bapt. Ephesorum in nomen Christi (Giss. 1783); Bircherode, D. cultus Dianae Ephes. (Hafn. 1723);
Conrad, Ephesus (Peters. 1710); Depl. Acta Pauli cum Ephesius (in his Obs. sacri Il, 362 sq.) Le-
derlin, De templo Dianae Ephesiorum (Argent. 1714);
Schorrfeh, De libris Ephesiorum. (Viteb. 1698); Siber,
De ym'xorpeo Ephesiorum (Viteb. 1668); Wallen, Acta
Pauli Ephes. (Gyph. 1788); Stickel, De Ephesius libri
longiores favorit. die Socianda (Jen. 1860). See Ephes-
ians, Epistle to.

EPHESUS, GENERAL COUNCIL OF. The third
ecumenical council, convoked by the emperor Theo-
 DOSIUS II, was held at Ephesus in 431, upon the con-
 versery raised by Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople,
who had asserted that Jesus Christ had two natures, one
of God and one of man, and that each was of equal
importance. For the circumstances which led to the con-
 vocation of this council, see the articles Nestorius, Nestorianism, Pelagius. Cele-
 sionate, the pope, not seeing fit to attend in person, sent
three legates, Arcadius and Proclus, bishops, and Philippus, a presbyter, and six bishops from the
church of Alexandria, and accompanied by Ireneus, a nobleman, his
friend and protector. Cyril of Alexandria also,
and Juvenal of Jerusalem came, accompanied by about fifty
of the Egyptian bishops; Memnon of Ephesus had
brought together about forty of the bishops within his
jurisdiction; and altogether more than two hundred
bishops were present. Candidianus, the commander
of the forces in Ephesus, attended, by order of the
emperor, to keep peace and order; but by his conduct he
greatly discredited the party of Nestorius. The day ap-
pointed for the opening of the council was June 7th;
but John of Antioch, and the other bishops from Syria
and the East not having arrived, it was delayed till
the 22d of the same month. At the first session of the
council (June 22), before the Greek and Syrian bishops
had arrived, Cyril addressed the council in behalf of the
doctrines of Nestorius, and deposed and excommuni-
cated him. This sentence was signed by one hun-
dred and ninety-eight bishops, according to Tilmont,
and by more than two hundred according to Fleury; it
was afterwards made known to the emperor, and published in the public places. At the same time,
the sentence of it was sent to the clergy and people of Constanti-
nople, with a recommendation to them to secure the
property of the Church for the successor of the de-
prived Nestorius. As soon, however, as Nestorianism
had received notice of this sentence, he protested against it,
and all that had passed at the council, and forward-
ed to the emperor an account of what had been done,
setting forth that Cyril and Memnon, refusing to wait
for John and the other bishops, had hurried matters
on in a tumultuous and irregular way. On the 27th
of June, two bishops of Syria, a presbyter, and the
other bishops of the East, assembled, chose
John of Antioch for their president, and deposed Cyril
in their turn. In August, count John, who had been
sent by the emperor, arrived at Ephesus, and directed
the bishops of both synods to meet him on the follow-
ing day. Accordingly, John of Antioch and Nestorius
attended the council, and Cyril was deposed ortho-
dox; but immediately a dispute arose between them,
the latter contendirig that Nestorius should not be
present, while the former wished to exclude Cyril.
Upon this, the count, to quiet the dispute, gave both Cyril
and Nestorius the custody, and they endeavored,
but in vain, to reconcile the two parties. And thus
matters seemed as far as a settlement as ever.
The emperor at last permitted the fathers of the council to
send to him eight deputies, while the Orientals or Syri-
ans, on their part, sent as many. The place of meet-
ing was Chalcedon, whether the emperor proceeded,
and spent five days in listening to the arguments on
both sides; and here the Council of Ephesus may, in
fact, be said to have terminated. Nothing is known of
what passed at Chalcedon, but the event shows that
Theodosius sided with the Catholics, since upon his
return to Constantinople he ordered, by a letter, the
Catholic deputies to come there, and to proceed to con-
verse with the Nestorians in the presence of Cyril. He
had already ordered to leave Ephesus, and to confine himself to his monastery near Antioch. Afterwards
he directed that all the bishops at the council, includ-
ing Cyril and Memnon, should return to their respective
dioceses. The judgment of this council was at
once approved by the people of the Western Empire, especially
the greater part of the East, and was subsequently
confirmed by the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon,
consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops. Even
John of Antioch and the Eastern bishops very soon
acknowledged it. But Nestorius protested to the last
that he regarded the sentence as anathema-
tized by the council. See NESTORIUS.

Of the other councils of Ephesus, the following are all that need be mentioned: 1, in 245 (?), against
the Patropannian Naosus; 2, in 400, under Chrysostom,
where Heraclius was consecrated bishop of Ephesus;
3, in 446, at which the emperor Theodosius, Zeno,
Justinian, and other emperors, in the presence of the
ROBER COUNCIL (see next article).—Landon, Manual
of Church History, 235; Mansi, Conc. iv, 1212, 1230, et al.;
Gieseler, Hist. Chr. 88; Neander, Church Hist., ii,
488 sq.; Murd. Mosheim, Church Hist. i, 488; Palmer,
On the Church, i, 385 sq.; Lardner, History of
Theology, i, 328 sq.; Hasele, Concilegeschichte, i, 161 sq.;
Smith, Tables of Church History; Christmas Exam-
ier, iv, 49.

EPHESUS, ROBER COUNCIL OF (αυξόδοσις ηρωτα-
σεις, latrunculorum Ephesinum), the so-called second gen-
eral council, was held at Ephesus in 449, which
Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, had in the
preceding year deposed on account of heretical opin-
ions, appealed to a general council, at which the patri-
archs of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica,
and other heads of the Church should be present, and
prevailed upon the emperors to convene the council im-
mediately. Theodosius wrote to Dioccorus, bishop of
Alexandria, desiring him to attend at Ephesus on the
1st of August, with ten metropolitan as and as many
Egyptian bishops, and no more, in order to inquire
into a question of faith in dispute between Flavianus
and Eutyches, by which the latter had been removed from the Church by the favor-
ers of Nestorius. In the same manner he wrote to
other bishops, always fixing the same number of met-
ropolitans and bishops, and especially forbidding
Theodoret to leave his diocese. He sent his own offi-
cers, Elpidius and Eulogius, with authority to provide
such troops as they might deem necessary, in order to
carry into effect what might be required. The bish-
ops who had sat in judgment upon Eutyches at the
council held by Flavianus at Constantinople in 448
were present at the council, but were allowed to take
no part in the debates, and merely to take the lead in everything relating to the council. The council met August 8, and about 130 bishops at-
tended. Dioccorus and his party ruled throughout;
Eutyches was declared orthodox, and re-established in
his priesthood and office of abbot; and sentence of
deposition was pronounced against Flavianus. Flavia-
num appealed from this decision to the bishop of Rome,
whose legate, Hilary, boldly opposed the sentence; at
the same time many of the bishops on their knees im-
plored Dioccorus to reconsider the matter; but he, de-
termining to carry it through, cried out for the impe-
rial officers, upon which the proconsul Proculus entered,
followed by a band of soldiers, armed with swords and
sticks, and carrying chains, who by threats and blows
compelled the bishops to sign the sentence of deposition. This, at last, ninety-six of them did, many, however, being first severely wounded; Flavianus himself was treated with such excessive violence that he died of the injuries he had received within three days; it is said that Dioscorus jumped upon him as he lay upon the ground, and that Harsumas and the monks kicked him with the utmost brutality. To the condemnation of Flavianus that of Eusebius of Doryleum was added, which ended the first session; after which the legate Hilary, dreading fresh scenes of violence, fled secretly to Rome. In the following sessions Theodoret of Tyre was deposed, also Domnus of Antioch and Ibas of Edessa; after which Dioscorus departed, and the bishops withdrew from Ephesus. Thus ended the nivo stropics, as the Greeks justly named this disgraceful assembly, in which violence and injustice were carried on to the utmost excess. — Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 236; Mansi, Concilii, vi, 588 et al.; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 509 sq.; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. § 89; Hefele, Conciliengeeschichte, ii, 350 sq.; Schaff, Church Hist. ii, 348; iii, 798; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, i, 278; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, iv, 81; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 610; Lewald, Die sogenannte RäuberSynode, in Illgen's Zeitschrift für d. Kirch. Theo. 1858, p. 39. See Dioscorus.

Ephal (Heb. Ephod, ἐφόδος, judge), the father of Obad and of Tachath, of the lineage of Sheeshan, of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 57). B.C. post 1618.


Ephod (ἐφόδος [rarely ἐφόδος], ἐφόδος), twice [Exod. xxviii, 8; xxxix, 5] in the fem. ἐφόδος, ἐφόδουδας, something girt; ἐφόδους, ἐφόδους, Eucl. xlv, 8], a sacred vestment originally appropriate to the high-priest [Exod. xxviii, 4], but afterwards worn by ordinary priests (1 Sam. xxii, 18), and deemed characteristic of the office (1 Sam. ii, 28; xiv, 8; Hos. iii, 4). A kind of ephod was worn by Samuel (1 Sam. ii, 18), and by David when he brought the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi, 14; 1 Chron. xv, 27); it differed from the priestly ephod in material, being made of ordinary linen (ἐφόδος), whereas the other was of fine linen (ἐφόδος); it is noticeable that the Sept. does not give ἐφόδους or ἐφόδος in the passages last quoted, but terms of more general import, στολὴ Ἰακώβ, στολὴ Ἰουδα. Attached to the ephod of the high-priest was the breast-plate with the Urim and Thummim; this was the ephod by eminence, which Abiathar carried off (1 Sam. xxiii, 6) from the tabernacle at Nob (1 Sam. xxi, 9), and which David consulted (1 Sam. xxiii, 9, xxx, 7). The importance of the ephod as the receptacle of the breast-plate led to its adoption in the idolatrous forms of worship instituted in the time of the judges (Judg. vii, 27; viii, 5; xviii, 14 sq.). The amount of gold used by Gideon in making his ephod (Judg. viii, 26) has led Gessnerius (Theaur. p. 155), after Vatke (Jüd. Theol. i, 267), following the Peshto version, to give the word the meaning of an idol-image, as though that, and not the priest, was clothed with the ephod; but there is no evidence that the idol was so invested, nor does such an idea harmonize with the general use of the ephod. Idol's wood of ore were often thus overlaid with plates of gold or silver, and are probably alluded to in Judg. xvii, 5; xviii, 17-20; Hos. iii, 4; Isa. xxx, 22. The ephod itself, however, would require a considerable amount of gold (Exod. xxviii, 8 sq.; xxxix, 2 sq.), but certainly not so large a sum as stated to have been used by Gideon; may we not therefore assume that to make an ephod implied the introduction of a new system of

worship with its various accessories, such as the grave image, which seems, from the prominence assigned

The Sacraltotal Ephod, according to Braun (De re sacr. ii, 478).

a. a. The two shoulder-pieces (ταυρησίαμα). b. b. The belt (ταινία), or two bands for girding it on. c. c. The two golden rings (ταυρησίαμα) for fastening the bottom of the breast-plate.

d. d. The two bands or settings (ταυρησίαμα; A. V. "ouches"), each with its memorial gem (ταυρησίας, "onyx stone") engraved with six of the tribal names; serving also as clasps or buttons for fastening the shoulder-pieces together, and likewise as attachments for the gold chains on the upper corners of the breast-plate.

e. e. The vacant space, a span wide (τριγόνων ταυρησίαμα στενά), left for the insertion of the girded breast-plate, according to Josephus (Ant. ii, 13, 7).
ed to it in Judges xviii, 31, to represent the Urim and Thummim, the molten image, and the Teraphim (xxvii, 4, 5), and would require a large consumption of metal? The ephod was worn over the tunic and outer garment or pallium (Exod. xxviii, 31; xxix, 5), without sleeves, and divided below the arm pits into two parts or halves, of which one was in front, covering the breast and belly, and the other behind, covering the back. These were joined above on the shoulders by clasps or buckles of gold and precious stones, and reached down to the middle of the thighs; they were also made fast by a belt around the body (Exod. xxviii, 6-12). The ancient Egyptian priests appear to have been arrayed in white garments of the same materials. The hieroglyphs, or sacred scribe, especially wore, over the kilt or apron (corresponding to the Jewish sacerdotal "breaches" or drawers) which constituted the universal undergarment, a loose upper robe with full sleeves, which in all cases was of the finest linen, and was secured by a girdle round the loins. Sometimes a priest who offered incense was clad in like manner. At other times the priests wore, in addition to the apron, a shirt with short tight sleeves, over which was thrown a loose robe, leaving the right arm exposed (Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt, i, 354). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Ancient Egyptian Tunic. One of the two obtained by Gen. Regnier, when in Egypt with the French expedition, from the Arabs at Sakkarah, who said they had found them in a hole filled with sand. This is three feet square, shaped exactly like a modern shirt, but having patches of embroidery sewed upon the arms, shoulders, down the neck, and on the corners. The material is probably linen. The seams are covered with edging, the sleeves are bound, and the hole for the neck has strings for drawing it closer (Egyptian Antiq., ii. 119). Its resemblance to the Jewish ephod is very striking, especially if, as Josephus says (ib. supra), the latter had sleeves.

Eph'phatha (ἐφ'θα, a Gracized form of the Syro-Chaldaic imperative ἐπέθανεν or ἐπέθησα, strictly ἐπέθα, meaning be opened, as it is immediately interpreted), an exclamation uttered by Christ in curing the deaf-mute (Mark vii, 34).

Ephraem Manuscript (Codex Ephraemi, usually designated as C. of the New Test.), a very important uncial palimpsest, which derives its name from having been (about the 12th century) rewritten over with a portion of the Greek works of Ephraem the Syrian (see below). It seems to have been brought from the East by Andrew John Lascar, at whose death (A.D. 1535) it passed into the hands of Cardinal Bodel, and thence, through Pietro Strozzi, into the possession of Catharine de Medicis, who deposited it in the Royal Library at Paris, where it still remains (numbered Ms. 9). The old Greek writing, which is barely legible (having been partly effaced to make room for the later matter), contains portions of the Sept. version of the N. T., on 64 leaves, and fragments (enumerated in Scrivener's Introd., p. 94 note) of every part of the N. T. on 145 leaves. It is elegantly written, very much resembling in form and arrangement of the books and general appearance the Codex Alexandrinus, and has but one column on a page, containing from 40 to 46 lines. The characters vary in size, are somewhat elaborate, and have the characteristics of the Alexandrian recension, and of the 6th century. The Ammonian sections stand in the margin, but not the Eusebian canons; the latter, perhaps, having been washed out, as they were usually in red ink. There are no chapter initials, no notes, no glosses, and but few punctuation marks. Traces of at least three later correctors may be discovered; the first, perhaps, of the 6th century, inserted many acrostics, and the rough breathing; by him or the third hand (whose changes are but few), small crosses were interpolated as stops; the second, perhaps, not earlier than the 9th century, appears to have clumsily added the ecclesiastical notes in the margin. A chemical preparation, applied to the MS. at the instance of Fleck in 1884, though it revived much that was before illegible, has defaced the vellum with stains of various color. The older writing was first noticed by Peter Allix nearly two centuries ago; various readings extracted from it were communicated by Boivin to Kuster, who published them in his edition of Mill's N. T., 1711. A complete collation of the N. T. portion was first made by Wetstein in 1716, for
Bentley's projected edition, and used by Wetstein in his own Greek Test. of 1751-2. In 1845 Tischendorf published the N.-T. part fully, and the O.T. in 1845, in a splendid and accurate form, page for page and line for line, in capital but not fac-simile letters, with valuable prolog, and ten, etc. -Tregillus, in Huc's Introd. iv, 16 sq.; Christian Remembrancer, Oct. 1862; Tischendorf, Nov. Test. Gr. 7th edit. p. cxlix sq. See MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

**Ephraim** (Heb. *Ephra‘îm*, עֵפְרָיָם, a dual form; Gesenius signifies רְעָם, רְעָעֶד, fruitful; Sept. *Ephayyμ*, the name of a man (including the tribe and named from him, with other kindred objects), and of one or two other places of doubtful authenticity and certainly of much less note.

1. (Josephus Grecian) *Eφαραμίος, Ephraymi, Ephraym*, Ant. ii, 7, 4.) The second son of Joseph by Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah (Gen. xlii. 10), born during the seven years of plenteousness (B.C. cir. 1878), and an allusion to this is presently liable in the name, though it may also allude to Joseph's increasing family: "The name of the second he called Ephraim (i.e. double fruitfulness), for God hath caused me to be fruitful ἐφραίμιοι, in the land of my affliction" (Gen. xlii. 62).

Josephus (Ant. ii, 6, 1) gives the derivation of the name somewhat differently — "Restorer, because he was restored to the freedom of his forefathers" (אֶפְרַעְיֶם, . . . כִּבְדִּי אֱלֹהִים). That the incident in Gen. xlii. 19, as well as that of his elder brother Manassesh, is the blessing of the grandchildren by Joseph, Gen. xlviii—a passage on the age and genuineness of which the severest criticism has cast no doubt (Tuch, Genesis, p. 546; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. i, 594, note). Like his own father, nephew, son and dissimilar, Jacob's eyes were dim so that he could not see (xlviii, 10; comp. xxxvii, 7). The intention of Joseph was evidently that the right hand of Jacob should convey his ampler blessing to the head of Manassesh, his first-born, and he had so arranged the young men. But the result was otherwise ordained. Jacob had been himself a younger brother, and his words show plainly that he had not forgotten this, and that his sympathies were still with the younger of his two grand-children. He recalls the time when he was flying with the birthright from the vengeance of Esau; the day when, as the head of a day laborer who had appeared to him at "Luz in the land of Canaan," and blessed him in words which foreshadowed the name of Ephraim ("I will make thee fruitful") וֹנָא, וֹנָא, ma-pheka, Gen. xlviii, 4; "Be thou fruitful," וֹנָא, pe-reh, XXXVIII, 11; both from the same root as the name Ephraim); the still later day when the name of Ephraim (comp. Ewald, Gesch. i, 498, n.) became bound up with the very trial of his life (xlvii; xxxvii, 16). See EPHRAIMITE. Thus, notwithstanding the pre-arrangement and the reminiscence of Joseph, for the second time in that family, the younger brother was made greater than the elder—Ephraim was set before Manassesh (xlviii, 19, 20). Ephraim would appear at that time to have been about twenty-one years old (comp. Gen. xlvii, 28). Before Joseph's death Ephraim's family had reached the third generation (Gen. i, 28), and it may have been about this time that the affray mentioned in 1 Chron. vii, 21, occurred, when some of the sons were killed on a plundering expedition along the sea-coast to rob the cattle of the men of Gath, and when Ephraim named a son Beriah, to perpetuate the memory of the disaster which had fallen on his house. See BERIAH. Obscure as is the interpretation of this fragment, it enables us to catch our last glimpse of the genius, interior and admirable, in the midst of the circle of his brethren, and at last commemo rating his loss in the name of the new child, who, unknown to him, was to be the progenitor of the most illustrious of all his descendants—Jehoshua, or Joshua, the son of Nun (1 Chron. vii, 27; see Ewald, i, 491). To this early period, too, has been referred the circumstance alluded to in Psa. lxviii, 9, when the "children of Ephraim, armed bowmen ἐφραίμιοι, A. V. "being armed [and] carrying bows," which Gesenius and others support, from the Sept. and the LXX., although Ewald strongly objects ("carrying slack bows"), turned back in the day of battle." Others, however, assign this defection to the failure of the tribe (in common with the rest of the Israelites) to expel the Canaanites (Judg. i, 29).

1. TRIBE OF EPHRAIM. This tribe, although, in accordance with the ancient laws of primogeniture, inferior, so to speak, yet receives an especial honor over that descended from the elder Manassesh by virtue of the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xii, 52; xvii, 11). That blessing was an adoptive act, whereby Ephraim and his brother Manassesh were counted as sons of Jacob, in the place of their father; the object long had been, through Joseph, through his sons, a double portion in the brilliant prospects of his house. Thus the descendants of Joseph formed two of the tribes of Israel, whereas every other of Jacob's sons counted but as one. There were thus, in fact, thirteen tribes of Israel; but as Joseph's tribe is usually regarded as either by excluding that of Levi (which had no territory) when Ephraim and Manassesh are separately named, or by counting these two together as the tribe of Joseph when Levi is included in the account. The intentions of Jacob were fulfilled, and Ephraim and Manassesh were counted as tribes of Israel at the departure from Egypt, and, as such, shared, in the territorial distribution of the Promised Land (Num. i, 38; Josh. xvii, 14; 1 Chron. vii, 20). The precise position of the immediate descendants of Joseph in Egypt might form an interesting subject for investigation. Blessing the sons of one in eminent place, and through their mother connected with high families in Egypt, their condition could not at once have been identified with that of the sojourners in Goshen; and perhaps they were not fully amalgamated with the rest of their countrymen until their famous sons, who knew not Joseph.

The numbers of the tribe did not at times correspond with the promise of the blessing of Jacob. At the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num. i, 32, 38; ii, 19) its numbers were 40,500, placing it at the head of the children of Israel. Manassesh's number being 32,900, and Benjamin's 35,400. But forty years later, on the eve of the conquest (Num. xxvi, 37), without any apparent cause, while Manassesh had advanced to 52,700, and Benjamin to 45,000, Ephraim had decreased to 32,500, the only smaller number being that of Simon, 22,200. At the period the families of both the elder brother tribes are enumerated, and Manassess has pre ce dence over Ephraim in order of mention. It is very possible that these great fluctuations in numbers may, in part at least, have been owing to the various standards under which the "mixed multitude" (נַפְּלִים, naf'ilim), i.e. mongrel population of semi-Egyptian Egyptians that followed them in the emigration host has undergone itself in its fickleness at different times (Matt. Qua rt. Hebr. April, 1863, p. 306 sq.). During the march through the wilderness the position of the sons of Joseph and Benjamin was on the west side of the tabernacle (Num. ii, 18-24), and the prince of Ephraim was Eliabah, the son of Ammihud and Nefiah.

It is at the time of the sending of the spies that we are first introduced to the great hero to whom the tribe owed much of its subsequent greatness. The representative of Ephraim on this occasion was "Osbah, the son of Nun," whose name was at the termination of the list chosen by the priestly body of the nation, most probably in form in which it is familiar to us. As among the founders of the nation Abram had acquired the name of Abraham, and Jacob of Israel, so Osbah, "help,"
became Jehoehuah or Joshua, "the help of Jehovah" (EwA, ii. 306).

According to the arrangement of the records of the book of Joshua—the "Domesday book of Palestine"—the two great tribes of Judah and Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh) first took their inheritance; and after them the seven other tribes entered on theirs (Josh. xv, xvi, xvii, xviii, 5). The boundaries of the portion of Ephraim are given in xvi, 1-10, and a part of it apparently in duplicate in vers. 6, 7. The south boundary was coincident for part of its length with the north boundary of Benjamin (q. v.), which latter, however, is somewhat more exactly stated in Josh. xviii, 12 sq. See TRIBE. Commencing at the Jordan, at the reservoir opposite Jericho (strictly Jordan of Jericho), נְדֵד נְדֵד, an expression that would lead us to locate the boundary at the point nearest that city, did not the necessity of including within Benjamin certain other pretty well identified places compel us to carry it somewhat farther up the river), it ran to the "water of Jericho," probably the vicinity of the Ras el-Ain; thence by one of the ravines, perhaps the wady Samiah, it ascended through the wilderness—Midbar, the uncultivated waste hills—to Mount Bethel and Luz; and thence by the Ataroth, "the Japhletite," Bethoron the lower, and Gezer (q. v.) two of which are known—along the northern boundary of Dan (q. v.) to the Mediterranean, probably about Joppa. This agrees with the enumeration in 1 Chron. vii, in which Bethel is given as the eastern, and Gezer—somewhere east of the present Ramleh—as the western limit. In Josh. xvi, 6, 8, we apparently have fragments of the northern boundary (compare xvii, 10), and at least three of the points along that line (Asher, Tappuah, and Janoah) are pretty well identified (see each name), we are tolerably safe in fixing the eastern extremity on the Jordan at about the mouth of wady Fasali, and the western, or the torrent Kanah, at the modern Nahr Fails, north of Apollonia. But it is possible that there never was a very definite subdivision of the territory assigned to the two brother tribes. Such an inference, at least, may be drawn from Josh. xvi, 14-18, in which the two are represented as complaining that only one portion had been allotted to them. Among the towns named as Manasseh's were Bethshean in the Jordan valley, Endor on the slopes of the "Little Hermon," Taanach on the north side of Carmel, and Dor on the sea-coast south of the same mountain. Ephraim thus occupied the very centre of Palestine, embracing an area about 49 miles in length from E. to W., and from 6 to 25 in breadth from N. to S. It extended from the Mediterranean on the W. to the Jordan on the E.; on the N. it had the half-tribe of Manasseh, and on the S. Benjamin and Dan (Josh. xvi, 5 sq.; xviii, 7 sq.). This fine country included most of what was afterwards called Samaria, as distinguished from Judaea on the one hand, and from Galilee on the other. See SAMARIA.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antipatris</th>
<th>Arch.</th>
<th>Arumah</th>
<th>Ataroth (s-adar)</th>
<th>Baal-hamon</th>
<th>Baal-shalisha</th>
<th>Bethoron</th>
<th>Bochim</th>
<th>Bethel</th>
<th>Canaan</th>
<th>Gaza</th>
<th>Geshur</th>
<th>Gerarim</th>
<th>Gath</th>
<th>Gibeath</th>
<th>Gilgal (2 Kings ii, 2)</th>
<th>Gilgal (Josh. xii, 23)</th>
<th>Gob</th>
<th>Jacob's Well</th>
<th>Janoah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Palestine consists of an elevated district which rises from the flat ranges of the wilderness on the south of Judah, and terminates on the north with the sea on which lie the ruins of ancient Ephraim. On the west a flat strip separates it from the sea, and on the east another flat strip forms the valley of the Jordan. Of this district the northern half was occupied by the great tribe we are now considering. This was the "Har-Edom," as Ephraim, a district which seems to extend as far south as Ramah and Bethel (1 Sam. i. 1; vii. 17; 2 Chron. xiii. 4, 19, compared with xx, 8), places but a few miles north of Jerusalem, and within the limits of Benjamin. (See below.) In structure it is limestone—rounded hills separated by valleys of denudation, but much less regular and monotonous than the part more to the south, about and below Jerusalem; with "wide plains in the heart of the mountains, streams of running water, and continuous tracts of vegetation" (Stanley, *Palast.* p. 295). All travellers bear testimony to the "general growing richness" and beauty of the country in going northwards from Jerusalem, the "immunerable fountains" and streamlets, the villages more thickly scattered than anywhere in the south, the continuous corn-fields and orchards, the moist, vapory atmosphere (Martineau, p. 516; Van de Velde, i, 886-8). These are the "precious things of the earth, and the fulness thereof," which are invoked on the "ten thousands of Ephraim" and the "thousands of Manasseh" in the blessing of Moses. These it is which, while Dan, Judah, and Benjamin are personified as quarrelling and weakening their strength by their prey among the barren rocks of the south, suggested to the lawgiver, as they had done to the patriarch before him, the patient "bullock" and the "bough by the spring, whose branches ran over the wall" as fitter images for Ephraim (Gen. xxii. 22; Deut. xxxii. 17). And centuries after, when great disasters had fallen on the kingdom of Israel, the same images recur to the prophets. The "flowers" are still there in the "olive valleys," "faded" though they be (Isa. xxviii. 1). The vine is an empty, unprofitable vine, whose very abundance is evil ( Hos. viii. 12); Ephraim is still the "bullock," now "unaccustomed to the yoke," but waiting a restoration to the "pleasant places" of his former "pasture" (Jer. xxxi. 18; Hos. ix. 13; iv. 16)—"the heifer that is taught and loveth to tread out the corn," the heifer with the "beautiful neck" (Hos. xi. 1); or the "kine of Bashan on the mountain of Samaria" (Amos iv. 1).

The wealth of their possession had not the same immediately energizing effect on this tribe that it had on some of its northern brethren, e.g. Asher (q.v.). Various causes may have helped to avert this evil. 1. The central situation of Ephraim in the highway of all communications from one part of the country to another. From north to south, from Jordan to the Sea—from Galilee, or still more distant Damascus, to Phœnicia and Egypt—these roads all lay more or less through Ephraim, and the constant traffic along them must have always tended to keep the district from sinking into stagnation. 2. The position of Shechem, the original settlement of Jacob, with his well and his "parc el" gardens, 1 with the two mountains of Ebal and Gerizim, the scene of the impressive and significant ceremonial of blessing and cursing; and the tomb and patrimony of Joshua, the great hero not only of Ephraim, but of the nation—the fact that all these localities had deep in the heart of the land, must have made it almost the resort of large numbers from all parts of the country—of larger numbers than any other place, until the establishment of Jerusalem by David. Moreover, the tabernacle and the ark were deposited within its limits, at Shiloh; and the possession of the sacerdotal establishment, which was a central object of attraction to all the other tribes, must, in no small degree, have enhanced its importance, and increased its wealth and population. It is, perhaps, to this fact that David alludes in Ps. cxxxix. 6, if by "Ephraim" this tribe is there meant. 3. But there was another cause, which to some extent took the place of the former. The tribe was not extinct, though both a cause and a consequence of these advantages of this position. That spirit, early domineering and haughty (Josh. xvii. 14), though sometimes taking the form of noble remonstrance and republication (2 Chron. xxviii. 20), usually manifested as the king of the nation the seat of the arch-arch-enemy, and some entailed on the tribe advantage or premium in the same one share. Why did ye despise us that our advantage should not have been the first, the first and the last thou searest us thus that thou calledst us not?" The unsettled state of the country in general, and of the interior of Ephraim in particular (Judg. ii.), and the continual incursions of foreigners, prevented the power of the tribe from manifesting itself in a more formidable manner than by these murmurs, during the time of the Judges and the first stage of the monarchy. Samuel, though a Levite, was a native of Ramah in Mount Ephraim, and Saul belonged to a tribe closely allied to the family of Joseph, so that during the priesthood of Deion and the reign of David, Ephraim was neither as strong as the tribe that had been under the supreme influence of Ephraim may be said to have been practically maintained. Certainly in neither case had any advantage been gained by their great rival in the south. But when the great tribe of Judah produced a king in the person of David, the pride and jealousy of Ephraim was a deadly traffic. A single man, less chiefly through their means that Abner was enabled for a time to uphold the house of Saul; for there are manifest indications that by this time Ephraim influenced the views and feelings of all the other tribes. They were at length driven by the force of circumstances to acknowledge David upon conditions; and they were probably not without hope that, as the king of the nation at large, he would establish his capital in their central portion of the land. Again, the brilliant successes of David, and his wide influence and religious zeal, kept matters smooth for another period, even in the face of the blow given to both Shechem and Shiloh by the concentration of the civil and ecclesiastical capitals at Jerusalem. Twenty thousand and eight hundred of the choice warriors of the tribe, "men of name throughout the house of their father," went as far as Hazeroth to make David king over all Israel (2 Chron. xili. 30). Among the officers of his court we find more than one Ephraimites (1 Chron. xxvii. 10, 14), and the attachment of the tribe to his person seems to have been great (2 Sam. xix. 41-43). But as he not only established his court at Jerusalem, but proceeded to remove the ark thither, making his native Judah the seat both of the theocratic and civil government, the
Ephraimites, as a tribe, became thoroughly alienated, and longed to establish their own ascendency. The building of the temple at Jerusalem, and other measures of Solomon, strengthened this desire; and although the minute organization and vigor of his government produced a long period of Judah’s prosperity, the son of this train was then laid, and the reign of Solomon, splendid in appearance but oppressive to the people, developed both the circumstances of revolt and the leader who was to turn them to account. Solomon saw through the crisis, and if he could have succeeded in killing Jeroboam, their rival, he would have done (1 Kings xi. 40), the disruption might have been postponed for another century. As it was, the outbreak was deferred for a time, but the irritation was not allayed, and the insane folly of his son brought the mischief to a head. Rehoboam probably selected Shechem—the old capital of the confederacy—for his capital, in the presence and the ceremonial might make a powerful impression, but in this he failed utterly, and the tumult which followed shows how complete was the breach. "To your tents, O Israel! now see to thine own house, Dathan and Korah were certainly not the last kings of Judah who were set as far as he was within his own dominion, and he was the last who, having come so far, returned unremolded to his own capital. Jehoshaphat escaped, in a manner short of miraculous, from the trap of the battle of Ramoth-Gilead. The fate of this monarch of Canaan, the king of the Hittites, when the Jews, while the Israelites, was meant, is the word is found, in the original (Deut. v. 9); when the people, mas. (Isa. vii. 8). Thus in two senses the history of Ephraim is the history of the kingdom of Israel, since not only did the tribe become a kingdom, but the kingdom embraced little besides the tribe. This is not surprising, and quite susceptible of explanation. North of Ephraim the country appears never to have been really taken possession of by the Israelites. Whether from want of energy on their part, or great stubbornness of resistance on that of the Canaanites, it is certain it was not included in the list of the six towns from which the original inhabitants were expelled, the great majority belonging to the northern tribes, Manasseh, Asher, Issachar, and Naphtali. In addition to this original defect there is much in the physical formation and circumstances of the upper portion of Palestine to explain why these tribes never took any active part in the kingdom. They were exposed to the inroads and seductions of their surrounding heathen neighbors—on one side the luxurious Phenicians, on the other the plundering Bedouins of the desert. They were more open to the attacks of Syria and Assyria from the north, and Egypt from the south, than any part of the central plain of Edom, which communicated more or less with all the northern tribes, was the natural outlet of the no less natural high roads of the maritime plain from Egypt, and the Jordan valley for the tribes of the north, and was an admirable base of operations for an invading army. But, on the other hand, the position of Ephraim was altogether different. It was one at once of great richness and security. Her fertile plains and well-watered valleys could only be reached by a laborious ascent through steep and narrow ravines, all but impassable for an army. There is no record of any attack on the central kingdom, either from the Jordan valley or the maritime plain.
But the statements of xxviii, 24, 26, and also the expression of xviii, 4, "That thou succor us out of the city," i.e. Mahanaim, allow no escape from the conclusion that the locality was on the east side of Jordan, though it was on a considerably lower level than the site of the city of Mahanaim. The wooded country must have lain several miles away from the stream, and on the higher ground above the Jordan valley. Is it not at least equally probable that the forest derived its name from this very battle? The growth of Ephraimites though mentioned in the transactions of Absalom's revolt, cannot fail to have taken the most conspicuous part in the affair, and the reverse was a more serious one than had overtaken the tribe for a very long time, and possibly combined with other circumstances to retard materially their rising into an independent kingdom. But others suppose that it was because the Ephraimites were in the habit of bringing their flocks into this quarter for pasture; for the Jews allege that the Ephraimites received from Joshua, who was of their tribe, permission to feed their flocks in the woodlands within the territory of the tribe of Judah, that if, as this forest lay near their territories on the other side the Jordan, they were wont to drive their flocks over to feed there (see Jarchi, Kimchi, Aburabanel, etc., on 2 Sam. xviii, 6). It is probably referred to under the name Ephraim (q. v.) in Psa. cxxxix, 6, where the other margin of the verse has "fields of the wood." Others, however, not unreasonably suppose this to be a different locality. See Forest.

2. In "Baal-hazor, which is 'by' Ephraim," was Absalom's sheep farm, at which place took the murder of Amnon, one of the earliest precursors of the great revolt (2 Sam. xiii, 28). The Hebrew particle 37 rendered above "by" (A. V. "beside"), always seems to imply actual proximity, and therefore we should conclude that Ephraim was not the tribe of that name, but a town. The cities of Dan and Asher are other instances of localities beyond the tribes, yet bearing their names; and the former suggests that the appellation may in all these cases have arisen by colonization. Ewald considers this to be a genuine addition, and to refer to Beth-horon, N.W. of Jerusalem, off the Nablus road, but the indication is surely too slight for such an inference. Any force it may have is against the identity of this Ephraim with that in John x, 54, which was probably in the direction N.E. of Jerusalem, where the question appears to refer to Absalom's Galilee. Baal-hazor was situated (2 Sam. xiii, 28; also with the city called Ephraim, near the wilderness in which our Lord lived for some time (John x, 54); and with Ephraim (37, 37), a city of Benjamin, apparently not far from Bethel (Josh. xviii, 28; comp. Josephus, War, iv, 9, 5) and which has been located by Dr. Robinson (Researches, new ed. i, 447), with much accuracy at the modern village of el-Tuqubah. (See Ewald, Gesch. iii, 219, 466; v. 365; Stanley, Palestine, p. 210.) See Ephraim 8. 

Ephratah [some Ephra'oth] [Heb. Ephra'oth, 37, 37, Gen. xxxv, 16, 19; xxvii, 7 twice; Psa. cxxxvi, 6; Mic. v, 1; 1 Chron. ii, 50; iv, 4; Sept. Es'opo or Esopo, Vulg. Ephra'ta, A. V. "Ephraim" in all but Gen. and the last-named passage of Chron., where it gives "Ephrath"), a prolonged or sometimes "directive" form of Eph'ra'th (Hebrew Ephra'ath), 37, 37, probably fruitful, 1 Chron. ii, 19; Sept. Ephra'atha, Vulg. Ephra'ta), the name of a woman and of one or two places.

1. The second wife of Caleb, the son of Hezron, mother of Hur, and grandmother of Caleb the spy, according to 1 Chron. ii, 19, 50, and probably 24 [see Caleb-Ephraim], and iv, 4, in which last passage Hur is apparently called "the father (i.e. founder) of Bethlehem" (see below). B.C. post 1565.
2. The ancient name of Bethlehem in Judah, as is manifest from Gen. xxxv, 16, 10; xxviii, 7, both which passages distinctly prove that it was called Ephrath or Ephrathah in Jacob's time, and use the regular formula for adding the modern name, הבחרת, which is Bethlehem (comp. e. g. Gen. xxiii, 2; xxxv, 27; Josh. xv, 10). It cannot, therefore, have derived its name from Ephrath, the mother of Hur, as the author of Qere, Deut., xxxiii, 12, says, and that might other- wise have supposed from the connection of her descendants, Salma and Hur, with Bethlehem, which is somewhat obscurely intimated in 1 Chron. ii, 50, 51; iv, 4. It seems obvious, therefore, to infer that, on the contrary, Ephrath, the mother of Hur, was so called from the town of her birth, and that probably was the owner of the town and district; in fact, that her name was really gentillicious. But if this be so, it would indicate more communication between the Israelites in Egypt and the Canaanites than is commonly supposed. It was probably impossible that a son of Hezron may have married a woman having property in Ephrathah. Another way of accounting for the connection between Ephrath's descendants and Bethlehem, is to suppose that the elder Caleb was not really the son of Hezron, but merely referred to as the head of a Hebrew house. He may in this case have been one of an Edomish or Horite tribe, an idea which is favored by the name of his son Hur [see Caleb], and have married an Ephrathite. Caleb the spy may have been their grandson. It is singular that 'Salma, the father of Bethlehem,' should have married a Canaan- itish woman. Could she have been of the kindred of Caleb in any way? If she were, and if Salma obtained the title, a portion of Hur's inheritance, in consequence, this would account for both Hur and Salma being called 'father of Bethlehem.' Another possi- bility, however, is that Ephrathah may have been the name given to some daughter of Benjamin to commemorate the circumstance of Rachel his mother having died close to Ephrath. This would receive some support from the son of Rachel's other son Joseph being called Ephrath, a word of identical etymology, as appears from the fact that בֵּית אֵפְרְטָה means indiscriminately an Ephrathite, i. e. Bethelhemite (Ruth i, 2, 2), or an Ephrathite (1 Sam. i, 1). It would not account for Ephrathah's descendants being settled at Bethlee- m. From Ruth i, 2, where the sons of Naomi are called 'Ephrathites of Bethlehem of Judah,' it would seem that Ephrath was the name of a district of which Bethlehem was the chief town; and the designation of Mic. iv, 2 as 'Bethlehem of Ephrath' 'is ren- dered in Matt. ii, 6, 'Bethlehem in the land [yiq] of Judah,' as if to distinguish it by adding the name of a district, although a larger one (Lange, Comment. on Matt. in loc.). At all events we should note that in Gen., and perhaps in Chron., it is called Ephrath or Ephrathah; in both cases in the text, but the inhabit- ants Ephrathites; in Michah, Bethlehem Ephrathah; in Matt. Bethleem in the land of Judah. The Sept. supply [Ἐφρασά (απο ιερ Βηθλε'] its omission among the cities of Judah in Josh. xv, 60 (see Reiniec- clus, Procr, on this point, Weissenfels, 1728). Jerome, and after him Kalisch, observe that Ephrathah, fruitful, has the same meaning as Bethlehem, house of bread, a view which is favored by the neighboring corn- fields. Ver howe has written monographs entitled Tabernaculi Dei in Ephratha [Psalm cxviii] (Coburg, 1739); In hia Bethlehemi (ib. 1728); also two entitled Futa Bethlehemi (both 16 eod.). See Beth- lehem.

3. Genesis and others think that in Psa. cxxii, 6, "Ephrathah" means Ephraim (q. v.). The meaning of that passage, however, is greatly disputed. The most obvious reference is to Bethlehem, which is else- where known by that name (see above), and may here be spoken of as the residence of David at the time when he offered the sacrifice of the first born of the sacred ark (see Hengstenberg, in loc.). Others consider the name as equivalent to the tribe Ephraim (comp. Ephrathite for Ephraimite, Judg. xx, 5), which contained Shiloh, the depository of Jehovah's early favor (so Good, in loc., as most interpreters; Delitzsch, Commentar. über d. Psal- ter, ii, 265, argues at length in favor of this view).

Perhaps the best explanation is that which refers the word to Mt. Ephraim (as a special designation of that part of the tribe which contained Shiloh), in parallel- ism with the other part of the verse alluding to the Forest. (loc. cit.), however, is merely a poetical term for fruitful field, e. g. Beth-se- mesh, the latter part of the verse alluding to Kirjath-jeearim as the "wood" (יִשְׁרַי, "yair").

Eph'rathite (Heb. 'Ephrathîthê, דָּנָשָׁת, "Ephrathite"), the designation of the inhabitants of two widely different local- ities.

1. Properly Bethlehe'mite, or citizen of Ephrah (q. v.) or Bethlehem (Ruth i, 2; 1 Sam. xvii, 12; 2 Sam. xiv, 25; 2 Kings iv, 25). He is, however, a merely poetical term for fruitful field, e. g. Beth-se- mesh, the latter part of the verse alluding to Kirjath-jeearim as the "wood" (דָּנָשָׁת, "yair").

Eph'rithites (Heb. 'Ephrāthîthê'im, רומא 'Ephrāthîthê'im, "Ephrathites"), the designation of the inhabitants of two widely different local- ities.

1. Properly Bethlehe'mite, or citizen of Ephrah (q. v.) or Bethlehem (Ruth i, 2; 1 Sam. xvii, 12; 2 Sam. xiv, 25; 2 Kings iv, 25). He is, however, a merely poetical term for fruitful field, e. g. Beth-se- mesh, the latter part of the verse alluding to Kirjath-jeearim as the "wood" (דָּנָשָׁת, "yair").

Eph'rithites (Heb. 'Ephrāthîthê'im, רומא 'Ephrāthîthê'im, "Ephrathites"), the designation of the inhabitants of two widely different local- ities.

1. Properly Bethlehe'mite, or citizen of Ephrah (q. v.) or Bethlehem (Ruth i, 2; 1 Sam. xvii, 12; 2 Sam. xiv, 25; 2 Kings iv, 25). He is, however, a merely poetical term for fruitful field, e. g. Beth-se- mesh, the latter part of the verse alluding to Kirjath-jeearim as the "wood" (דָּנָשָׁת, "yair").

Eph'rah'm, or Eph'rham (Jos. i, 32). An eminent Church- father, and the greatest light of the Syrian Church, was born at Nisibis (Soran. II, E. iii, 57), and became bishop of Edessa, and flourished A.D. 370. The accounts of his early life are variant and unreliable. His parents were heathen, according to one account, and drove him from home for becoming a Christian; but, according to another account, he was bred in a Christian family. Jacob of Nisibis took care of his education, and took him to the Council of Nicea, A.D. 325. In 388 Nisibis was closed by the emperor Jovin- ian to the Persians, and Ephraem went to Edessa, whither the most distinguished Syrians came to receive his instruction. Here he lived as a hermit, only coming from his seclusion to teach and preach. His repue for piety and learning became so great that he was elected bishop; but when he heard of it he rushed forth into the market-place, and acted in such a man- ner that the people thought he was out of his senses. 'He then ascended until another had been appointed to the office of bishop in his place. He now went to Cephalis in Cappadocia to see Basilius the Great, who formed the highest opinion of his learning and piety. Ephraem spent the greater part of his life in writing and preaching on devotional and moral subjects, and especially against the Arian heresy; but he was equal- ly energetic whenever there was any occasion to show by his acts that he really was the benevolent man that he appeared to be. This was especially manifest at the time when Edessa was suffering from famine; he gave his last money to be used for such as were the richest to help the poor, and he himself undertook the care of seeing that the poor received what was intend-
He was looked up to with admiration and reverence by his contemporaries, who distinguished him by the honorable designation of 'the prophet of the Syrians.' He died about 375, having ordered in his will that no one should praise him, according to the custom of the Syrian Church, not to dignify a body should not be wrapped up in costly robes, and that no monument should be erected on his tomb" (English Cyclopedia, s. v.). This "will" of Ephrem is, however, generally held to be spurious.

All accounts unite in testifying to the virtues of Ephrem. The Acts of the Fathers, 1 (126), 19 (ed. Eccl. iii, 16) tells the following story to illustrate his command of a naturally irascible temper. After a fast, his servant, presenting some food to him, let fall the dish on which it was placed. Ephrem, seeing him overwhelmed with shame and terror, said to him, 'Take courage; as the food has not come to us, we will go to it.' Whereupon Ephrem sat down on the floor, and ate the fragments left in the broken dish.

He was a voluminous author, writing commentaries, practical religious works, sermons, and numerous poems. The only works of his that are known are in Greek, and his other writings exist only in Greek and other versions.

It is doubtful whether he understood Greek; Sozomen (I. c.) expressly says that he knew only Syriac, but that his writings "were translated into Greek during his life, and preserved much of their original force; on the other hand, they are not so additional in Greek than in Syriac." One of the legends tells that in his visit to Basil both were miraculously enabled to speak the other's language—Basil the Syriac, and Ephrem the Greek. "His commentaries extended over the whole Bible," from the book of creation to the last book. "Gracien," according to Gregory of Nyssa, says: We have his commentaries on the historical and prophetical books of the Old Testament and the book of Job in Syriac, and his commentaries on the epistles of Paul in an Armenian translation. They have been but little used thus far by commentators. He does not interpret the text from the original Hebrew, but from the old Syriac translation, the Peshito, though he refers occasionally to the original. His sermons and homilies, of which, according to Photius, he composed more than a thousand, are partly expository, partly homiletical. They are a marked contrast between the Jews, and he is especially mentioned in the Church. He evinced a considerable degree of popular eloquence; they are full of pathos, exclamations, apostrophes, antitheses, illustrations, severe rebukes, and sweet comfort, according to the subject; but also full of exag- gerations, bombast, prolixity, and the superfluities of his age; and with the exception of his "Hymn on the Virgin Mary, the saints, and relics. Some of his sermons were publicly read after the Bible lesson in many Oriental, and even Occidental churches. His hymns were intended to counteract the influence of the heretical views of Bar- desanes and his son Harmonius, which spread widely by means of popular Syriac songs. "When Ephrem perceived," says Sozomen, "that the Syrians were charmed with the elegant diction and melodious veri- fication of Harmonius, he became apprehensive lest they should lose their own opuscula, and, therefore, although he was ignorant of Greek learning, he applied himself to the study of the metres of Harmonius, and composed similar poems in accordance with the doctrines of the Church, and sacred hymns in praise of holy men. From that period the Syrians sang the "simeon" no less than three hundred and thousand verses of "Harmonius." Theodoret gives a similar account, and says that the hymns of Ephrem combined harmony and melody with piety, and suberved all the purposes of valuable and efficacious medicine against the hereti- cal hymns of Harmonius. It is reported that he wrote no less than three hundred and thousand verses. But, with the exception of his commentaries, all his Syriac works are written in verse, i.e. in lines of an equal number of syllables, and with occasional rhyme and assonance, though without regular metre (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, iii, 932 sq.)."

The best edition of his collected works is Ephremi Syri Opera omnia, Gr., Syr., et Lat., edita cum profusio- timulis, cum lectionibus, et notis historico-criticis a Greg. et P. Benedetti (Rome, 1732-46, 6 vols. fol.). Before this edition, many of his writings had been collected and translated from Greek into Latin by Gerard Voss, who published them (3) at Rome, A.D. 1598-93-97; (2) at Cologne in 1608 and 1610; and (3) at Antwerp in 1613 (2 vols. fol.). The first three contain extracts of various treatises, partly on subjects solely theologici- cal, as the priesthood, prayer, fasting, etc., with others partly theological and partly moral, as truth, anger, obedience, envy. The second volume contains many epistles and addresses to monks, and a collection of Apostles' homilies and excerpts from homilies on parts of Scripture, and characters in the Old Testament, as Elijah, Daniel, the three children, Joseph, Noah. Photius gives a list of 49 homilies of Ephrem (Cod. 196), but which of these are included in the present work is impossible to ascertain, though it is certain that many are not" (Smith, Dictionary of Biog- raphy, s. v.).

Of separate works there are numerous editions, of which lists may be found in Hoffmann, Bibliographi- sches Lexicon, ii 3 sq., and in Fabricius, Bibliotheca Græca, ed. 171, vii, 317 sqq. The only Greek writings of Ephrem were published by Thwaites (Oxford, 1769), edited from 28 MSS. in the Bodleian Library. An English translation from the Syrian by J. B. Morris (Oxford, 1847) contains 13 pieces of verse on the Nativity, 1 against the Jews, and 80 of the martyrs; in the latter, H. Burgess has published Select metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus, translated from the original Syriac, with an Introducti- on, and historical and philological notes (London, 1853). In his introduction Mr. Burgess mentions, as extant in Syriac verse, 41 exegetical expositions, more than a hundred homilies, and a similar number of sermons, and nearly as many practical homiletical homilies, all in poetry; four pieces on the freedom of the will, not only in metre, but the strophes arranged in alphabetical order, like the verses of the 119th Psalm; and he assures us that all these compositions show a high degree of poetical talent, and are distinguished for their 'sonorosity and grace,' and have 'a charm which no translation can express.' Indeed, almost all the three folios of St. Ephrem's printed works in Syriac are poetical. In this volume the author gives us translations of 35 of his principal hymns, and 147 of his principal homilies or sermons. They are illustrated by a learned introduction and very instructive notes. More than half the hymns relate to death and eternity, and the others are on various topics pertaining to the Chris- tian life. The subjects of the poetical sermons are the following: (1) Paradise; (2) Satan; (3) to the clergy, (4) the Trinity, (5) matter not eternal, (6) error counterfeits truth, (7) the Trinity, (8) two natures of Christ, (9) man ignorant of himself" (Bibl. Sacra, Oct. 1853, p. 386). M. Callau published a Latin version of Ephrem's hymns (Venice, 1802), forming vols. xxiv-xii. of the Patris Selecti, in which the following order is used: 1. Commentaries; 2. Exeget- ical homilies; 3. Sermons; 4. Epistles; 5. Prayers. The writings of Ephrem in Ephrem in Armenian were published at Venice, 4 vols. 8vo. 1866. Hahn und Sieffert's Christologia Syriaca (Leips. 1850-1860) contains 19 select hymns of Ephrem; see also Hahn, Barde- sanes Gnaoticus (Leips. 1819). A German version of many of his poems is given by Zingerle, Ausg. Schriften des hl. Ephraem (Innsbr. 1830-37, 6 vols.). His funeral sermons are translated into Italian (Stori funebri di S. Ephrem Siro, tradotti per la prima volta... per il serv. pad. P. Fa- sinio, Firenze, 1831). In 1858 J. Aslebone announced a complete edition of the Syriac works of Ephrem, in a
EPHRON

The Epicurean philosophy is based on the teachings of Epicurus, who founded the school in the 4th century BC. It emphasizes the pursuit of pleasure as a primary goal and the rejection of superstition and religious beliefs. The Epicureans believed in the atomistic theory of Democritus, which posited that the universe is composed of indivisible particles, or atoms, which move in a random fashion.

The Epicurean school was established in Athens and quickly gained popularity due to its emphasis on personal freedom and the pursuit of happiness. The school was known for its emphasis on simplicity and moderation, and its members were often described as serene and content. The Epicureans believed in an afterlife, but it was not one of torment or punishment, but rather a state of peace and tranquility.

The Epicureans also developed a system of ethics that emphasized living a simple and virtuous life. They believed in the importance of friendship and the pursuit of knowledge, and their philosophy was characterized by a sense of calm and detachment.

The Epicurean philosophy had a significant influence on later philosophers, including the Stoics and the Neoplatonists. It continues to be studied and explored today, and its ideas continue to be relevant in discussions of ethics and the nature of reality.
epicurean philosophy should exclude the notion of a divine architect. This
\[\text{epicurus undertook, with such materials as were at hand.} \]
\[\text{the elastic school has asserted an absolute} \]
\[\text{porter and convoyed the gods; and denied them any participation} \]
\[\text{in the process of the universe. He ascribed to} \]
\[\text{immortality and human form, and assigned to them attenuated and spectral bodies, as milton also} \]
\[\text{appears to have done ("negut esse conscribi, nec tanguum sanguinem,") (Cic.
\[\text{De Nat. Deor. i. xxy).} \]
\[\text{accords to them indestructibility, immutability, and the serene happe} \]
\[\text{nness of eternal repose. Their tranquillity would have been} \]
\[\text{disturbed by any care; accordingly, they are en} \]
\[\text{closed in sublimity: and altogether obtuse to human apprehension. This mode of recognising and} \]
\[\text{at the same time cashiering divinity has been recently} \]
\[\text{imitated by herbert spencer. So far as human actions or thoughts are concerned, the gods are practi} \]
\[\text{cally non-existent, and religion is nothing better than a vague and irrational aspiration which is founded} \]
\[\text{on dreams, and cherished by ignorant fear.} \]
\[\text{ethics of epicurus. without divine sanction, without} \]
\[\text{responsibility or existence hereafter, with neither reward nor penalty in a future life for "deeds done in} \]
\[\text{the body," no real system of ethics is conceivable. There is no constraint, no obligation to render good; there is no moral compulsion; there is domain for conscience; there can only be a more or less judicious} \]
\[\text{and provident adaptation of actions to the judgments or dispositions of} \]
\[\text{men, and to the supposed satisfaction of the moral sense of} \]
\[\text{the individual. Morality is a wondrous contrivance for the} \]
\[\text{preference and a delusion. A tranquil and pleasurable ex} \]
\[\text{istence becomes the summus bonum of the sage; the} \]
\[\text{gratification of every passion as it arises the sole duty of} \]
\[\text{an eager and undisciplined nature. Every restraint is removed except such as may be voluntarily imposed; and though men are impassive, and indifferent to external things, they may maintain an external propriety of demeanor when exposed to no temptation, there can be no guarantee for rectitude of conduct, and the license of all passions will be gratified by the uncanny beasts that wallow in the epicurean style. The insufficiency of the doctrine of consciousness as a rule of duty was especially pointed out by epicurus. He placed the highest pleasure in undisturbed repose, but he considered every pleasure to be good in itself; and his favorite disciple, met rodorus, asserts that the dictates of natural reason would limit all care to the satisfaction of the belly, thus taking as the corner-stone of the system the declaration of ecclesiastes,} \]
\[\text{"all a man's labor is for his mouth."} \]
\[\text{The stories which circulated in regard to the connection of} \]
\[\text{epicurus and his companions with leontium, marmarizm, and other notorious ladies of the like persua} \]
\[\text{sion, show that the tendencies of the doctrine were at once recognised, even if they were not illustrated in practice.} \]
\[\text{As all the religious foundations of virtue were re} \]
\[\text{moved, no logical foundation remained. The economic of epicurus, which was at once his logic and his meta} \]
\[\text{physica, is the necessary result of the non-existence of god, and hence the inexistence or} \]
\[\text{immutable truth. The sensible impression was the sole criterion of truth. Every sensation, as every gen} \]
\[\text{eral conception, was necessarily true; and we are here} \]
\[\text{reminded, though in different modes and degrees, of the position of luther and david garrick. no guidance is accorded for the conduct of the understanding more assured than the immediate impression or the unregulated fancy, and the passions are thus left without any valid control by the reason. a life} \]
according to natural impulse becomes therefore the aim and the duty of a philosopher.

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

The leading lines of his physical doctrine are that matter is uncreated and indestructible. Its primitive elements are indivisible particles—atoms—which are eternal and imperishable, passing through various combinations and permutations, assuming new forms and forms according to these mutable compositions. These atoms are infinite in number, and solid, though so small as to be imperceptible by the senses. They possess gravity, and move downwards in an infinite vacuum. Their descent, however, is not in a uniform line; they are deflected by a spontaneous impulse, due to mere contingency, and come into collision, conjunction, composition with each other. Thus worlds, infinite in number, and infinitely varied in their phenomena, are formed. These atoms are in a continual state of vibration or oscillation, and from their concretions and disolutions, the condition of translucent, and disintegrating, and disintegrates, and all the multitudinous changes of inorganic and organic nature are derived. All, however, are governed by chance alone; there is no compulsion, no necessity, no external law, no decree of fate. The cause of being is not external, nor involved in the process and act of being. No room is allowed for the operation of any conscious and ordaining intelligence; the world is nothing more than the curious result of uncomprehending, undiscovering accidents. It will be observed that this theory of Epicurus differs from the doctrines of Des Cartes in little else than in ascribing a steady, downward, but variable motion to the atoms in a vacuum, while Cartesianism assigns to them a gyration movement and denies a vacuum. The difference is more obvious between this system and the recent doctrine of evolution, but the logical principle is the same—the contraction and continuation of the universe by simple elements and simple forces generated within its own sphere, and independent of external determination. It is consequently not surprising that an attempt has been very recently made to bring the Epicurean Physics into harmony with modern science, whose present tendencies are in the direction of similar irrational self-sufficiency. A like attempt was made by Gassendi more legitimately, but without any permanent acceptance, in the 17th century; and it may be confidently asserted that, in an age of infidel appetites, there will always be a revival of the Epicurean philosophy and Epicurean proclivities.

 Authorities.—The historians of ancient philosophy: Bayle, tit. "Leçons Lucrèce"; Gassendi, De Vita et Mortuis Epicuri (Hag. Comitt. 1656, 4to); Symmtogia philosophica Epicuri (1659); Dacier, "Vendita de' Apologia des Epicuri" (Berlin, 1776, 8vo); Kondel, "La Vie d'Epicure" (Paris, 1767); Warnekros, "Apologia uti de Labe"; Epictetus, "Asia, First Discourse.

Epicurean. See HAMATH.

Ephiphanius (Ἐφηφανῖος), bishop of Constantia, one of the church fathers, was born in Palestine, near Eleutheropolis, in the early part of the 4th century (between 310 and 320). His parents are said to have been Jews, but in his sixteenth year he embraced Christianity; it is only one of the rest of them were either converts from heathenism, or born of Christian parents. He went to Egypt, and there gave himself to ascetic life among the monks; one record also says that he imbibed Gnostic errors, from which he was reclaimed by the monkish discipline. He became a friend of monasticism, and founded a monastery near
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his native village, of which he became abbot. In 367 he was elected bishop of Constantin (Salamis), the metropolis of Cyprus. Here he remained thirty-six years, busy with the duties of his episcopate, and especially busy with his pen. He devoted himself to the study of Scripture, and to the writing of Fathers, but with temperate zeal and violence. He cherished a special hatred for Origen and his doctrines, and wrote, preached, and travelled in order to destroy their Influence in the Church. This hatred led him into a quarrel with John, bishop of Jerusalem. "A report then spread abroad in Palestine and Syria and Jerusalem, and sanctioned even by John, bishop of Jerusalem, excited Epiphanius to such a pitch that he left Cyprus (A.D. 394) to investigate the matter on the spot. At Jerusalem he preached so violent a sermon against any abettors of Origen's errors, and made such evident al-


that, if it should excite a popular insurrection, he would
be regarded as responsible for the outrages that might follow. By these arguments Epiphanius was induced to relinquish his designs." About this time the empress Eudoxia sent for Epiphanius to pray for her son Constantius II. Epiphanius learned that the emperor would recover provided she would not patronize the defenders of Origen. To this message the empress answered that Epiphanius had failed to save that of his own archdeacon, who had recently died. Finally, some of the Origenists had a conversation with Ep-


him, and they accused him of saying that he had acted rashly. Soon after (Sozomen, I. c.), he embarked for Cyprus, either because he recognized the futility of his journey to Constantinople, or because, as there is reason to believe, God had revealed to him the approaching death, for he died while on his voyage back to Cyprus. It is, and in critical distress, to the bishops who had accompanied him to the place of embarkation, "I leave you the city, the palace, and the stage, for I shall shortly depart." He died at sea, on his return to Cyprus, A.D. 408. He is commemo-
rated as a saint on March 6th.


Epiphanius was "a man of earnest monastic piety, and of sincere but illiberal zeal for orthodoxy. His good nature allowed him to be easily used as an instrument for the passions of others, and his zeal was not according to knowledge. He is the patriarch of the "heresy-house." He identified himself with the monastic piety and ecclesiastical orthodoxy, and consid-
ered it the great mission of his life to pursue the hydra of heresy into all its hiding-places. His learning was extensive, but ill digested. He understood five lan-
guages—Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and a little Latin. Jerome, who knew but three languages, thought he knew these far better than Epiphanius, calls him χρυ-


"Sodoma, the five-tongued; and Rufinus reproach-


fully says of him that he considered it his sacred duty to slander the great Origen in all languages and na-
tions. He was lacking in knowledge of the world and of men, but a good judge. It is, and in critical distress, to the bishops who had accompanied him to the place of embarkation, "I leave you the city, the palace, and the stage, for I shall shortly depart." He died at sea, on his return to Cyprus, A.D. 408. He is commemo-
rated as a saint on March 6th.
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no display of charity; none are admitted after their departure hence, nor can we then correct what was before amiss. There Lazarus goeth not to Dives, nor Dives to Lazarus; the garners are sealed, the combat finished, the crowns distributed. Those who have not yet encountered have no more opportunity, and those who have are not sent away. (Socrates, Hist. Eccl. vi, 80, 450.)

The extant writings of Epiphanius are the following, in the order in which they are given in the edition of his works by Petavius (Paris, 1622; Leipzig, 1685; and in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, vol. xii, xiii, xili):

1. Panarion (medicinal), a treatise against heresies. It was written at the request of two monks, named Paul and Acaicus, belonging to a monastery near Berea, in Lower Syria. Prefixed to the work is a letter to these monks, which serves as a preface. The whole work is divided into three books, which are subdivided into seven or more sections. The first book contains three of these subdivisions, and each of the others two. The whole includes an account of eighty heresies, twenty of which were before Christ: 1, the Barbarians, from Adam to Noah; 2, the Sceytians, from Noah to Terah; 3, the Hebrews, all paid divine honors to the catectare, including idolatry proper, and also the philosophical arts of Stoics, Platonists, Pythagoreans, Epicureans; 4, the Samaritans, arising from a mixture of Hellenism and Judaism, and including four sects; 5, the Mandaeans (exclusively Judaism), including seven sects of the Tobiad, Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees, Heremobaptists, Nazarenes, Essenes, and Heroldians. Of Christian heresies he names the Simonians (followers of Simon Magus), the Basilidians, and other Gnostic sects. With the sixty-fourth heresy he begins his account of the heresies of his own age, Origenism. A critical work of great ability on the information given by Epiphanius has been published by Lippsius, Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius. It limits itself to heresies 13 to 57, which are mostly Gnostic systems. Lippsius shows that Epiphanius, Philaster, and Pseudo-Tertullian made use of the same source, and that this source was the work of Hippolytus against 52 heresies called euvyremma, which was still known to Photius.

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

3. Panarion (Migne, xii, 285), which is a summary or abridgment of the Panarion, the order of topics being somewhat varied.

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

5. Περὶ τῶν αὑτόκειων, de xii gemmae quam erant in veste Aaronis (on the 12 gems which were Aaron's breast-plate).

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

The complete edition of Epiphanius (by Petavius and Migne) have been named above. There is a new edition by Dindorf (Leips. 5 vols. 8vo, 1869-1863.)

The Panarion is given in vols. ii, iii, of Oehler, Corpus Hseresiologicum (Berlin, 1869-1882, 5 vols. 8vo). There is a German translation of portions of Epiphanius, with notes, by Rosler (1778, 8vo). His account of the Arians and Meleitian heresies was translated into English by Whiston, in his Collection of Ancient Monuments on the Trinity (London, 1713, 8vo). A separate life of Epiphanius was published by Gervaise (Paris, 1738, 4to).

See Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. vi, 82; viii, 15; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. vi, 10, 12, 14; Dione, Eccl. Writ. ii, 324; the account of the Bollandists, in Migne, Patrol. Græc. xili; Oudin, De Script. Eccl. i, 527; Cellier, Journal des Artistes chr. sept. (1800), vol. xvi, 268. The book was finished after we have departed hence" (Harr. 59).

Epiphanius, St., bishop of Pavia, was born in that city, of a noble family, in 439 (according to others 438). He received an education for the priesthood under the special superintendence of St. Crispin, bishop of Pavia. He was consecrated subdeacon in 456, deacon in 458, and on the death of Crispin in 466, he was unanimously chosen bishop by the clergy and people. He had long been noted for his rigid asceticism, and after his election his rigor greatly increased. He took only one meal a day, abstained altogether from wine and meat, never used a bath, and was present at divine service in his feet locked together. At that time the West Roman empire was falling to pieces, a prey to the incursions of northern tribes. During these disturbances, bishop Epiphanius seems to have gained to a high degree the esteem and the confidence of all the rulers. He mediated a peace between emperor Zeno and his son-in-law Justinian. In 474 he was sent by the emperor Næsus as envoy to Ethiopia, king of the Visigoths. In 476 king Odoacer conquered Pavia, and gave the city up to plundering, on which occasion the cathedral was destroyed. Epiphanius rebuilt the cathedral, and prevailed upon the king to exempt the city for five years from all taxes. During the war between Odoacer and Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, he gained the confidence of both parties. Theodoric, who in 493 became the master of Italy, granted, upon the intercession of Epiphanius, an amnesty to all who had borne arms against him. Theodosius the Great (492) sent Epiphanius on an embassy to Constantine, king of the Burgundians, to treat with him for the release of the Ligurian prisoners, who were to reproach the desolate districts of Italy. The mission was successful, and Theodoric subsequently remitted to the Burgundians the two thirds of the taxes. When Epiphanius died in Pavia, Jan. 21, 497. In 962 the emperor Otho had his relics transported to Hildesheim, in Germany. The Church of Rome commemorates him as a saint on Jan. 21.—Butler, Lives of Saints, i, 191; Acta Sanctorum, Jan. 21 (biography by his successor Eunuidius); Neander, Lighri in Dark Places (New York, 1833), p. 97; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xvi, 161; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iii, 100. (A. J. S.)

Epiphanius, Scholasticus, an ecclesiastical writer of the Latin Church, lived at the beginning of the 6th century, and is supposed to have been an Italian by birth. At the request of his friend Cassiodorus (q. v.) he translated from Greek into Latin the works of the Church historians Sozomen, Sozomen, and Theodoret. Cassiodorus revised the translation, and made out of the three works one, which, under the name of Historia Tripartita, remained throughout the Middle Ages one of the standard historical works. Likewise, at the request of Cassiodorus, Epiphanius translated several other works, as the Codece Encycloides (a collection of synodal epistles to the emperor Leo I in defense of the Council of Chalcedon); a Commentary on the Song of Songs; a Commentary of Didymus on the proton Didymus, of the ennae Megist., and of the cathol. episcopi (Rome, 1760, 4to); Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xvi, 162; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 100.

Epiphanius (ἐπιφανία, rá ipófáina, the "man-
faction" of Christ), one of the oldest festivals of the Christian Church, and questioned as such by Clement of Alexandria (Stromat, I, 1). Until the time of Chrysostom, it opened in the Eastern Church the cyclic of festivals. It denoted at first the baptism of Christ, which he was to come to choose for his church, and with greater sense than his birth, his real manifestation to men. A special festival of the birth of Christ arose later than the festival of Epiphany, and up to that time the commemoration of the birth of Christ was included in that of Epiphany. According to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, the festival of Epiphany was celebrated in Alexandria by the Basilidians, but soon it was introduced into the orthodox Church also. Nearer thinks that it did not originate with the Basilidians, but that they derived it from Jewish Christians in Syria and Palestine. The first trace of the festival in the Latin Church is found in 369, when, as Ammianus Marcellinus (xxi, 2) mentions, the emperor Julian took part in a celebration of the festival at Vienne. In the Western Church it came early to denote the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, with especial reference to his appearance to the wise men. When and how the festival was introduced into the Jewish deities of the Magi, and what the Magi were called the Magi, is unknown. The story of the journey of the Three Wise Men from the East to Bethlehem is a Christian legend, but the custom of celebrating the festival on the first Sunday after Christmas continues to this day. The festival of Epiphany is the celebration of Christ as the King of the Gentiles, and as such it is observed in the Eastern Church and in the Catholic Church of the West. The festival is celebrated on the first Sunday after Christmas, and is observed with great solemnity. The festival is a time of rejoicing and thanksgiving for the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, and of praying for the extension of his kingdom to all nations. The festival is also a time of repentance and preparation for the reception of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ. The festival of Epiphany is one of the most important and most ancient of the Christian festivals. It is a festival of light, a festival of joy, a festival of thanksgiving, a festival of repentance, and a festival of preparation. It is a festival of the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, and of the reception of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ. It is a festival of the extension of the kingdom of Christ to all nations, and of the reception of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ. It is a festival of the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, and of the reception of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ. It is a festival of the extension of the kingdom of Christ to all nations, and of the reception of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ. It is a festival of the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, and of the reception of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ.
then, is that apostle with whose actions we are best acquainted seemingly aware that there would be continual occasion in the Christian Church for the exercise of that authority over pastors and teachers which the apostles had derived from the Lord Jesus; and by these two examples of a delegation, given during his lifetime, preparing the way for that dispensation that authority exercised by the successors of the apostles in all ages. Accordingly, the earliest Christian writers tell us that the apostles, to prevent contention, appointed bishops and deacons; giving orders, too, that upon their death other approved men should succeed in the work they had commenced in that part of the church; that these orders constituted their first-fruits, that is, their first disciples, after they had proved them by the Spirit. Bishops and deacons of those who were to believe; and that the apostle John, who survived the rest, after returning from Patmos, the place of his banishment, went about the neighboring nations, ordaining bishops, establishing whole churches, and setting apart particular persons for the ministry, as they were pointed out to him by the Spirit" (Watson, s.v.). In substance, the high Episcopalians claim that "after the ascension of our Lord, and before the death of the apostles, the church was divided into churches, and the church into the ministry—apostles, presbyters, and deacons; and these three orders have continued ever since. The name apostle, out of respect to the memory of the inspired apostles, was changed to bishop, while the office remained the same." The view above given, however satisfactory it may be to high Episcopalians, is not adopted by the more moderate writers on that side, nor by other denominations of Christians. The following brief account, from Neander's Introduction to Coleman's Apostolical and Primitive Church, is only verbal and imperfect; but the earliest constitution of the Church was modelled, for the most part, after that religious community with which it stood in closest connection, and to which it was most assimilated—the Jewish synagogue. This, however, was so modified as to conform to the nature of the Christian community, and to the new and peculiar spirit with which it was animated. Like the synagogue, the Church was governed by an associated body of men appointed for this purpose. The name of presbyter, which was appropriated to this body, was derived from the Jewish synagogue. But in the Gentile churches formed by those who took the name of εἰσισκούς, εὐσκούς, a term more significant of their office in the language generally spoken by the members of these churches. The name presbyter denoted the dignity of their office, while bishop was expressive of the nature of their office, εἰσισκούς τήν ἱερατίαν, to take the oversight of the Church. Most certainly no other distinction originally existed between them. But, in process of time, some one, in the ordinary course of events, would gradually obtain the pre-eminence over his colleagues, and, by reason of that peculiar oversight which he exercised over the whole community, might come to be designated by the name εἰσισκούς, bishop, which was originally applied to them all indiscriminately. The constant tumults, from within and from without, which agitated the Church in the time of the apostles, may have given it in such three-cornered doings an opportunity to exercise his influence the more efficiently; so that, at such a time, the controlling influence of one in this capacity may have been very salutary to the Church. This change in the relation of the presbyters to each other was not the same in all the churches, and varied according to their different circumstances. It may have been as early as the latter part of the life of John, when he was sole survivor of the other apostles, that one, as president of this body of presbyters, was distinguished by the name εἰσισκούς, bishop. There is, however, no evidence that the apostle himself introduced this change, much less that he authorized it as a perpetual ordinance for the future. Such an ordinance is in direct opposition to the spirit of that apostle. This change in the mode of administering the government of the Church, resulting from peculiar circumstances, may have been introduced as a salutary expedient, without implying any departure from the purer principles of Christianity. But, if so, the doctrine is, as it gradually gained currency in the third century—that the bishops are by divine right the head of the Church, and invested with the government of the same; that they are the successors of the apostles, and by this succession inherit apostolical authority; that the church is divided into distinct communities in respect of the succession of that ordination which they have received merely in an outward manner, the Holy Ghost, in all time to come, must be transmitted to the Church—when this becomes the doctrine of the Church, we certainly must perceive in these assumptions a great corruption of the Christian system. It is a carnal perversion of the true idea of the Christian Church. It is a falling back into the spirit of the Jewish religion. Instead of the Christian idea of a church, based on inward principles of communion, and extending itself by means of these, it presents us with the image of one like that of the Old Testament peoples, under the external ordinances, and seeking to promote the propagation of the kingdom of God by external rites. This entire perversion of the original view of the Christian Church was itself the origin of the whole system of the Roman Catholic Church, emerging from the profanity of the Dark Ages. We hold, indeed, no controversy with that class of Episcopalians who adhere to the Episcopal system as well adapted, in their opinion, to the exigencies of their Church. But the doctrine of the absolute necessity of the Episcopal as the only legitimate form of the government of the Church, of the Episcopal succession of bishops above mentioned in order to a participation in the gifts of the Spirit, we must regard as something foreign to the true idea of the Christian Church. It is in direct conflict with the spirit of Protestantism, and is the origin, not of the true catholicism of the apostle, but of that of the Roman Church. When, therefore, Episcopalians disown, as essentially deficient in their ecclesiastical organization, other Protestant churches which evidently have the spirit of Christ, it only remains for us to protest, in the strongest terms, against their setting up these standards for the Church real they be from us, who began with Luther in the Spirit, that we should now desire to be made perfect by the flesh (Gal. iii, 9)."

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

Professor R.D. Hitchcock (American Presbyterian Review, Jan. 1867) gives a luminous sketch of the origin and growth of the Episcopal churches. The Episcopal system was in full force in the Church before the end of the third century, he shows clearly, nevertheless, that it was not of apostolic origin, but a later growth of ecclesiastical development, as follows: (1) The best Episcopal writers now admit that the Episcopal system was not to be found in the N.T. (2) The earliest witness, outside of the N.T., is Clem-
ant of Rome (about A.D. 100), in whose Epistle to the Corinthians the words bishop and presbyter are used interchangeably. Dr. Hitchcock analyzes the letters of Ignatius (1157) both in the Syriac version of his Epistle and in the thorniugreek version. Giving every passage in which Episcopacy occurs. His conclusions are that, (1.) Admitting the substantial integrity of the texts, the strong infusion of Episcopacy in them "is best explained by supposing it to be a new thing, which Ignatius was doing, always, everywhere, its ultimate results in every- special passage according to the text, the Episcopate of the Ignatian epistles is easily understood. (2.) The Ignatian Episcopacy is not diocesan, but Congregational. Each of the churches addressed had its own bishop, presbyters, and deacons. (3.) The apostolic succession (in Ignatu- tius) is not Episcopalian, but Presbyterian. The bishop is the representative of Christ, as Christ is of the Fa- ther; the presbyters are representatives of the apos- tles, and the deacons of the precept or commandment of Christ. In short, the Ignatian Episcopacy, instead of having the supremacy of the Bishop, rules by his clergy, and is a perfect submission to the apostles. (4.) In certain cited passages he uses "bishop" and "presby- ter" interchangeably, as Clement does. This wa- tering is indicative, not of apostolic tradi- tion, but of apostolic succession growing, and not yet completed."—Tertullian (1420 ?) draws the line distinctly between clergy and laity, and discrimi- nates clearly between bishops, priests, and deacons. In Cyprian (248-256), as has been remarked above, Episcopacy is fully matured. (See Church, III, 288.)

I. A recovery of the Roman Catholic Church. (1.) The theory of the Episcopacy according to Roman writers springs from the Romish doctrine of a visible Church. "An invisible Church" (Mohler, Symbolism, § 43) "needs only an inward, purely spiritual sacrifice, and a general priesthood," but the visible Church, in its very idea, according to the Romish view, requires an external sacrifice, and the consecration of especial priests to perform it. The priest is supposed to receive the internal consecration from God through the external consecration of the Church—that is to say, he receives it through the agency of the bishops. The stability of the visible Church is supposed to require, therefore, an ecclesiastical ordination, originating with Christ, and per- petuated in uninterrupted succession; so that, as the apostles were sent forth by Christ, they, in their turn, instituted bishops, and these have appointed their suc- cessors down to our days. But, if these bishops are to form a perpetual corporation, they need a centre and head connecting them firmly together, and exer- cising jurisdiction over them, and this head is found in this Pope. The Episcopacy, with the pope at its head, is revered in the Church of Rome as a divine in- stitution.

(2.) We say "with the pope at its head," for this point is essential to the Romish idea of an Episcopacy, fure diesin. The Roman Church has been divided on this question for ages. It formed one of the chief controverses in the Council of Trent, where many of the bishops earnestly endeavored to have their office pronounced to be of divine right apart from the pope, while the papal legates strenuously, but adroitly, re- claimed this claim, and managed to prevent its authori- zation by the council. The decree of Trent on the Episcopate is as follows (s.ess. xxiii, De Reformazione, ch. iv.): "The sacred and holy synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops, who have succeeded unto the place of the apostles, princip-

ally belong to the (this) hierarchical order; that they are placed, as the apostle says, by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God (Acts xx, 28); that they are superior to priests; confer the sacrament of ordina- tion; ordain the bishop, and teach. The pope (same session, Can. vi) "If any one shall say that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy instituted by divine ordination, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers, let him be anathema." And also (Can. vii), "If any one shall say that bishops are not superior to priests, or that they have not the pow- er of confirming and ordaining, etc., let him be anath- ema." Nothing is said here of the divine right of the Episcopalian pope. But, in fact, it is not even called an order at all. In chapter ii of the same session (Touch- ing the seven orders) we have priests, deacons, sub- deacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, but not a word about bishops. So far as order is con- cerned, the bishops are simply priests. The Catechism of the Council of Trent declares that the order of priest- hood, though essentially one, has different degrees of dignity and power; unity of the presbyters; 2, bishops; 3, archbishops; 4, patriarchs; and, 5, superior to all, the sovereign pontiff. The history of the stormy 22d session of the council throws great light upon these de- crees. A canon was proposed concerning "the in- stitution of bishops," and the Spanish prelates de- manded that it be decided whether the bishop was to be of divine right. This question arose, in fact, in 1546, and was before the council, in some shape or other, until 1562 (sess. xxii), when it took the precise form, "Are bishops superior to priests by divine right, and inferior to the pope only by ecclesiastical right?" The pope knew that if it should be decided that the bishops held their power directly from God, there was no ground for the doctrine that they existed only through the pope, and feared that they would ultimately assert their entire independence. The dispute ended in drop- ping altogether the canon on the "institution of bish- ops," and substituting the vague decrees and opinion above cited.

(3.) Two theories, then, of the Episcopate exist in the Roman Church: 1, the so-called Papal system, ac- cording to which the pope is the sole bishop by divine right, and all other bishops exist and are ordained by him, and derive their superiority to presbyters solely from him; 2, the Episcopalian system, which asserts an inde- pendent divine right on the part of each bishop. The former is the ultramontane view, and it is now prev- alent throughout the Church, and the latter is the moderate or Gallican view. It holds that the bishops are the rightful governors of the Church, superior to presbyters by the direct appointment of God; and maintains that the pope is, with regard to other bishops, primus inter pares, appointed for the sake of keeping up the unity of the Church as a cor- porate body. The question, in fact, turns upon that of the primacy of the see of Rome. See Primacy.

The Episcopalian system was adopted by the Gallican clergy (see Gallicanism), by the Jansenists (q. v.), and by Fosheim (q. v.). The present tendency of the entire Roman Church, however, is to the ultra- montane theory.

The Romish Episcopacy, as a whole, is diocesan. See Dioeces. The clergy of the diocese are subject to the bishop, but his authority does not extend beyond the diocese. There are, besides the Roman bishops, bishops exsistentes, bishops in partibus, bishops territoriales, etc., for which distinctions, see Bishops. The division of the Church into dioceses may be viewed as a natural consequence of the institution of the office of bishop. The authority to exercise jurisdiction, when committed to them, may not extend or extend only within limits determined by church law, but the Church, and the Church, instead of being benefited by the appointment of governors, might be exposed to the
double calamity of an overplus of them in one district, and a total deficiency of them in another. Hence we find, so early as the New Testament history, some plain indications of the rise of the diocesan system in the cases respectively of James, bishop of Jerusalem; Timothy, bishop of Ephesus; Titus, bishop of Crete; the seven churches of Asia may be added the angels or bishops of the seven churches in Asia. These were placed in cities, and had jurisdiction over the churches and inferior clergy in those cities, and probably in the country adjacent. This first diocese was formed by planting a bishop in a city or considerable village, which the official authority, in the time of Christ, doubtless, and took the spiritual charge, not only of the city itself, but the suburbs, or region lying round about it, within the verge of its [civil] jurisdiction, which seems to be the plain reason of that great and visible difference which we find in the Church of the present day, so much larger, others very small, according as the civil government of each city happened to have a larger or lesser jurisdiction" (Hook). See Bingham, *Orig. Eccl. bk. ix. ch. ii.* The bishops are named from the principal city of the diocese, as Rome, Lyons, etc. There is vigorous rising holy stem, in regard to an 12th century (see Christian Remembrancer, Jan. 1855, p. 215). While the Romish bishops are independent of each other, they are all subordinate to the pope, and must make regular returns to him of the state of their dioceses. See Bingham.

III. (1.) *The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* hold that there are three orders of ministers in the Church, bishops, priests, and deacons, and that bishops are the successors of the apostles, and superior to priests and deacons. The High-Church theory maintains the divine right of Episcopacy, and its absolute necessity to the existence of the Church; the Low-Church party deny that there is any positive command upon the subject in Scripture, or that there is anything in the standards of the Church of England which makes episcopacy necessary. The High-Churchmen maintain, and the Low-Churchmen reject the theory of the "exclusive validity of episcopal orders." See Succession.

In the preface to the Ordinal of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, it is declared as "evident unto all men who live under the government of the Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." The doctrine of those churches in general is, "That there is in the Church a superior order of ministers, the successor of the apostles, who possess in their own persons the right of ordination and jurisdiction, and who are called *priests*, being the overseers not only of the people, but also of the clergy; and an inferior order of ministers, called presbyters, the literal translation of the word *presbiteros*, which is rendered in our English Bibles elders, persons who receive from the ordination of the bishop power to preach and to administer the sacraments, who are set over the people, but are themselves under the government of the bishop, and have no right to convey to others the sacred office which he gives them authority to exercise for him." This is a phrase used by Charles I, who was by no means an unlearned defender of that form of government to which he was a martyr, the presbyters are *episcopi gregis* [bishops of the flock], but the bishops are *Episcopi gregis et pastores* [bishops of the flock and of the pastors]. The liberal writers, however, in the Church of England do not contend that this form of government is made so binding in the Church as not to be departed from and varied according to circumstances. It cannot be proved, says Dr. Paley, that any form of church government was laid down by the apostles as a rule to be followed in the Jewish Scriptures, with a view of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages. The truth seems to have been, that such offices were at first erected in the Christian III. — 96 Church as the good order, the instruction, and the exigencies of the society at that time required, without any intention, at least without any declared design of regulating the appointment, authority, or the distinction of Christian ministers under future circumstances. To this same effect, all Bishop Tilley's of the apostles, is not contended that the bishops, priests, and deacons of England are at present precisely the same that bishops, presbyters, and deacons were in Asia Minor seventeen hundred years ago. We only maintain that there have always been bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church of England, which, with different powers and functions, it is allowed, in different countries and at different periods; but the genera: principles and duties which have respectively characterized these clerical orders have been essentially the same in all times, and in all places, and in all situations which they have undergone have only been such as have ever belonged to all persons in public situations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and which are, indeed, indispensable from every thing in which mankind are concerned in this transitory and fleeting world. And many other things were this general and universal in view of the ministerial office, and to make these observations upon the clerical orders subsisting in this kingdom, for the purpose of pointing out the foundation and principles of Church authority, and of showing that our ecclesiastical establishment is as nearly conventional, conformable to the circumstances of our nation, than the practice of the primitive Church. But, though I flatter myself that I have proved episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops. No church can exist without some government; but, though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship, though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers, and though a subordination among them is prescribed in the highest degree, yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country; they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society, with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other things which are here not specified. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of divine ends. Yet in the most explicit terms, enjoined obedience to all governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and whatever may be their denomination, as essential to the character of a true Christian. Thus the Gospel only lays down general precepts, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents." Bishop Tomline, however, and the High-Episcopalians of the Church of England, contend for an original distinction in the office and order of bishops and presbyters; which notion is contradicted by the founder of the Church of England, Archbishop Whitgift, who distinguished, with a phrase of the phrase, the priests were at one time, and were not two things; but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion" (Whitton). On the inconsistency of the position of that portion of the so-called evangelical Episcopalians which holds that bishops are real successors of the apostles, see an admirable article in the *Princeton Review*, January, 1856 (art. I). (2.) The episcopacy of the Church of England is diocesan, like that of the Church of Rome, and the bishops are named from the chief city of the diocese (London, York, etc.). In New England, the churches of the same are generally coterminal with the States of the Union, and the bishops are named accordingly (Delaware, Connecticut, etc.). The larger
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states are in some instances subdivided. "In the American Church the bishops are all of equal authority, each ruling his own diocese independently of the control of an ecclesiastical superior. No bishop is amenable to any central authority." There are no archbishops; but the bishop and the presbyters are authorized. See BISHOPS, and PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

IV. Methodist Episcopal Church.—(1.) The episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church is believed to be "in accordance to the apostolic model" in that of the churches which maintain the apostolic succession. Its simple idea is, that certain elders are chosen from the body of the presbyters to superintend the Church, and are called bishops or superintendents, both terms being used in the Methodist ritual. The bishops, in virtue of their functions, naturally stand above the brethren. With regard to the ordinary functions of the ministry, they do not differ from other ministers; but extraordinary functions, such as ordaining, pre- sideing in assemblies, and the like, are devolved upon them by the brethren, and exercised by them exclusively and of right—right not divine, but ecclesiastical and human, founded upon the will of the body of pastors. The primitive principle that bishops and presbyters are of equal rank in the N.T. is fully recognized; nor are bishops regarded as the successors of the apostles. As functions of a presbyter are more than one pastor, it is natural and necessary that one should preside over the rest, and that "certain functions should be reserved to him." (Bunyan, Council of Trent, bk. v. ch. ii.) It is not contrary to the essence of the ministry, but rather in harmony with its mission and pastoral aims, that the providence of the Church being limited to a particular diocese, while the jurisdiction of the apostles was extended to every part of the earth, whereverover their universal vocation to convert the nations and to found churches conducted them." (Church History, i. 226, Lond. 1845.) Under the Methodist system, a bishop has a pastoral and superintendental duty to presbyters in March in New York, in May in Illinois, in July in California, in October in China, and in December in Germany.

(3.) The Methodist episcopacy was instituted by Wesley. During the Revolution, most of the clergy of the Church of England left the country. Before the war, the American preachers, like those in England, had been forbidden to administer the sacraments: the people were sent to the clergy of the Church of England for baptism and the Lord's Supper. After the Revolution, they were without the ordinances, and were likely to be disband in consequence. After duly considering the exigency, Mr. Wesley (who had previously in vain urged the bishop of London to ordain preachers for America) determined to organize the American Methodists into an independent Episcopal Church, and ordained the Rev. Thomas Coke, L.L.D., as superintendent, and Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey as elders. In 1784 the Rev. Francis Asbury was ordained by Dr. Coke, and the Methodist Episcopal Church was duly organized.—the first American Episcopal Church. See Marrionn, Mr. Wesley did not pretend to ordain bishops in any other sense than according to his view of primitive episcopacy, in which, as he maintained, bishops and presbyters are the same order. The grounds of his procedure in the case are stated in his "Letter to Dr. Coke and the Methodist Preachers in the United States." (See Marrion, p. 244.) An excellent sketch of the rise of the Methodist episcopacy is given by Stevens, History of Methodism, vol. ii. V. The Unitas Fratrum (Unitas Fratrum) holds to episcopacy. Their bishops, however, are not diocesan. The history of the preservation of the episcopate is given in De Schweinitz, The Moravian Episcopate (Bethlehem, 1865). See MORAVIANS.
See Canones et Decretae Concil. Trident. sess. xxiii.; Catechism of the Council of Trent, pt. ii, Sacrament of Orders; Byfurd, The History of the Council of Trent, bk. v, ch. ii; Elliott, Delegation of Romanism, bk. ii, chap. xv; Möhler, Symboles, § 48; Rothe, Anfänge d. christlichen Kirche, vol. i; Baur, Uebersicht des Episcopat (Tübingen, 1888, 8vo); Neander, Church History, i, 190; Mosheim, Ch. History, vol. i; Kilien, Ancient Church, sch. ii; Ussher, Universal History; Palecian, The New Testament, chap. viii; Coleman, Apostolical and Primitive Church, ch. vi; Lord King, Primitive Church (12mo); Bengs, Original Church of Christ (N. Y. 12mo); Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. i, § 107, 108; Emory, On Episcopalcy; Emory, Defence of our Fathers (N. York, 1831, 8vo); Simons, Calv. Dispens. Public. (Paris, 1832, 8vo); Stevens, History of Methodism, vol. ii, chaps. vi, vii; Watson, Life of Wesley, ch. xiii; Burnet, History of English Reformation, i, 490, 586; iv, 176; Porter, Compendium of Methodism; Princeton Review, January, 1836; Lightfoot, On Philippians (1689), Appendix; The Rise of the Episcopate (New Englander, July, 1867); Palmer, On the Church (High-Church view), ii, 849 sq.; Hinds, Rise and Early Progress of Christianity (Encyclop. Metropol. London, 1850, 12mo); and the article SucceSSION. The High-Episcopal view is taken, as that is the position that the teachers in the Philadelphians (Philadelphia, 1866, 12mo); the moderate, in Litton, The Church of Christ (London. 1851, 8vo; Philadelphia, 1883, 8vo).

Episcopalian, members of those churches which adopt the Episcopal form of Church government. See also Episcopal Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, Moravians, Lutheran Church, England, Church of, Protestant Episcopal Church.

Episcopius. SIMON (Dutch, Bisschop), an eminent and learned Arminian theologian, was born in January, 1558, at Amsterdam, where he received his school education. In 1600 he went to the University of Leyden, where he took his degree of M. A. in 1606. He thenceforward devoted himself to the study of theology. "Earnestly," says Currerellus (in his eulogy on Episcopius), "did he listen to the lectures of those very learned professors, Francis Gomar, Luke Triccatius, and James Arminius; and in the exercises of debates and harangues, which they commonly called these, he left many of his equals far in the distance, and was highly esteemed as one worthy of being called to the ministry of the divine word. But when, especially after the death of his esteemed teacher (Triccatius) and in consequence on predestination, which afterwards agitated all Holland, finally arose, and was not only secretly carried on between the two professors, but also broke forth into open violence, our Episcopius became favorably inclined towards the Arminian doctrines. For this reason he received little favor from the pastors on the opposite side of the controversy, so that when the very illustrious councils of the state of Amsterdam, to whom the singular learning and piety of Episcopius had become known, would have invited him to become their preacher, these pastors, by causing delays, entirely frustrated the plans of the council. Episcopius, disheartened at this affair, determined to leave the academy at Leyden, and in the year 1609 (in which year Arminius died) he betook himself to the Franeker Academy, belonging to the Friari, incited especially by the great Daniel Heinsius, the celebrated professor of the sacred language, John Drusius. But there he displayed, as youths of a bold mind are wont, such a zeal in the theological discussions, that he gave not a little offence to Sibrandus Lubbertus, a professor of that academy. Accordingly, a few months after, he departed and came into France, where, in a brief space of time he obtained so fair a mastery of the French language that he not only understood it, but could speak it with considerable ease and purity. Finally, in the year 1610, he returned to his native land, only to receive the same tokens of ill will." In that year he was ordained pastor of Bleywick, a village near Rotterdam. In 1611 a colloquy was held at the Hague, on order of the States General, with a view to ending the agitating controversy between the Government and Arminians, between six Remonstrant pastors and six Contra-Remonstrants. Episcopius, as one of the six Remonstrants, displayed so much learning and skill that his fame spread through all the country. In 1612 he was appointed Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden, as successor of Gomar. Here his pre-eminent talents had full scope, and his reputation grew rapidly. The Gomarist controversy, however, waxed hotter and hotter; the orthodoxy of Episcopius was called in question by his theological opponents; and the nearly suppressed publications he renewed in the same place even went so far as to threaten violence. In 1614 he went to Amsterdam to attend a baptism, and the minister, Heyden, having stigmatized him as a heretic, he was saved from stoning only by the zeal of his friends. One blacksmith once after him with a hot iron with the cry, "Stop the Armenian disturber of the Church," and would probably have murdered him but for the interference of bystanders.

The Synod of Dort was held in 1618. See Dort. Episcopius was the chief spokesman of the Arminians. At the 24th of February, 1618, he was elected to the presbytery, and took the power, which is to be found in his Works, in Limborch's Vita Episcopii, and in Calder's Life of Episcopius (N. Y. 1837, chap. x). The Synod condemned the Arminians, and by the aid of the civil government banished the Remonstrant ministers. Episcopius retired first to Antwerp, from where he wrote his Remonstrantische Verzet van Waddingijs Januas Epistolas (1621, on the Rule of Faith and on the Worship of Images); he celebratedConsistori Padri Remonstrantium (Remonstrants' Confession of Faith, 1622; Opera, vol. iii); Annidotum, sive gemina Declarationem sent. Synodi Dordracena (Opera, vol. ii, London, 1626). When the war between the United Provinces and the Netherlands was renewed, Episcopius took refuge in France, residing chiefly in Paris (1621-1626). Here he published Paraphrase in cap. vii-x Epist. ad Romans (Paraphrase on Romans viii-xl, Opera, vol. i); Bodechusin Inscriptis (Bodechus in the Return of the Remonstrants against the charge of Socialism, Examen theism J. Copelli (on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy in Belgium); Tractatus de Libero Arbitrio (opera, vol. i); Correspondence with John Cameron on Grace and Free Will (Opera, vol. i). On the death of his relative Maurice (1628), the influence of the Remonstrants slackened, and it became safe for Episcopius to return to his country in 1626, when he became minister to the Remonstrants of Rotterdam. Here he published Apologia pro Confessione, etc. (Apology for the Confession of the Remonstrants), and other controversial tracts (Opera, vol. iii). In 1648 he was made rector of the newly-established college of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, where the rest of his life was spent in diligent and successful teaching, and in constant literary and pastoral activity. The fruits of his lectures appear in permanent form in his Institutiones Theologicae lib. iv, which, however, was left unfinished, and published posthumously (Opera, vol. i); and also in Responsa ad Quæstiones Theologicae vivae (Answers to 64 questions in theology proposed by students). He died April 4, 1648.
tale for controversy was of a very high order; but his Institutes shows that he also possessed the power of clear and luminous statement to a rare degree. The theology of Epicsurus is, in substance, that of Arminius. He has been charged with Socinianism, but his writings, controversial and other, sufficiently refute this charge. He sought not only against the charge of Socinianism in general. The charge was in part due to the fact that he held the ethical side of Christianity to be the best of communion rather than the doctrinal; holding that Christianity is not so much a doctrine as a life, and that it has its dignity from its bearing on life. He was one of the great champions of the doctrine of the Trinity in England, Waterland and Bull, both wrote against Epicsurus. Waterland (Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, Works, Oxford, 1638, liii, 440 sq.) states that Epicsurus holds the doctrine of the Trinity, as to the main substance of it, to be certain and clear, but yet not necessary to be believed in order to salvation," and adds that the doctrine is "taught in full and strong terms in the Confession of the Remonstrants," and in other places in the works of Epicsurus. He then goes on to say, "It was not necessary to show the error and danger of the unguarded statement of Epicsurus as to its importance. Bull's Judgment of the Catholic Church on the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is very God (Works on the Trinity, Oxford, 1605, vol. iii.), was written expressly to refute the statement of Epicsurus (f., xxvii., iv. ch. 5) that, "in the primitive churches, during at least three centuries, the belief and profession of the special divine sonship of Christ was not judged necessary to salvation." It is hardly necessary to say that Bull makes out his case. He does not, however, charge Epicsurus with doctrinal errors, bow with too great and too dangerous liberality. He states also that, "although Epicsurus was a man of unquestionable great ability, and in many respects possessed learning of no ordinary kind, yet he but little consulted or regarded, nay, he actually despised the writings of the ancient fathers and doctors." But he does not, as he says himself, refer to the writings of his authors (cf. Life of Epicsurus, N. Y., ed. p. 215). After the death of Epicsurus, Jurieu charged him with Socinianism, which gave rise to a sharp letter from Clericus (Le Clerc) refuting the charge (see Bayle, s. v. Epicsurus). There were two editions of Epicsurus, one by Calvius, who published vol. i., Amst. 1650, with a sketch of the author's life; vol. ii., edited by Poelenburg, appeared in 1666. A second edition was published under the title S. Epicsurus operis omnium theologica, cum autographo collocata, at a mendis aliquot gravissimis repara, vol. 2, 1678, 2 vols. fol.). This was also written by Philip Limborch, first in Dutch, and afterwards enlarged in Latin (Hist. Vitae S. Epicsurus, etc., Amst. 1701). There is an English version of his Labarum Ponsius under the title Psalms Labyrinthus, or a Treatise on Infallibility (Lond. 1703). See also Calvin, Commentaries on Simon Epicsurus (New York, 1887, 12mo); Hepp, in Herszeg, Real-Encyclopedia, iv. 100; a translation of Curcellus's sketch, in the Mediatorial Quarterly Review, Oct. 1865, p. 612; Nichols, Calvinism and Arminianism compared (Lond. 1824, 2 vols. 8vo); Mortimer, The Church of the Remonstrants, 1849, 8vo); Schröder, Kirchengeschichte seit d. Reform. v, 229-296; and the articles ARMINIANS; DORT; REMONSTRANTS.

Epispocopus Episcoporum, bishop of bishops, a title assumed by the popes.

Episcopus in Partibus in Infidelium, see Bishop, vol. i, p. 821, col. 2.

Eupicopus Clunensis, O. Capuchin bishop, a title of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Epistle (epistole), something sent, as a letter). The use of written letters implies, of course, considerable progress in the development of civilized life. There must be a recognised system of notation, phonic or symbolic; men must be taught to write, and have writing materials at hand. In the early nomadic stages of society accordingly, like those which mark the period of the patriarchs of the O.T., we find no traces of any but oral communications. In the Homeric age, where epic poetry was maintained, the written words were hieroglyphical letters is not unknown (Uli, vi). Messengers were sent instructed what to say from Jacob to Esau (Gen. xxxii, 8), from Balak to Balaam (Num. xxii, 5, 7, 16), bringing back in like manner a verbal, not a written answer (Num. xxiv, 12). See MESSENGER. The negations between the prophets and the king of the Ammonites (Judg. xi, 12, 13) were conducted in the same way. It was still the received practice in the time of Saul (1 Sam, xi, 7, 9). The reign of David, bringing the Israelites, as it did, into contact with the higher civilization of the Phoenicians, witnessed a change in this respect also. See AMABASADOR. The first recorded letter (אֶפֶֽסֶת = "book"; comp. use of בִּבְלָו, Herod. i, 123) in the history of the O.T. was that which "David wrote to Joab, and sent by the hand of Uriah" (2 Sam. xi, 14), and this must obviously, like the letters that came into another history of crime (in this case also in traceable connection with Phoenician influence, 1 Kings xxii, 8, 9), have been written with the king's seal, with the guarantee of their authority, and a safeguard against their being read by any but the persons to whom they were addressed. The material used for the impression of the seal was probably the "clay" of the robe xx, 13). The act of sending a letter, however, pre-eminently, if not exclusively, a kingship, where authority and secrecy were necessary. Hence they contained simply royal commands, and nothing is said of salutation or even address in connection with them. Joab, on the other hand, answers the letter of Absalom with the words, "he writes, as he will send him a letter, and receives a verbal message in return. The demand of Benhadad and Ahab's answer to it are conveyed in the same way (1 Kings xx, 2, 5). Jehu wrote letters, and sent them to Samaria to authorities, respecting Ahab's children, the form of which, or of the one transcribed, is the first instance in the Bible of anything like a formula. It begins, "Now as soon as this letter cometh to you," but ends without any like phrase. It was apparently replied to by a message, and Jehu wrote another letter, which, as given, has not the same peculiar character. That Jehu, who, though perhaps well born, was a rough soldier, should be a writer—and there is no ground for supposing that he used a scribe, but, from the extremely characteristic style, rather evidence against such an idea—indicates that letter-writing was then common (2 Kings x, 1-7). In this case secrecy may have been thought desirable, but the importance of the matter would have been a sufficient reason for writing. Written communications, however, become more frequent in the later history. The letter which the king of Syria, Benhadad, sent by Naaman to Jehoram, king of Israel, though to a sovereign with whom the writer was at peace, is in the same peremptory style, with no salutation (2 Kings v, 6, 6), from which we may conjecture that only the principal contents are given in this and like instances. The "writing" (טועב) to Jehoram, king of Judah, from Eliah (q. v.) must have been a written prophecy rather than a letter (2 Chron. xxii, 12-18); though it must be observed that such prophecies which are addressed to persons of high rank are of that character. Hezekiah, when he summoned the whole nation to keep the Passover, sent letters "from the king and his princes," as had been determined at a council held at Jerusalem by the king, the princes, and all the congregation. The contents of these letters are given, or the substance. The form is that of an exhortation, without, however, address. The
character is that of a religious proclamation (2 Chron. xxx, 1-9). Hezekiah, in fact, introduced a system of couriers like that afterwards so fully organized under the Persian kings (comp. Herod. vii, 38, and Esth. viii, 10, 14). The letter or letters of Sennacherib to Hezekiah have been wrongly supposed to have been written to his messengers, which were given to Hezekiah to show him that they had their master's authority. It is to be observed that the messengers were commanded, "Thus shall ye speak to Hezekiah," and that Hezekiah "received the letter" from them. What he received was probably a roll of parchments, as that which Jeroboam burnt seems to have been (Jer. xxxvi, 29), for when he took it to the Temple he "spread it before the Lord" (2 Kings xix, 9-14; Isa. xxxvi, 9-14; comp. 2 Chron. xxxii, 17). It does not appear to have been usual for the prophets to write letters. Generally they seem, when they did not go themselves to those whom they would address, either to have sent a messenger, or to have publicly proclaimed what they were commissioned to say, knowing that the report of it would be carried to those whom it specially concerned.

When we find naming of one of the people of Judah, we read how Jeremiah addressed them by a letter, which is a written exhortation and prophecy (xxix, 1-23). It can scarcely be said that here we perceive a positive distinction between the later prophets and the earlier, for Elijah sent a letter or "writing" to Jehoram, King of Israel, as already noticed. The distance of Babylonia from Jerusalem, and of Jerusalem from the kingdom which was the scene of Elijah's ministry, seems to afford the true explanation. That letters were not uncommon between the captives at Babylonia and those who remained at Jerusalem before it was destroyed, appears probable from the mention of letters to Zephaniah the priest, and to others from a false prophet Shemariah, at Babylon, in contradiction of Jeremiah's letter (24-29). Jeremiah was commanded to send to the captives in Babylon a confession of this man, and it is therefore probable that at least three letters passed on this occasion. Though with the little evidence we have we cannot speak positively, it seems as if the custom of letter-writing had become more common by degrees, although there is no ground for inferring any change in its character. Still we find naming of an address or signature. The letter seems to be always a document, generally a message written for greater security or to have full authority, and was probably rolled, tied up, and sealed with the writer's seal. See Letter.

Although no Hebrew letters are preserved of the time before David, it might be supposed that the form might have been derived from Egypt. We have papyri containing copies by Egyptian scribes of the kings of the Ramesses family about the 18th century B.C., of letters of their own correspondence. These show a regular epistolary style, the conventionalism of which at once removes us from all ideas of Semitic literature. There is an air of the monuments about it that strikes us in the descriptive character of certain of the formulas. Some letters, from a superior to an inferior, commence in the manner shown in the following example: "The chief librarian Amem-em-an, of the royal white house, says to the scribe Penta-en, Whereas, this letter is brought to you, saying—communication." A usual ending of such letters is, "Do thou consider this." Some begin with the words "Communication." The fuller form also seems to be an abbreviation. An inferior scribe, addressing his superior, thus begins: "The scribe Penta-en salutes your lord, the chief librarian, Amem-em-an, of the royal white house. This comes to inform my lord. Again I salute your lord. Whereas I learn to have been the commands imposed upon me by your lord, well and truly, completely and thoroughly? I have done no wrong. Again I salute your lord." He ends, "Behold, this message is to inform my lord." A more easy style is seen in a letter of a son to his father, which begins, "The scribe Amen-mesu salutes [his] father, captain of bowmen, Bek-en-phant," and ends "Farewell." A military officer writing to another, and a scribe writing to a militiaman, is very frequent; the latter saults the former, asks a prayer for the king before the formula "Communication." A royal or government letter is a mere written decree, without any formal introduction, and ending with an injunction to obey it. The contents of these letters are always addressed to the persons written to, the writer using the first person singular. The subject-matter is various, and perhaps gives us a better idea of the literary ability of the Egyptians, and their lively national character, than any other of their compositions (see Goodwin on the "Horaiie Papyri," in the Cambridge Essays, 1855, p. 226 sq.). Indeed in Egypt everything of importance was committed to writing (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg., ii, 176, alridg.,) and the monuments constantly depict scribes taking an inventory or check of all sorts of operations. See Egypt.

In the books of Scripture written after the return from Babylon, mention is made of letters of the enemies of the Jews to the kings of Persia, and of the kings to these persons, the Jews, or their officers, some of which are given. These are in an official style, with a greeting, and sometimes an address. The letter to Artaxerxes contains the form, "Be it known unto the king," "Be it known unto the king" ( Ezra iv, 11-16); and his answer thus begins, "Peace [or "welfare"], and so forth" (17-22), the expression "and so forth" occurring elsewhere in such a manner that it seems to be used by the transcriber for brevity's sake (10, 11; vii, 12). It must, therefore, not be compared to the common modern Arabic formula of commencement. After the [usual] salutations. The letter of the opponents of the Jews to Darius (Hystaspis) thus begins: "Unto Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king" (6-17). The letter of Artaxerxes (Chosroes) to Ezra is a written decree, and not an ordinary letter, save in form (vii, 11, 26). Nehemiah asked for, and was granted, letters from the same king to the governors and the keeper of the king's forest (Neh, ii, 7, 9). When he was rebuilding Jerusalem, Sanballat sent him "an open letter" by his servant, repeating an invented rumor of the Jews' intention to rebel (vi, 5, 7): no doubt it was not sealed purposely, either in order that the rumor should be so spread as if by accident, or to show disrespect. At this time many letters passed between the nobles of Judah and Tobiah, and letter-writing seems to have been common (17; see also 19). In Esther we read of exactly the same custom as that spoken of in the case of Jezebel's letter, the authority
of writings with the king's name and seal, even if not written by him. It is related that Ahasuerus "took his signet to the north and gave it to Haman," who composed letters to be written containing a mandate: "In the name of king Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king's signet" (Esth. iii. 10, 12, 18). In like manner, the same authority was given to Esther and Mordecai, and it is remarked, "For the writing which is written in the name of the king and signed with the king's signet, may not be revealed" (viii. 7, 8).

The influence of Persian, and yet more, perhaps, that of Greek civilization, led to the more frequent use of letters as a means of intercourse. Whatever doubts may be entertained as to the genuineness of the epistles of Esther and Mordecai, of James (i. 30; xii, 6, 30; xv, 1, 16; 2 Macc. xi. 16, 34), indicates that they were recognised as having altogether superseded the older plan of messages orally delivered. See LETTER.

The two stages of the history of the N.T. present in this respect a very striking contrast. The list of the canonical books shows how largely epistles were used in the expansion and organization of the Church. Those which have survived may be regarded as the representatives of many others that are lost. We are perhaps entitled to the belief that the absence of all mention of written letters from the Gospel history is just as noticeable. With the exception of the spurious letter to Abgarus (q. v.) of Edessa (Euseb. H. E., i. 18) there are no epistles of Jesus. The explanation of this is to be found partly in the circumstance of one who, known as the "carpenter's son," was training as his disciples those who, like himself, belonged to the class of laborers and peasants, partly in the fact that it was by personal rather than by written teaching that the work of the prophetic office, which he represented and perfected, was to be accomplished. See JESUS CHRIST.

In the Acts of the Apostles we have the short epistle addressed by the apostolic council held at Jerusalem to the Gentile converts in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia (Acts xv. 23-24). There is also a letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix, which may be supposed to preserve the official style of the provinces. Both use the common Greek formulas, beginning, after the names of the writer and the person written to, with the salutation, and ending with the adieu. The epistles of the N.T. in their outward form as such might be expected from men who were brought into contact with the Roman civil and literary life and, of course, themselves belonging to a different race, and so reproducing the imported style with only partial accuracy. They begin (the Epistle to the Hebrews and 1 John excepted) with the names of the writer, and those to whom the epistle is addressed, putting the name of the writer first. In the case of salutation (analogous to the ἀγαθὰς ἱεράς ἑορτὰς of Greek, the S., S. D., or S. D. M., salutem, salutem dicit, salutem dici multam, of Latin correspondence)—generally in Paul's Epistles in some combination of the words "grace, mercy, and peace" (χάριν, ἀγάπην, εἰρήνην); in others, as in Acts xx, 23; James i, 1, with the closer equivalent of χάριν, "greeting," which last is never used by Paul. Then the letter itself commences in the first person, the singular and plural being used, as in the letters of Cicero, indiscriminately (comp. 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 8, 15; 1 Thess. iii, 1, 2; and passim).

When the individual Epistles have been answered, questions answered, truths enforced, there come the individual messages, characteristic, in Paul's Epistles especially, of one who never allowed his personal affections to be swallowed up in the greatness of his work. They are all marked by a propriety modified by the fact that the letters were dictated to an amanuensis. When he had done his work, the apostle took up the pen o reed, and added, in his own large characters (Gal. vi, 11), the authenticating autograph, sometimes with special stress on the fact that this was his writing (1 Cor. xvi, 21; Gal. vi, 11; Col. iv, 18; 2 Thess. iii, 17), always with one of the closing formulae of salutation, "Grace be with thee"—the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.—In one instance, Rom. xvi, 22, the amanuensis in his own name adds his salutation. In the "farewell" (βαφτιστὶ of Acts xxiii, 38; βαφτιστὶ of Acts xv, 29) we have the equivalents to the sake, sále, which formed the customary conclusion of Roman letters. It need hardly be said that the fact that Paul used an amanuensis in this way accounts for many of their most striking peculiarities, the frequent digressions, the long parentheses, the vehemence and energy as of a man who is speaking strongly as his feelings prompt him rather than writing calmly. An allusion in 2 Cor. i, 9 brings before us the class of these letters which had been in frequent use in the early ages of the Christian Church, the ἱερατικὰ ὑπομνήματα, or letters of recommendation, by which travellers or teachers were commended by one church to the good offices of the others (there may be a reference to Apollo in Acts xvi, 27). Thus did it come to the Church of Corinth relying on these. Paul appeals to his converts as Christ's epistle (ἵππος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. iii, 3), written, "not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God." For other particulars as to the matters and implements used for epistles, see WARRING.

EPISTLES, APOSTOLICAL. All the revelations of God to mankind rest upon history. Therefore in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, the history of the deeds of God stands first, as being the basis of holy instruction, and the developments of the theories of the prophets. In the case of the New Testament the themes of the apostles are the contents of the times of the New Testament; and at the conclusion of the New Testament stands its only prophetic book, the Revelation of John.

1. THE PAULINE epistles are thirteen in number, or fourteen, if we add to them the epistle to the Hebrews. Three of these are distinctly styled the Pastoral Epistles, namely, those to Timothy and Titus, as being chiefly on the duties of the pastors. Up to our days the genuineness of the first thirteen epistles of Paul has almost unanimously been recognized in Germany, with the exception only of the pastoral epistles, and more especially those to Titus and Philemon. It is less that the emendations and Beuer have attacked the genuineness of all the three pastoral epistles, and Schleiermacher that of the first epistle to Timothy. Indeed, the very peculiar character of the Pauline epistles is so striking to any reader, that it is hard to imagine that any one could read these epistles of Paul and fail to believe the personal character of the apostle may be most beautifully traced in his epistle to the Philippian and in that to Philemon. (On many peculiarities of the Pauline epistles, see Laurent, New Testament Studies, Gotha, 1886.) See PAUL.

All Pauline writings, except the one to the Romans, were called forth by circumstances and particular occasions in the affairs of the communities to which they were addressed. It is believed that all the apostolical epistles of Paul have been preserved; for the inference from 2 Cor. v. 9, 10 here can not be made out as the manuscripts. Eissfeldt in this case has been lost, but not warranted by the language and circumstances. See CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO. From Col. iv, 16, it has also been concluded—though probably erroneously, since there perhaps the letter to the Ephesians is referred to—that another letter to the community of Laodicea has like-
wise been lost. See Laodiceans, Epistles to and from. Presse of business usually compelled Paul—
as was, besides, not uncommon in those times—to use his companions as amanuenses. He mentions (Gal. vi, 3) that some private complaints that he had written this letter with his own hand. This circumstance may greatly have favored the temptation to forge letters in his name, because, since the period of Alexanderine literature, it was not unusual to indite spurious books, as is evident from Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. p. 23); and, accordingly, Eusebius has made complaints about the falsification of their letters. Paul alludes to this (2 Thess. ii, 2), and therefore writes the greeting (2 Thess. iii, 17) with his own hand. Paul himself exhorted the communities mutually to impart to each other his letters to that end, and read them aloud in their assemblies (Col. iv, 16). It is therefore probable that copies of these letters had been early made by the several communities, and deposited in the form of collections. So long, therefore, as the various communities transmitted the manuscripts to each other, no other letters, it is obvious, could controul or extinguish collections than to whose genuineness the communities to whom they were originally addressed bore witness. Even Peter (2 Pet. iii, 16) seems to have had before him a number of Paul's letters, as, about forty years later, a number of letters of Ignatius were transmitted by Polycarp to Sardis. Indeed, Paul's letter addressed to him directed them to him (Ep. Polyc. sub. fin.; Eus. Hist. Eccles. iii, 56). The Pauline collection, in contradiction to the Gospels, passed by the name of ἀπ' εὐαγγελον, or "The Apostle." The letters of Paul may be chronologically arranged as those written before his first Roman imprisonment, those written during it, and those written after it: thus, (a), beginning with his first letter to the Thessalonians, and concluding with that to the Romans, embracing an interval of about six years (A.D. 49-55); (b) Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, about two years (A.D. 57-59); and (c), his letter to Titus and his second to Timothy, about two years (A.D. 63-64). See Acts (of the Apocalypse). In our Bibles, however, the letters are arranged according to the pre-eminent parts and stations of the communities to whom they were addressed, and conclude with the epistles to the two bishops and a private letter to Philudem. (See each in its proper place.)

That these epistles offered great difficulties was already felt in the earliest times (2 Peter iii, 16). In the Roman Church their true understanding was more particularly lost in the 12th century. It is understood by the law only the opus operatum of the ceremonial law; consequently the Roman Church could not comprehend justification by faith, and taught instead justification by works. As soon, therefore, as the true understanding of these epistles dawned upon Luther, his breach with the Roman Church was decided. See Justification.

2. The Catholic epistles. There is, in the first instance, a diversity of opinion respecting their name: some refer it to their writers (letters from all the other apostles who had entered the stage of authorship along with Paul); some, again, to their contents (letters of no special, but general Christian tenor); others, again, to the recipients (letters addressed to no community in particular). None of these views, however, is free from difficulties. The first and the second views—and more, indeed, as something of a circumstance to harmonize with the idiomatic expressions in the extant pages of the ancient writers; the second is, besides, contradicted by the fact that the letter of James is of a special tenor, while, on the contrary, that to the Romans is, as it were, a general letter as to that he had written "Catholic" or ἤλθεν τῇ ἁγ. (v.) in that sense. The third opinion is most delicately justified by passages from the ancient writers (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. v. 18; Clem. Alex. Strom. iv, 15, ed. Potter, p. 606; Orig. cf. Col. i, 63).

The Pauline epistles all had their particular directions, while the letters of Peter, James, John, and Jude were circular epistles. The epistles 2 and 3 John were subsequently added, and included on account of their shortness, and to this collection was given the name Catholic Letters, in contradiction to the Pauline, which were addressed to particular churches or individuals. The dates of nearly all of them are later than those of Paul, but their precise time is uncertain. See each in its order; also under Acts (or the Apostolic History) and Hebrews (q. v.).

3. Literature.—Besides the general Introductions (q. v.) to the N.T., or parts of it, and the Prolegomena in most modern commentaries on each epistle, there is a wide range of general discussion relating to them which cannot be here profitably reviewed. Special treatises only can be enumerated, and even those not exhaustively. On the autograph letters there are monographs in Latin by Ratzebus (Hannov. 1752) and Stoech (Guelph. 1751); on ecclesiastical letters in general, and their various descriptions, by Berg (Jen. 1666), Bucchin (Taurin. 1720), Breckel (Hafn. 1711-1712), Friederici (Gotha, 1754), Kleising (Lips. 1744), Muller (Stad. 1862), Peszold (Lips. 1868), Schmid (Helmt. 1718), Spies (Altorf. 1745); also Dodwell (Discert. Cyriq. Vox. 1864, p. 17 sqq.); Cassabrius (Not. Concil. Lugd. 1870, p. 275 sqq.); introductory in general, by Braun (Selecta Philol. Lugd. 1811-1812), Kiepert (Ueber den Apostol. 1799), Kohler (Germ. Lips. 1830); and of the catholic epistles specially, by Storr (Tub. 1789), Tiegel (Rost. 1807), Stãddker (Gott. 1790).

Special Commentaries on all the epistles of the N.T. are the following, or the works of which the latter are denoted by an asterisk (*): Casselendor: Compendium (ed. Chandler. Lond. 1722, 12mo); Card. Cajetan, Enarratio (Ven. 1581, Par. 1589, 1587, 1546, Antw. 1611, fol.; Paris, 1540, Lugd. 1566, 1549, Paris, 1501, 1505, 8vo; also in Opp. v.); Tittelmann, Erklärung (Antw. 1545, 8vo); Schottius, Erklärung (Lips. 1547, Lugd. 1558, 12mo); Bullinger, Commentarius (Tigur. 1587, 1549, 1558, 1582, 1863, 1803, fol.); Pellican, Commentarius (Tigurini, 1589, fol.); Gagnonius, Schölia (Par. 1543, 1547, 1550, 1663, 1629, 1838, 8vo); Politus (or Catharinius), Commentarius (Rom. 1546, Ven. 1551, Par. 1564, fol.; Bredy, Commentarius (Gotha, 1755, 12mo, fol.); Buonricci, Parâfrasi (Ven. 1665, 4to); Bexa, Erklärung (Genev. 1565, 1570, 8vo); Hemming, Commentarius (Lips. 1572, Vittemb. 1576, Fret. 1579, Argent. 1589, fol.); Arias Montanus, Erklärung (Antw. 1568, 8vo); Guazzoni, Hervisitulite (Tigur. 1597, 8vo); Eyrthomius, Erklärung (Gos. 1605, 8vo, 4 vols. 4to); *Lucins, Erklärungen (on nearly all the epistles) (Rost. 1610, 4to); *Esa, Commentarius (Duoci, 1614-6, Colon. 1631, Paris, 1638, 1640, 1658, 1660, 1667, 1679, fol.); Vorstius, Commentarius (on most of the epistles) (Amst. and Herder. 1631, 4to); Fabrichius, Acalypha (in Catenara, Lips. 1634, 1639, fol.); Gomarus, Erklärung (in Opp. 1644, fol.); Dickson, Commentarius (Glasg. 1645, 4to; in English, Lond. 1659, fol.); Trapp, Commentarius (Lond. 1647, 4to); Godeau, Paraphrases (Par. 1651, 6 vols. 1659, 1675, Lyons, 1663, 8 vols. 12mo); Vayron, Commentarius (Lov. 1658, Paris, 1674, fol.); Anon. Verklärung (Amst. 1679, 4to); *Whitby, Commentarius (London, 1700, fol., and since with others); Huhn, Commentarius (Yittemb. 1707, fol.); Joel Alexander, Commentarius (Rothm. 1710, 2 vols. 4to); Pyle, Paraphrases (London. 1725, 8vo); *Halle, 1726, 8vo; *Loed Pioneer, and Benson, Paraphrase (published separately, London, 1733-52, 3 vols. 4to; upon the same plan, and together forming a commentary on all the epistles); Dale, Analysis (London, 1737, 2 vols. 8vo); Weitenauer, Erklärung, etc. (Aug. Vind. 1747, 4to); *Leblanc, Erklärung (Leipzig, 1782-9, 3 vols. 8vo); Nibbit, Illustration (Lond. 1787, 1789; in Germ., Nürnberg, 1790, 8vo); Bahrdt, Erklärung (Berlin, 1787-9, 3 vols. 8vo); Prizovicus, Copitiation.
EPISTLES OF BARNABAS

(3:18, 19) Consequences of apostasy:
1. The apostate becomes an enemy of God and man.
2. He spreads false teaching and leads others astray.
3. His influence weakens the church and the spread of the gospel.

EPISTLES, SPURIOUS

(3:18, 19) The apostate's role in spreading heresy:
1. He distorts doctrine to fit his own agenda.
2. His teachings are characterized by a lack of respect for the authority of the apostles and the writings of Scripture.
3. The resulting confusion and division among believers can lead to spiritual harm.

EPISTLES OF BARNABAS

(3:18, 19) Barnabas's purpose:
1. To warn against false teaching and the dangers it poses to true doctrine.
2. To encourage a return to the simplicity and purity of the early church's faith.
3. To foster a spirit of unity and love among believers despite the challenges of heresy.

EPISTLES, SPURIOUS

(3:18, 19) The influence of false teaching:
1. It can erode the foundations of true faith.
2. It undermines the credibility of the church.
3. It can lead to moral and spiritual decay among believers.
It seems certain that those now extant are the same which were known to Jerome and Augustine. The genuineness of these letters has been maintained by some learned men, but by far the greater number rejects them as forgeries. Jerome conceives them to be a forgery of the fourth century, founded on Philip. iv. 22. Indeed, there are few persons mentioned in the New Testament as companions of the apostle who have not had some spurious piece or other fathered on them. See SEXTUS.

As among the apocryphal letters now universally rejected are the well-known Epistle of Leontius to the Roman senate, giving a description of the person of Christ (Ortodoxographia, p. 2, Basil. 1655; Fabricii Cod. Epigraphi, 1710), and some pretended epistles of the Virgin Mary. One of those is said to be written in Hebrew, and addressed to the Christians of Messina in Sicily, of which a Latin translation has been published, and its genuineness strongly vindicated (Veritas Vindicata, 1892, fol.). It is dated from Jerusalem, in the 4th year "of our Son," none of July, Lxxxv 17, Ferra quinque. The metropolitan church of our Lord of the Letter, at Messina, takes its name from the possession of this celebrated epistle, of which some have pretended that even the autograph still exists. An epistle of the Virgin to the Florentines has been also celebrated, and there is extant a pretended letter from the same to St. Ignatius. None of these, however, has received any general acceptance as genuine. In like manner, three of these spurious letters, see Fabricii, Cod. Apocryph. N. T. iv. 492. See JESUS CHRIST.

For other spurious epistles, see APOCRYPHA.

Epistola. When the ancient Christians were about to travel into a foreign country, they took with them letters of credence from their own bishop, in order that they might communicate with another church. These letters were of three kinds: first, the epistola communicatoria, given to persons of quality, or persons whose reputation had been called in question, or to the clergy who had occasion to travel into foreign countries; secondly, the epistola dicionaria, such as were given by the bishops to the clergy when removing from one diocese to another. All these were called epistola formatae, because they were written in a peculiar form, with certain marks, which served to distinguish them from counterfeits. — Farrar, Eccles. Dictionary, a. v.; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. ii, ch. iv.

Epistola Obscurorum Virorum (Epistles of obscuri viri, Men), a celebrated collection of letters by anonymous persons, among them the one known as Prisca Euphrasii, and the Church of Rome in general, were castigated with pungent satire. The special occasion for the publication of these epistles was a bitter controversy between the learned Reuchlin (q. v.) on the one hand, and a converted Jew named Pfeifferkorn, and the Dominicans of Cologne (headed by Hochstraten [q. v.]), the inquisitor, and by Prior Ortuinus Gratius) on the other. The latter advocated the expulsion of all Jews from Germany, the burning of their books, and the forcible education of their children in the Christian religion. Reuchlin, being asked for his opinion, advised that only the writings of the Jews against Christianity should be burned. The bishop of Spires declared in favor of Reuchlin. Pope Leo X, who personally cared more about the friendship of the Humanists than about the Church, but who, as pope, dared not withstand the皇帝 (the emperor). The Humanists now organized themselves everywhere into a league, and flooded Germany with books against the fanatical monks. Among these books, the Epistola Obscurorum Virorum are the most celebrated. They survive in the following forms:

1. The type, which were of very poor quality, and abound in abbreviations, were a studious imitation of those used by Quintilius of Cologne, the publisher of Pfeifferkorn and the Dominicans. The name of Al-
three last-named editions. See, besides the authors already cited, Herzel, Real-Encyklop. iv, 111; Wetzer u. Weis, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 633.

Epistole Præstantium Víorum, a valuable collection of letters illustrating the history of the Ar-

menians and Nogarmans. See Præstantiarum

Státum ac Eruditorum Víorum Epistole Ecclesiásticas et

Theològicas varii argumenti, inter quos eminent or, quas o


Grotio, Casp. Barloso, conscripta sunt. (Amst. 1600, 5vo

2d ed. Amst. 1694, fol.).

Epistulae (plur. aris), a term used in Biblical

criticism (q. v.) to distinguish those MS. Lectionaries

(q. v.) or selections from the Greek Text, anciently

employed in Church service that contained selections from

the epistles only. See Manuscripts of the Bible.

Epistolarium. The office of the Holy Communion

was in the early ages of the Church contained in

four volumes, viz. the Antiphoner, the Lectionary, the


The second of these, the Lectionary, was the book of the

epistles read at mass (Du Cange, Glossarium, s. v. Le-

ctionarium), generally called the Epistolarium, also Co-

masium et Apostolorum.—Procter, On the Book of Common

Prayer, p. 9.

Epistaphia (επιστάφαι), funeral obsequies. It was

usual in the early Church to make funeral obsequies

(λυγοι επιστάφων) in praise of those who had been

distinguished during life by their virtues and merits.

Several of these are extant, as that of Eusebius at the

funeral of Constantine; those of Ambrose on the death

of Theodosius and Valentinian, and of his own brother

Satyrus; those of Gregory of Nazianzus upon his fa-

ther, his brother Cassarius, and his sister Gorgonia;

and that of Gregory of Nyssa upon the death of Melitius,

bishop of Antioch.—Riddle, Christ. Antiq. bk. viii, ch. iii.

Epoch. 1. The point of time, usually marked by

some important event, from which a series of years,

termed an era, is computed or dated; although

"epoch" and "era" are often used synonymously for

either a chronological period or date in general (see

Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Era). An era properly so

called the ancient Hebrews did not possess. Signal

events in human history have been made use of as points

date of which are mentioned. Moses, like Herodotus, reckoned

generations. The Exodus, as may be seen in Exod.

xii, 34, and noted in Prov. i. 27, probably also, the build-

ing of the first Temple (1 Kings ix, 10; 2 Chron. iii, 2),

were employed as starting-points to aid in assigning

events' position in historical succession. Also

the destruction of the first Temple, or the beginning

of the Babylonish captivity (in the summer of the year

B.C. 586), and the liberation of the Jews from the Syri-

an yoke by the valor of the Maccabees (in the autumn

of the year B.C. 145), were used as epochs from which

time was reckoned. After the manner of other na-

tions, the Hebrews computed time by the succession

of their princes, as may be seen throughout the books

of Kings and Chronicles. At a later period, and in

the first book of the Maccabees, what is termed the

Greek era, or that of the Seleucidae, began to be em-

ployed. This era, which is also called the era of the

Syro-Macedonians, commences from the year of Rome

444 (b.c. 198), or the death of Alexander, and

311 years and four months before the birth of the

Saviour. For the commencement of the

Fourth, the epoch of the first conquest of Seleucus Nica-

tor in that part of the West which afterwards com-

posed the immense empire of Syria (see Noris, Annae

et epocha Syro-Macdonum, Lips. 1696).

The Julian year is dated from Roman months after

July 1 of the year 46 BC, on which September 23, to

which the difference between the styles then amounted.

The alteration was effected in the month of September, the

day which would have been the third being called the

fourteenth. See Vulgar Era. 
EQUOVIATION.

The following summary shows the correspondence of the principal epochs, eras, and periods with that of the birth of Christ, or Christian era. (A valuable treatise on *Eras of ancient and modern Times* may be found in the *Companion to the Almanac*, 1880.) See also **Era**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Commencement</th>
<th>Abbrev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>5003, Sept. 1</td>
<td>A.M. Gr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiana</td>
<td>5003, Mar. 21 or Apr. 1</td>
<td>A.M. Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrina</td>
<td>5003, Feb. 22</td>
<td>A.M. Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrina</td>
<td>5002, Aug. 29</td>
<td>A.M. Al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrina</td>
<td>5002, Sept. 2</td>
<td>A.M. Ant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian period</td>
<td>4728, Jan. 1</td>
<td>J. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundane era</td>
<td>4552, July 22</td>
<td>H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish era</td>
<td>3761, vern. equinox</td>
<td>A.M. Jud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish civil era</td>
<td>3751, Oct.</td>
<td>A.M. Jud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenic year of World</td>
<td>3237, July 25</td>
<td>A.M. Abs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of Troy</td>
<td>1184, June 12 or 24</td>
<td>E. Troj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep. of Solomon’s Temple</td>
<td>1748, n. moon of summer solstice</td>
<td>Olym.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era of the Olympiad</td>
<td>714, n. moon of summer solstice</td>
<td>Olym.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Rome</td>
<td>753, April 1</td>
<td>A. T. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Roman empire</td>
<td>741, Feb. 26</td>
<td>A. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep. of Daniel’s 70 weeks</td>
<td>456, vern. equinox</td>
<td>A. T. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metonic cycle</td>
<td>437, July 10</td>
<td>Met. Cyc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callicipperiod</td>
<td>380, n. moon of summer solstice</td>
<td>Cal. Per.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaeno-period</td>
<td>293, June</td>
<td>E. Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syro- Macedonian era</td>
<td>312, Sept. 1</td>
<td>E. Selen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syro-Macedonian era</td>
<td>312, April 19</td>
<td>E. Selen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bactrian era</td>
<td>110, Oct.</td>
<td>E. Sid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu era of Vrāmānida- tya</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian era</td>
<td>48, Jan. 1</td>
<td>E. Jul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etrusco-canaanite era</td>
<td>36, Jan. 1</td>
<td>E. Can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era of Actium</td>
<td>20, Jan. 1</td>
<td>E. Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actium era in 8677</td>
<td>20, Sept. 1</td>
<td>E. Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punican indiction</td>
<td>3, Dec. 25 or Jan. 1</td>
<td>Post. Ind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indict. of Constantinople</td>
<td>3, Sept. 1</td>
<td>Ind. Const.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Epworth League.** See p. 1046 of this vol.

**Equiuitus, a lay abbey of many monasteries, both male and female, in the province of Valeria, who lived in the 6th century. The year both of his birth and death are unknown. He had not taken orders, but he nevertheless very active in preaching. He was therefore denounced at Rome, and the pope summoned him before his tribunal, but the great and general reputation of Equiuitus induced the pope to dismiss the case. Equiuitus led a very ascetic life, and is said to have always, during many travels, carried the Bible with him. According to Baronius, pope Gregory I was a monk according to the rule of St. Equiuitus, but this is denied by other writers. —Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iv, 113; Wetzler u. Weiler, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 636. (A. J. S.)

**Equity** is that exact rule of righteousness or justice which is to be observed between man and man. Observe in this respect that, just as it is a sin to break a promise, it is a sin to break a promise. It is in these words: All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets (Matt. vii, 12).

This golden rule, says Dr. Watts, has many excellent properties in it. 1. It is a rule that is easy to be understood, and easy to apply by the meanest and weakest understanding.2. It is a very short rule, but it is remembered that a weakest memory can retain it; and the meanest of mankind may carry this about with them, and have it ready at all occasions. 3. This excellent precept carries greater evidence to the conscience, and a stronger degree of conviction in it, than any other rule of moral virtue. 4. It is a precept fitted for practice, because it includes in it a powerful motive to stir us up to do what it enjoins. 5. It is such a rule as, if well applied, will always almost secure our neighbor from injury, and secure us from guilt if we should chance to hurt him. 6. It is a rule as much fitted to awaken us to sincere repentance as any. "The true creation of it as it is to direct us to our present duty. 7. It is a most extensive rule, with regard to all the stations, ranks, and characters of mankind, for it is perfectly suited to them all. 8. It is a most comprehensive rule with regard to all the actions and duties that concern our neighbors. It teaches us to regulate our temper and behavior, and promote tenderness, benevolence, gentleness, etc. 9. It is also a rule of the highest prudence with regard to ourselves, and promotes our own interest in the best manner. 10. This rule is fitted to make us altogether as happy as any other state of things will admit. See Watts, *Sermons*, serm. 33, vol. i; Evans, *Sermons*, serm. 28. See also for the principles of this rule. **Equivoication** (quæ, coqu, to use one word in different senses). How absolute the knife is! We must speak the same word, equity or equivocation will undo us. (Homer, act v, scene 1). In morals, to equivoicate is to offend against the truth by using language of double or double meaning, in one sense, with the intention of its being understood in another—or in either sense according to circumstances. The ancient oracles gave responses of ambiguous or double meaning. Scripture would mean, 'Edward of the covenant shall not the deed be good; but with it after notice, the meaning would be, 'Edward will not, to fear the deed is good.' Henry Garnet, who was tried for his participation in the Gunpowder Plot, thus expressed himself in a paper dated March 26, 1585-6: 'Concerning *equivoication*, it is my opinion: in moral affairs, and in the common intercourse of life, when the truth is asked among friends, it is not lawful to use *equivoication* for that would cause great mischief in society; wherefore, in such cases, there is no place for *equivoication*. Equiuitus —Bede where it becomes lawful to an individual for his defense, or for avoiding any injustice or loss, for obtaining any important advantage, without danger or mischief to any other person, then *equivoication is lawful* (Jardine, *Gunpowder Plot*, p. 225). Dr. Johnson would not allow his servant to say if the was not at home when he really was. 'A servant's strict regard for truth,' said he, 'must be weakened by such a practice. A philosopher may know that it is merely a form of denial, but few servants are such nice distinguishers. If I custom a servant to tell a lie for me, have I reason to apprehend that he will tell many lies for himself?' (Boswell, *Journal*.) There may be *equivoication* in sound as well as in sense. It is told that the queen of George III asked one of the dignitaries of the Church if ladies might *knot* on
Sunday. His reply was, Ladies may not; which, in no sense sound, is equivocal."—Flamsteed, Vocabularium Philosophiae, s. v.

Ere (Heb. id. "תַּחַלָּתָה," "watchful; Sept. and N. T. "חָלָה"); Vulg. Her.,) the name of three men. See also Ezr.

1. The eldest son of the patriarch Judah by Bath-Shuah (daughter of Shua), a Canaanite. His wife was Tamar, but he had no issue, and his widow eventually became the mother of Pharez and Zara by Judah. Er was wicked ("חָלָה," a paranomasia of "חָלָה") in the sight of the Lord, and the Lord slew him. (Gen. xxviii, 3-7; Num. xxxvi, 19). B.C. cir. 1896. It does not appear whether the nature of his sin was; but, from his Canaanitish birth on the mother's side, it was probably connected with the abominable idolatries of Canaan.

2. A son of Shelah (Judah's son), and "father" of Leah (1 Chron. iv. 21). B.C. prob. ante 1618.


Era. See Era.

Eraf. See Talhud.

E'tran (Heb. 'E'ran, "נְבָאָלָה,") Sept. 

E'rani (Heb. with the art. "ה-"Erawn, "נְבָאָלָה"): Vulg. Heresia, A. V. "the Eranatis"); a patronymic designation of the descendants of the Ephraimite Eran (Num. xxvi, 56).

Erasmus, Desiderius, was born at Rotterdam, October 28, 1467 (1600). His father's name was Gerhard, his mother's Margaret: she were never married. The boy was called Gerhardus Gerhardi, which he changed into the name Desiderius Erasmus (properly Erasmianus), having the same meaning in Latin and Greek (ερασμίος). The father went to Rome. Being informed that Margaretha was dead, he entered into a convent; but finding her alive, he changed her alms to the training of their son. At six he was a chorister in the cathedral at Utrecht. At nine he was sent to school at Deventer, where he had for school-fellow a youth who afterwards became pope, Calixtus V. He displayed great talent at Deventer that it was even then predicted that he would one day be the most learned man in Germany. After the death of his parents, when he was under fourteen, his guardians determined to make a monk of him; in order, it is said, that they might secure his patriotism for themselves. He refused to enter the monastic life; but his guardians placed him in the seminary at Herzogenbusch, where, as he says, he spent three useless and unhappy years. He was then put at the monastic house of Zion, near Delft, and finally he entered the Augustinian monastery of Emals, or Stein, near Gouda. Here, after sturdy resistance, he entered on his novitiate in 1486. His life at Stein was unhappy, except so far as it was relieved by study, to which he devoted all the time possible. His hatred of monkery increased with each year of his stay in the monastery. In 1493, the bishop of Cambray, desiring a capable Latinist as his secretary for a projected journey to Rome, obtained permission for Erasmus to leave the convent. The journey did not come off, and Erasmus (who was ordained priest in 1492) remained some years under the bishop of Cambray, who authorized him to proceed to Paris to continue his studies, instead of returning to the monastic life. At Paris, Erasmus barely supported himself by taking pupils, and he suffered greatly from sickness and poverty. He afterwards attributed his weakness of constitution to his wretched food and unwholesome lodgings in Paris. After a short visit to Cambray and to Rome, and for his health, he returned to Paris, where his pension from the bishop failed, and he taught for his bread. Among his pupils was Lord William Mountjoy, who ever after remained his friend and patron. For him he wrote the treatise De Hereditatibus.

Mountjoy offered him a pension to accompany him to England. Erasmus passed a year there (1498-9), chiefly at London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and became acquainted with many Englishmen distinguished for piety and learning. At Oxford he studied in St. Mary's College. He made many connections which were afterwards of use to him. Among his special friends were Colet, Grocyn, Latimer, and the celebrated chancellor Thomas More. From England Erasmus returned to Paris, where he again supported himself by pupils. In 1499 he returned to the Continent, and spent his time chiefly in studying Greek, and in translating Greek authors into Latin. He had no fixed abode; now he was in Paris, and again in the provinces of France or in Holland. The Adages and the Enchiridion Militis Christiani were published between 1500 and 1504. He began his Biblical studies also about this time, publishing in 1506 a new edition of the Remarks of Laundrenius Valli on the N. T. In 1505 he spent a short time in England, where he made the acquaintance of Archbishop Warham, to whom he dedicated his translation of the Hecateus. He relinquished his long-cherished desire of visiting Italy, where he succeeded in obtaining from Pope Julius II a dispensation from his monastic vows. At Tarin he was made D.D. (1506), and his time was divided between Bologna, Rome, Florence, and Paris. He published his Adagia (1500) under the instruction of the best Greek and Italian scholars. In 1517 he superintended, at Venice, a new edition of his Adagia, printed by the celebrated Aldus Manutius. "At Rome he met with a flattering reception, and promises of high advancement; but, having engaged to return to England, he did so in 1510, in the expectation that the recent accession of Henry VIII., with whom he had for some time maintained a correspondence, would insure to him an honorable provision." On the journey he wrote the work which gave him his greatest celebrity for the time, the Encomium Moriae (Panegyric on Folly), which he dedicated to Thomas More. He lived "for some time at Cambridge, where he was appointed Lady Margaret professor (in divinity), and also lectured on Greek. His lodging was in Queen's College, in the grounds of which Encausus, or the Walk, is still shown. In 1509, at the request of Colet, he published Copiis Verborum ac rerum, long in use as a school-book. He accepted an invitation from the archdeacon, afterwards Charles V., and went to Brabant in 1514, with the office of counsellor, and a salary of 290 florins. After this we find him resident sometimes in the Netherlands, sometimes at Basel, where the great work in which he had been
many years engaged, the first edition of the New Testament in Greek was published in 1516, accompanied by a new Latin translation. Some amusing specimens of the objections made to this undertaking by the ignorant clergy will be found in his 'Letters' (vi, 2) (Eng. Cyclop.). It was dedicated to pope Leo X. His fame had by this time spread all over Europe; he and Bucerius were called the Erasists. From that time period onward he resided chiefly at Basel, though his wandering habits were never entirely shaken off. The second edition of his N. T. appeared in 1519, and prefixed to it was his Ratio novi Methodus compendiose perniciænullius (also prefixed to the first, 1516, and together with his Paraphrases in N. T. (1594, fol., and 1596, fol.). The Paraphrases were so much esteemed in England that it was made the duty of every parish church, by an order in council (1547), to possess a copy of them. Erasmus's Latin translation of the New Testament (London, 1545, 12mo. fol., by Udall, Coverdale, and others; 2d edit. 1551) As Erasmus had decided to remain in the Church of Rome, his residence at Basel became an uneasy one when the Reformation got possession of that city. In 1529 he removed to Freiburg, in Breisgau, where he built himself a luxurious villa, called the Erasmus House, and his own residence (1535, fol.). This house was called the 'Erasmus' or the 'Erasists.' Erasmus's Latin translation of the New Testament during his whole life was prodigious. He early imbibed a love for the ancient classics, and contributed largely to increase the taste for ancient culture by his writings in praise of them, by his editions of classic authors, and by his attacks on the scholastic theologv. He had an almost religious contempt for the ignorance of the monks. He worked incessantly at various branches, and completed his works with great rapidity; he had not the patience to revise and polish them, and accordingly most of them were printed exactly as he threw them out; but this very circumstance rendered them universally acceptable; their great charm was that they communicated the trains of thought which passed through a rich, acute, witty, intrepid, and cultivated mind, just as they arose, and without any reservations. Who remarked the many errors which escaped him? His manner of narrating, which still rivets the attention, is so simple and so easy to follow away (Ranke, Reformation, by Austin, bk. ii, chap. i). His Ciceronius is an elegant and stinging satire on the folly of those pedants who, with a blind devotion, refused to use in their compositions any words or phrases not found in Cicero's works. His own Latin style is clear and elegant; not always strictly classical, but like that of one who spoke and wrote Latin as readily as his mother tongue. His 'Letters,' comprising those of many learned men to himself, form a most valuable and amusing collection to those who are interested in the manners and literary histories of the age in which they were written; and several of them in particular are highly valuable to Englishmen as containing a picture of the manners of the English of that day (Eng. Cyclop.). But, of all his writings, the only ones that are likely to retain a lasting place in literature are the Colloquies, and the Panegyric on Folly—writings of his comparative youth, and regarded by him rather as pastime. For neither as a wit nor as a poet was he perhaps even a bit of a poet, and in his Colloquies and Panegyric on Folly rank among master intellects; and in the other departments of literature no one has ventured to claim for him a more elevated station. His real glory is to have opened at once new channels of popular and of erudition knowledge, to have given a great impulse to the study of ancient history and literature, and to have lived and written for noble ends—to have been surpassed by none in the compass of his learning, or the collective value of his works—and to have prepared the way for a mighty revolution, which it required moral qualities far loftier than his to accomplish. For the soul of this great man did not partake of the energy of his intellectual faculties. He repeatedly confesses that he had none of the spirit of a martyr, and the acknowledgment is made in the tone of sarcasm rather than in that of regret. He belonged to that class of actors on the scene of life who only appear (most often) when the great social changes—men gifted with the power to discern and the hardihood to proclaim truths of which they want the courage to encounter the infallible results; who outstrung their generation in thought, but lag behind it in action; players at the statute book, as long as reforming appears at an indefinite distance; more ostentatious of their mental superiority than anxious for the well-being of mankind; dreaming that the dark page of history may hereafter become a fairy tale, in which enchantment will bring to pass a glorious catastrophe, unthought of by the public, and so supine, and suffering; and therefore overwhelmed with alarm when the edifice begins to totter, of which their own hands have hatched the foundation. He was a reformer until the Reformation became a fearful reality; a jester at the bullwarks of the papacy until they began to give way; a propagator of the Scriptures until men betook themselves to the study and the application of them; depreciating the mere outward forms of religion until they had come to be estimated at their real value; in short, a learned, ingenious, benevolent, amiable, direct, honest man, who, bearing the responsibility, and not assigned to others the greatest horror of this human mind from the bondage of a thousand years. The distance between his career and that of Luther was therefore continually enlarging, until they at length moved in opposite directions, and met each other with mutual animosity (Edinburgh Review, lxviii, 392).

The relations of Erasmus to the Reformation have been summarily stated in the paragraph just cited. He was the literary precursor of the Reformation. His exegetical writings prepared the way for later expositors, opened a new era in Biblical criticism, and also aided in giving the Bible its Protestant position as the rule of faith. His satires upon the monks, upon the scholastic theology, and upon Church abuses generally, contributed largely to prepare the minds of literary men throughout Europe for a rupture with Rome. He taught, in his perfect knowledge of Church knowledge should be drawn from the original sources, viz. the Scriptures, which he said should be translated into all tongues. In his Encomium Moriae, Folly is introduced as an interlocutor who turns into ridicule all the schemes and projects that are then going on, that all have lost themselves, the syllogisms with which they labor to sustain the Church as Atlas does the heavens, the intolerant zeal with which they persecute every different of opinion. She then comes to the ignorance, the dirt, the strange and ludicrous pursuits of the monks, their barbarous and obtrusive style of preaching; she attacks the bishops, who are more solicitous
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for gold than for the safety of souls; who think they do enough if they dress themselves in the triclinial costume, and under the name of the most revered, most holy, and most beloved fathers in God, pronounce a blessing or a curse; and, lastly, boldly assails the court of Rome and the pope himself, who, she says, takes only the pleasures of his station, and leaves its duties to St. Peter and St. Paul. Among the curious works published are a Latin commentary on St. Luke's Epistle, with which the book was adorned, the pope appears with his triple crown. It produced an indescribable effect: twenty-seven editions appeared even during the lifetime of Erasmus; it was translated into all languages, and greatly contributed to confirm the age in the "new science" (Erkenntnis), but the personal character of Erasmus was not fitted for such storms as those of the Reformation. Intellectually, he was too many-sided and too undecided; morally, he was of too flaccid a fibre, too timid, and too fond of ease, to devote himself to a certain strife with very uncertain issues. Moreover, he never touched on religious convictions or experience. The monks, nevertheless, were right in a certain extent in their saying that "Erasmus laid the egg; Luther hatched it. At first Erasmus regarded Luther with favor as a confessor, in his attacks upon the ignorance of the monks, and the reforms of literature. But Luther saw the weakness and spiritual poverty of Erasmus, and expressed his fears in letters to Spalatin and Lange as early as 1517; while Erasmus, in letters to Zwingle, deprecated the haste and vehemence with which Luther was proceeding (March 28). Luther wrote: a friendly letter to Erasmus, who was in reply (April 30): "I hold myself aloof from the controversies of the times to devote my whole strength to literature. After all, more is to be gained by moderation than by passion; so Christ conquered the world. It is better to guide others than to abuse, or despise the authority of the papacy than against individual popes."

In 1520, Frederick, elector of Saxony, meeting Erasmus at Cogne, asked his opinion of Luther; his reply was, "Lutherus pessimi in divinis, nempe quod legitur coram populo pontificum et clericorum: Luther has committed two blunders; he has ventured to touch the crown of the pope and the bellies of the monks... but his language is too violent," etc. He expressed similar cautions in a letter to Justus Jonas at the time of the Diet of Worms (1521). The earnest Ulrich von Hohenheim, the most sincere of the early Protestants, side, but in vain. In 1522 Hutton published an Expositio cum Erasmo, abounding in bitter invective, to which Erasmus replied in Spongia adversus Hutteni expergientes (Basel, 1523) (see Gieseler, Church History, ed. by Smith, iv, § 8). Luther is said to have denounced both these pamphlets as disgraceful. Luther wrote (1524) to Erasmus an earnest letter, urging him, if he would not join the Reformers, at least to refrain from open opposition. "You might, indeed, have aided us much by your wit and your eloquence; but, since you have not the disposition and the courage for this, we would have you serve God in your own way. Only we feared, lest our adversaries should entice you to write against us, and that necessity should compel us to oppose you to your face. If you cannot, dear Erasmus, assert our opinions, be persuaded to let the same issue, and remain suited to your taste" (Bibl. Sacra, 1866, p. 129). "From this time Erasmus complains incessantly of the hostility of the Evangelicals. The haughty style in which Luther offered him peace (in the letter above cited) could only have the effect upon that ambitious man of giving him the larger weight to the required time, and reached him at the same time from England, that he would take revenge upon Luther for his attack upon the royal author (Henry VIII). And so, to assail the formidable Luther in the weakest part of his theological system, Erasmus wrote his treatise De Libero Arbitrio (Sept. 1524). Luther replied with his usual bitterness in his De Serro Arbitrio (Dec. 1523). Erasmus replied in like vein in his Hyperepistulae (1526). Thus the renowned Erasmus now passed over into the ranks of the enemies of the Reformation, though he did not cease to recommend conciliatory measures towards it" (Gieseler, l. c.).

The writings of Erasmus were collected and published by several hands, but much drawn together by his friend Leclerc, under the title Des Erasmi Opera Omnia, edenda et auctiora, etc. (L. Bat. 1708-9, 10 vols. in 11 fol.). He edited many of the fathers, viz. Origen, Ireneaus, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, Laetantius, and translations of selections from them are given in his Opera Omnia (1877). His most popular works (the Encomium, Adagogia, Colloquia, etc.) are very numerous. There are English versions of the following: Panegyric upon Folly (two translations: one by Chaloner, the other by Kennet; often printed); Colloquies (1671, and often, especially in selections); Erasmus the Philosopher (1838, and often); Christian's Manual (from the Excommunication Militia, London, 1816, 8vo); Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher (chiefly from Erasmus, London, 1787, small 8vo); De Contemptu Mundi (Lond. 1580, 16mo); De Immensis Dei Missione et Mercem (London, 1787, 2 vols. 12mo); Jocelin, Life of Erasmus (London, 1788, best ed. 1806, 8 vols. 8vo; abridged by Laycey, London, 1805, 8vo) Hues, Leben des Erasmus (Zurich, 1790); Butler, Life of Erasmus (London, 1825, 8vo); Niceat, in Studia et Monumen. (Paris, 1835); Müller, Leben des Erasmus (Hamburg, 1838, 8vo; reviewed by Ullmann, Studien u. Krit. 1829, p. 1); Glausi, On Erasms as Church Reformer (a crowned prize-essay in the Dutch Language, the Hague, 1850). See also Bayle, Dictionary (s. v. Erasmus); Dupin, Autour des Ecoles, tom. xiii; Waddington, History of the Reformation, 1841), ch. xxii; by Well, A Biographical History of the Reformations, vol. i; Hoefert, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xvi, 207; Hallam, History of Literature (Harper's ed.), i, 154 sq.; Mackintosh, Miscellanea Works (London, 1851), i, 190 sq.; Christ. Examiner, xliii, 80; Christian Quarterly Review, April, 1861; and Theological Quarterly, Nov. 1850, p. 581; Bibliotheca Sacra, xix, 106; Brit. and For. Ec. Review, July, 1867, p. 577; H. Rogers, in Good Words, Feb. 1868.

Erasatism; the title generally given to "that system which would rest the government of the Church spiritual as well as civil altogether in the Christian magistrate." This, however, was far from being an invention of Erasmus, since in every kingdom of Europe the Roman claims had been in use on the like principles for centuries before he was born; the peculiarity of Erasmus's teaching lay rather in his refusing the right of excommunication to the Christian Church (see Oxf. Hooker, Ed. Pref. p. liii)" (Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s. v.). Hardwick proposes "byzantinism" as the proper title for the theory named instead of "Erasitism" (History of the Reformation, chap. viii, p. 856). See also Nichols, Anecdotes of Bonny identifies his person, the Church of England and Erasitism (Lond. 1854); Hagenbach, History of Documents (Smith's ed.), ii, 296; Cunningham, Historical Theology, ii, 569; Orme, Life and Times of Baxter, i, 71; Christian Review, viii, 579; and the articles CHURCH; DISCIPLINE; ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY; ERASUS, THOMAS.

Eras'tus (Ἐράστος, bearded, an old Greek name, Diog. Laert. iii, 91), a Corinthian, and one of Paul's disciples, whose salutations he sends from Corinth to
ment or communion of the Lord's Supper—was not vice or immorality, but a difference in theological opinion with the church from which he sought the privilege. The church was to decide who were its members, and thereby entitled to partake in its privilege, but not those who were entitled to take upon itself the punish- ment of offences by withholding these privileges or by inflicting any other punishment on the ground of moral misconduct. Few authors so often referred to have been so little read as Erastus. The original theses are very rare. An English translation was published in 1857, and was received with approbation by Robert Lee in 1843. By some intractable exaggeration, it had become the popular view of the doctrines of Erastus that his leading principle was to maintain the authority of the civil magistrate over the conscience, and to subject all ecclesiastical bodies to his direction and control, both in their doctrine and their discipline. In the discussions in the Church of Scotland, of which the result was the secession of a large body of the clergy and people because it was found that the Church could not make a law to nullify the operation of lay patronage, those who maintained within the Church the principle of Erastus in its highest form, were branded by the Church as separatists, and Erastus as a term of reproach. As in all cases where such words as Socinian, Arian, Antinomian, etc., are used in polemical debates, the party rejected with disdain the name thus applied to it. But it is singular that this name should have been dropped, when one is thought of thinking that the controversy in which Erastus was engaged was about a totally different matter, and that only a few general and very vague remarks in his writings have given occasion for the supposition that he must have held the principle that all ecclesiastical authorities are subordinate to the civil. Erastus died at Basel on the 31st Dec., 1 Jan., 1588.


Bredt. Paulinus, a German Franciscan monk, professor of theology at the University of Freiburg, was born at Vertoch in 1787. He displayed much zeal in opposing infidelity, both by his translations from English and French as well as his own works. The most important of his works is Historia literaria theologica opuscula octodecim libris comprehensa, avus ad historiam literariam theologicae redditum; ad admirandissimam litterariae in urbe Augusta, 1785, 4 vols. 8vo. Eras died Dec. 16, 1800.

Brebinti, Village of (Ερμοσίνθος οικ. house of chick-peas), a place on the line of Titus's wall of circumvallation around Jerusalem during the final siege (Josephus, War, v, 12, 2); apparently on the brow of the hill opposite Mount Zion, on the west. See JERUSALEM. Eusebius speaks of a village Ermontika (Ερμοντικα, Onomast. s. v.), situated, however, in the south of Judea, which Reland thinks (Pallat. p. 766) is the same as the Betherebin (Βαιτερέβις) mentioned by Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. ix, 27).

E'rech (Heb. E'rech, אֶרֶךְ, length; Sept. Ὠραθ, Vulg. Arach), one of the cities which formed the beginning of Niniroth and the end of the plain of Carmel (Gen. x, 10). It is not said that he built these cities, but that he established his power over them; from which we may conclude that they previously existed. It was probably also the city of the ARCHSEVETS, who were among those who were transplanted to Samaria by the Exile (2 Chron. xxxiv, 20). Until recently, the received opinion, following the authority of St. Ephrem, Jerome, and the Targumists, identified Ereh with Edea or Calirhoe (now Urfa), a town in the north-west of Mesopotamia. This opinion is supported by Von Bohlen (Intro to Gen. p. 283), who connects the name Calirhoe with the Biblical Edessa as through the Syriac form Erothou, suggesting the Greek word ἔρος. This identification is, however, untenable: Edeasa was
probably built by Seleucus, and could not, therefore, have been in existence in Ezra's time (Ezra iv, 9), and the extent thus given to the land of Shinar presents a great advantage. Ezech must be sought in the neighborhood of Babylon. Geoemius (Theaur. p. 161), following Bochart (Philea, iv, 16), rather seeks the name in that of the Sidonians. Among the ancient accounts, which was on the Tigris, upon the borders of Babylonia and Susiana (Ptolemy, vi, β; Ammian. Marcell. xxiii, 6, 26). This was probably the same city which Herodotus (i, 185; vi, 119) calls Αρδήσσικα (Αρδησικας), i.e. Great Ezech. Rosenmüller happily conjectures (Atlen. iii, 22) that Ezech probably derived from Babylon than Aracca; and this has lately been confirmed by Col. Taylor, the British resident at Bagdad, who is disposed to find the site of the ancient Ezech in the great mounds of primitive ruins, indifferently called Irak, Iruk, Wurka, and Senedhak, by the nomad Arahs, and sometimes El-Akapi, "the place of pebbles" (Bonomi, Vincen. p. 40). These mounds, which are now surrounded by the almost perpetual marshes and inundations of the lower Euphrates, lie some miles east of that stream, about midway between the site of Babylon and the junction of the intestine. This is doubtless the same as Orchōs (Ορχος) 82 miles south, and 42 east of Babylon (Ptolemy, vi, 20, 7), the modern designations of the site bearing a considerable affinity to both the original names. It is likewise probable that the Αρειμίς (Αρειμις) described by Strabo as an aristocratic part of the Chaldees residing near Babylon (xxi, p. 739); in Ptolemy as a people of Arabia living near the Persian Gulf (v, 12, 2); and in Pliny as an agricultural population, who banked up the waters of the Euphrates, and compelled them to flow into the Tigris (vi, 27, 81), were really inhabitants of Orchōs and of the district surrounding it. This place appears to have been the necropolis of the Assyrian kings, the whole neighborhood being covered with mounds, and strewn with the remains of bricks and coffins. Some of the bricks bear a monogram of "the moon," and Col. Rawlinson surmises that the name Ezech may be nothing more than that of Της, the Heb. name for that luminary (Athenæum, 1854, No. 1377); but the orthography does not sustain this conjecture. Some have thought that the name of Ezech may be preserved in that of Irak (Irak-Arabi), which is given to the region inclosed by the two rivers in the lower part of their course. (See Chesney. Euphrates and Tigris, p. 178; Airisworth. Babyl. and Assyr. p. 178; Loftus, Chaldea, p. 160 sqq., where a full description is given.) For another Ezech, probably in Palestine, see Archi.

Eremite (ερείπιος, desert), one who lives in a wilderness, or other solitude, for purposes of religious contemplation. The name was given in the ancient Church to those Christians who fled from the persecutors of Christianity into the wilderness, and there, isolated from all other men, gave themselves up to life of rigid asceticism. Paul of Thebes is called the first eremite, and he soon found numerous followers. From the association of eremites the cenobites arose, who, in turn, form the transition to the monastic orders, which became in the Church of Rome and in the Eastern Church the most common form of organized asceticism. The name eremite remained, however, in use both for those who, in opposition to monastic association, preferred the eremitic life, and for a number of orders or branches of orders (orders of eremites), which either retained some customs in the life of the original eremites, or which made special provisions that their members might live in entire isolation from each other, meeting only for the celebration of divine service. Thus the proper name of the Augustinians (q. v.) was the community of St. Augustine, although they became, in fact, a regular order. There were also eremites belonging to the orders of Francisca (q. v.), Camaldulenses (q. v.), Celestines (q. v.), Hieronymites (q. v.), and Servites (q. v.). Among the other orders of the eremites were the Eremites of St. John the Baptist (see John the Baptist, Eremites of), and the Eremites of St. Paul. See Paul, St., Eremites of.

Eres. See Eder.

Erfurt, a city in the Prussian province of Saxony, with, in 1865, 84,308 inhabitants. In 741, Erfurt became the seat of a bishop, but St. Adalar was the last as well as the first bishop, the see being united with that of Mentz. In 1378 the city received permission from the pope residing at Avignon (Clement VII) to hold a diocesan synod, and the permission was confirmed in 1389 by the Roman pope Urban V. In 1892 the university was opened, being the fifth university of Germany. At the beginning of the 16th century, Luther was for some time one of its professors. Subsequently its reputation dwindled down, and it was abolished in 1818. —Wetzer u. Wetzel, Kirchen-Lexikon, iii, 661.

Erhard, Bishop. See Hildesl.

Eri (Heb. ἔριν, ἕριν, watchful), the fifth son of the patriarch Gad (Gen. xlvi, 16; Sept. ἄρογις, Vulg. Hērē), and progenitor (Num. xxvi, 16; Sept. Ἀττις, Vulg. Herē) of the Erites (q. v.). B.C. 1856.

Erio IX (according to some historians VIII), sursum, the saint, a king of Sweden. He was the son of Jedward, a "good and rich yeoman," as he is called in an old mediaeval chronicle, and of Cecilia, the sister of king Eric Arsal. Having become king of Sweden, his chief endavor was the Christianization of Sweden. He conquered southern Finland, and compelled the inhabitants to adopt the Christian religion. He also united Norway with Sweden. In the war against the Danish prince Magnús, he fell in a battle near the town of Upsala, May 18, 1160.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gén. xvi, 243.

Erigena. See Scotus Erigena.

Erite (Heb. collect. with the art. הָרֵי, הָרֵית, Sept. [appar. everywhere in this name reading ה for ה] יָרֵית, Vulg. Herē, A. V. "the Erites"), a patronymic designation (Num. xxvi, 16) of the descendants of the Gadite Eri (q. v.).

Erizatay (Sargis or Sirges), a learned Armenian bishop, born towards the middle of the 13th century, at Eriza or Ardzandjan, a city of Armenia. In 1290, John the Catholic, brother of St. Hagop, called him to his court, and made him his secretary. In 1291 he was consecrated bishop of Ardzandjan, and, a short time after, the king of the Armenians of Cilicia (Hayton or Hethoum II) made him almoner of his palace. In 1306 he was present at the national council which was held at Sic, capital of Cilicia, and died a short time after. He wrote a treatise on The Hierarchic, and several other works, which remain in MS.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gén. xvi, 258.

Erlangen, a city in Bavaria, with a population of 18,628 inhabitants, mostly Protestant. It is the seat of one of three universities of Bavaria, with a Lutheran theological faculty. The University was founded in 1742 by the margrave Friedrich of Brandenburg-Baireuth for his residence, but in 1743 transferred to Erlangen. The University has in modern times been a chief seat of the Confessional party in the Lutheran Church. (A. J. S.)

Ernestei, Johann August, an eminent critic and scholar, was born Aug. 4, 1707, at Tennstedt, in Thuringia. He completed his academic studies at Wittenberg and Leipsic. In 1712 he became professor of ancient literature at Leipsic, and in 1738 doctor and professor of theology there. He founded the two last named professorships together till 1740, when he gave up the former to his nephew, August Wilhelm. He...
died Sept. 11, 1781. He distinguished himself greatly by his philological and classical publications, and also by the new light which his theory of interpretation threw upon the sacred Scriptures. He adopted from Weisstein the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, and gave it its final development. Among the most important of his critical and philological writings are Opuscula philologico-critica (Amster. 1762, 8vo):—

Opuscula oratoria, orationes, prolusiones et eloquia (Leyd. 1767 and 1787, 8vo):—Archaeologia littariorum (Leips. 1773, 1 vol. 8vo). He also wrote Selecta epistolae sophronicae (Leips. 1786; 7th ed. 1783, 8vo). The style of this work, his adherents say, is the best known is his Proverbialem Arabicorum Centuria Due (Leyden, 1614)* (Chambers, s. v.).

ERROR. "Knowledge being to be had only of visible certain truth, error is not a fault of our knowledge, but of our judgment, giving assent to the which is true (Locke, Essay on Human Understanding, bk. iv, ch. xx). "The true," said Bossuet, after Augustine, "is that which is, the false is that which is not," To err is to fail of attaining to the true, which we do when we think that to be which is not, or think that not to be which is. Therefore to err is not in things which exist in the mind of him who errs, or judges not according to the truth. Our faculties, when employed within their proper sphere, are fitted to give us the knowledge of truth. We err by a wrong use of them. The causes of error are partly in objects of knowledge and partly in ourselves. It is only the truth that real which exists, it is only the true and real which can reveal itself. But it may not reveal itself fully, and man, taking a part for the whole, or partial evidence for complete evidence, falls into error. Hence it is that all error has some truth. To discover the relation which this partial truth bears on the whole truth is to discover the origin of the error. The causes in ourselves which lead to error arise from wrong views of our faculties and of the conditions under which they operate. Indolence, precipitation, passion, custom, authority, and education may also contribute to lead us into error (Bacon, Novum Organum, lib. i: Malebranche, Recherche de la Verité; Descartes, Of Method; Locke, Of Human Understanding, bk. vi, c. xx)."—Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, pp. 166-167.

Erskine, Ebenezer, an eminent and pious Scotch divine, founder of the "Secession Church." He was born in the parish of the Bass Rock, June 22, 1680, and educated at the University of Edinburgh, where he acted for some time as tutor and chaplain in the family of the earl of Rothes, and became a licentiate in divinity in 1702. In 1708 he was chosen minister of Portmoak, in the shire of Kinross, and became a very popular preacher. He accepted a charge in Stirling in 1781. "Mr. Erskine's first difference with his colleague of the Church of Scotland was in his support of the principles of the 'Marrow of Modern Divinity,' a subject of great contention during the early part of the 18th century. He was one of several clergymen who, in connection with this subject, were 'rebuked and admonished' by the General Assembly. The secession of the body, headed by Mr. Erskine, was occasioned by the operation of the act of queen Anne's reign restoring lay patronage in the Church of Scotland, and, though not in all respects technically the same, it was virtually on the same ground as the late secession of 'The Free Church.' The Presbyterianism of Kinross, led by Erskine's brother Ralph, had refused to induct a presenter forced on an objecting congregation by the law of patronage. In 1792, the General Assembly enjoined the presbytery to receive the presenter. At the same time the latter had been ordered to regulate the patronage, which, as it tended to enforce the law of patronage, was offensive to Mr. Erskine, and he preached against it. After some discur...
sion, the General Assembly decided that he should be 'rebuked and admonished,' confirming a decision of the inferior ecclesiastical courts. Against this decision Mr. Erskine entered a 'protest,' in which he was joined by several of his brethren. He was afterwards suspended from his functions, but he functionally subsistently endeavored to smooth the way for his restoration, but he declined to take advantage of it, and he and his friends, including his brother Ralph, formally seceded in 1736. When the Secession was divided into the two sects of Burghers and anti-Burghers, Mr. Erskine and his brother went into the latter party. He died on the 2d of June, 1756. The Secession Church, reunited by the junction of the Burghers and anti-Burghers in 1820, remained a distinct body till 1847, when a union being effected with the Relief Synod (a body which arose from Mr. Gillespie's secession from the Established Church of Scotland in 1752), the congregations assumed the name of the United Presbyterian Church' ('English Cyclopedia). Erskine bore a very high reputation as a scholar. His writings are collected in The whole Works of Erskine, 2 volumes, Edinburgh, 1799. See Moreland, E.., 227 sqq. See Seeckers; Scotland, Church of; United Presbyterian Church.

Erskine, John, D.D., an eminent Scotch divine, was born in Edinburgh, June 2, 1721, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. His father (author of the Institutes of the Laws of Scotland) wished him to devote himself to law, but finally yielded to his son's desire that he should study theology. At twenty he published an essay on The Law of Nature sufficiently propagating a blosom world, aiming to show that the ignorance and unbelief of the heathen is not due to want of evidence (Rom. i., 29). In 1743 he was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Dunblane, and in 1744 he became minister of Kirkintilloch. In 1748, Mr. Erskine, and other evangelical clergy of the Established Church, invited Whitefield into their pulpit. The animated discussion took place, in which Mr. Erskine triumphantly defended himself. Such a course required courage at a time when the character and doctrine of Whitefield, as well as his open-air preaching, were often assailed. In 1758, when his hospital was dissolved, he was appointed a chaplain in the army, and in the following year Mr. Erskine published An essay intended to promote the more frequent dispensation of the Lord's Supper. In 1758 he was translated to Cullross, and in 1758 to New Greyfriars' church, Edinburgh. Here he prepared his Theological Disquisitions (Lond. 1767), which, in the two succeeding volumes, he published as follows: one on the Covenant of Sinai, one on Sense Finding, and one on the Apostolic Churches. He also edited a new edition of Hervey's Theorem and Apologist, with a preface against John Wesley, written with some bitterness, which gave rise to some letters between Erskine and Wesley, in which the latter appears to have had the advantage (Wesley, Works, N. York ed. vi., 125 sq., 74). In 1779 he published anonymously a pamphlet under the title 'Shall I go to war with my American brethren?' to expose the impolicy of such a contest. On the occasion of the hostile visit of the American ambassador, he repulsed him with his name, following it up with another, entitled Reflections on the Rise, Progress, and probable Consequences of the present Controversies with the Colonies, in which he urged the duty of the mother country resorting to conciliatory measures. In 1776 he issued a third pamphlet, written in German, called Wider die Vermuthungen der Goernern in the Messures that have occasioned the American Revolt tried by the sacred Oracles. On this subject Erskine was one of the few clear-sighted men of the time in Great Britain. When nearly sixty he studied Dutch and German in order to read the Continental dunciad; the fruit of these studies appeared in Sketches and Hints of Church History and Theological Controversy, translated or abridged from foreign Writers (Edinburgh, 1790-97, 2 vols. 12mo). He died January 19, 1803. After his death appeared his Discourses (Edinburgh, 1818, 2 vols. 12mo).--Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 139; Jones, Christian Biography, p. 191; Wellwood, Life of Erskine.

Erskine, Ralph, brother of Ebenzer, was born at Monilawa, Northumberland, March 18, 1805, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1729 he became minister at Dunfermline. In 1734 he joined his brother and others in their secession from the Church. See Seeckers. He died Nov. 6, 1752. He was a preacher of great popular abilities, devotional and zealous. His sermons are collected under the title Sermons and other practical Works, consisting of about 150 sermons, besides his poetic pieces, to which is prefixed an account of the author's life and writings (Falkirk, 2 vols. 12mo, 1794-96).--Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, i., 1808.

Erubim. See Talmd.

Erythrian Sibyl. See Sibyl.


E'zar-had'don (Heb. Esar-haddon, בֶּשֶׁר אָדָדִּון, perhaps skin with Pers. Abro-daws, gift of fire; Sept. ἀραθοδών [in Exer ἀραθοδών] v. r. ἀραθοδών, in Tob. i., 31, ἀραθοδών; Josephus, Antiq. x., 1, 5, ἀραθοδώνα, the son and successor of Sennacherib (2 Kings xix., 20, etc.). Nothing is really known of Ezer-haddon until his succession (B.C. cir. 680; see Col. Rawlinson in the Lond. Aenemos, Aug. 22, 1865), which seems to have followed quietly and without difficulty on the murder of his father and the flight of his guilty brothers (2 Kings xix., 20; Isa. xxvii., 26). It may, perhaps, be concluded from this that he was at the death of his father the eldest son, Assaradadus, the Babylonian vicerey, having died previously. It is impossible to fix the length of Ezer-haddon's reign, or the order of the events which occurred in it. Little is known to us of his history but from his own record, and they have not come down to us in the shape of annals, but only in the form of a general summary (see them translated by H. F. Talbot, in the Jour. of Soc. Est. April, 1859, p. 68-79). That he reigned thirteen years at Babylon is certain from the Candace Tolomei, the Governor of Egypt, who had a shorter time in Assyria. He may, however, have reigned longer, for it is not improbable that after a while he felt sufficiently secure of the affections of the Babylonians to re-establish the old system of vice-regal government in their country. Saosudchumus may have been set up as an interlocutor in the matter of authority in B.C. 667, and he may have withdrawn to Nineveh, and continued to reign there for some time
longer. His many expeditions and his great works seem to indicate, if not even to require, a reign of some considerable duration. It has been conjectured that he died about B.C. 660, after occupying the throne for twenty years. He appears to have been succeeded by his son, Rezin, or, if not Rezin, then his son-in-law, Ser- dani-pal, or Saldua. Rezin is mentioned by the Chronicler as being the prince for whom he had built a palace in his own lifetime. No farther mention is made of this monarch in Scripture but that he settled certain colonists in Samaria (Ezra iv, 2). See ASAPH-PRIEST.

Ezra-Christ appears by his monuments to have been one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful of all the Assyrian monarchs. He carried his arms over all Asia between the Persian Gulf, the Armenian mountains, and the Mediterranean. Towards the east he engaged in wars with Median tribes "of which his father had never heard thiellim," towards the west he extended his influence over Cilicia and Cyprus; towards the south he claimed authority over Egypt and Ethiopia. In consequence of the disaffection of Babylon, and its frequent revolts from former Assyrian kings, Esar-haddon, having subdued the sons of all those kings who held sway in that country, introduced the new policy of substituting for the former government by viceroyes a direct dependence upon the Assyrian crown. He did not reduce Babylonia to a province, or attempt its actual absorption into the empire, but united it to his kingdom in the way that Hanun had united it to Judah until 1484, when he held both crowns himself, and residing now at one and now at the other capital. He is the only Assyrian monarch whom we find to have actually reigned at Babylon, where he built himself a palace, bricks from which have been recently recovered bearing his name. By his Babylonian reign lasted thirteen years, from B.C. 680 to B.C. 667, and it was undoubtedly within this space of time that Manasseh, king of Judah, having been seized by his captains at Jerusalem on a charge of rebellion, was brought before the Assyrian monarch or his captains (2 Chron. xxxvi, 11), and destined for a long time as prisoner there. This must therefore have been Esar-haddon, who, persuaded of his innocence, or excusing his guilt, eventually restored him to his throne (comp. ver. 13), thus giving a proof of clemency not very usual in an Oriental monarch. It seems not to have been in a spirit of compassion, according to the inscriptions, gave a territory upon the Persian Gulf to a son of Merodach-Baladan, who submitted to his authority and became a refugee at his court. As a builder of great works Esar-haddon is particularly distinguished. Besides his palace at Babylon, which he also has already mentioned, he had three others in different parts of his dominions, either for himself or his son, while in a single inscription he mentions the erection by the hands of no fewer than thirty temples in Assyria and Mesopotamia. His works appear to have possessed a peculiar magnificence. He describes his temples as "shining with silver and gold," and boasts of his Nineveh palace that it was "a building such as the kings his fathers who went before him had never made." The south-west palace at Nimrud is the best preserved of his constructions. This building, which had been excavated by the usual dull and dreary process, is remarkable for the carefulness of its plan as well as for the scale on which it is constructed. It corresponds in its general design almost exactly with the palace of Solomon (1 Kings vii, 1-12), but is of larger dimensions; the great hall being 220 feet long by 150 broad. See also Nimrod, Nim. and Babel, p. 50 (3rd edit.), and the porch or antechamber 160 feet by 60. It had the usual adornment of winged bulls, colossal sphinxes, and sculptured slabs, but has furnished less to our collections than many inferior buildings, from the circumstance that it had originally been destroyed by fire, by which the stones and alabaster were split and calcined. This is the more to be regretted as there is reason to believe that Phoenician and Greek artists took part in the ornamentation. See Bridge, Hist. of Esarhaddon (Lond. 1881). Comp. Assyria.

Eszau (Heb. Esau, ‘ez-z, hairy [see Gen. xxv, 25; his surname Edom was given him from the red potage, Gen. xxv, 30; Sept. and N. T. "Hebron"), the eldest son of "Isaac, Abraham's son" (Gen. xxv, 19) by Rebekah, "the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, of Padan-aram, the sister to Laban the Syrian." The marriage remained for some time (about 19 years; comp. xxv, 20, 26) unproductive, Isaac entreated Jehovah, and Rebekah became pregnant. Led by peculiar feelings "to inquire of Jehovah," she was informed that she should give birth to twins, whose fate would be as diverse as their character, and, what in those days was strange still, that the elder should serve the younger. On occasion of her delivery, the child that was born first was "red, all over like a hairy garment; and they called his name Esau." Immediately afterwards Jacob was born. B.C. 2004. This was not the only remarkable circumstance connected with the birth of the infant. Even in the womb the twin brothers struggled together (xxv, 22). Esau was the first-born; but he was being issued into life, Jacob's hand grasped his heel. The bitter enmity of two brothers, and the increasing strife of two great nations, were thus foreshadowed as a fact (Gen. xxv, 26). From the attentive drawn to his hairy appearance, one would suppose that the name Esau (אֵזָעַ), or Essau, was intended to give expression to that quality. So have many learned men in recent as well as former times held, though they are obliged to resort to the Arabic for the etymological explanation; a word very similar in Arabic, signifying hairy. The elder Hebrew commentators, however, derived it from the root הָעַס, to make, and explained the word as signifying "made," "complete," "full-grown":-viewing the hair as an indication of premature manly vigor. But the Jews of the present day seem more disposed to fail in with the other derivation (for example, Raphall in loco). The unusual covering of hair, which not only distinguished Esau as a child, but kept pace with his growth, and in mature life gave his skin a kind of goat-like appearance (Gen. xxvii, 16), was undoubtedly meant to be indicative of the man; it was a natural sign, coeval with his very birth, by which his parents might desyer the future's fate, in whom they saw the future, and greatly preponderate over the moral and spiritual qualities of nature—a character of rough, self-willed, and untamed energy. From the word designating his hairy aspect, sear (אֶזְעַ), it is not improbable that the mountain-range which became the possession of his descendants was called Mount Sear, though it is also possible that the rough, wooded appearance of the mountain itself may have been the occasion of the name. See SEIR.

In process of time the different natural endowments of the two boys began to display their effects in dissimilar aptitudes and pursuits. While Jacob was led by his less robust make and quiet disposition to fulfill the duties of a shepherd's life, and pass his days in and around his tent, Esau was impelled, by the ardor and lofty spirit which agitated his bosom, to seek in the toils, adventures, and perils of the chase his occupation and sustenance; and, as is generally the case in such natures like his, his spirit was high repented by his bold and daring, which allied him to the martial exercises of the Canaanites (xxv, 27). He was, in fact, a thorough Beduine, a "son of the desert" (so we may translate פִּלְגָּל הַגָּלָה, man of the field), who delighted to roam free as the wind of heaven, and who was impatient of the restraints of civilized or settled life. His old father, by a caprice of affection not uncommon, loved his wildling, vagrant boy; and with hard words and coarse food being gratified by Esau's venison, he liked him all the better for his skill in hunting (xxv, 28).
In Gen. xxvi, 34, she is incorrectly called Bashemath, apparently by confusion with the name of his third wife, although her parentage is correctly given. Her only child was Eliphaz, who was therefore Esau's first-born (Gen. xxxvi, 10, 19; 1 Chron. i, 30). (2) Esau's second wife, the daughter of Aholibamah, as well as the accounts agree except that in Gen. xxvi, 34, where, by some error or variation of names, she is called Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite. Thir Anah, in Gen. xxxvi, 2, 14, is called the daughter of Zilcaon, but from ver. 20, 24, and 35, in Gen. i, 30, it is evident that he was the brother of Ajah, and his only children a son Dishon and this daughter Abihaiamah. We may also remark that this Anah and this Dishon had each an uncle of the same name respectively (Gen. xxxvi, 20, 21), and the name of another Abilamaah (Gen. xxxvi, 15, 16) to be the chief-tain of an Edomite tribe (ver. 41). Zilcaon was a son of Seir, the original settler of the mountain which went by his name. His descendants were properly called Horites (Gen. xxxvi, 20, 29), but in ver. 20 he is called a Hivite, a term frequently interchangeable for heathen or Hittite. The latter name is twice used for the same purpose. This connection of Esau with the original inhabitants of Iduma will explain his subsequent removal to that region, and the eventual supremacy of his descendants there. His children by Aholibamah were Jashar, Jaalam, and Korah. In Gen. xxxvi, 15, 16, he is called Ẓebon (Companion Gen. xxxvi, p. 325), after Hengstemberg. These sons of Esau rose to the importance of sheikhs ("dukes") in their respective families (those by Aholibamah being especially so styled, Gen. xxxvi, 18) and this was naturally more emphatically the case with his descendant (Gen. xxxvi, 19), for the name Korah is an intercalation, and Amalek is reckoned along with the legitimate children of Eliphaz; comp. the parallel account in 1 Chron. i, 36, where the name Timna is in like manner intercalated), who were probably contemporaneous with the native sheiks mentioned in ver. 29, 30, or but little later. The gradual superiority of the Edomites over the Horites appearing from the fact that the heirs of the latter (ver. 22-28) are not named with this distinction (comp. ver. 20, 21). This double line of chief-tains of the respective tribes appears to have continued for a long time; for in the subsequent genealogy the kings (ver. 31-38) and heads of the Edomite part of the inhabitants (ver. 40, 48), coming down in parallel lines to about the time of the Exode (but from what point dated is uncertain), each appears to have regularly succeeded his predecessor, not by hereditary right indeed, but by that species of common consent, founded upon acknowledged pre-eminence, which is to this day recognised in the election of Arab emirs. See Edomites.

The time for the fulfillment of the compact between the brothers has at length arrived. Isaac is "sick unto death, as well as his father, as his dying was," and his father, on hearing of the death of his son, "was grieved." The present condition of Esau is remarkably changed; the feeling of jealousy which has been characteristic of him has now given place to deep affection, and he is now "sick unto death."
Isaac, however, had lost his sight—indeed, all his senses were dull and feeble. It was therefore not very difficult to pass off Jacob upon him as Esau. Rebekah takes her measures, and, notwithstanding Jacob's fears, succeeds. Isaac, indeed, is not without suspicion, but a falsehood comes to aid Jacob in his otherwise discreditable personation of Esau. The blessing is pronounced, and thus the coveted property and ascendancy are secured. The affectionate admonitions which pass between the deceivers and the abused old blind father stand in painful contrast with the base trickery by which the mother and the son accomplish their disgraceful end. Isaac is blind, but Jacob is still more painful than the former, as it fully brings out those bitter family rivalries and divisions which were all but universal in ancient times, and which are still a disgrace to Eastern society. Esau, in his extreme forgetfulness of the patriarchal blessing, pronounces a blessing upon Jacob. Isaac, who feels the decipied and sightless father, declaring who he is.

"And Isaac trembled very exceedingly, and said, Who? where is he that hath taken venison and brought it me, and I have eaten all of before thou camest, and have blessed him? yea, and he shall be blessed." On this the elder brother, the true eldest, pleads for himself—"Bless me, even me also, O my father." Urging this entreaty again and again, even with tears, Isaac at length said to him, "Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; and by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and when thou shalt have dominion, thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck" (Gen. xxvii). Thus, deprived forever of his birthright, in virtue of the irrevocable blessing, Esau but too naturally conceived and entertained a bitter grudge against his brother Jacob, and vowed vengeance. But, fearing his aged father's patriarchal authority, he secretly congratulated himself: "The days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob" (Gen. xxvii). Thus he imagined that by one bloody deed he would regain all that had been taken from him by the means of his blind old father. He ought not to know a mother's watchful care. Not a sinister glance of his eyes, not a hasty expression of his tongue, escaped Rebekah. Words to the above effect which Esau let drop were repeated to his mother, who thereupon felt that the life of her darling son, whose gentle manner, whose graceful deportment, whose affection, was now in imminent peril; and she prevailed on her younger son to flee to his uncle Laban, who lived in Haran, there to remain until time, with its usual effect, should have mitigated Esau's wrath. B.C. 1957. The sins of both mother and child were visited upon the former. She herself died, and all her household in the attendant anxieties and dangers. By a characteristic piece of domestic policy, Rebekah succeeded both in exciting Isaac's anger against Esau, and obtaining his consent to Jacob's departure—"And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth; if Jacob take a wife such as these, what good shall my life do me?" Her object was attained at once. The blessing was renewed to Jacob, and he received his father's commands to go to Padan-aram (Gen. xxvii, 46; xxviii, 1-5).

When Esau heard that his father had commanded Jacob to take a wife of the daughters of his kinsman Laban, he also resolved to try whether by a new alliance he could propitiate his parents. He accordingly married his cousin Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael (xxviii, 9). This marriage appears to have brought him into the enmity of his brother Jacob. It was beyond the valley of Arhab. He soon afterwards established himself in Mount Seir; still retaining, however, some interest in his father's property in Southern Palestine. It is probable that his own habits, and the idolatrous practices of his wives and rising family, continued to excite and even increase the anger of his parents; and that he, consequently, considered it more prudent to remove his household to a distance. He was residing in Mount Seir when Jacob returned from Padan-aram, and had then become so rich and powerful that the impressions of his brother's early offences seem to have been almost completely effaced. Jacob, however, feared lest his elder brother might intercept him on his way, to take revenge for former injuries. He accordingly sent messengers to Esau, in order, if possible, to disarm his wrath. Esau appears to have announced in reply that he would proceed to meet his returning brother. When, therefore, Jacob was informed that Esau was on his way for this purpose with a band of forty men, he was greatly alarmed, in fear of that hostility which his conscience told him he had done something to deserve. What, then, must have been his surprise when he saw Esau running with extended arms to greet and embrace him? and Esau fell on his neck, kind and affectionate. Jacob had prepared a present for Esau, hoping thus to conciliate his favor; but, with the generous ardor which characterizes, and somewhat of the disinterestedness which adorns, natures like his, Esau at first courteously refused the gift: "I have enough, my brother; thou knowest my line." (Gen. xxvii, 9.) Jacob passed on to Damascus, and immediately after his departure turns westward across the Jordan (Gen. xxxii, 29, 30). He reached Seir (Gen. xxxiii, 18; xxxiv, 9; xxxv, 1); and took up his abode there, where he passed the remainder of his life. The whole of this encounter serves to show that, if Jacob had acquired riches, Esau had gained power and influence as well as property; and the homage which is paid to him indirectly and by implication, by Jacob, is a demonstration of the most marked and respectful manner, by the females and children of Jacob's family, leads to the supposition that he had made himself supreme in the surrounding country of Idumea. See EDOM.

It does not appear that the brothers again met until the death of their father, about twenty years afterwards. Mutual interests and mutual fear seem to have constrained them to act honestly, and even generously towards each other at this solemn interview. They united in laying Isaac's body in the cave of Machpelah. B.C. 1959. (See ROOT, Pri.Esau in property, Baal, Baal of. 1 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings.) Then, after their parting, Jacob dwelt in the land of the Canaanites, and all his substance, which he had got in the land of Canaan—such, doubtless, as his father, with Jacob's consent, had assigned to him—and went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob" (xxxv, 29; xxxvi, 6). He now saw clearly that the covenant blessings bestowed upon his children, as that of Jacob, But God doubly allotted the land of Canaan to Jacob's posterity, and that it would be folly to strive against the divine will. He knew also that as Canaan was given to Jacob, Mount Seir was given to himself (comp. xxxv, 9; xxxvii, 8; and Deut. ii, 5), and he was therefore desirous, with his increased wealth and power, to enter into full possession of his country, and drive out its old inhabitants (Deut. ii, 12). Another circumstance may have influenced him in leaving Canaan. He "lived by his sword" (Gen. xxvii, 40), and he felt that the rocky fastnesses of Edom would be a safe and suitable abode for such as by their habits provoked the hostilities of neighboring tribes than the open plains of Southern Palestine. Esau is once more presented to us (Gen. xxxvi) in a genealogical table, in which a long line of illustrious descendants is referred to "Esau, the father of the Edomites" (Gen. xxxvi, 3, 4). The country to which Esau, with his innumerable flocks, retired, was the tract of Mount Seir, from which they gradually disposed of the thinly scattered population that preceded them in its occupancy, and which they continued to occupy. It was a region entirely suited to the nomadic and roving character of the race. But in regard to the rela-
tionship between them and the seed of Israel, the remote descendants of Esau proved less pliant or generous than their progenitor; for from the time that Israel left the land of Egypt, when the two families again came into contact, the posterity of Esau seemed to remember only the old quarrel between the respective heads of the races, and to forget the brotherly reconciliation. A spirit of keenest rivalry and spite characterized their procedure towards Israel; through many a bloody conflict they strove to regain the ascendency which the decree of heaven had destined in the earlier time, and in the time of Israel's backsliding and unfaithfulness they showed themselves already, according to the prophetic word of Isaac, "to break his yoke from off their neck," and to drive the evil to the uttermost. But it was a fruitless struggle; the purpose of Heaven stood fast; the dominion reasserted with the house of Jacob; and the course of the Maccaulanean wars the children of Esau finally lost their independent existence, and became substantially merged in the house of Israel. The decree of Heaven, as we have said, had so fixed it; but that decree did not realize itself arbitrarily; the preference for Israel and his seed was no senseless favoritism; from the first the qualities were there which inevitably carried along with them the superiority in might and blessing; while, on the other hand, in Esau's carnalism, sensuality, godlessness, the destiny of his race was already marked.

If the historical outline now given is supported by the scriptural narrative, the character of Esau has not ordinarily received justice at the hands of theologians. The injurious impression against him may be traced back to a very ancient period. The Targum of Jonathan (Gen. xxiv, 34) sanctified and spread, if it did not originate, the misjudgment by unwarrantable additions to the account given in Genesis. The reason, it states, why Esau did not at once slay his brother was lost, as happened in the case of Cain and Abel, another man-child might be born, and thus he should still be deprived of house and inheritance, and be therefore or solved to wait till the death of Isaac, when the murder of Jacob would leave him in safe and undisturbed possession. Representations made in the Talmud are of a similar tendency (Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 207; Witwein, N. T. ii, 437; comp. Philo, Opp. i, 551; ii, 441, 475); and on the same principles, in the earlier fragments, the story of the hour, Hist. Orient. p. 53 sq.), Cedrenus gives (Hist. Eccl. p. 34) the story of his having been killed by an arrow discharged by Jacob. The fathers of the church, particularly Augustine, regard Esau as the representative of evil, as the type of one who, as that of the elect (see Stimpel, De saeculo Esau, Jena, 1678), basing these views upon an erroneous interpretation of such passages as Rom. xii, 16; ix, 13. (Shuckford's Connections, ii, 174; Clarke's Comment, on Gen. xxvii, xxviii; Kretzle's Daily Illustr. in loc. ; Niemeyer, Charact. ii, 153 sq.; Baumgarten, Alph. Welthlit. ii, 50 sq.; Bauer, Hbr. Gesch. I, 147; Hochhelter, Jnt. Orient. 1841. No. 35; Sherlock, Works, v; Dupin, Nouv. Bibl. iv; Evans, Script. Dog. i, Roberts, Sermons, p. 134; Puckel, Sermons, l, 96; Simeon, Works, l, 211; Alcock, Apologia for Exo, Plymouth, 1751; Townsend, Sermons [1798], p. 253; Goodwin, Paroch. Sermons, i, 1.) See JACOB.

E'SAU (Heb., Vulg. Sel), given (1 Esd. v, 29) as the name of the head of one of the families of "Temple servants" or Nethim that returned from the captivity; in place of the Zina (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra i, 40).

E'say (Hebajic, Vulg. Isaia, Isaias), the form in which the name of the prophet Isaiah (q. v.) constantly appears in the A. V. of the New Testament (Eccles. xlvi, 20; 22; 2 Esd. ii, 18). See ESAY.

Eschatology (a discussion of the last things, te-xo-xo), a branch of theology which treats of the doc-

trines concerning death, the condition of man after death, the end of this world period, resurrection, final judgment, and the final destiny of the good and the wicked. We treat it here.

I. In its Biblical aspects, especially as to the doctrine of the Bible concerning the end of the world, denoted by the title of "days," which is applied in the O. T. to the consummation of the Jewish economy by the introduction of the Messianic (Isa. ii, 2; Mic. iv, 1; comp. Acts iii, 1; Heb. i, 2), and in the N. T. is extended to the still expected developments of the first purpose respecting the Church (2 Tim. iii, 1; 2 Pet. iii, 3).

1. The Maccaullean Agr.—In the O. T. propheta the return from Babylon is often made a type of the incoming of the more glorious dispensation of the Gospel. This is the first, more obvious, and most literal of prophetic types, and particularly of Isaiah bearing upon it has therefore a double sense (q. v.) or twofold application. See Restoration of the Jews.

2. The Chaldaean Period.—This is the Christian, as the preceding was the Jewish view of the consummation of the Jewish kingdom and divine economy, so far as relates to the administration of this world. It will be treated under Millennium.

3. The Final Demise of all terrestrial Affair.—This whole branch of the subject is particularly exhibited in the Lord's discourse to his disciples upon the Mount of Olives (Matt. xxiv, xxv), in which are included two scenes of the retribution impending over Jerusalem, and the final judgment, are intimately associated together, in accordance with that almost constant practice in the Hebrew prophets by which one event is made the type and illustration of another much farther in the future. See hypostasis. This is emphatically exemplified in the vaticinations of Isaiah (q. v.), who perpetually refers to the coming glory of Christ under the figure of the nearer deliverance from Babylon, both these demises being projected upon the same plane of prophetic life, without any mention of the interval of time between; likewise in the visions of John in the Revela-

tion (q. v.), where the dr atraxiis personae are generic representations of certain principles constantly reaprearing in the history of the Church rather than confined to particular characters at one time only. Such often repeated views of the existing division of human races into "coming of the Son of Man" and its attendant phenomena, in the sketches or rather glimpses afforded us by the Scriptures into the future. See Sign of the Son of Man.

As a leading passage in Matthew, which forms the leading proof-text of eschatological treatises, the following expository hints will serve to clear up much of the obscurity and ambiguity which has been thrown around the text by the confused manner in which many interpreters have treated its predictions (see Strong's Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels, § 129; Stier, Words of Jesus, in loc.; Whedon, Commentary, in loc.; Nest, Commentary, in loc.).

(1.) The question of the apostles (Matt. xxiv, 3) relates to two distinct subjects, namely, the "coming of the Son of man" and the "end of the world." These two topics, therefore, are discussed by Christ in his reply. (More strictly, there are two questions concerning the first event, namely, "when," and "the sign." Mark and Luke evidently mean to confine their reports of this discourse to this former catastrophe, and therefore they do not mention the second inquiry as to the "end of the world," at all.) Yet, as the questioners apparently supposed that these two events would be simultaneous, or at least intimately connected (as the constant tenor of all former prophecies had naturally made them think), the answer also uses whatever language in treating the latter more in the style which their analogous nature peculiarly required. Still, the Great Teacher could not fail to give them...
true criteria by which to separate these two catastrophes, and for these we are to look in his language. That all the events pictured in Matthew's account as far as xxiv, 34 are connected with the former of these themes, namely, the demolition of Jerusalem and abolition of the Jewish polity, is certain from the declaration at that verse, that they should all occur within the then living generation; and the following verses are so intimately connected with these, as to suggest a continuity of idea and notes of simultaneity, that a disruption anywhere before ch. xxx, 31 would be very harsh and arbitrary. At this point, however, we discover clear intimations of a transition (easy indeed, as the sense is more hazardous, but the expression and metaphor would lead us to expect, yet a real and marked one) to the second subject, the general judgment. The change is introduced by the notes of time, "But [unwarrantably omitted in our translation] when . . . . then . . . ." and by the loftier tone of the style, besides the distinctive mention of "all nations" as the subjects of that adjudication (ver. 32). In the latter portion of Christ's discourse alone is employed the briefer and more general mode of prediction usual with the prophets in prefiguring far-distant events, and here only is the language all exclusively applicable to the final judgment. The expectation of the judgment at a point or intervals other than our Saviour's calculation at other points than those assumed above (xxiv, 55, and especially xxx, 31) will be noticed presently; it is sufficient here to say in general that, as the passages embraced within the medial portion (xxiv, 27-xxv, 53) are designed to be a link of connection between the two large sets of events so connected in character, they naturally assume a style that might be applied to either, borrowing some expressions in describing the former which otherwise would belong exclusively to the latter. See a similarly blended style in describing the ruin of the Thebes (the name of the place "Thebes," comp. with ii, 2; and comp. Matt. xvi, 27, 28.

Many places at the end of Matt. xxiv, 28 the transition to the final judgment; but it is difficult to extend the intimations of consequenteness that follow ("But [immediately after], But [in those days]" over such a change of style as true, the description ensuing in verses 29-31 is unusually allegorical for a prose discourse, but this is explained by the fact that it is evidently borrowed almost wholly from familiar poetic predictions of similar events. Many of these particulars, moreover, may refer, partly at least, in a literal sense, to the first catastrophe of which allusion is made in Luke xxii, 11; and in their utmost stretch of meaning they also hint at the collapse of nature in the general judgment. The objection of anachronism in this application of the "tribulation" of verse 29 as a subsequent event to "the beginning of sorrows," which refers to the incipient stages of the "tribulation" of verse 21, where the previous context shows that the distress of the first siege and preliminary campaigns are especially intended; Luke (verse 24) gives the personal incidents of the catastrophe itself as succeeding, with an allusion to the long desolation of the land that should follow; so that Christ here resumes the thread of prophetic history (which had been somewhat interrupted by the caution against the impostors who were so rife in the brief interim of the suspension of actual hostilities) by returning to the national consequences of the second end of the Heidel. The assignment of these events contained in the ensuing verses, as to take place "after the tribulation" (presumed to be that of the ace of the Jewish struggle), is the strongest argument of those who apply this whole following passage to the final judgment. But that theory overlooks the equal exclamation of "immediately after," and, moreover, fail to discriminate the precise date indicated by "that tribulation." This latter is made (in verse 21 of Matthew) simultaneous with the flight of the Christians, which could not have been practicable in the extremity of the siege, but is directed (in verse 15) to be made on the approach of the besiegers. The consummation intimated here, therefore, refers to the close of the siege (i.e. the end of itself), and the preceding rigors are those of its progress. It ought, moreover, to be considered that the fall of the capital was but the precursor of the extinction of the Jewish nationality (here typified by celestial prodigies); the utter subjugation of the country at large of course following that event. Another interpretation is, that the following passage refers to a second overthrow (the final extermination of the Jewish metropolis under the emperor Adrian in a subsequent war), as distinguished from the first under Titus; this is in fact hardly tenable by the style and language here employed, and would, moreover, require the limit "immediately" to be extended half a century farther, when the living "generation" must have entirely passed away. Nor at this later event could the "redemption" of the Christians properly be said to "draw nigh" (verse 28 of Luke), the Jews having then ceased to have any considerable power to persecute; compare the deliverance prophetically celebrated in Rev. xi, especially verses 8, 13.

(2) In the highly-wrought description of Matt. xxiv, 29; Luke xxxi, 25, 26 (which constitutes the transition point or interval), the desire of our Saviour's calculation at other points than those assumed above (xxiv, 55, and especially xxx, 31) will be noticed presently; it is sufficient here to say in general that, as the passages embraced within the medial portion (xxiv, 27-xxv, 53) are designed to be a link of connection between the two large sets of events so connected in character, they naturally assume a style that might be applied to either, borrowing some expressions in describing the former which otherwise would belong exclusively to the latter. See a similarly blended style in describing the ruin of the Thebes (the name of the place "Thebes," comp. with ii, 2; and comp. Matt. xvi, 27, 28.

Many place at the end of Matt. xxiv, 28 the transition to the final judgment; but it is difficult to extend the intimations of consequenteness that follow ("But [immediately after], But [in those days]" over such a change of style as true, the description ensuing in verses 29-31 is unusually allegorical for a prose discourse, but this is explained by the fact that it is evidently borrowed almost wholly from familiar poetic predictions of similar events. Many of these particulars, moreover, may refer, partly at least, in a literal sense, to the first catastrophe of which allusion is made in Luke xxii, 11; and in their utmost stretch of meaning they also hint at the collapse of nature in the general judgment. The objection of anachronism in this application of the "tribulation" of verse 29 as a subsequent event to "the beginning of sorrows," which refers to the incipient stages of the "tribulation" of verse 21, where the previous context shows that the distress of the first siege and preliminary campaigns are especially intended; Luke (verse 24) gives the personal incidents of the catastrophe itself as succeeding, with an allusion to the long desolation of the land that should follow; so that Christ here resumes the thread of prophetic history (which had been somewhat interrupted by the caution against the impostors who were so rife in the brief interim of the suspension of actual hostilities) by returning to the national consequences of the second end of the Heidel. The assignment of these events contained in the ensuing verses, as to take place "after the tribulation" (presumed to be that of the ace of the Jewish struggle), is the strongest argument of those who apply this whole following passage to the final judgment. But that theory overlooks the equal exclamation of "immediately after," and, moreover, fail to discriminate the precise date indicated by "that tribulation." This latter is made (in verse 21 of Matthew) simultaneous with the flight of the Christians, which could not have been practicable in the extremity of the siege, but is
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invaders), by which the Christians’ rescue from siege, sack, and especially persecution, was effected; and the ‘trumpet sound’ refers to the warning intimations which the belligerent preparations afforded them, thus giving them at once an assurance and a signal of deliverance. In the similar language of Matt. xii. 41, 49, the primary reference is to the general judgment. But in this passage as in the text it is to be gathered together his elect only, in distinction from the ‘all nations’ of Matt. xxv. 32.

At Matt. xxiv. 44 (comp. Luke xii. 41), the discourse, which previously had been slightly tinged with allusions to the second judicial coming of Christ (verses 29-30), is now almost entirely devoted to that event at its final stage, as the reply to Peter that follows indicates. Still, there is no mark that the transition to the last judgment is effected till ch. xxv. 31.

In the conclusion of the first topic of Christ’s discourse (Matt. xxv. 1-12); comp. Luke xii. 38-39; the parable in Matt. xxi. 33-40 is parallel with an earlier one of our Lord, Luke xix. 11 sq., the near antiquity of the second topic produces almost a double sense in this (and to a degree, in the preceding) parable, which is not so much the effect of direct design as the nature of the language. The treatment of the kindred subject, by the vivid presence to the mind of a sublime one which is soon to be introduced; and, indeed, scarcely any phraseology (especially in the far-reaching style of allegory) could have been consistently adopted which would not have been almost equally applicable to both events. Still, a comparison of verse 13 and ch. xxv. 36, 42 shows that the same occurrences (Jerusalem’s siege and fall) are here chiefly referred to.

3. The imaginative style of the representation of the judgment day (Matt. alone, xxv, 31-36), which is especially betrayed in the comparison with the shepherd, shepherds, their sheep and their desert, is desirable only for poetic ‘drapery,’ needed to portray the actuality of that scene of the invisible world; the body of reality couched under it consists in the fact of a universal disinhibition of mankind at a future set time by Christ in the capacity of judge, according to the eternal decree of God, which is the argument of a corresponding destiny of happiness or misery Comp. Rom. xiv, 10, 12; 2 Cor. v. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

See Cremer, Eschatologische Rede Christi (Stuttgart 1869); Dorner, Die orakeln des Christi eschatologia (Stuttgart 1876); Lippe, Die prophetischen Sprüche (Dresden 1778); Speiser, Die Propheten in der Théol. Stud. u. Krit. 1838, ii, 289; 1846, iv, 963; 1861, iii; Jour. Soc. Lit. Jan. 1857; Stowe, in Bibliotheca Sacra, vii, 452. There are special exegetical treatises on Matt. xxiv and xxv, in Latin, by Jachmann (Lips. 1749), Brandes (Aboe, 1797), and Blume (Lips. 1827); by A. von Schmid (Jen. 1777), Masch (Nov. Bibl. Labe. ii, 69). Anon. (Lips. 1809); in German, by Crome (Eisenb. u. Verlag. Bibl. ii, 849), Ammon (N. theolog. Journ. i, 1865), Jahn (in Bengel’s Archiv. ii, 79), Anon. (in Eichhorn’s Biblioth., iii, 608); Beiträge zur Hoford. xi, 118; Töllner’s Kurse serm. Aufsätze, ii, 291-360; on Christ’s coming (ραποσοι, see Advent), in Latin, by Tychoen (Gott. 1785), Schott (Jena, 1819); in German, by Baumeister (in Kläber’s Stud. i, 219-41; iii, 1-59; ii, 1-104; iii, 3-48), Schultes (Neute Apost. Nachr. 1829), p. 18-48; on the phrase οἱ αὐτόν su vô, in Latin, by Osander (Copenhagen 1761); on the second parousia, in Latin, by Gott. by Goze (Sonderarb. Hamb. 1789, 1784), Moldenhauer (ib. 1784, bis). See Kahle, Biblische Exegetik (Got. 1750).

II. THEOLOGICAL EXEGETICAL—A subdivision of systematic theology, and particularly of dogmatic theology. It generally constitutes the concluding part of systematic theology, as it treats of what constitutes both the individual Christian and for the Christian Church, as a whole, the completion of their destiny. As eschatology presupposes a belief in the immortality of the soul, some writers on dogmatic theology (as Hase) treats of it in connection with the doctrine of man, and before they treat of the Church. Others connect the doctrine of death with the doctrine of sin. On some points of eschatology, different views were held at an early period of the Church. Origen understood a passage in the Epistle to the Romans on the Apocalypse (q. v.) as meaning a final reconciliation and salvation of the wicked, and that the first will be found only at that period. See Restorationists. In modern times, some go so far as to deny all punishment after the present life, and asserting the immediate salvation of all men [see Universalists]; while others teach that mortality will be the lot of only the good, and that the wicked, after their death, will be annihilated. See Annihilationists. See also the articles Death, Intermediate State, Judgment, Heaven, Hell, Resurrection, Immortality. The Church of Rome developed the theory of a future state, different from heaven and hell, for which see the article Purgatory. No point connected with eschatology has from the earliest period of the Church been more productive of excited controversy than the doctrine of the second advent of Christ and of the Millennium. For the history of this doctrine, see the article Millennium. In German there are separate works on the eschatology of the Church and on the doctrine of the last things. H. W. Frey (Bresl. 1838, 8vo); L. Paulus Lehre v. d. letzten Dingen (Brandenburg 1837, 8vo); Valenti, Eschologie (Basel, 1840, 8vo); Karsten, Lehre von d. letzten Dingen (Rostock, 3d ed. 1861); Schulz, Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit (Göttingen, 1852); Manfen, Das Judentum und der Christentum (Berlin, 1863-1866); Noldenbach, Grundsätze der Steligkeit (Berlin, 1863); Spittgarger, Tod, Fortleben u. Auferstehung (Halle, 1868); Rink, Vom Zustande nach dem Tode (Ludwigshaven, 2d ed. 1865); Oswald, Eschatologie (Paderborn, 1868); Hagenbach, Encycl. § 89; Herzog, Beitr. Encycl. iv, 165.

Escobar y Mendones, Antonio, a Spanish Jesuit and noted casuist, was born at Valladolid in 1558, and took the vows of the order of Jesuits in 1564. He became very eminent as a preacher, and is said to have preached daily (sometimes twice a day) for fifty years. He was also a prolific writer, leaving more than forty folio volumes of ascetic divinity, sermons, casuistry, etc. His Liber Theologiae Moralis (Lyons, 1646, 7 vols. 8vo) passed through many (29 in Spain) editions, and was long the favorite text-book of the Jesuits. He also wrote Universe Theologiae Moralis problemata (Lyons, 1652, 2 vols. fol.); Universe Theol. Moralis receptores sententiae, etc. (Lyons 7 vols. fol.). Escobar had the best of Pascal’s complete edition of the letters, a fact which will carry his name to the latest posterity. His “liberality” in morals was so excessive that even some of the Jesuits was compelled to disavow some of his doctrines. His complete works fill 42 volumes. He died July 4, 1693.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xvi, 375; Alemagno, Biblioth. Scriptorum Soc. Jesu (Louvain, 1851).

ESCURIAL, or Escurial, a city of Spain, twenty-four miles N.W. of Madrid, containing a celebrated convent palace generally called Escurial. The convent, built for 160 monks of the order of Jerome, was erected 1563-81, by Philip II, in fulfillment of a vow made at the battle of St. Quentin, fought on the anniversary of St. Lawrence. It stands in the valley of the Guadarrama, on a line of golden memorial of the martyrdom of the saint, and the king’s palace forms the handle. The buildings are 740 feet long, inclosing 20 courts, in which are 63 fountains; there are 17 cross paths, 890 doors, 1060 columns, 5600 windows, 6200 rooms and 32 churches surmounted by cupolas. A convent church with 48 altars in side chapels. The main altar is adorned by a statue of St. Lawrence in solid silver, weighing 450 pounds. Underneath is the costly burying vault of the king, of marble and Jasper. The library of the convent contains some 460 MSS., 1905 Arabic, and is the principal collection of Ori-
ental history and literature. Many of the MS. and other treasures were lost when the place was sacked by the French in 1808. Besides these, there are some 32,143 vols. of ancient authors, principally on history. The picture-gallerv contains some 405 original paintings. A park surrounds the king's palace, or Casa del Paço. —Penny Cyclopaedia; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 157.

Esdraela. See Jezerel.

Esdrael'lon. See Edraelon.

Edraē'lon [from v. r. "Edraē'lon"] (or rather Edraeleon, "Edraē'lon") is better "Edreke", or "Edreke", "Judith", viii, 5; "Edrekhe", Judith, viii, 3, where it is called "the great plain," as simply in Josephus everywhere, τὸ πάχυν πάνευ, the name of a valley or large bottom, a Greekized form derived from the old royal city of Jezerel, which occupied a commanding site, near the eastern extremity of the plateau, on a spur of Mount Gilboa. "The great plain of Edraeleon" extends across central Palestine from the Mediterranean to the Jordan, separating the mountain ranges of Carmel and Samaria from those of Galilee. The western section of it is the proper plain of Acre (modern Akka). The main body of this plain is a triangle. Its base on the east extends from Jenin (the ancient Engannim) to the foot of the hills below Nazareth, and is about 15 miles long; the north side, formed by the hills of Galilee, is about 12 miles long; and the south side, formed by the Samaria range, is about 15 miles. The apex on the west is a narrow pass opening into the plain of Akka. This vast expanse has a gently undulating surface—in spring all green with corn where cultivated, and rank weeds and grass where neglected—dotted with several low gray tells, and near the sides with a few olive groves. This is that valley of Megiddo (מגידב, מִגִּדְדָה, ro called from the city of Megiddo [q. v.], which stood on its southern border), where Barak triumphed, and where king Josiah was defeated and received his death-wound (Judg. vi, 2; Chron. xxxv). Probably, too, it was before the mind of the apostle John when he figuratively described the final conflict between the hosts of good and evil who were to gather to a place called Armageddon (Armageddon, from the Heb. יָרָּגָד, יָרָּגָד, that is, the city of Megiddo; Rev. xvi, 16). The river Kishon —"that ancient river"—so fatal to the army of Sisera (Judg. vi, 21)—drains the plain, and flows off through the pass westward to the Mediterranean.

From the base of this triangular plain three branch plains extend toward the sea, like fingers from a hand, divided by two bleak gray ridges, the one called by the familiar name of Mount Gilboa; the other called by Franks Little Hermon, but by natives Jebel ed-Duby. The northern branch has Tabor on the one side, and Little Hermon on the other; into it the troops of Barak descended from the heights of Tabor (Judg. iv, 6); and on its opposite side are the sites of Nain and Endor. The southern branch lies between Jenin and Gilboa, terminating in a point among the hills to the eastward; it was across it that Abaziah fled from Jebu (2 Kings ix, 27). The central branch is the richest as well as the most celebrated; it descends in green, fertile slopes to the banks of the Jordan, having Jezerel and Shunem on opposite sides at the western end, and Bethshean in its midst toward the east. This is the "valley of Jezerel" proper—the battle-field on which Gideon triumphed, and Saul and Jonathan were thrown (Judg. vii, 1 sq.; 1 Sam. xxix and xxxi). Indeed, a large part of the most sanguinary battles fought in Palestine in every age have been waged upon this eventful plain.

Two things are worthy of special notice in the plain of Edraeleon, our richnesse. Its untiring expanse of verdure contrasts strangely with the gray, bleak crowns of Gilboa, and the rugged ranges on the north and south. The gigantic thistles, the luxuriant grass, and the exuberance of the crops on the few cultivated spots, show the fertility of the soil. It was the frontier of Zebulun—"Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy going out" (Deut. xxxii, 18). But it was the special portion of Issachar—"And he saw that rest was good, and the land pleasant; and he is a goodly father to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Gen. xxiii, 15). 2. Its desolation.—If we except the eastern branches, there is not a single inhabited village on its whole surface, and not more than one sixteenth of its soil is cultivated. It is the home of the wild, wandering Bedouin, who has been driven by the pressure of population to seek its flocks and flocks—often in search of plunder; and when hard pressed can speedily remove their tents and flocks beyond the Jordan, and beyond the reach of a weak government. It has always been insecure since history began. The old bedouins fought victoriously through it in their iron chariots (Judg. iv, 6, 7); the nomad Midianites and Amalekites—those "children of the East," who were "as grasshoppers for multitude," whose "camels were without number"—devoured its rich pastures (Judg. vi, 1; vii, 11); the Philistines long held it, established their hold at Ekron (Judg. xix, 1, 4; xxxi, 10); and the Syrians frequently swept over it with their armies (1 Kings xx, 26; 2 Kings xiii, 17). In its condition, thus exposed to every hasty incursion and to every shock of war, we read the fortunes of that tribe which for the sake of its richness consented to aid in the destruction of the Bethshean state—"the famous Issachar, in thy tents Is; Issachar is a strong ass, crouching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and that the land was pleasant, and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Gen. xlix, 14, 15; Deut. xxxiii, 16). Once only did this tribe shrink from the yoke—when under the heavy pressure of Sisera, "the chiefs of Issachar were with Deborah" (Judg. v, 15). Their exposed position and valuable possessions in this open plain made them anxious for the succession of David to the throne, as one under whose powerful protection they would enjoy that peace and rest which they loved; and they joined with their neighbors of Zebulun and Naphtali in sending to David presents of the richest productions of their rich country (1 Chron. xiii, 32, 40). See Issachar.

The whole borders of the plain of Edraeleon are dotted with ancient and historic and picturesque and romantic places. Here we group them together, while referring the reader for details to the separate articles. On the east we have Endor, Nain, and Shunem, ranged round the base of the "hill of Moreh;" then Bethshean in the centre of the plain where the Valley of Jezerel opens to the sea; then Tabor; then Gilboa; then the "well of Harod," and the ruins of Jezerel at its western base. On the south are Engannim, Tannach, and Megiddo. At the western apex, on the overhanging brow of Carmel, is the scene of Eliah's sacrifice; and close by the foot of the mountain below runs the Kishon, on whose banks the false prophets of Baal were slain.

On the north, among places of less note, are Nazareth and Tabor. The modern Syrians have forgotten the ancient name as they have forgotten the ancient history of Edraeleon, and it is now known among them only as Mery Amer, "the Plain of the Son of Amer." A graphic sketch of Edraeleon is given in Stanley's Syria and Pales. p. 327 sq.; see also Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 351 sq.; Jowett, Christian Researches, p. 146, 222; Robinson, Researches, new edition, ii, 215-30, 866; iii, 118 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 216 sq.; Walfers, De Myraulōn τoν Παλαιστίνην (Lips. 1792). See Jezerel.

Eis'dra (Εἰσδρα; Vulg. Edraes), the Greekized form, used throughout the Apocalypse (1 Esd. viii, 3, 7, 7, 8, 11, 18, 19, 29, 35; 9, 1, 24; 10, 9, 46, 46; 2 Esd. i, 1; ii, 10, 38, 42; vi, 10; vii, 2, 25; vii, 19; xiv, 1, 36), of the name of the ebra.
(q. v.). In several manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, as well as in all the printed editions anterior to the decree of the Council of Trent, and in many since that period, the Apocrypha is placed among the books of Ezra. Each of these books was divided into the two parts, the first part of which was the apocryphal books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the second part of which was the subject of the articles below. The same are the same which are called 1st and 2d Ezra in the English Authorized Version. For these two parts the abbreviations of the canonical books, as in 1st and 2d Ezra, in d. Apos. p. 335 sq.; Hertzien, Gesch. d. Israel, p. 920 sq.; Ewald, Gesch. iv. 131 sq.; Keil, Erleid., s. d. 577 sq.; Davidson, Text of O. T. p. 587 sq. See APOCYPHTA.

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

1. Title and Position.—This book has different titles. In some editions of the Sept. it is called Μετικης τον Ιερουσαλημ, the Priest (Cod. Alex.), which is equivalent to Ezra, who, by way of eminence, was styled "the priest" or "the scribe," in others it is designated Καλντος, Ezra, while in the Targum, the modern translation of the Sept., as well as in the old Latin and the Syriac, it is called "the first book of Ezra," and accordingly is placed before the canonical Ezra, which is called "the second book of Ezra," because the history it gives is in part anterior to that given in the canonical book. In the Vulgate, again, where Ezra and Nehemiah are respectively styled the first and second book of Ezra, this apocryphal book, which comes immediately after them, is called "the third book of Ezra." Others, again, call it the second book of Ezra (Isidore, Orig. vi. 2), because Ezra and Nehemiah, which it follows, were together styled the first book of Ezra, according to a very ancient practice among the Jews, who, by putting the two canonic books together, obtained the same number of books in the Scriptures as the letters in the Hebrew alphabet; and others call it Ezechiel, in contrast to the canonical Ezra, in which the name of Ezra is given to it in the A. V. is taken from the Geneva Bible; the older English translations (viz., Coverdale's Bible, Matthew's Bible, the Bishops' Bible), as well as the sixth article of the Church of England (1571), following Luther and the Zurich Bible, call it the third Ezra, according to the Vulgate, since the Council of Trent (1546), this book has been removed from its old position to the end of the volume in the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vulgate. In the list of revisers or translators of the Bishops' Bible, sent by Archbishop Parker to Sir William Cecil, with the portion revised by early Ezra, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the apocryphal books of Earsas seem to be all comprised under the one title of Earsas. Barlow, bishop of Chichester, was the translator, as also of the books of Judith, Tobit, and Sapientia (Corresp. of Archb. Parker, 1st edn. 1852, p. 110). See Apocrypha.

II. Design and Contents.—The object of this book, as far as its original portion is concerned (i. 1−6), is to excite the heathen rulers of Judaea to liberality and kindness towards the Jews, by depicting the good example of Darius, from whom Zerubbabeles obtained permission, by the aid of wisdom, to return with his brethren to Palestine, and to rebuild the city and the Temple. This design is worked out in the following attractive story. Darius, having given a sumptuous feast to all his subjects in the second year of his reign, retired to rest (iii. 1−3); when asleep, his three bodyguards, Zerubbabel being one of them, proposed each to write a maxim stating what he thought was the most powerful thing in the world, and the king rewarded the wisest writer (ver. 4−9). Accordingly, they all wrote: one said "Wine is the most powerful;" the other, "A king is the most powerful;" while Zerubbabel wrote, "Womcn are very powerful, but truth conquers all." The slips containing these maxims were put under the king's seal, and given to him when he awoke (ver. 10−12). When he had read them he immediately sent for all his magistrates, and, having read these maxims before them (ver. 13−15), called upon the three youths to explain their sayings (ver. 16, 17). The first one of the three undoubtedly, but laboriously, wrote about the power of wine, in which man made manifest in different ways (ver. 18−24): the second descended upon the unlimited power of royalty, illustrating it by various examples (iv. 1−12); while Zerubbabel discoursed upon the mighty influence of women, frequently contrasting the power of wine and monarchy, and then, in praise of truth so eloquently, that all present exclaimed, "Great is truth, and mightiest above all things" (ver. 13−41). Darius then offered to Zerubbabel anything he should ask (ver. 42), whereupon he reminded the king of his vow to rebuild Jerusalem and return the sacred vessels when he should fall into the hands of the Persians. When the king stood up, kissed Zerubbabel, wrote to all officials to convey him and all his brethren to Palestine, and to supply all the necessary materials for the rebuilding of the Temple (ver. 48−63).

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

1. Chap. i. corresponds to Chron. xxxvi, 1, and xxxvi, giving an account of Josiah's magnificent celebration of the Passover-feast in the eighteenth month of his reign, and continuing the history till the Babylonian captivity.
2. Chap. ii. 1−15, corresponds to Ezra i. 1−11, recording the return of the Jews from Babylon under the guidance of Sana-basar in the year 538 B.C.
3. Chap. iii, 15−30, corresponds to Ezra iv, 7−34, giving an account of Artaxerxes' prohibition to build the Temple till the second year of Darius.
4. Chap. iii. 1−6, contains the original piece.
5. Chap. iv. corresponds to Ezra ii. 1−36, giving a list of the persons who returned with Zerubbabel, describing the commencement of the building of the Temple and the obstacles with which it was met, and lapsed "for the space of two years" until the reign of Darius.
6. Chap. vi. 1−11, 15, corresponds to Ezra v. 1−11, 22, giving an account of the rebuilding of the Temple by Zerubbabel in the reign of Darius, of its completion in the sixteenth year of this monarch's reign, and of the commencement of the Temple service.
7. Chap. vii. 1−24, corresponds to Ezra vii. 1−24, describing the return of Ezra with his colony, and the putting away of the strange wives.

The original piece around which all this clusters evidently was the cause of this transposition and remodelling of the narrative contained in the canonic book of Ezra. It has, however, been assumed that Zerubbabel returned to Jerusalem with a portion of his brethren in the second year of Darius, the compiler naturally placed Ezr a ii. 1−5, 5, which gives the list of those that returned, after the original piece, for it belongs to Zerubbabel's time, according to the original plan of the story, after Ezra iv. 7−24, because Ezra (Ezra iv. 24) led him to suppose that Artaxerxes reigned before Darius. Hence a twofold design in the compiler is discernible. One was to introduce and give scriptural sanction to the legend about Zerubbabel, which may or may not have a historical base, and may have been but a separate work; the other was to explain the grand obscurities of the piece of Ezra, and to present the narrative, as the author understood it, in historical order, in which, however, he has signaliy failed. For, not to advert to
ianumerable other contradictions, the introducing of the opposition of the heathen, as offered to Zerubbabel after he had been sent to Jerusalem in such triumph by Darius, and the describing of that opposition as lasting "until the reign of Darius" (v. 78), and as put down by an appeal to the decree of Cyrus, is such a palpable inconsistency as is alone sufficient quite to discredit the authority of this book. It is not in evidence that it is a forgery made up of scraps by several different hands. At all events, attempts to reconcile the different portions with each other, or with Scripture, is lost labor.

111. Unity and Original Language.—Th. ...ove and of its contents shows that the book gives us a consecutive history de templo restitutio, as the old Latin tersely expresses it. It is, however, not complete in its present state, as is evident from the abrupt manner in which it concludes with Neh. viii, 12. We may therefore legitimately presume that the compiler intended to add Neh. viii, 13-18, and perhaps also ch. ix. Josephus, who follows the history given in this book, continues to speak of the death of Ezra (Ant, xii, 5, 5), from which it may be concluded that it originally formed part of this narrative. More venturosor are the opinions of zoom, that the book is belon- gingly to this second book of Maccabees Gis. Vorträge, p. 29), and of Eichhorn, that 2 Chron. xxxiv followed the abrupt breaking off (Einleitung in d. Apokr. p. 345 sq.).

As to its original language, this compilation is undoubtedly made directly from the Hebrew, and not from the writings of the present compiler. He is in such evident from the rendering of אֻנָּה הָעִיר by יִזְכָּר עִיר (compare i, 11 with 2 Chron. xxxiv, 12), and of מִי יַעֲקֹבְּוּ by כֵּן נָעַץ יֶרֶךְ (reading הָעִיר) (comp. i, 53 with 2 Chron. xxxiv, 19; see also ii, 7-9 with Ezra i, 4, 6; ii, 17 with Ezra iv, 9; ii, 16 with Ezra iv, 7; ii, 24 with Ezra iv, 16; ix, 10 with Ezra x, 4), since these can only be accounted for on the supposition that the book was compiled and translated from the Hebrew The translator, however, did not aim so much as to be literal as to produce a version compatible with the Greek idiom. Hence he sometimes abbreviated the Hebrew (comp. i, 10 with 2 Chron. xxvii, 10-12; ii, 15, 16 with Ezra iv, 7-11; v, 7 with Ezra v, 6, 7; vi, 22 with Ezra v, 4; vii, 6 with Ezra vii, 6; viii with Ezra vii, 15; vii, 20 with Ezra vii, 22), and sometimes tried to make it more intelligible by adding some words (comp. i, 56 with 2 Chron. xxvi, 20; ii, 5 with Ezra i, 8; ii, 9 with Ezra i, 4; ii, 16 with Ezra iv, 6; ii, 18 with Ezra iv, 12; v, 40 with Ezra ii, 63; vii, 54 with Ezra vii, 5; v, 62 with Ezra iv, 1; vi, 41 with Ezra ii, 64; vi, 8 with Ezra vii, 14; vi, 9 with Ezra v, 8; vii, 9 with Ezra vi, 18). The original portion, too, is a Palestinian production, embellished to suit the Alexandrian taste. The Hebrew forms of it may be seen in Josephus (Ant, xii, 5, 1) and Joseph ben-Gonio (ib. c, 6, p. 47 sq., ed. Breithaupt).

IV. Author and Date.—As regards the time and place when the compilation was made, the original portion is that which alone affords much clue. This seems to indicate that the writer was thoroughly conversant with Hebrew, and not as contemporary with the events narrated, appears from the indiscriminate way in which he uses promiscuously the phrase Medes and Persians, or Persians and Medes, according as he happened to be imitating the language of Daniel or of the book of Esther. The allusion in iv, 23 to "sailing upon the sea and upon the riv- er," for the purpose of "robbing and stealing," seems to indicate a residence in Egypt, and an acquaintance with the lawlessness of Greek pirates there acquired. The phraseology of v, 78 savors also strongly of Greek rather than Hebrew. If, however, as seems very probable, the legend of Zerubbabel appeared first as a separate piece, and was afterwards incorporated into the narrative made up from the book of Ezra, this Greek element in the present text is not as to the language in which the original legend was written. The expressions in iv, 40, "She is strength, kingdom, power, and majesty of all ages," is very like the doxology found in some copies of the Lord's Prayer. This may be retained by us, "She is the king- dom, and the power and the glory forever." But Lightfoot says that the Jews in the Temple service, instead of saying Amen, used this antiphon, Blessed be the Name of the Glory of His Kingdom forever and ever (Works, vi, 427). Thus the resemblance may be accounted for by their being both taken from a common source.

Whoever the author was, he seems to have lived in Palestine (comp. v, 47), and certainly was a master of Greek, as is evident from his superior style, which resembles that of Symmachus, and from his success- ful presentation of the story as the main theme of this book (compare Ez. viii, 5 with Ezra vii, 17; ix, 18 with Ezra x, 14). The compiler must have lived at least a century before Christ, since Josephus follows his narrative of the times of Ezra and Nehemias (Ant, xii, 5; x, 43). The book must therefore have existed for some time, and the compiler must have had access to ch. v, which v. would not prove anything to the Jewish historian to prefer its description of those days to that of the canonical books.

V. Canonicity and Importance.—This book was never included in the Hebrew canon, nor is it to be found in the catalogue of the Hebrew Scriptures given by the early fathers, e.g., Melito, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Council of Laodicea, and many others; and St. Jerome emphatically warns us "not to take pleasure in the dreams of the 3d and 4th apocry- phal books of Ezra" (Pref. in Esdr. et Nehem.). The councils of Florence (1438) and Trent (1546) decided against its canonicity. The reason of this last exclusion seems to be that the Tridentine fathers were not aware that it existed in Greek; for it is not in the Complutensian edition (1515), nor in the Biblia Regia. Vatalinairst says, "I have never seen a Greek copy of this book, in the preface to the apocryphal books, speaks of it as only existing in some MSS. and printed Latin Bibles. Baduel also, a French Protestant divine (Bibl. Crut.) (about 1556), says that he knew of no one who ever seen a Greek copy. For this reason it seems it was excused from the Canon, though it has certainly quite as good a title to be admitted as Tobit, Judith, etc. It has indeed been stated (Bp. Marsh, Compar. View. ap. Soames, Hist. of Ref. ii, 608) that the Council of Trent, in excluding the two books of Esdras, allowed Augustine's Canon; but this is not true, for Augustine (de Doctr. Christ. Lib. ii, 15) distinctly mentions among the libri canonicí Esdra duo; and that one of these was our 1st Esdras is manifest from the quotation from it given in his De Civ. Dei. Hence it is also sure that it was included among those pronounced as canonical by the then orthodox in the 2d century, e.g. 268 or 418, where the same title is given. Esdra libri duo: here it is to be noticed by the way that Augustine and the Council of Carthage use the term canonical in a much broader sense than we do; and that the manifest ground of considering them canonical in any sense is their being found in the Greek copies of the Sept. in use at that time. Luther would not even translate it, "because there is nothing in it which is not better said by Esop in his Fables, or even in much more trivial books." (Vorrede auf den Baruch): the version given in the later editions of Luther's Bible is the work of Daniel Cranmer, and the Protestant
Church generally has treated it with great contempt, because it contradicts the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah. On the other hand, Josephus, as we have seen, regards it as a great authority, and it was treated with great reverence by the Greek and Latin fathers. St. Augustine mentions it among the canonical books (De Libr. Haer. iii. ii. 19), and quote it in the famous passage, "Truth is the strongest" (ch. iii. 12), as Ezra's prophecy respecting Christ (De Cæsariæ. Dei. xviii. 16); the same sentence is quoted as Scripture by Cyprian (Epist. lxxxiv.; comp. also Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. i. 1; Athenæus, Deipn. Fab. Mixt. Art. xxii. 375; Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph.); Modern criticism has justly taken the middle course between treating it with contempt and regarding it as canonical, and has recognised in it an important auxiliary to the settling of the text, and to the adjusting of the facts recorded. Consequently, Ezra, as Nehemiah, can safely be said to have been evidently made from a different recension of the Hebrew, and has some readings and divisions preferable to those contained in the canonical books (comp. v. 9 with Ezra ii. 12; ix. 12 with Ezra x. 6; ix. 16 with Ezra x. 16). Botth Bertheau in his commentary on Nehemiah, and Neumayer in his commentary (Handb. pt. xviii.), and Fritzsch in his commentary on the apocryphal Ezra (Ezech. Handb. s. d. Apokr. pt. i.), have shown the important services which the canonical and apocryphal records may render to each other.

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

ESDRAS. SECOND BOOK or, I.e. the second in the order of the apocryphal books as given in the English translations of the Bible, which follow the Zurich Bible.

I. Title and Position.—The original designation of this book, which is also properly called the Greek Church, is Ἐσθραηιος Ἐσθραη, or παναθυνήν Εσθραη, the Revelation or Prophecy of Ezra (comp. Nicodorus, apud Fabric. Cod. Psalm. V. 7. ii. 176; Cod. Apocr. V. 7. i. 95 a.); Montfaucon, Antiqu. Codex, p. 194). The designation "1 Ezra," which it has in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, arises from the fact that it was placed before the canonical Ezra because it begins a little earlier (i.e. B.C. 588) than the Hebrew Ezra. It is called "2 Ezra" in the Latin version because it follows the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah, which were together styled the first Ezra, and it is still more generally (4 Ezra), a "name given to it by St. Jerome (comp. Prof. in Esdr. et Nehem.), because it is in most of the Latin MSS. the fourth book of their argument, 3 Ecclesiasticus, and it is placed in the following order: 1 Ezra, i.e. the canonical Ezra; 2 Ezra, i.e. Nehemiah; 3 Ezra, i.e. 1 apocryphal Ezra; and 4 Ezra, i.e. this book.

The name "4 Ezra" is retained by Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, Matthew's Bible, Cranmer's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, and in the 6th article of the Church of England (1571). The name "2 Esdras," given to it in the A.V., is taken from the Geneva Bible, and is the title given to it by the author himself (2 Esdr. i. 1). This book, like the former one, is placed at the end of the Vulgate, in the nintine and Clementine editions, because it has been excluded from the Canon by the Council of Trent.

II. Design and Plan.—The object of this book was to comfort the chosen people of God who were suffering under the grinding oppression of the heathen, by assuring them that the Messiah had appointed a time of deliverance when the oppressors shall be judged, and the ten tribes of Israel, in union with their brethren, shall return to the Holy Land to enjoy a glorious kingdom which shall be established in the days of the Messiah. This is gradually developed in an introduction, and several apocalyptic revelations, or visions, in which Ezra is instructed in the mysteries of the moral world, as follows:

1. Introduction (iii. 1-36, A. V.; or i. 1-36, Ethiopic Ver.).—When on his couch in Babylon, in the 30th year after the destruction of Jerusalem (B.C. 558), mourning over the depraved fate of his brethren (ver. 1-3), and recounting the dealings of God with mankind generally (ver. 4-15), and with his church in particular; in a sense of their sinful nature inherited from Adam (ver. 13-22), for which the Temple was destroyed and the city delivered into the hands of Gentiles (ver. 23-27), Ezra asked God why the heathen sinners of Babylon are spared, whilst the people of his covenant are so unsparingly punished (ver. 28-30)?

2. First Revelation (iv. 1-5, A. V.; ii. 1-iii. 23, Eth.).—In answer to this, the angel Uriel is sent, who, after cursing the presumptuousness of a short-sighted man in trying to fathom the unsearchable dealings of God in the history of his people, warns him to continue to pray and fast seven days (ver. 22-15).

3. Second Revelation (v. 16-21, 34, A. V.; iii. 24-iv. 37, Eth.).—Having fasted seven days according to the command of the angel, and against the advice of the heathen (ver. 16-21), Ezra again renders himself to God, asking why he does not punish his sinful people himself rather than give them over to the heathen (ver. 22-30)? Uriel, who appears a second time, after referring again to the inescapable judgments of God (ver. 31-36), reveals to Ezra, according to promise, more distinctly what shall be the signs of the latter days, saying that with Ezra (the Iudæamæ) the present world will terminate, and the world to come will begin with Jacob (vi. 1-10), whereupon the day of judgment will follow, and be announced by the blast of a trumpet (ver. 11-20); Enoch and Elias, the fore-runners of the Messiah, shall appear (ver. 20), and sin and corruption will be destroyed (ver. 27, 28); tells him to be comfortable, patient, and resigned, and that he shall hear something more if he will fast again seven days (ver. 29-34).

4. Third Revelation (vi. 35-ix. 25, A. V.; iv. 38-ix. 27, Eth.).—The fasting being over, Ezra again appeals to God, to know how it is that his chosen people, for whom this wonderful world was created, are deprived of their inheritance (ver. 35-39)? Whereupon Uriel appears a third time, tells him that it is because of their sin, (ver. 40-45), their rejection of their Messiah, the resurrection, the judgment, and the things which will come to pass, concluding with an admonition to Ezra to fast and pray again (ver. 26-ix. 25).

5. First Vision (ix. 26-x. 99, A. V.; ix. 28-xxx. 74, Eth.).—After appealing again to God in behalf of his brethren (ver. 26-37), Ezra suddenly saw a woman in the deepest mourning for her only son, who had been born to her after being married thirty years, and who died on the day of his nuptials (ver. 38-1), and she would not be comforted (ver. 2-4). He rebuked her for being so despondent about the loss of one son, when Sion was bereaved of all her children (ver. 4-14), and recommended her to submit to the dealings of God (ver. 15-24); her face speedily shone very brightly, and she disappeared (ver. 25-27); whereupon Uriel appeared to Ezra, and told him that the woman is the church of Sion (x. 1-24), and that in thirty years wherein no sacrifice was offered in her, her first-born is the Temple built by Solomon, his death on the day of his marriage is the destruction of Jerusalem, and the extraordinary brightness of the mother's face is the future glory of Sion (ver. 29-34).

6. Second Vision (xi. 1-58, A. V.; x. 1-111, 58, Eth.).—Ezra in a dream had a revelation of the latter days under the figure of an eagle coming up from the
sea with three heads and twelve wings, which afterwards produced eight smaller wings spread over all things, and reigning over all the world (ver. 1-7). These wings, beginning from the right side, according to a voice which proceeded from the body of the eagle, regained successively the whole world, and perished so that there remained six small wings (ver. 8-23), which, however, in attempting to rule, also perished, and the three heads only were left on the eagle's body (ver. 24-31). These now reigned, one after the other, and it so happened that a single head remained (ver. 25-30). A lion (the Messiah) declared to the eagle that all his wings and heads were destroyed because he ruled the earth wickedly (ver. 36-46); then the body and whatever was left of the eagle were burnt in fire (xii, 1, 2). Ezra awoke, and having prayed for the intercession of this vision (ver. 3-8), was told by the angel that the eagle was the fourth monarchy which Daniel saw, and was admonished again to fast and pray (ver. 10-51).

7. Third Vision (xiii, 1-58, A. V.; xili, 1-64, Eth.).—Ezra then had another dream, in which he saw a mighty angel coming with a great crowd; he was like a man, who destroyed all his enemies with the blast of his mouth, and gathered around him large multitudes (ver. 1-13). On awaking, Ezra was told by the angel that it was the Messiah, who shall gather together the ten tribes, lead them to their holy land, and give them Sion "prepared and built for them" (ver. 14-58).

8. Conclusion (xiv, 1-48, A. V.; xiv, 1-52, Eth.).—Three days later, the voice which spoke to Moses in the bush tells Ezra that the latter days are at hand (ver. 1-12), and his house in order, reproves those that are living (ver. 13-18), and writes down, for the benefit of those who are not yet born, ninety-four books, i.e., the twenty-four inspired books of the O. T. which have been burnt, and seventy books of divine mysteries, which he only did with the help of scribes (xv, 1-14). The angel, recovered Scriptures to be communicated to all, and the Caballistic books only to the aages (ver. 45-48).

The chief characteristics of the "three-headed eagle," which refer apparently to historic details, are "twelve feathered wings" (duodecem ale pennorum), "eight counter-feathers" (contrarius penes, "eight heads"); but, though the writer expressly interprets these of kings (xii, 14, 20) and "kingdoms" (xiii, 23), he is, perhaps intentionally, so obscure in his allusions that the interpretation only increases the difficulties of the text. It is, at least, not considered certain—the eagle can typify no other empire than Rome. Notwithstanding the identification of the eagle, the fourth empire of Daniel (comp. Barnabas, Epist. p. 4), it is impossible to suppose that it represents the Greek kingdom (Hilgenfeld; compare Volkmar, Dio- riet Bouch Euxor, p. 36 sq.). The power of the Ptolemies could scarcely have been described in language which may be rightly applied to Rome (xi, 2, 6, 40); and the succession of kings quoted by Hilgenfeld to represent "the twelve wings," preserves only a faint resemblance to the imagery of the vision. But then, if it is established that the interpretation of the vision is to be sought in the history of Rome, the chief difficulties of the problem begin. The second wing (i. e. king) rules twice as long as the other (xi, 17). This fact seems to point to Octavianus and the line of the Cæsars; but thus the line of "twelve" leads to no satisfactory conclusion. If it is supposed to close with Trajan (Lücke, 1st ed.), the "three heads" receive no satisfactory explanation. If, again, the "three heads" represent the three Flavii, then the "twelve" must be composed of the nine Cæsars (Jul. Cæsar—Vitellius—the three Flavii, Placentius, Vindex, and Nymphidius (Gfröer), who could scarcely have been brought within the range of a Jewish Apocalypse. Volkmar proposes a new interpretation, by which two wings are to represent one king, and argues that this symbol was chosen in order to conceal better from strange eyes the revelation of the seer. The twelve wings thus represent the six Cæsars (Cæsar—Nero); the eight "counter-feathers," the usurping emperors Vindol. and Otho, Vitellius, and Nero, and the three Flavii. This hypothesis offers many striking coincidences with the text, but at the same time it is directly opposed to the form of interpretation given by Ezra (xii, 14, regnantum . . . duodecem reges; v. 48, octo regnorum). Volkmar's hypothesis that the twelve and eight were marked in the original MS. in some way so as to suggest the notion of division, is extremely improbable. Van der Vis and Lücke, in his later edition, regard the twelve kings as only generally symbolic of the Roman power; and while they identify the three heads with the triple throne, they seek an explanation of the other details. All is evidently as yet vague and uncertain, and will probably remain so till some clearer light can be thrown upon Jewish thought and history during the critical period B.C. 100-A.D. 100.

In the first character, the Apocalypse of Ezra offers a striking contrast to that of Enoch (q. v.). Triumphant anticipations are overshadowed by gloomy forebodings of the destiny of the world: the idea of victory is lost in that of revenge. Future blessedness is reserved only for "a very few" (vii, 70; viii, 1, 52-55; viii, 11); the great question of the ungodly shall be punished, but how the righteous shall be saved, for whom the world is created "(ix, 18). The "voes of Messiah" are described with a terrible minuteness which approaches the despairing traditions of the Talmud (v; xiv, 10 sq.; ix, 16 sq.). For a reign of 400 years (vii, 28-33; the clause is wanting in Eth., v, 29), "Christ," it is said, "my Son, shall die (Arab. omitis), and all men that have breath: and the world shall be turned into the old silence seven days, like as in the first beginning, and so man shall reign main" (viii, 1 sq.). Then shall all ordinances and lastimg privileges (vii, 30), are plainly stated; and, on the other hand, the efficacy of good works (vii, 35), in conjunction with faith (ix, 7), is no less clearly affirmed.

111. Unity and Original Language.—For a long time this book of Ezra was known only by an old Latin version, which is preserved in some MSS. of the Vulgate. This version was used by Ambrose, and, like the other parts of the Vetus Latina, is probably older than the time of Tertullian. It is published in Walton's Polyglot, vol. iv. An Arabic text was discovered by Mr. Gregory, about the middle of the 17th century, but only in two MSS. In the text (Cod. Pseudo-Makki) the text was published by [archbishop] Laurence, with English and Latin translations (Primi Esebi libri, versio \textit{Ephesiana} . . . Latina \textit{Aegyptica} reddita, Oxon. 1820); likewise from a Bodleian MS. which had remained wholly disregarded, though quoted by Ludolf in his dictionary, and published by Ettinghausen, and by Gfröer, with the various readings of the Latin and Arabic (Prof. \textit{Pseudo}. Stuttg. 1840, p. 66 sq.). But the original Arabic text has not yet been published.
The three versions were all made directly from a Greek text. This is evidently the case with regard to the Latin (Lücke, *Versuch einer Rolst. Einleitung*, i, 149) and the Ethiopic (Van der Vlies, *Disputatio critica de Ezra lib. apocr. p. 75 sqq*), and apparently so with regard to the Arabic. A clear trace of a Greek text occupies the position of Ethnarch text (van der Vlies Ex. v, 5), but the other supposed references in the apostolic fathers are very uncertain (e.g., Clem. i, 20; Herm. *Pist. i, 1, 3, etc.*). The next witness to the Greek text is Clement of Alexandria, who expressly quotes the book as the work of "the prophet Ezra" (*Strom. iii, 150*). The opinion of the Church, however, has been raised whether the Greek text was not itself a translation from the Hebrew (Breitneider, in Henke's *Mus. iii, 478 sqq.*), ap. Lücke l. c.); but the arguments from language, by which the hypothesis of a Hebrew (Aramaic) original is supported in the fathers (see below, sect. 4), and, in default of direct evidence to the contrary, it must be supposed that the book was composed in Greek. This conclusion is farther strengthened by its internal character, which points to Egypt as the place of its composition.

The idea of a Hebrew original has now been pretty generally given up by scholars, despite the positive assertion of Galatinus (*De Aemol. Catholico Veritatis*) that a copy of it was reported to exist among the Jews at Constantinople in his day, and it is commonly believed that it was written in Greek. Although the Greek text can be traced in part to the old Latin version, through which alone this book has been known to us till lately, it was a translation from that language. This is evident from the fact that it imitates the Greek idiom in making the adjective in the comparative degree the genitive case, and not as in Latin, *an ablative, and introduces other Greekisms, which are barbarous, in the version (comp. ii, 24; v, 18, 26, 39; vi, 25, 31, 46, 57; vii, 5; viii, 7, 8, 38, 44; ix, 14; xi, 42). This is, moreover, corroborated by the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, as well as the quotation from this book in the fathers (see below, sect. 4), which prove the very early existence of it in Greek. It is, however, equally certain that many of the things contained in this book are of Palestinian origin, and are still to be found in Hebrew or Aramaic dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim.

In the English version, which is followed in the English version, contains two important interpolations (ch. i, ii; xv, xvi) which are not found in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, and are separated from the genuine Apocalypse in the best Latin MSS. Both of these passages are attributed by the Christian writers to the compiler of the book of the Christian Scriptures (e.g., i, 30, 33, 37; ii, 13, 26, 45 sqq.; x, 8, 35; xvi, 54), and still more they are pervaded by a passion and an anti-Jewish spirit. Thus, in the opening chapter, Ezra is commanded to reprove the Israelites for their own rebellions (1, 1-23), in consequence of which God threatens to cast them off (I, 24-32), and to "give their houses to a people that shall come." But, in spite of their desertion, God offers once more to receive them (ii, 1-32). The offer is rejected (iii, 85), and the heathen are called. Then Ezra sees "the Son of God," standing in the midst of a great multitude "wearing crowns and bearing palms in their hands" in token of their victorious confession of the truth. The last two chapters (xv, xvi) are different in character. They contain a stern prophecy of the woes which shall come upon Egypt, Babylon, Asia, and Syria, and upon the whole earth, with an exhortation to the chosen to guard their faith in the midst of all the trials with which they shall be visited (iii the Decian persecution; comp. Lücke, p. 186 sqq.). Another smaller interpolation occurs in the Latin version in vi, 28, where *Mfitu means in the Ethiopic "crown" in the Ethiopic language, and to "My Son Messiah" in the Arabic (comp. Lücke, p. 170, sqq.*). On the other hand, a long passage occurs in the Ethiopic and Arabic versions after vii, 35 which is not found in the Latin (Ethiop. c. vi), though it bears all the marks of genuineness, and was known to Ambrose (*De bone mort. x, xi*). In this case the omission was probably due to dogmatic causes. The chapter contains a strange description of the intermediate state, which, and a peremptory denial of the efficacy of human intercession after death. Vigilius appealed to the passage in support of his views, and called down upon himself by this the severe reproof of Jerome (*Lib. in Vigil. c. 7*). This circumstance, combined with the Jewish complexion of the narrative, probably led to its rejection in later times (comp. Lücke, p. 155 sqq.).

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

IV. Author and Date.—The greatest divergency of opinion prevails on this subject. The author has successively been described as a true prophet who lived B.C. 386; an impostor who flourished A.D. 106; a Jew, a Christian, a converted Jew, and a Montanist. The maternal connection of the Hebrew with the Latin version in-*Ezra* (vi, 1-17) in-*Esther* (iv, 5-12) inestimably shows that the author of it was a Jew. His personating Ezra, the contempt and vengeance which he breathes against the Gentiles (vi, 50, 57), the intense love he manifests for the Jews, who alone know the Lord and keep his precepts (vi, 30-36), indicating that for them alone was this world created (iv, 63, 66; vi, 55, 59; vii, 10, 11), and reserving all the blessings of salvation for them (vii, 1-13); his view of righteousness, which consists in doing the works of the law, and that the righteous are justified and rewarded for their good works (viii, 8, 36); the purport of his questions, referring exclusively to the interests of this people (iv, 35; vi, 59); the Haggadic legends about the Behemoth and Leviathan which are reserved for the great Messianic feast (vi, 49-52); the ten tribes (xiii, 49-57); the restoration of the Scriptures and the writing of the apocalypse which have been detected of Israel (xiv, 29, 37-47)—all this proves beyond doubt that the writer was a thorough Hebrew. Chapters i, ii, xv, xvi, which contain allusions to the N. T. (compare i, 30 with Matt. xxii, 37-39; ii, 11 with Matt. xix, 9; ii, 12 with Rev. xxii, 2; xv, 8 with Rev. vi, 10; xx, 25 with Matt. xxvi, 42-44 with 1 Cor. vii, 29), and especially the anti-Jewish spirit by which they are pervaded, as well as the name of *Jesus* in ch. vii, 28, which have been the cause why some have maintained that this book is the production of a Christian, are now generally acknowledged to be later interpolations made by some Christian. (See above, sect. iii.)

As to the date of the book, the limits within which opinions vary are narrower than in the case of the book of Enoch. Lücke (*Versuch einer Rolst. Einleitung*, etc., ed. 2, 1, 269) places it in the time of Caesar (C. L. van der Vlies (*Disput. crit. l. c.*) shortly after the death of Cæsar. Laurence (l. c.) brings it down somewhat lower, to B.C. 28-25, and Hilgenfeld (*Jub. Apokr. p. 221*) agrees with this conclusion, though he arrives at it by very different reasoning. On the other hand, Gfrorer (*Jub. d. 6 star.* i, 69 sqq.) assigns the book to the time of Domitian, and in this he is followed by Wieseler and by Bauer (Lücke, p. 189 sqq.), while Lücke, in his first edition, had regarded it as the work of a Hellenist of the time of Trajan. The interpretation of the details of the work of the evangel of the ancient Ethiopian tradition (for data for determining the time of its composition is extremely uncertain, from the difficulty of regarding the
and the last destruction of Jerusalem may have suggested Ezra as the medium of the new revelation. (Comp. Fabricius, Cod. Pseudoep. ii, p. 189 sq., and Lücke, p. 187, n. 1, sq., for a summary of the earlier opinions on the composition of the book.) But the book was not known at the commencement of the Christian era, and Messiah was a phrase which was written some time before to have obtained such general currency and acceptance; and 2. The minute description which the writer gives of the pre-existence and death of the Messiah (vii, 29; xiv, 7), such as no Jew would have given at the very outset of Christianity, to which we have already referred, shows how prominent at this period the stumbling-block to the ancient people, and formed the points of contest between Judaism and Christianity, thus showing that it must have been written before Christ. We may therefore safely assign it to about 150 B.C.

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

V. Canonically and Importance. By many of the fathers, Ezra was considered as canonical. The quotation from it in the epistle of Barnabas is described as the saying of a prophet (ch. xii); the quotation by Clemens Alexander in introduced in the same manner ("Gesch. u. gewöhn. leg., Strom. iii, 10; and Whitworth speaks of it as containing divine revelations ("De Bethra Morah, x, xii). The famous story about Ezra being inspired to write again the law, which was burned (xiv, 20-48), has been quoted by Ireneus (adv. Hær., iii, 21, 2); Tertullian (De Cael. iem., i. 3); Clemens Alexander (Stromat. i, 22); Chrysostom (Homil. viii in Hbr.), and many others. The Ethiopian Church regards it as canonical, which may be seen from the manner in which it is alluded to in the Book of Devotions called "The Organon of the blessed Virgin Mary" (written in A.D. 1240). "Open my mouth to praise the virginity of the mother of God. Then didst open the mouth of Ezra, who rested not for forty days until he had finished writing the words of the law and the prophecies, which Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had burnt" (Prayer for Monday; see also Prayer for Tuesday). St. Jerome was the first who denounced it. In reply to this objection, Aquinas, in his commentary, appealed to xii, 36-45, to prove that "one would venture to intercede for others in the day of judgment," this father, placing upon the name Vigilantius, remarked, "Tu vigilans dormis, et dormiens scribis, et propinans nihil li-

Es'eb'on, They are (oi 'Esēb'wīrūs v. r. oi 'Esēb'wūs, Vulg. Hebron), a Greekized form of the name of certain Canaanites beyond Jordan referred to in the Apocrypha: Esdras 2 v. 15 as having been destroyed by the Israelites; evidently the inhabitants of Heshbon (q. v.) of the O. T. (Num. xxii, 26).

Ese'bria (Εσεβρίων, Vulg. Sedebria), the first named of the ten priests separated with ten others by Ezra to transport the silver and gold from Babylon to Jerusalem (1 Esd. viii, 54); evidently the Sherheraz (q. v.) of the Heb. text ( Ezra viii, 24).

Ese'ek (Heb. id. ממער, scattered; Sept. and Vulg. translated 'Azaria, cameans, as if reading ממער), a well (ממער) containing a spring of water, which the herdsmen of Isaac dug in the valley of Gerar, and which received its name because the herdsmen of Gerar quarreled (נער חוכך, Junc. x. 16, Sept. 'h'ilvēr, Vulg. evasively, A. V. "strove": but different from the לַעֲמָה of the preceding clause, implyאנו היר, jurispr. find "strove") with him for the possession of it (Gen. xxvi, 20). Isaac seems to have therefore relinquished it. It appears not to have been one of those which Abraham had previously dug (ver. 18): the context there was a question of title, here of possession. There are still several wells in this vicinity. See Gerar.

Esh 'ba'al [some Es-h-ba'al] (Heb. 'Esba' el, בִּפּוּר בָּאָל, in pause בִּפּוּר בָּאָל, man of Baal; Sept. 'Esba' el, בִּפּוּר בָּאָל, Vulg. Buchol), the proper name of the fourth son of king Saul, according to the genealogy of 1 Chron. viii, 33 and ix. 39. He is doubtless the same person (see Num. xxxii, 2, compared with 2 Sam. ii, 8) as Itai-besheth (q. v.), since it was the practice to change the obnoxious name of Baal into Bosheth or Beesheth, as in the case of Jerub-besheth for Jerub-baal, and (in this very genealogy) of Marib-baal for Mephib-besheth; compare also Josh. ix, 10, where Bosheth (A. V. "shame") appears to be used as a synonym for Baal. See Baal.

Esh 'ban (Heb. Eshhon, אֵשִּׁחַ, man of considera-
tion; Sept. 'Eshebān and 'Eshebān v. r. 'Eshebān, Vulg. Eshcan), the second named of the four sons of Dishan (Gen. xxi, 26, A. V. "Dishon") or Dishon (1 Chron. i. 41), the son of Seir the Horite. B. C. post 1963.

Esh 'cool (Heb. Eshköl, אֵשְׁכֹּל, [twice plente ṣalḥ ָה, Num. xiii, 24; xxxiii, 9], a bunch of grapes), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. (Sept. Eshkol, young Josephus 'Esphol, Vulg. Eshcol.) A young Amoritish chieftain, who, with his brothers Mandre and Aner, being in alliance with Abraham, when the latter resided near Hebron, joined him in the recovery of Lot from the hands of Chedorlaomer and his confederates (Gen. xiv. 15, 24; comp. xiii, 18). B. C. post 1963. According to Josephus (Ant. i. 16, 2) he was the foremost of the three brothers, but the Biblical narrative leaves this quite uncertain (comp. ver. 13 with 24). Some have thought that the name of Eshkol remained attached to one of the fruitful valleys in that district till the arrival of the Israelites (Num. xiii. 24): this has not been interpreted, the appellation as signi-

ficient of the gigantic "cluster" (in Hebr. eschol) which they obtained there; but this does not accord with the independent origin of the latter name as as-

signed in the narrative (see below).

2. A-eady (رأ), winter-torrent; Sept. and Vulg. translating likewise the name itself φισσάρ, φισσαρ, φισσαρ, or [Num. xiii, 24] נָתַלְבָּה, A. V. "brook"

and "valley") in which the Hebrew spies obtained the fine cluster of grapes which they took back with them, borne "on a staff between two," as a specimen of the fruits of Canaan (Deut. x. 4). The cluster was doubtless large; but the fact that it was carried in this manner does not, as usually understood, imply that the bunch was as much as two men could carry, seeing that it was probably so carried to prevent its being bruised in the journey. See Grape. From the fact that the name had existed in this neighborhood centuries before, when Abraham lived there with the chiefs Aner, Eschol, and Mamre, not Hebrews, but Amorites (see Gen. xiv. 13), many have supposed that the appellation in this instance ("because of the cluster,") בּוּרְכַּס, Sept. בּוּרְכָּס, Vulg. torrens bovis) was merely the Hebrew way of appropriating the ancient name derived from the fruit itself — the conquerors, consistently with the paronomastic turns so much in favor at that time, and with a practice traces of which are deemed to appear elsewhere; but it is more probable that the same reason which led the Israelites to apply to the valley such a designation, had operated a similar change when the region became the possession of the Moabites. In that case the Amoritish chieftain may have been so called (that dialect being doubtless akin to the Hebr.) from his fertile region. From the terms of two of the notices of this transaction (Num. xxxii, 9; Deut. i, 24), it might be inferred that Eschol was the farthest point this valley penetrated and that it could contradict the express statement of Num. xiii, 21, that they went as far northward as Rehob. They must, therefore, either have carried the bunch of grapes this whole distance and back, or, as is more likely, they probably returned by a short cut (Num. xiii, 22), the valley in question seems to have been in the vicinity of Hebron. Accordingly, the val-

ley through which lies the commencement of the road from Hebron to Jerusalem is traditionally indicated as that of Eschol. This valley is now full of vine-

yards. See Eshkol. The Hebrew traveller Ha-Parchi speaks of it as north of the moun-
tain on which the (ancient) city of Hebron stood (Ben-
jamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, ii, 247); and here the name has apparently been preserved still attached to the mountain of remarkably fine water called 'Ain-Eschol, in a valley which crosses the Vale of Hebron north-east and south-west, and about two miles north of the town (Van de Velde, Narrativia, ii, 54). Dr. Rosen, however, still more recently, writes the name as Atin el-Eskukda (Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellsch. 1856, p. 481).

Esh'-ekin [some Esh'ekin] (Heb. 'Eshek, אֵשֶּק, a prop; Sept. 'Esav v. r. 'Esav, Vulg. Esexum), a city in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Dumah and Janum (Josh. xv, 52), situated in the group west by south of Hebron (Keil, Comment. in loc.). Van de Velde thinks (Memoire, p. 210, 211) the place may be the same as Ashan (q. v.); but this is inadmissible, partly because of the difference in the name (אֵשֶּק), and partly because the only Ashan mentioned in Scripture lay in the low country (Josh. xv, 42; comp. ver. 38), while Eshcan is expressly placed in the hill country of Judah (ver. 48, 52). To escape this last and fatal objection, Van de Velde follows Von Baumer (Paulist. p. 178) in supposing two Ashans, one in the mountains of Judah, and the other in the southern plain of Pales-
tine, belonging to Simeon; but that the Ashan of Ju-
dah and that of Simeon were one and the same, is evi-
dent from comparing Josh. xv, 42 and xix, 9, where
Either as appears in the vicinity of both, and Josh. xix, 7 with 1 Chron. iv, 32, where the same is the case with AIN-RIMMON. Still, although Eshekah cannot thus be identified with the Chor-aashan of 1 Sam. xxx, 80, we may perhaps adopt Van de Velde's location of the former at the ruins of Khuara (Robinson's Researches, iii, Appendix, p. 116), not far south-west of Hebron (Stewart, Temp., p. 224).

Eshhek (Heb. id. עַשְּקה, oppression; Sept. 'Eshal, Vulg. Esca), brother of Azel (q.v.), a Benjaminite. EMRIM, the father of seven sons, among them Ulam, was the father of several sons, among them Ulam, the founder of a large and not very famous story of archers, lit., "tressors of the bow" (1 Chron. viii, 89). B.C. ante 1150. They are omitted in the parallel list of 1 Chron. ix, 84-89.

Eshel. See TAMAR-KISH.

Esh'kalonite (Heb. collect. with the art. ha-Eshkalonite, מֵתֶּלֶת הַאֶשֶּׁקֶּלֹן, Sept. ὁ Ἐσχαλονίτης, Vulg. Eusalonite, A. V. "the Eshkalonites"), the patriotic designation (Josh. xili, 8) of the inhabitants of ASHEKALON (q.v.).

Esh'toāl (Heb. Eshthaol, עַשְׁתֹּאָל [but defectively עַשְׁתָּאֵל in Judg. xiiii, 20; xviii, 2, 8, 11], according to Fürst, narrow pass, but Gesenius suggests perhaps petition; Sept. Ἀσσαῦιας n. r. [in Judg. xiiii, 5] Σαυδόν, Vulg. Esthal or [in Josh. xvi, 33] Estabol), a town in the low country of Judah, the Shephelah or plain of the Philistines. It is the first of the first of groups of cities that had made ¥ur侯, with Zorah and Zorah, or Zorah, in company with which it is commonly mentioned. Zorah and Eshtaol were two of the towns allotted to the tribe of Dan out of Judah (Josh. xix, 41). Between them, and behind Zorah and Eshtaol, was situated MANAN-DAN, the camp or stronghold which formed the head-quarters of that little community during their constant encounters with the Philistines. Eshtaol was one of the great strongholds of the Danites, and its inhabitants, with those of Zorah, were noted for their daring. See Dan. The 600 men who captured and colonized Lachish were natives of these two towns (Judg. xviii). Here, among the old warriors of the tribe, Samson spent his boyhood, and experienced the first impulses of the Spirit of Jehovah; and, after his last exploit, his mangled body was brought, up the long slopes of the western ridge, to rest in the grave of Manoah his father (Judg. xiii, 25; xvi, 81, xviii, 2, 8, 11, 12). In the genealogical records of 1 Chron. the relationship between Eshtaol, Zorah, and Kirjath-jearim is still maintained (1 Chron. ii, 58). In the ONOMASTIC lists Eusebis and Jerome (q.v. 'Eshub' and 'Eschaton), Eshtaol is twice mentioned—(1) as ASHTOAL OF JUDAH, described as then existing between ASOTUS AND ASCALON under the name of ASTHO (Ashu); (2) AS ESHITAL OF DAN, TEN MILES NORTHERLY OF ELEUTHERopolis. The latter position is quite in accordance with the indications of the Bible. It is connected with Zorah, Zanoah, and Bethhemesh (Josh. xv, 33; xii, 41); and as these three places have been identified, we may conclude that Eshtaol was situated close to the foot of the mountains of Judah, and in or near wady Surar. Schwarz (Palest, p. 103) mentions a village called here, west of Zorah, but, Dan, the fact that this is corroborated by no other traveller and by no map, the situation is too far west to be "behind Kirjath-jearim" if the latter be Keryvet el-Enab. The village marked on the maps of Robinson and Van de Velde, as Yeshua, is added to by the former (Researches, new ed., iii, 35), who states that the name he pronounced Escharah, is nearer the requisite position. Yeshua lies at the extreme on the broad valley which runs up among the hills between Zorah and Bethhemesh. The mountains rise steep and rugged immediately behind it, but the valley is encompassed by fruitful fields and orchards. Zorah occupies the top of a conical hill scarcely two miles westward, and a lower ridge runs in the same direction as the main remains at Yeshua. Upon that ridge the permanent camp or gathering-place of Dan (Judg. xiii, 25) was probably fixed (Robinson, Later Res. p. 153 sq.). See MAHANAH-DEAN.

Esh'te'laite [many Esh'tile'ae] (Heb. collect. with the art. ha-Eshthalaui, מֵתֶלֶת הַאֶשֶּׁתָלָא), Sept. τοῦ Ἐσθαλαίου, Vulg. Eshthaliae, A. V. "the Eshtaulites," the descendants of Eshthaol (q.v.), who, with the Zaraithites, were at a later period among the families of Kirjath-jearim (1 Chron. li, 58).

Esh'temo'-a [many Esh'temo'of] (Heb. Eshtemo'a, עַשְׁתֵּמֹא [but defectively עַשְׁתֵּמֹא in 1 Chron.], obedience; Sept. in Josh. xxi, 14 ἐσθημίου, in 1 Sam. Es'wai, in 1 Chron. iv, 17, 19 ἐσθημών, in r. Es'wai, and Es'wai, in 1 Chron. vi, 57 [אֱשֶׁתֹמָא] Es'thama, Vulg. Esthemo, but ESTEMO in Josh., and ESTEMO in 1 Chron. vi) or Esh'temoh (Heb. Esh'temo'h, עַשְׁתֵּמָה), by interchange of final gutturals. Josh. xv, 59; Sept. ἐσθημίου, Vulg. Istemo, a town of Judah, in the mountains; mentioned between Jattir and Holon (Josh. xxi, 14; 1 Chron. vi, 57), and between ANAH and ANIM (Josh. xvi, 50). With its "suburbs" Eshtemo was allotted to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xxi, 14; 1 Chron. vi, 57). It was one of the places frequent in the Book of Judges and his followers during the long period of their wanderings; and to his friends there they sent presents of the spoil of the Amalekites (1 Sam. xxx, 28; 2 Sam. xii, 5-18; Ezr. iv, 9), and as the last station of the geographical, half topographical —of the descendants of Judah, Eshemo occurs as having been founded or rebuilt by an Exrraite called Ishbaal (1 Chron. iv, 17) (q.v.), perhaps the same with Naham of ver. 19 (see MAXED), where the place has the dubious epithet of "Maachath-sheva" (Heb. מָאַכְתּ יִשְׁבָּא), however, the Eshemoa there named as a PERSON from Maachab. Eusebis and Jerome simply mention the place as "a very large village" in the Daroma, in the province of Eleutheropolis (ONOMAST. s. v. Ἐσθημός, Eshemo). There is little doubt that it has been discovered by Dr. Robinson at Sema'da, a village seven or eight miles south of Hebron, on the great road from el-Milh, containing considerable ancient remains, and in the neighborhood of other villages still bearing the names of its companions in the list of Josh. xv: Debir, Socho, Jattir, etc., and other inhabited places described as "on the mountains," or "in the great desert" (Researches, ii, 194; comp. Schwarz, Palest, p. 105). It is a considerable village, situated on a low hill, with broad valleys round about; not susceptible of much tillage, but full of flocks and herds all in fine order. In several places there are remains of walls built of very large stones, bevelled, but left rough in the middle, several of them more than ten feet in length. There are the ruins of a castle at this place, with one tower tolerably perfect, but it is probably of Saracen origin (Robinson, Researches, ii, 627; Wilson, Lands of Bible, i, 354). A city Shema is also mentioned in the south of Judah (Josh. xv, 29); too far south, however, to correspond to Semua.

Esh'ton (Heb. Eshton, עַשְׁתּון, according to Ge. Eusausorius, according to Fürst careless; Sept. 'Asso'w, Vulg. Esthon), a son of Mehr, and grandson of Chelub, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 11). B.C. ante 1618. Among his four sons and one grandson enumerated (ver. 12) as the "men of Keach," two (Beth-rapha and Asebah) seem, however, to be rather names of places.

Es'kridge, Vernon, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church (South), was born in Westmoreland County, Va., Oct. 26, 1803. His early education was neglected, and on this account he hesitated to enter the ministry, to which he felt strong leanings; but on
The death of his young wife and child he besetted no longer, and in 1857 he began to preach as an itinerant minister. In this service he labored faithfully until 1857, when ill health compelled him to retire from the itinerancy, though he still preached diligently as his health would allow. In 1851 he was appointed chap- lain in the U.S. Navy, and during his service in the Cumberland in 1852 some twenty were converted, including captain Upahur. On his return to Portsmouth, Va., the yellow fever was raging there. He devoted himself night and day to the service of the sick, and on Sept. 4, 1853, he was taken with the disease, and died Sept. 11.—Sprague, Anm. vii. 735.

AEl ' (Ebel. v. r. 'Ebel), son of Naggat and father of Naum, of the maternal ancestors of Christ after the exile (Luke iii. 25); apparently identical with Eliog- nat, the son of Meariah and father of Johanan (1 Chron. iii. 23, 24). See Genealogy (of Christ).

Ele, Enea, or Esneh, "the hieroglyphic Sen, and the Greek Satopolis or Satopolis—the city of the Latin fish or Lat. Salapia from the fish there worshipped—is a small and badly-built town of Upper Egypt, and is situated on the left bank of the Nile, in lat. 25° 15' N. The central portion of Enea has edifices of colored brick. It contains about 4000 inhabi- tants, of whom 1500 are Copts, and has some manufactories of blue and red glass, and pottery. These are famous ruins at Enea, which consist of a sandstone temple, with a portico of four rows of six columns, which appears to have been founded by Thothmes III, whose name is seen on the jambs of a door. The temple, however, seems to have been restored or principally constructed by Ptolemy Euergetes (B.C. 246-222), and the pronaos was erected in the reign of the emperor Claudius (A.D. 41-54), and completed in that of Ves- pasian. The interior is of the date of Trajan, the Antoinnes, and Geta, whose name, erased or replaced by that of Trajan, there found. The great temple, which was dedicated to Chnum, Satius, and Har-Ihek. It has a zodiac like that of Denderah, formerly thought to be of the most remote antiquity, but now known to be no older than the Romans. A smaller temple with a zodiac, erected in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, formerly stood at or near the walls north of Enea, but is now destroyed. At Enea is also a stone quay, bearing the names of M. Aurelius. This city was the capital of a nome, and the coins struck in it in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 127-138) represent the fish la- turia of the embalmed N. Not. Epigr. p. 263; Whobel, Arch. Relig., xvi. 261; Tocchon d'Annecky, Médailles.

Enag (or Enag, Enigo, Enag), one of the most prominent men of the Armenian Church. He was born in 397, at Gocup or Golop, a place near Mount Ararat, and was one of the pupils of the patriarc Isaac and of Saint Mesrop. As he was accu- mulated with the Syriac language, he was sent in 426, together with Joseph of Palin, to Edessa, in order to translate the writings of the Syriac Church fathers into Armenian. After finishing this work they went to Constantinople, learned the Greek language, and began the translation of Greek works. On returning home in 431 they took with them many writings of Greek fathers, the acts of the synods of Nice and Eph- eesus, and a correct copy of the Alexandrine version. From the latter the Armenian version of the Bible, in which Enag co-operated, was made. Many other the- ological works were translated by him, and he is one of the six learned Armenians to whom the honorary title "Targmaniatsch" (translators) was given. In 449 Enag was present at the national synod of Arta- chad, which replied to the Persian king's demand upon the Armenians to embrace the doctrine of Zoroaster. He died about 478. Son of Egin. Beside of the numerous translations of foreign works, Enag wrote an original work against heresies. It is divided into four books, of which the first is directed against the pagans, the second against the Parsees, the third against the Greek philosophers, and the fourth against the Marcionites and Manicheans. This work contains some valuable information on the Parsees and on the system of Marcion which was taken up by Paul of Tarsus as a source. It has been published at Smyrna (1762) and at Venice (1826), and a French translation has ap- peared by Le Vaillant de Florival (Reflections des dif- ferent Sectes des perses, Paris, 1838). Parts of it have been translated into German by Neumann (in Hesperia, xxxiii, and in Zeitschrift fur histor. Theologie, 1854) and by Dr. Windischmann (Jahrb. fur Assyriken, 1854), and into Latin by Dr. Petermann (in his grammat. ling. Arm. p. 44-48). A Latin translation of the whole work was promised by the distinguished Orientalist, Dr. Windischmann, but it has never appeared. An appendix to the Venice edition contains a "collection of sentences drawn from the Greek fathers, and in par- ticular from St. Nilus." In point of style, Enag is counted among the classics of Armenian literature.— Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv. 183; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gén. xvi. 886; Wietzer u. Wele, Kirchen-Lex. i. 711; Neumann, Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Lit. (Tull. 1841).

Eso'a (properly Eso'a, Aisuph, Vulg. omita), a place fortified by the Jews on the approach of the Aes- sianyrian army under Holophernes (Judith iv. 4). The name may be the representative of the Hebrew word Hazor or Siborim (Simonis, Onom. N. T. p. 19). The Syrians residing in the neighborhood) suggests Beth-horob, which is not impossible.

Eoteric (Greek iotepweqoe), scientific as opposed to popular; applied, especially with regard to the an- cient mysteries, to doctrines taught only to the initi- ated, as distinguished from exoteric (i.e., without) doc- trines, which could be taught to the vulgar and unin- structed. If the philosophical temple of the Egyptian, like that of the other sects, was divided into the exoteric and the esoteric; the open, taught to all; and the se- cret, taught to a select number" (Warburton, Disc. Leg. bk. ii, note B). "According to Origen, Aulus Gel- lius, Porphyry, andambitious, the distinction of exo- teric and esoteric among the Egyptian was applied to the disciples, according to the degree of initiation to which they had attained, being fully admitted into the society, or being merely postulants (Ritter, Hist. Philos., French transl., i. 248). Plato is said to have had disciples both of the exoteric and of the esoteric doctrines which he taught only to a few, in secret. There is no allusion to such a distinction of doctrines in the writings of Plato. Aristotle (Physica, iv. 2) speaks of opinions of Plato which were not written. But it does not follow that these were secret. Aristo- tle himself frequently speaks of some of his writings as exoteric, and others as esoteric or exoteric. The former treat of the same subjects as the latter, but in a popular and elementary way, while the esoteric are more scientific in their form and matter (Ravaisson, Esaou sur la Metaph. d'Aristote, t. i. c. 1): Tucker, Lamps of Natural Philosophy, ii. ch. ii).—"Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, a. v.

Esben, Zbor Bernhard van, one of the most cele- brated writers on the ecclesiastical law in the 18th century, was born at Louvain July 9, 1466. He studied theology and philosophy at the university of his native city, and after having been ordained priest in 1473, and living for 16 years later in the service of a doctor of law), and appointed professor of canonical law at the Collegium Adrianum at the University. He lived very retired, devoting his whole time to study; but such became soon his reputation that he was consulted by a number of princes, bishops, tribunals, and lay persons in his jurisprudence; but above all, ever, particularly on the Congregation of the Index, on dispensations, immunities, exemptions, the roya-
place, and the appeal from the ecclesiastical to civil power, were not favorable to the pretensions of the papists, and in 1704 and 1734 all his works were put on the Index. His defense of the consecration of a Jansenist archbishop at Utrecht caused in 1728 his suspension from office. He still firmly took his seat from his chair at the University. All demands made upon him by the archbishop of Malines to revoke his opinions he firmly refused. He fled to Amersfoort, a common refuge of Jansenist exiles, where he died Oct. 2, 1738, at the advanced age of 82 years. Van Essen is universally known as the last and ablest writer on ecclesiastical law, and even pope Benedict did not withdraw a recognition of his ability. The best edition of his works is the one published by Haven (Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum, 5 vols. Louvain, 1758-60; also Cologne, 1777, 5 vols.; Ments, 1731, 3 vols.). An abstract of this work was published by Oberhauer (Anleitung, 1785; Cill, 1791).—Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 711; Hoefner, Nova. Bio. Orig. xvi, 410; Herzog, Real-Encykl. iv, 164; G. du Pac de Bellegarde, Vie de Van Essen (Louvain, 1876).

(A. J. S.)

The compiler of the Jews this was the ceremony of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the parties which usually preceded the marriage some time. The espousals frequently took place years before the parties were married. See BETRÖTHT.

2. In the early Christian Church espousals differed from marriage. The two terms are in early writers sponsalia and nuptiae. Certain preliminaries were necessary before persons could complete a marriage: they consisted in a mutual contract or agreement between the parties concerning their marriage to be performed within a certain limited time, which contract was confirmed by certain gifts or donations, called archo or arghabones, the earnest of marriage; as also by a ring, a kiss, a dowry, a writing or instrument of dowry, with a sufficient number of witnesses to attest it. The consent of parents or the archons concerned in their marriages was declared necessary by the old Roman law, which was confirmed by Diocletian, and inserted by Justinian in his code. When the contract was made, it was usual for the man to bestow presents on the woman: these were sometimes called sponasulki, espousals, and sometimes sponsalia donationes, espousal-gifts, or archo and pigmora, pledges of future marriage, because the giving and receiving them was a confirmation of the contract. These donations were publicly recorded. The ring was then presented to the woman as a further confirmation of her consent, but we do not appear to have been given in the actual solemnization of marriage. Bingham, in proof of this, quotes the words of pope Nicholas I, and also refers to Ambrose and Tertullian. The origin of the marriage-ring has been traced to the tenth century, and is supposed to have been introduced in imitation of the ring worn by bishops. Isidorus Hispalensis refers to the marriage-ring in this language: quod autem in nuptiis annulus a sponsa sponsam datur, id fit vel prosper mutuo dilectiorum signum, vel propter id nuptas ut hoc pignora corda eorum junctorit; unde et quarto digitu antiquus est, unde quaedam quaedam (ut fortunt) sambina ad cor usque perventit. "The reason why a ring is given by the bridgroom to the bride is either as a mark of mutual love, or rather a pledge of the union of their hearts; and the reason for its being placed on the fourth finger is that it should be a token of the union and of the adherence of the heart." The kiss was solemnly given, with the joining together of the hands of the betrothed. The dowry settled upon the woman was by a stipulation made in writing, or by public instruments under hand and seal. Chosen witnesses were present, the friends of each party, and their number was generally ten. Occasionally a ministerial benediction was used in espousals as well as in marriage. See MARRIAGE.


Espousal (properly ἐπαγωγή, 'araς, 2 Sam. iii, 14, to betroth, as elsewhere rendered; ἑρετικής, Matt. i, 18; Luke i, 27; ii, 5; less correctly for ἔπαγωγή, χαθανθακά, Cant. iii, 11, nuptialis; ἔρετος, keloth, Jer. ii, 2, the bridal state, i.e. condition of a bride before marriage; ἐρετικής,2 Cor. xi, 2, to cause to be married, i.e. to negotiate the match). Espousal was a ceremony of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the two parties which usually preceded the marriage some considerable time. See MARRIAGE. The reader will do well carefully to attend to the distinction between espousals and marriage, as espousals in the East are frequently contracted years before the parties are married, and sometimes in very early youth. This custom is alluded to figuratively, as between God and his people (Jer. ii, 2, to whom he was a husband (xxii, 32), and the apostle says he acted as a kind of assistant (prosomalos) on such an occasion: "I have espoused you to Christ" (2 Cor. xi, 3); have drawn up the writings, settled the agreements, given pledges, etc., of your union (compare Isa. liv, 5; Matt. xxxv, 6; Rev. xix). See BETRÖTHT.

Esr'1 (Eszrā v. v. ʾEzrā, Vulg. omit.), one of the Israelites, "son of Osora," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Eed. ix, 34); corresponding in position with the Shaarai (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Exra x, 40), although the form is confused with that of Arsalus = Aarezel following it.

Esr'om (ʾEzrāû v. v. ʾEsrāû), a Grecianized form (Matt. i, 9; Luke iii, 85) of the name of Hesron (q.v.), the grandson of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 5).

Ess, Karl van, a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Warburg, in Westphalia, Sept. 25, 1770. He entered the Benedictine order in 1788, and in 1801 became prior of the Abbey of Huyseburg, near Halberstadt. Together with his cousin, Leonard van Eas (q.v.), he published a German translation of the Bible (Brunswick, 1807, and a great many editions since), which had an immense circulation until it was forbidden by the pope. Being appointed in 1811, by the bishop of Paderborn, episcopal commissary, he abandoned his liberal views. He wrote a brief history of religion (Entwurf einer kurzen Geschichte der Religion, Halberstadt, 1817), which called forth several replies. He died Oct. 22, 1824,—Hersog, Real-Encykl. xix, 398.

Esa, Leander van, a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, and cousin of the preceding one, was born at Warburg, in Westphalia, Feb. 15, 1772. At an early age he entered the Benedictine abbey of Marienmünster, in the diocese of Paderborn. In 1813 he was appointed pastor at Marburg, and extraordinary professor at the university of that city; and later he also became assistant director of the normal school. No priest in the Roman Catholic Church of the 19th century showed so great a zeal for the circulation of the Bible as Leander van Eas. Aided by his cousin Karl (q.v.), he prepared a German translation of the New Testament, and issued the British and American Bible Society in its circulation. A translation of the Old Testament he published in 1819 (Nuremberg). He also published an edition of the Vulgate (1822), and an edition of the Greek New Testament cut from the Vatican manuscript (1824). The pope was highly indifferent at first as to this undertaking (as it is said he was not anxious to have the notorious papal bulls against Bible societies), but Leander van Eas timely receded from his liberal position, but Leander bravely maintained it. He resigned his offices at Marburg, and devoted his time chiefly to a literary defence of his efforts in circulating the true Bible, "a selection from the works of Church fathers and other great Catholic writers concerning the necessary
and useful reading of the Bible" (Auslegung aus den heil. Vater, etc., Leips, 1868): a Latin treatise on the autho- rity of the original text of the Bible as compared with the Vulgate (Pragmatica doctorum Catholicores Tractati circut Vulgatum decreet senamus tridentinum his- toricorum, etc., Leips, 1810; in German 1824); and sev- eral other works urging a frequent reading of the Bi- ble by the people (Was war die Bibel der ersten Chris- ten? 1816; Gedanken über Bibel u. Bibellesen, 1816; Die Bibli nicht ein Buch war für Priester, 1818). He also wrote a book in defence of marriages between Protas- tants and Roman Catholics (Rückert's Gericht der gemisch. Ehem. 1821). He died Oct. 13, 1847. His very valu- able library, rich in manuscripts and incunabula, was purchased by the Union Theological Seminary in New York.—Herzog, Real-Enzyk., xix. 489.

Essence (essentia, from esses, the old participle of esse, to be), a term in philosophy corresponding to oivia in Greek, and sometimes to nature, sometimes to being or substance in English. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, xii, 11) derives it as follows: "Sicut ab eo quod est esse, vocatur substantia; sic ab eo quod esse est, vocatur essentia." Chaucin (Lex. Phil.) gives the definition: "Tutum illud per quod res est, est et id quod est." Locke (Essay, bk. iii, chap. iii., § 15) says: "Essence may be understood as the very being of anything, whereby it is what it is." Locke distinguishes the real and the nominal essence. "The nominal essence depends upon the real essence; thus the nominal essence of gold is that complex idea which the word 'gold' represents, viz., heavy, malleable, fusible, and fixed; but its real essence is the constitution of its insensible parts, on which these qualities and all its other properties depend, which is wholly unknown to us. The essence of things is made up of that common nature wherein it is founded, and of that distinctive nature which is formed. This last is commonly understood when we speak of the formality, or forma- lia ratio (the formal consideration) of things; and it is looked upon as being more peculiarly the essence of things, though it is certain that a triangle is as truly made up in part of figure, its common nature, as of the three lines and angles which are distinctive and peculiar to it." (Fleming, "Vocab. of Philosophy, s. v.")

With regard to the Trinity, the Greek writers (Athana- nias and others) distinguish oivia (essentia, substantia), which denotes what is common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, from oivia (voula, pronoia), which denotes what is individual, distinctive, and pecu- liar to the three in one. Shedd ("History of Doc- trine," ii, 363) distinguishes the various scholastic terms carefully, and says of oivia, or essence, that it "denotes that which is common to Father, Son, and Spirit. It denominates the substance, or constitutional being of the Deity, which is possessed alike and equally by each of the personal distinctions. The essence is in its own nature one and indivisible, and hence the statement in the creed respecting it affirms simple unity; and warns against separation and division. The terms 'generation' and ' procession' do not apply to it." McCosh discusses the term and its uses in his "Intuitions of the Mind" (1866, 8vo, p. 152).

Essenes (Essenei, Josephus generally; Eesien, Pliny) or ESSENANS (Essenioi, Josephus, War, i, 3, 5, etc.; Philo), a Jewish sect of mystico-ascentic, which combined foreign elements, especially Oriental and Greek, with Jewish doctrines, and with certain pecul- iar views and practices of their own. They rejected most of the Jewish sacrifices, and made their fellow- ship an exclusive one.

1. Signification of the Name.—This has been very variably explained, as follows: 1. Philo (Quod omnis pears, p. 150) derives it from the Hebrew dos, holy. 2. Josephus, according to Jost ("Geschichte d. Juden- thums," i, 207), seems either to derive it from the Chal- dean NIN, to be quiet, to be mysterious, because he ren- dered the high-priest's breastplate, for which the Sept. has λευκών, by λαυκών, or directly from din, in the sense of λευκούς or λαυκών, endowed with the gift of prophecy.

2. Epiphanius (Her. xix) takes it to be the Hebrew יפוא היפֶּה יפוא יפוא, the stout race. 4. Suidas (s. v.) and Higlenfeld (Die jud. Apokal. p. 278) make it out to be the Aramaic form נפש, the people, and the latter maintains that this name was given to the sect because they pretended to see visions and to prophesy. 5. Joseph ben-Gorion (bib. iv, § 6, p. 274 and 276, ed. Breithaupt) takes it for the Heb. נפש, the souls, the pious, the puritans.

6. De Ascens (Moor Ebn. c. iii, Ofher, Philo, ii, 341), Dähne (Erich und Grundtvig, ii, 512, 1835), Nork (Revue de l'orient, v.), Herfeld (Geschichte d. V. Israel, ii, 895), and others, insist that it is the Aramaic נפש, the spiritual, or the physical cures they performed. 7. Aboth R. Nathan (c. xxxvi), and a writer in Jost's Annales (i, 145), derive it from נפש, to do, to perform; the latter says that it is the Aramaic from נפש, and that they were so called because of their endeavors to perform the law. 8. Rappaport (Erich Millin, p. 41) says that it is the Greek νοσήμα, an associate, a fellow of the fraternity. 9. Frankel (Zeitschr., 1846, p. 449 sq.) and others think that it is the Hebrew expression נפש, the retired.

10. Ewald (Geschichte d. V. Israel, iv, 420) says that it is the Rabbinic נפש, servant of God, and that the name was given to them because it was their only desire to be נפשי, the pious.

11. Grätz (Geschichte d. Juden, iii, 525) will have it that it is from the Aramaic נפש, to bathe, with Aleph prothetic, and that it is the shorter form for נפש, not נפש, התרמא, keremoph- tika, a name given to this sect because they baptized themselves early in the morning. 12. Dr. Low (Ben Chananja, i, 892) never doubts that they were called Essenes after their founder, whose name be tells us נפשי, or Jesus, the disciple of Joshua b. Perachia.

13. Others, again, say that it alludes to Jesus, the father of David. 14. Others, again, submit that it is derived from the town Eesah, or the place Yaad Qasa (compare Ewald, Geschichte d. V. Israel, iv, 420).

15. Dr. Adler (Volkst., vi, 60), again, derives it from the Hebrew נפש, the soul, נפש, התרמא, keremoph- tika, a name given to this sect because they baptized themselves early in the morning. 16. Dr. Cohen (Ben Chananja, iv, 374), again, derives it from the Hebrew נפשי, πνευμα, πνευμα, alluding to the נפש mentioned in the Talmud (Bechoroth, 80, a), i. e. the apon which the Essenes wore. 17. Others, again, derive it from a supposed form נפש, in the sense of pious, because it connects the Essenes with the Chuni- dim, from which they are thought to have originated. See ASIANNANS.

II. Tenets and Practices. — The cardinal doctrine of this sect was the sacredness of the inspired law of God. To this they adhered with such tenacity that they were led thereby to pay the greatest homage to Moses the lawgiver, and to consider blasphemy of his name a capital offence. They believed that they obeyed diligently the commandments of the Law, to lead a pure and holy life, to mortify the flesh and the lusts thereof, and to be meek and lowly in spirit, would
ESSENES

bring them in closer communion with their Creator, and make them the temples of the Holy Ghost, when they would be able to prophesy and perform miracles, and, like Elias, be ultimately the forerunners of the Messiah. This last stage of perfection, however, could only be attained by gradual growth in holiness, and by advancement from one degree to another. Thus, when once a man had attained the state of \textit{outward or bodily purity} by baptism (πρωτεύουσα, aprom, which, from its being used to dry one's self with after the baptism, was the symbol of purity, he attained, 1. To the state of \textit{outsider or bodily purity by baptisms (πρωτεύουσα, aprom). From bodily purity he progressed to that state which imposed abstinence from \textit{amanueld intercourses (πρωτεύουσα, aprom). From this stage, again, he attained to that of \textit{insider or spiri-}

ual purity (πρωτεύουσα, aprom). From this stage, again, he advanced to that which required the banishing of all anger and malice, and the cultivation of a meek and lowly spirit (πρωτεύουσα, aprom). 5. Thence he advanced to the stage of holi-

ness (πρωτεύουσα, aprom). 6. Thence, again, he advanced to that stage where he could perform miraculous cures and raise the dead (πρωτεύουσα, aprom); and, 7. Attained finally to the position of Elias, the forerunner of the Messiah (πρωτεύουσα, aprom). Comp. Jeru-


As contact with any one who did not practise their self-imposed Levitical laws of purity, or with anything belonging to such a one, rendered them impure, the Essenes, were, in the course of time, obliged to with-

draw altogether from general society, to form a separate society, and live apart from the world. Their manner of life and practices were most simple and self-

denying. They chiefly occupied themselves with till-

ing the ground, tending flocks, rearing bees, and mak-

ing the articles of food and dress required by the community (as it was contrary to their laws of Levitical purity to get anything from one who did not belong to the community), as well as with healing the sick, and study-

ing the mysteries of nature and revelation. Whatever they possessed was deposited in the general treasury, of which there were several managers, who, supplied from the wants of every one, so that they had all things in common; hence there were no distinctions amongst them of rich and poor, or of masters and servants. They repro-

bated slavery and war, and would not even manufac-

ture martial instruments. They rose before the sun, and did not talk about any worldly matters till they had all assembled together and offered up their national prayer for the renewal of the light of the day (ג"ה רואין), whereupon they dispersed to their respective engagements, according to the directions of the overseers, till the fifth hour, or eleven o'clock, when the labor of the forenoon terminated, and all re-

assembled, had a baptism in cold water, after which they put on their white garments, entered their refec-

tory with as much religious solemnity as if it were the holy Temple, sat down together in mysterious silence to a communal meal, which had the character of a sac-

rament—and may be the reason why the Essenes sacrificed in the Temple—the baker placed before each one a little loaf of bread, and the cook a dish of the most simple food, the priest invoked God's blessing upon the repast, and concluded with thanks to the Beneficent Suppeller of all our wants. This was the signal of their dismissal, when all withdrew, put of their sacred garments, and resumed their several employments till the evening, when they again partook of a common meal. Such was their manner of life during the week. On the Sabbath, which they observed with the utmost rigor, and on which they were more especially instructed in their distinctive ordi-
nances, Philo tells us, "They frequent the sacred places which are called synagogues, and there, according to their age, in classes, the younger sitting below the elder in becoming attire, and listening with eager attention. Then one takes up the holy volume and reads it, whilst another of the most experienced ones expounds, omitting that which is not generally known; for they philosophise on most things in sym-

bols, according to the ancient zeal" (\textit{Quod omnis prob. 49}, sec. xii). The study of logic and metaphysics they regarded as injurious to a devotional life. They were governed by a president, who was chosen by the whole body, and who also acted as judge. In cases of trial, however, the majority of the community, or at least a hundred members of it, were required to constitute the tribunal, and the brother who walked disorderly was excommunicated, yet he was not regarded as an en-

emy, but was admonished as a brother, and received back after due repentance.

As has already been remarked, the Essenes generally were celibates; their ranks had therefore to be recruited from the children of the Jewish community at large, whom they carefully trained for this holy and ascetic course. Previous to his final consecration the candidate for the order had to pass through a novitiate of two stages. Upon entering the first stage, which lasted twelve months, the novice (\textit{πρωτεύουσα, aprom}) had to cast in all his possessions into the common treasury, and received a \textit{robe} (\textit{εργασις, δυνάμενος} = νικ) to bury the excrement (compare Deut. xxiii, 12-15, \textit{aprom} (πρωτεύουσα, aprom), used at the baptisms, and a white robe to put on at meals, which were the symbols of purity, and, though still an outsider, he had to observe some of the ascetic rules of the society. If, at the close of this stage, the community found that he had properly acquitted himself during the probationary year, the novice was then admitted into the second stage, which lasted two years. During this period he was admitted to a closer fellowship with the brother-

hood, and shared in their lustral rites, but was still excluded from the common meals. Having passed satisfactorily through the second stage of probation, the novice was then fully received into the community (\textit{πρωτεύουσα, aprom}), and then also became a priest by a solemn oath on which he promised to follow his holy and ascetic life; that in the first place, he will exercise piety towards God; and then that he will observe justice towards all men; and that he will do no harm to any one, either of his own accord or by the command of others; that he will always hate the wicked, and help the right-

eous; that he will ever be faithful to all men, especi-

ally his rulers, for without God no one comes to be

ruler, and that if he should be ruler himself he will never be overbearing, nor endeavor to outshine those he rules either in his garments or in finery; that he will walk always in truth, and convince and go before those that lie; that he will keep his hand from stealing, and his soul clear from any unjust gain; that he will not conceal anything from the members of his society, nor communicate to any one their mysteries, not even if he should be forced to it at the point of death; and, finally, that he will never deliver the doc-

trines of the Essenes to any one in any other manner than he received them himself; that he will abstain from all species of robbery, and carefully preserve the books belonging to their sect and the names of the angels (\textit{War}, ii, 6, 7). This last expression was not made to the secrets of the Tetragrammaton (ס"כ ס"כ), and the other names of God and the angels comprised in the theosophy (ס"כ ס"כ, and to
from God; so the Pharisees (comp. War, ii, 8, 7, with Bar Kochba, 58, a).
12. An applicant for admission to the order of the Pharisees must pass through a novitiate of twelve months; so the *γρηγορία* among the Pharisees (compare War, ii, 8, 7, with Bacher, 30, b).
13. The novice among the Pharisees received an apron (περικοφή) the first year of his probation; so the scholar amongst the Essenes (compare War, ii, 8, 5, with Tobiæs Damay, c. ii; Jerusalem, Demay, ii, 3, 5; Bacher, 30, b).
14. The Pharisees delivered the ethical books, and the sacred names, to the members of their society; similarly the Essenes (comp. War, ii, 8, 7, with Chajgin, 7, a).

The real differences between the Essenes and the Pharisees developed themselves in the course of time, when the extreme rigor with which the former sought to perform the laws of Levitical purity made them withdraw from intercourse with their fellow-men, and led them, 1. To form an isolated order; 2. To keep from marriage, because of the perpetual pollutions to which women are subject in menstruation and childbirth, and because of its being a hindrance to a purely devotional state of mind; 3. To abstain from frequenting the Temple where the sacrificial sacrifices (compare Josephus Ant. xviii, 15, 5); and, 4. Though they firmly believed in the immortality of the soul, yet they did not believe in the resurrection of the body (War, ii, 8, 11).

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

But the best among the Jews felt the peril of Esseneism as a system, and combined to discourage it. They shrank with an instinctive dread from the danger of connecting asceticism with spiritual purity, and cherished the great truth which lay in the saying, "Doctrine is not in heaven." The miraculous energy which was attributed to mystics was regarded by them rather as a source of suspicion than of respect, and theosophic speculations were condemned with equal strictness (Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1858, p. 62 sqq., 68, 71).

As to their connection with Christianity, there can be no difficulty in admitting that Christ and the apostles recognised those principles and practices of the Essenes which were true and useful. Though our Saviour does not mention them by the name of Essenes, which Philo and Josephus coined for the benefit of the Greeks, yet there can be no doubt that he referred to them in Matt. xix, 12, when he speaks of those "who abstain from marriage for the kingdom of heaven's sake," since they were the only section of Jews that voluntarily imposed upon themselves a state of celibacy in order that they might devote themselves more closely to the service of God. Also 1 Cor. vii can hardly be understood without bearing in mind the notions about marriage entertained by this God-fearing and self-denying order. As to other coincidences, Matt. v, v, etc., and James, x, 12, urge the abstinence from the use of oath which was especially taught by the Essenes. The manner in which Christ commanded his disciples to depart on their journey (Mark vi, 10), is the same which those pious men adopted when they started on a mission of work. The primitive Christians, like the Essenes, sold their land and houses, and brought the prices of the things to the apostles, and they had all things in common (Acts iv, 32-34). John the Baptist was a parallel to this holy order, as is evident from his ascetic life (Luke xi, 25); and when Christ pronounced him to be Elias (Matt. xi, 14), he may almost be said to have declared that the Baptist had really attained to that spirit and power which the Essenes strove to obtain in their highest stage of purity. From the nature of the case, however, Essenism, in its extreme form, could exercise very little direct influence...
ENCE on Christianity. In all its practical bearings it was diametrically opposed to the apostolic teaching. The dangers which it involved were far more clear to the eye of the Christian than they were to the Jewish doctors. The only real similarity between Essenes and Christianity lay in the common existence of a body of true Judaism; and there is little excuse for modern writers who follow the error of Eusebius, and confound the society of the Therapeutes with Christian brotherhoods. Nationally, however, the Essenes occupy the same position as that to which John the Baptist was personally called to mark the close of the Old and the advent of the New Testament. The Saviour and the ancient Jewish writers do not speak of them as a separate body. Josephus, however, speaks of them as existing in the days of Jonathan the Maccabean, B.C. 143 (Ant. xiii. 3, 5; 9): he then mentions Judas, an Essene, who delivered a prophecy in the reign of Aristobulus I., B.C. 116 (War, i. 3, 5; Ant. xiii. 11, 2). The second mention of their existence occurs in connection with Herod (Ant. xv. 10, 5). These accounts distinctly show that the Essenes at first lived amid the people, and did not refrain from frequenting the court, and that the Essenes was a friend of Herod, who was kindly disposed towards this order (ib.). This is, moreover, evident from the fact that there was a gate at Jerusalem which was named after them (EpwOwv Xvuk, War, v. 4, 2). When they ultimately withdrew themselves from the rest of the Jewish nation, the majority of them settled on the north-west shore of the Dead Sea (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 17; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii. 17), and the rest lived in scattered communities throughout Palestine and other places. Their number is estimated both by Philo and Josephus (4000).

The obscurity of the Essenes as a distinct body arises from the fact that they represented originally a tendency rather than an organization. The communities which were formed out of them were a result of their practice, and not a necessary part of it. As a sect they were distinguished by an aspiration after ideal purity rather than by any special code of doctrines; and, like the Chasidim of earlier times, they were confounded in the popular estimation with the great body of the zealous observers of the law (Pharisees). The growth of Essenism was a natural result of the religious feeling which was awakened by the circumstances of the Greek dominion, and it was easy to trace the process by which it was matured. From the Maccabean age there was a continuous effort among the stricter Jews to attain an absolute standard of holiness. Each class of devotees was looked upon as practically inseparable by their rabbis from the laws of purity still further; and the Essenes stood at the extreme limit of the mystic asceticism which was thus gradually reduced to shape. The associations of the "Scribes and Pharisees" (X6X6X6, "the companions, the wise") gave place to others bound by a more rigid rule; and the rule of the Essenes was much more rigorous and stricter. Those who Josephus speaks of as allowing marriage has been supposed to have belonged to such bodies as had not yet withdrawn from intercourse with their fellow-men. But the practice of the extreme section was afterwards regarded as characteristic of the whole class, and the isolated communities of Essenes furnished the type which is preserved in the popular descriptions.

The changes of the Essenes limited its spread. Outside of Palestine, Levitical purity was impossible, for the very land was impure; and thus there is no trace of the sect in Babylonia. The case was different in Egypt, where Judaism assumed a new shape from its intimate connection with Greece. Here the original form in which the Essenes were represented did not by direct copies, but by analogous forms, and the tendency which gave birth to the Essenes found a fresh development in the pure speculation of the Therapeuten (q. v.). These Alexandrine mystics abolished the practical labor which rightly belonged to the Essenes, and gave themselves up to the study of the inner meaning of the Scriptures. The impossibility of fulfilling the law naturally led them to substitute a spiritual for a literal interpretation; and it was their object to ascertain its meaning by intense labor, and then to satisfy its requirements by absolute devotion. The "whole day, from morn to morn, was occupied in medita-
tional discipline." Bodily wants were often forgotten in the absorbing pursuit of wisdom, and "meat and drink" were at all times held to be unworthy of the light (Philo, De Vita cont. 3. 4).

According to the Deipneustikon of the Hellenistic Eumenides and Euhomites (in Winer's Zeitschr. i. ii-iii. 217 sq.), the Euhomites descended from the Essenes. Gräbe says (ib. p. 665) that the Therapeuten, who lived in Egypt (Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. ii. 135 sq., 725), were a class of the Essenes (see Böhl, Diss. Hellenist. Therapeutica ordinis, Upsal, 1746). According to Philo (De Abstinentia, p. 861) and Eusebius, the Egyptian philosopher, Josephus, Ant. xvi. 18, 15. Dr. Wise thinks that the founder of the Essenes must have been an Egyptian Jew who was acquainted with the mysticism of the order, and came to Palestine about B.C. 500; and says farther that the Therapeutae (founded about B.C. 170) of Egypt and elsewhere were in name and essence an imitation of the Essenes. He asserts also that no positive traces of their messianic views are left either by Josephus or Philo, even by the Talmudists. In consideration of their numerous similarities to the Egyptian Jews, they may be supposed to have entertained messianic hopes similar to the Egyptians (The Isis in Il, 1167).

V. Litterature.—The oldest accounts we have of the Essenes are those given by Josephus, War, ii. 6, 3; 5; Ant. xii. 5, 9; xv. 10, 4 sq.; xvii. 1, 2 sq.; Philo, Quod omnis probus sit, § 12 sq.; Pliny, Hist. Natur. v. c. xvi, vii; Solinus, Polyhist. c. xxxv; Porphyry, De Abstinentia, p. 861; Epheliphanus, de Sen. bib. i. ii. 4; Eusebius, Histor. Eccles. ii. c. xvii. Of modern productions we have Beilermann, Geschichtliche Nachrich-
ten aus dem Alterthum über Essener und Therapeutae (Berlin, 1821), who has studiously collected all the de-
scriptions of this order: Gfört, Philo and die jüdisch-
alexandrinische Theosophie (Stuttgart, 1885), p. 299 sq.; Frédeaux, Observations sur les op. et n. T. part ii, bk. v; Dähne, Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdischen und
alexandrinischen Religionen Philosophie, i. 567 sq.; and by the same author, the article Essener, in Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopädie; Neander, History of the Church, ed. Bonn, vol. i. The Essays of Frankel, in his Zeitschrift für die Religion in Interessen der Judenchristen (Lpz. 1859), p. 441 sq.; and Monatschrift für Geschichtliche u. Wissen-
schaft der Judenchristen, ii. 80 sq., 61 sq., are most important, and may be considered as having created a new epoch in the treatment of the history of this order. Adopting the results of Frankel, and pursuing the same course still further, Grätz has given a masterly treat-
tise upon the Esseins in his Geschichte der Juden (Leip-
zig, 1816), ii, 364 sq.; treatise of great value are
also given by Josef, Geschichte des Judenthums und
seiner Staaten (Leipzig, 1857), p. 207 sq.; and Herzfeld,
Geschichte d. V. Israel (Nordhausen, 1857), ii, 368, 388
sq. The accounts given by Ewald, Geschichte d. Volker
Israel (Gottingen, 1822), iv, 420 sq.; and Hilgenfeld,
Die Geschicht des Volker Israel (Leipzig, 1823), ii, 386 sq.,
though based upon Philo and Josephus, are important contribu-
tions to the literature of the Esseins; that of the latter is interesting and ingenious, but essentially one-
sided and unservive to the writer's theory (compare Volkmar, Das vierte B. Esaro, p. 60). To these must be added
the following allusions in the historical religions of the
Esseins, published by Jellinek, with instructive notices by
See also Ginsburg, History and Doctrines of the Esse-
ins (London, 1864); Hermes, De Essenis (Hilal, 1729);
Lund, De Phar. A. Essenis et Esseron (Abou, 1690); Sauer,
De Essenis et Therapeutis (Vritasil, 1829); Willemer, De
Essenis (Viteb, 1808); Zeller, Ueb. d. Zusammenh. d.
1848, 1, 210 sq.; 1854, 1, 40 sq.); Willemer, id. (Viteb, 1808); Lange, B. (Hal. 1721); Tressen-
reuter, De Esserorum nomine (Alt. 1749). Van der Hude,
Nim diez etf. B. Jod. furst. furent Esseri (Helmut 1754);
Carpozy, Domkyper an Gott, p. 282 sq.; Rennelli, Ueb.
Ps. "Porphyrius de Abstinentia" (in his Theol. Bibli. ix, 63 sq.). A worthy work is also, Porphyrius et Philosophumena (Gott.
1868). Biedecke, De Essenis et Therapeutis (Starg. 1753);
Bittner, De Essenis (Jen. 1870); Credron, Ueb. Essenis
und Ebonien (in Winer's Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.
ii, 211-264); Grossmann, De asceti Judorumm (Altenb.
1850); Zimck, De Therapeutis (Lips. 1724). On the
supposed relations of Essenism to Christianity, there
are special treatises in Latin by Zorn (in his Opusc.
Sacc. ii, 62 sq.), Kaiser (in his Question. Symod. [Cur-
rice, 1801], p. 25 sq.). Dorffmuller (Wunsiedel, 1803);
Tinga (Groning, 1865); in German by Luderwald (in Hecke's Magaz. iv, 572 sq.), Bengel (in Flatt's Magaz.
iv, 132 sq.). See likewise the Stud. u. Krit. 1845, 3, 649;
Jour. Sac. Lit. Oct. 1852, 176-186; April, 1858, p. 170 sq.; Blackwood's Magazine, 1849, 105, 463,
feld's Zeitschr. fur wissenschaft. Theologie, 1867, 1, art. 6;
Hilgenfeld's Thet. Kolleg. 1869, 8; sa, Theol. 1870, 8; Strass.
1855, p. 315 sq.; 1860, p. 401 sq.; Meth. Quart.
Rec. July, 1867, p. 490; North British Rev. Dec. 1867,
p. 151; Pressefren, Religionen before Christ, p. 231-234;
Schaff, Apostolische Church, p. 175, 695 sq.; Holzmann,
Grund d. V. Israel i, 296 sq.; ii, 186 sq.; Gesch. der
Essenissen (Strass. 1881). Comp. Sects. JEWISH.
Esseins, ANDREW, or Dutch theologian, was born
at Bommen in February, 1618, and was educated at
Utrecht, where he became pastor in 1651. In 1653 he
was made professor of theology in the University of
Utrecht. He died May 18, 1677. Among his writings are
Triumphus Crucis (Amst. 1649) — De Mortalitate
(Salzburg 1650) — Controversiae Theol. Dogm. (1650) — Con-
Geschle, xvi, 441.
Essentia. See ESSENCE.
Establishment. This term is applied to the posi-
tion of that religious denomination in any country
which solely or peculiarly enjoys the patronage of
the state, and the clergy of which have, in consequence,
their several endowments and incomes especially settled
and maintained by the Legislature or government.
The general tendency of all the countries of the
New against established churches, and in favor of
the voluntary principle for the support of churches.
The subject is discussed at length, historically and other-
wise, in the article CHURCH AND STATE (ii, 329). We
present here a summary of the arguments on both
sides.
(1.) The partisans for religious establishments ob-
serve (1) that they have prevailed universally,
throughout every age and nation. The office of prophet, priest, and
king were united in the same patriarch (Gen. xvii, 19;
xvii and xxi; xiv, 18). The Jews enjoyed a religious
establishment dictated and ordained by God. In
turning our attention to the heathen nations, we shall find
the same incorporation of religious with civil govern-
ment (Gen. xlvii, 22; 2 Kings xii, 7, 29).
Every one who is at all acquainted with the history of Greece
and Rome knows that religion was altogether blended
with the policy of the state. The Roman may be
considered the general creed and code of all the
Mohammedan tribes. Among the Celts, or the origi-
nal inhabitants of Europe, the Druids were both their
priests and their judges, and their judgment was final.
Among the Hindoes the priests and sovereigns are of
different tribes or castes, but the priests are superior in
rank; and in another the emperor is the supreme ponti-
tiff, and presides in all public acts of religion.
(2) Again: it is said: that although there is no form
of Church government absolutely prescribed in the New
Testament, yet from the associating law, on which the
Gospel lays so much stress, by the respect for civil
government and consequently enjoins, is one which
followed and finally prevailed, Christians
cannot be said to disapprove, but to favor religious estab-
lishments. (3) Religious establishments also, it is ob-
served, are founded on the nature of man, and inter-
woven with all the constituent principles of human so-
 ciety: the knowledge and profession of Christianity
cannot be upheld without a clergy; a clergy cannot be
supported without a legal provision; and a legal pro-
vision for the clergy cannot be constituted without the
preference of one sect of Christians to the rest. An
established church is most likely to maintain its
respectability and usefulness by holding out a suitable
encouragement to young men to devote themselves
early to the service of the Church, and likewise ena-
bles them to obtain such knowledge as shall qualify
them for the important work.
(4.) There is a choice on the contrary side observe,
that (1) the patriarchs sustaining civil as well as
religious offices is no proof at all that religion was incor-
porated with the civil government in the sense above
referred to; nor is there the least hint of it in the sacred
Scriptures. That the case of the Jews can never be
considered as analogous, as they were not a theocracy
and a ceremonial dispensation that was to pass away,
and consequently not designed to be a model for Chris-
tian nations. That, whatever was the practice of
heathens in this respect, this forms no argument in fa-
vor of that system which is the very opposite to pagan-
ism. (2) The Church of Christ is of a spiritual na-
ture, and ought not, yet, cannot in fact be incorpo-
 rated with the state without sustaining material in-
jury. In the three first and purest ages of Chris-
tianity the Church was a stranger to any alliance with
temporal powers; and, so far from needing their aid,
religion never prospered to such a degree as when they
were combined to suppress it. (3) As to the support which
Christianity, when united to civil government, yields
to the peace and good order of society, it is observed
that this benefit will be derived from it in at least as
much extent as an establishment of religion is with
that. Religion, if it have any power, operates on the con-
science of men; and, resting solely on the belief of
invisible realities, it can derive no weight or solemnity
from human sanctions. Human establishments, it is
said, have been, and are, productive of the greatest
everlasting evil; and, as this case is requisite to give
preference to some particular system; and as the magistrate
is no better judge of religion than others, the chances
are as great of his lending his sanction to the false as
the true. The thousands that have been persecuted
and suffered in consequence of establishments will always form an argument against them. Under establishments religion would be all church-room for 10,000 inhabitants. Evidently the English church had failed to do this. It is a curious fact that the church of England should have been so slow to perceive the light of reason. Emolument must be attached to the national church, which may be a strong inducement to its ministers to defend it, be it ever so remote from the truth. Thus, also, error becomes permanent; and that set of opinions which prevails in a church in which the government is formed, continues, in spite of superior light and improvement, to be handed down, without alteration, from age to age. Hence the disagreement between the public creed of the Church and the private sentiments of its ministers. (4.) Finally, though all Christians should respect civil society in such a case, and all magistrates ought to encourage the Church, yet no civil magistrates have any power to establish any particular form of religious binding upon the consciences of the subject; nor are magistrates ever represented in Scripture as officers or rulers of the Church. As Mr. Coleridge observes, the Christian Church is not a kingdom, realm, or state of the world, nor is it an estate of any such kingdom, realm, or state; but it is the appointed opposite to them all collectively—the sustaining, correcting, befriending opposite of the world, society, and state. It is this distinction that makes the inevitable evils and defects of the state as a state, and without reference to its better or worse construction as a particular state; while, whatever is beneficent and humanizing in the aims, tendencies, and proper objects of the state, it collects in itself as in a focus all the bulwarks of a life which is to be changed, the metaphor, it completes and strengthens the edifice of the state, without interference or commixture, in the mere act of laying and securing its own foundations. And for these services the Church of Christ asks of the state neither wages nor dignities; she asks only protection, and to be let alone. These, indeed, she demands; but even these only on the ground that there is nothing in her constitution nor in her discipline inconsistent with the interests of the state; nothing resistant or impedimental to the state in the exercise of its rightful powers. In the fulfillment of its appropriate duties, or in the effectuation of its legitimate objects. (5.) As to the provision made for the clergy, this may be done without an establishment, as matter of fact shows in hundreds of instances in the Dissenting and Methodist churches in England, and in the United States also. The question is not the question of the value of the voluntary principle may be considered as finally settled by the experience of the English and American churches. In England, in 1855, the Established Church had church accommodation for 5,980,000, and all other denominations could seat 4,000,000, making the Church of England and all the rest together, 9,980,000 of the population. In the United States there were church accommodation in 1850 for 14,000,000, and it is computed by Dr. Baird (Religion in America) that there must be altogether far more than one minister for each 900 inhabitants. In England they have been accumulating edifices for worship the most costly and durable that the world knows, and yet the United States, without any aid from the government, seats a larger proportion of the inhabitants in houses of worship. Nor is this a matter of authority to kill them all, you and your sons and children, and take possession of all their property. The circumstance that Esther herself, though queen, seemed to be included in this doom of extirpation, enabled her to turn the royal indignation upon Haman, whose resentment against Mordecai had led him to obtain the king to order that all his friends and countrymen should be cast into the fiery furnace. And if the empire would not allow the king to recall a decree once uttered; but the Jews were authorized to stand on their defence; and this, with the known change in the intentions of the court, averted the worst consequences of the decree. The Jews established a yearly feast in memory of this deliverance, which is observed
8. Proposed Identifications with Personages in Profane History.—The question as to the identity of the Persia king referred to in connection with Esther is discussed under Ahasuerus, and the reasons there given lead to the conclusion that he was Xerxes, the son of Darius Hystaspis. (See, however, a contrary view in the Jour. of As. Lit. July, 1890, p. 400 sq.)

A second inquiry remains. Who, then, was Esther? Artaxerxes, Ahasuerus, and others are indeed excluded by the above decision; but are we to conclude, with Scaliger, that because Ahasuerus is Xerxes, therefore Esther is Amestris? Surely not. None of the historical particulars related by Herodotus concerning Amestris (Herod. iv. 136; comp. Ctesias, ap. Photius, Cod. 72, p. 57) make it possible to identify her with Esther. Amestris was the daughter of Otanes (Omphax in Ctesias), one of Xerxes’s generals, and brother to his father Darius (Herod. vii. 61, 82). Esther’s father and mother had been Jews. Amestris was wife to Xerxes before the Greek expedition (Herod. vii. 61), and her sons accompanied Xerxes to Greece (Herod. vii. 90), and had all three come to man’s estate at the death of Xerxes in the 30th year of his reign. Darius, the eldest, had married immediately after the return from Greece. Esther did not enter the king’s palace till his 7th year, just the time of Darius’s marriage. These objections are conclusive, without adding the difference of character of the two queens, which is truly evident. The truth is that a virtual marriage both about Vashti and Esther. Herodotus only happens to mention one of Xerxes’s wives; Scripture only mentions two, if indeed either of them were wives at all. But since we know that it was the custom of the Persian kings before Xerxes to have several wives, besides Xerxes, one surely that Cyrus (Herod. i. 3); that Cambyses had four whose names are mentioned, and others besides (iii. 31, 32, 68); that Smerdis had several (ib. 68, 69); and that Darius had six wives, whose names are mentioned (ib. passim), it is most improbable that Xerxes should have been content with one wife. Another strong objection to the idea of Esther being his one legitimate wife, and perhaps to her being strictly his wife at all, is that the Persian kings selected their wives not from the harem, but, if not foreign princesses, from the noblest Persian families and from their own countrymen, instead of from the seven great Persian houses. It seems therefore natural to conclude that Esther, a captive, and one of the harem, was not of the highest rank of wives, but that a special honor, with the name of queen, may have been given to her, as to Vashti before her, as the favorite companion of a favorite priest, whose offspring she would have over her, if she had any, would not have succeeded to the Persian throne. This view, which seems to be strictly in accordance with what we know of the manners of the Persian court, removes all difficulty in reconciling the history of Esther with the scanty allusions left us by prose authors of the reign of Xerxes.

It may be convenient to add that the 8th year of Xerxes, in which the banquet that was the occasion of Vashti’s divorce was held, was B.C. 488, his 7th, B.C. 473, and his 12th, B.C. 474 (Clinton, F. H.), and that the simultaneous battles of Platea and Mycale, which frightened Xerxes from Sardis (Diod. Sic. xi. 36) to Susa, happened, according to Ptolemy and Clinton, in September of his 7th year. For a fuller discussion of the identity of Esther, and different views of the history of Ptolemaic Egypt, see ii. 105, 106. In the case of the Iliad, Homer (Pettav. De doctr. temp. xii. 27, 28) makes Esther wife of Artaxerxes Longin., following Joseph. Ant. xi. 6, as he followed the Sept. and the apocryphal Esther; J. Scalig. (De emend. temp. vii. 591; Arm. Aesop. Euseb. p. 106) making Ahasuerus Xerxes; Ussher (Ant. 4, i. 1) making him Tim Darius Hystaspis, and not Darius Chaldaea, etc. Eusebius (Conon. Chron. 338, ed. Mediol.) rejects the hypothesis of Artaxerxes Longin. on the score of the silence of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and adopts that of Artaxerxes Mnemon, following the Jews, who make Darius Codomannus to be the same as Darius Hystaspis, and the son of Artaxerxes by Esther! It is most observable that all Petavius’s and Ptolemy’s arguments against Scaliger’s view apply solely to the statement that Esther is Amestris. See XERXES.

4. The character of Esther, as she appears in the Bible, is that of a woman of deep piety, faith, courage, patriotism, and caution, combined with resolution; a dutiful daughter to her adoptive father, docile and obedient to his counsels, and anxious to share the king’s favor with him for the good of the Jewish people. She is depicted as a virtuous woman, whose situation, when her situation made it possible, a good wife to the king, her continued influence over him for so long a time warrants us to infer. There must have been a singular grace and charm in her aspect and manners, since she “obtained favor in the sight of all that looked upon her” (iv. 15). That she was raised up as an instrument in the hands of God to avert the destruction of the
Jewish people, and to afford them protection, and for-
ward their wealth and peace in their captivity, is also
manifest from the Scripture account. But to impute
to her the sentiments put in her mouth by the apocry-
phal author of ch. xiv, or to accuse her of cruelty be-
coming the narrative death of Haman and his sons, and the sec-
cord day's slaughter of the Jews' enemies at Shushan,
is utterly to ignore the manners and feelings of her age
and nation, and to judge her by the standard of Chris-
tian morality in our own age and country instead.
In fact, the simplicity and truth to nature of the script-
ural narratives, and the striking contrast which with
forced and florid amplifications of the apocryphal ad-
ditions, and with the sentiments of some later com-
mentators. See Debesa, Historia Esther (in his Com-
ment. Allegor., vi); Anon. De Ansero (in the Crit. Sac.
Thes. Nov., i, 761); Robinson, Script. Char., ii; Hughes,
Esther and Ahasuerus (London, 1846); Juste, Histoire
d'Ahasverus en Esther (in Eichhorn's Repertor. xvi, 1
sq.); Tyrrhivt, Esther et Ahasverus (London, 1868,
2 vols. 8vo).

ESTHER, Book of, or the last of the historical books
of the O. T., according to the arrangement in the Author-
ised Version (See Davidson, in Horne's Introd., new ed.,
i, 627 sq.).

I. Contents, Name, and Place in the Canon.—In this
book we have an account of certain events in the his-
tory of the Jews under the rule of the Persian king
Ahasuerus (Achashverosh), doubtless the Xerxes of
the Greek historians. The author of the writ-
er informs us of a severe persecution with which they
were threatened at the instigation of Haman, a favor-
ite of the king, that sought in this way to gratify his
jealousy and hatred of a Jew, Mordecai, who, though
in the service of the king, refused to render to Haman
the homage which the king had enjoined, and which
his other servants rendered; he describes in detail the
means by which this was averted through the influ-
ence of a Jewish maiden called "Hadassah, that is,
Esther," the cousin of Mordecai, who had been raised
to the rank of queen, along with the destruction of
Haman and the advancement of Mordecai; he tells
us how the Jews, under the sanction of the king, and
with the aid of his officers, rose up against their ene-
 mies, and slew them to the number of 75,000; and he
concludes by informing us that the festival of Purim
was publicly celebrated among the Jews in commemora-
tion of this remarkable passage in their history. —From
the important part played by Esther in this history, the
book bears her name. It is placed among the hagi-
ographies (q. v.) or Kethubim (קֶתְבַּים) by the Jews,
and in that first portion of them which they call the
cfive Megilloth (מגילהּ), rolls), or books read in the syn-
agogue on special festivals; the season appropriate to it
being the feast of Purim, held on the 14th and 15th
of the month Adar, of the origin of which it contains
the account. Hence it stands in the Hebrew Canon
after Kohileth or Ecclesiastes, according to the order
of time in which the Megilloth are read. By the Jew
it is called the Megillah, by way of eminence, either
from its great circumstance in its importance to its con-
tents, or from the circumstance that from a very early period
it came to be written on a special roll (תובלה) for use
in the synagogue (Hittigener, Thes. Phil., p. 494). In
the Sept. it appears with numerous additions, prefixed,
interspersed, and appended; many of which betray a
later origin, but which are so inwrought with the orig-
inal story as to make it as continuous and, on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-
tween Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocry-
phal additions [see next article]; the Protestant ver-
sions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end
of the book of Esther, in the Sept. and Curiel, and on the
whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christian it has
been variously placed; the Vulgate places it be-

Whilst apparently accepted without question by the churches of the West in the early centuries, the testimony of the Eastern Church concerning it is more fluctuating. It is omitted in the catalogue of Melito, an omission which is shared with Nehemiah, and which supports the suggestion by some that both these books were included by him under Ezra, a suggestion that may be admitted in reference to Nehemiah, but is less probable in reference to Esther. Origens inserts it, though not among the historical books, but after Job, which is supposed to indicate some doubt regarding it in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, of the apostolical canons, of Cyril of Jerusalem, and of Epiphanius, it stands among the canonical books; by Gregory of Nazianzus it is omitted; in the Symposia, Str. Sac. It is mentioned as said by some of the ancients to be accepted by the Hebrews as canonical; and by Athanasius it is ranked among the ἀνεγίγνωσκόμενα, not among the canonical books. These differences undoubtedly indicate that this book did not occupy the same unquestioned place in general confidence as the other canonical books of the O. T.; but the force of this, as evidence, is greatly weakened by the fact that it was not on historical or critical grounds, but rather on grounds of a dogmatical nature, and of subjective feeling, that it was thus treated. On the same grounds, at a later period, it was subjected to doubt, even in the Latin Church (Junnilius, Pro. 30). At the time of the Reformation, Luther, on the same grounds, pronounced the book more worthy to be placed "extra canonem" than "in canonem" (De serv. arbitrio; comp. his Thes. 4, 408; Berlin ed. 1848), but in this he stood alone in the Protestant churches of his day; nor was it till a comparatively recent period that his opinion found and any advocates. The first who set himself systematically to impugn the claims of the book was Semler, and him Oeder, Corradi, Augusti, Bertholdt, De Wette, and Bleek have followed. Eichhorn with some qualifications, Jahn and Havernick unsparingly, have defended its claims. The objections urged against the canonicity of the book resolve themselves principally into these three:—1. That it breathes a spirit of narrow, selfish, national pride and vindictiveness, very much akin to that displayed by the later Jews, but wholly alien from the spirit of the acknowledged books of the O. T.; 2. That its unhistorical characteristic is manifested in the total omission in it of the name of God, and of any reference to the divine providence and care of Israel; and, 3. That many parts of it are so incredible as to give it no place rather of a mere piece of history than of the character of a true history (Bertholdt, De Wette, etc.). In regard to the first of these, whilst it must be admitted that the spirit and conduct of the Jews, of whom the author of this book writes, are not those which the religion of the O. T. sanctions, it remains to be seen whether, in what he narrates of them, he has not simply followed the requirements of historical fidelity: and it remains to be proved that he has in any way indicated that his own sympathies and convictions went along with theirs. There can be little doubt that among the Jews of whom he writes a very large state of religious and moral depravity prevailed from what belonged to their nation in the better days of the theocracy. The mere fact that they preferred remaining in the land of the heathen to going up with their brethren who availed themselves of the promise of the land, is no sufficient reason to suppose how little the true spirit of their nation remained with them. This being the case, the historian could do nothing else than place before us such a picture as that which this book presents; had he done otherwise he would not have narrated the truth. It does not follow from this, however, that he himself sympathized with those of whom he wrote, in their motives, feelings, and conduct, or that the spirit dominant in them is the spirit of his writing. It is true, occasions may frequently present themselves in the course of his narrative when he might have indulged in reflections of an ethical or didactic character on what he has narrated, but to do this may not have been in the plan and course of his work, and he may therefore have intentionally avoided it. Observations to the same effect may be made on the second objection. If the purpose of the author was to relate faithfully and without comment the actions and words of persons who were living without any vital contact with the observer, the critic, the circumstances of the council in the narrative will be sufficiently accounted for by this circumstance. If it be said, But a pious man would have spontaneously introduced some such reference, even though those of whom he wrote gave him no occasion to do so by their own modes of speech or acting, it may suffice to reply that, as we are ignorant of the reasons which moved the author to abstain from all remarks of his own on what he narrates, it is not competent for us to conclude from the omission in question that he was not himself a pious man. If again it be said, How can a book which so simply narrated many conduct of Jews who had to a great extent forgotten, if they had not renounced the worship of Jehovah, without teaching any moral lessons in connection with this, be supposed to have proceeded from a man under God's direction in what he wrote, it may be replied to this, that a man who is under God's direction will be full of important moral lessons, even though these are not formally announced in it. That it is so with the book of Esther may be seen from such a work as M'Crie's Lectures on this book, where the great lessons of the book are expounded with the skill of one whose mind has been for a long period in historical research. As the third objection above noticed rests on the alleged unhistorical character of the book, its force will be best estimated after we have considered the next head. 111. Credibility.—In relation to this point three opinions have been advanced: 1. That the book is wholly unhistorical, a mere legend or romance; 2. That it has a historical basis, and contains some true statements, but that with these much of a fabulous kind is intermixed; 3. That the narrative is throughout true history. Of the first it may be said that it has no support. It is obviously incompatible with the reception of the book into the Jewish canon; for, however late be the date assigned to the closing of the canon, it is incredible that what must have been known to be a mere fable, if it is one, could have found a place in the canon of the Mosaic law, if written by the Jews of the feast of Purim, instituted to commemorate the events recorded here (comp. 2 Macc. xv. 86); and it is rendered improbable by the minuteness of some of the details, such as the names of the seven eunuchs (i. 10), the seven officers of the king (i. 14), the ten sons of Haman (ix. 7-10), and the general accurate acquaintance with the manners, habits, and contemporary history of the Persian court which the author exhibits. (See the ample details on this head collected by Eichhorn and Havernick, Excld. 11, 1, 339-357). The reception of the book into the canon places a serious difficulty in the ear and opinion; for if those who determined this would not have inserted a book wholly fabulous, they would as little have inserted one in which fable and truth were indiscriminately mixed. It may be proper, however, to observe that the latter view is not altogether to be regarded for only thus can the objection be satisfactorily refuted. First, then, it is asked, How can it be believed that if the king had issued a decree all the Jews should be put to death, he would have published this twelve months before it was to take effect (iii. 12, 15)? But, if this seem incredible, the other view appears no less incredible to those for whom the book was written; and nothing can be more im-
probable than that a writer of any intelligence should by mistake have made a statement of this kind; indeed, a fiction of this sort is exactly what a fabulist would have been the most ready to have invented, and thus to have deprived the narrative of historical value.

xi, d. 4), who observes that the facts of the history are posterior to the time of Ezra, attributes it to some later but unknown author. Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromata, lib. i. p. 822; ad Polycarpum), and Maccabees to Mordecai. The pseudo-Philo (Chronographia) and Rabbi Azarias maintain that it was written at the desire of Mordecai by Jehokam, son of Joshua, who was high-priest in the 12th year of the reign of Ahasuerus. The Alexandrine version states that the epistle regarding the feast of Purim was brought by Dositheus into Egypt, under Ptolemy and Cleopatra (B.C. cir. 160); but it is well known that these subscriptions are of little authority. The authors of the Talmud say that it was written by Nehemiah and the memlim, or Great Synagogue of Jerusalem; and we may quote Ezekiel and the twelve Prophets. But the whole account of the Great Synagogue, said to have been instituted by Ezra, and concluded by Simon the Just, to whom it is said to have been committed, and whose death took place B.C. 292, is by some looked upon as a rabbinical fabrication. It is impossible to decide to what superscriptions the subscription to Mordecai seems the most probable.

The minute details given of the great banquet, of the names of the chamberlains and eunuchs, and of the women and sons, and of the customs and regulations of the court, point to the authorship of Shushan, and probably at court, while his less important remarks are in harmony with the private affairs both of Esther and Mordecai. The whole suits the hypothesis of the latter being himself the writer. It is also in itself probable that as Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who held high offices under the Persian monarchy, had an interest in the establishment of the nation, in which they took a leading part, so Mordecai should have had the transactions of the book of Esther likewise. The termination of the book with the mention of Mordecai's elevation and government agrees also with this view, which has the further sanction of many great names, as Aben Ezra, and most of the Jews, Yatazab, Carmezov, and many others. Those who ascribe it to Ezra, or the men of the Great Synagogue, may have merely meant that Ezra edited and added it to the canon of Scripture, which he probably did, bringing it, and perhaps the book of Daniel, with him from Persia. The transition is so smooth and natural that it is more probable than that German professors in the 19th century.

The casual way in which the author of 2 Macc. xv, 86 alludes to the feast of Purim, under the name of "Mardochaeus's day," as kept by the Jews in the time of Nicomed, is another strong testimony in its favor, and tends to justify the strong expression of Dr. Lee (quoted in Whitson's Josephus, xii, ch. vi), that "the truth of this history is demonstrated by the feast of Purim, kept up from that time to this very day."

The style of writing is remarkably chaste and simple, a style, like the simple and mind of the narrative of the story, free from declamation; and thus advantageously distinguished from the similar stories in the Apocrypha (Introduction, Parker's translation, Boston, 1845).

IV. Authorship and Date.—Augustine (De Civitate Dei) ascribes the book to Ezra. Eusebius (Chronic.
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ESTHER. APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO THE BOOK OF—Besides the many minor deviations from the He
brew, there are six important additions in the Septu
ginnes, and the other ancient versions of the book of Esther.

1. Title and Position.—In the Sept. and the Old Latin these additions are dispersed through the canonical
copy, forming with a well-adjusted whole, and having its own title. In Hebrew, however, separated them in his translation, and removed them to the end of the book, because they are not found in the Hebrew.

2. In the Vulgate and the English version, ch. xi. 2-17, 3.

3. Between ver. 19 and 14 of ch. vii. in the canonical

4. Before ver. 1 and 2 of ch. vi. in the canonical

5. Between ver. 16 and ch. viii. in the canonical

The whole book is closed with the following entry:
"In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemaeus and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said he was a priest and..."
Levite, and Ptolemy his son, brought this epistle of Pharim, which they said was the same, and that Ly- simachus, the son of Ptolemy, had written the same. This entry was apparently intended to give authority to this Greek version of Esther by pretending that it was a certified translation from the Hebrew original. Ptolemy Philometer, who is here meant, began to reign B.C. 181. He is the commander in the nation of the Jews (see John v. 45; 7: xi; 12; comp. Joseph. Ant. xiii. 4, 1 and 3, and Clinton, F. H. ii. 393). Doxistae seems to be a Greek version of Mattithiah; Ptolemy was also a common name for Jews at that time.

II. Origen, Historical Character, and Unity.—The passage which mentions the Jewish nation so fondly extolled upon the remarkable events and characters of by-gone days, and which gave rise to those beautiful legends preserved in their copious literature, scarcely ever had a better opportunity afforded to it for employing its richly inventive powers to magnify the great Jehovah, embalm the memory of the heroes, and brand the names of the enemies of Israel, than in the canonical book of Esther. Nothing could be more natural for a nation who "have a zeal of God" than to supply the name of God, and to point out more distinctly what was the case of the book, and, though recording their marvellous escape from destruction, had for some reasons omitted avowedly to acknowledge the Lord of Israel. Besides, the book implies and suggests far more than it records, and it cannot be doubted that there are many other things connected with the history it contains, which were well known at the time, and were transmitted to the nation. This is evident from the fact that Josephus (Ant. xi, 6, 6 sq.) gives the edict for the destruction of the Jews in the Persian empire, the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, and the second edict authorizing the Jews to destroy their enemies. (Comp. Conybeare, on the name of the eunuch's servant, a Jew, who betrayed the conspiracy to Mordecai, and citing other passages from the Persian chronicles read to Ahasuerus, besides that relating to Mordecai, and amplification of the king's speech to Haman, etc.; and that the second Targum, the Chaldean, published by De Rossi, and Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, p. 74 sq.), give the dream of Mordecai, as well as his prayer and that of Esther.

The second addition which heads the canonical book, and in which Mordecai foresees in a dream both the dangers and the salvation of his people, is in accordance with the desire to give the whole a more religious tone. The second addition originated from the fact that ch. iii, 18 of the canonical book speaks of the royal edict, while the plain text speaks of the story of the said document; the same is the case with the third addition, which follows ch. iv, 17, and gives the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, for the said passage in the canonical volume relates that Esther ordered prayers to be offered. The fourth addition after ch. v, 1, giving a detailed account of Esther's interview with the king, originated from a desire to give more information upon the fact, which is simply alluded to in the canonical passage. The fifth addition, after ch. viii, 13, originated in the same manner as the second, viz. in a desire to supply a copy of the royal edict, while the sixth addition, however, which is followed by the interpretation of the dream with which the first addition commences the canonical volume. From this analysis it will be seen that these supplementary and embalming additions are systematically dispensed through the book, and that they are well-adjusted and continuous history. In the Vulgate, the days, obtained currency by the versions of the Reformers on the Continent and our English translations, where these additions are torn out of the proper connection and removed to a separate place, they are most incomprehensible.

IV. Author, Date, and Original Language.—From what has been remarked in the foregoing section, it will at once be apparent that these apocryphal additions were not only manufactured by the translators of the canonical Esther into Greek, nor are they the production of the Alexandrian nor of any other school or individual, but embody some of the numerous national stories connected with this marvellous deliverance of God's ancient people, the authorship of which is lost to us now, and is known to us only through these stories. All these stories are connected with the nucleus of the event itself, around which they cluster, and all of them grew up at first in the vernacular language of the people (i.e. in Hebrew or Aramaic), but afterwards assimilated the complex and language of the countries in which the Jews happened to settle down. Besides, the references given in the second section lead us to these conclusions, we also refer to the two Midrashim published by Jellinek in his Beith Ha-Midrash, i (L.P. 1858), 1 sq. In ch. iii. the pretended copy of Artaxerxes' decree for the destruction of the Jews is written in thorough Greek style; the prayer of Esther excurses her for being wife to the uncircumcised king, and denies her having eaten anything or drunk wine at the table of Haman; the pretended copy of Artaxerxes' letter for reversing the previous decree is also of manifestly Greek origin in ch. viii, in which Haman is called a Greek, and is accused of having plotted to transfer the empire from the Persians to the Macedonians, a palpable proof of this portion having been composed after the overthrow of the Persian empire by the Greeks.

V. Canonicity of these Additions.—It is of this Sept. version that the reference is made (Fest. p. 39, and Sem. p. 39, Oxf. translation) spoken when he ascribed the book of Esther to the non-canonical books; and this, also, is perhaps the reason why, in some of the lists of the canonical books, Esther is not named, as, e.g. in those of Melito of Sardis and Gregory Nazianzen (see Whittaker, Disput. on H. Scr. Park. Soc. p. 85, 58, and Neander, Gesch. der Scr. p. 49, 50), unless in these it is included under some other book, as Ruth or Esdras ("this book of Esther, or sixth of Esdras, as it is placed in some of the most ancient copies of the Vulgate," Lee's Dissert. on 2d Esdras, p. 25). The fathers, who regarded the Septuagint as containing the sacred scriptures of the O. T., believed in the canonicity of these additions. Even Origen, though admitting that they are not in the Hebrew, defended their canonicity (Ep. ad African. ed. West, p. 225), and the Council of Trent pronounced the whole book of Esther, with all its additions, to be canonical. These additions, however, were never included in the Hebrew canon, and the fact that Josephus quotes them only shows that he believed them to be historically true, but not inspired. St. Jerome, who knew better than any other his own country, as the earliest Jew included in their canon, most emphatically declares them to be apurivous ("Librum Esther varii translatiorum constat esse viiutam; quem ego de archivis Hbreorum relevans, verbum et verbio expressa transitari. Quem librum editio vulgatis lacunosis hinc inde verbum sinibas [al. funibus] trahit, addens ea quae ex tempore dici poterant et audiiri; sicut solius est scholaribus disciplinis summo thmate exegi- tare, quibus verbis uti potuit, qui injuriam passuis est, vel qui injuriam fecit," Prof. in 1 Esth.). Sixtus Se- nensis, in spite of the decision of the council, speaks of these additions as inserted by the Septuagint in the Hebrew, and censures hinc inde quorundam scriptorum temeritate inseratas", and thinks that they are chiefly derived from Josephus; but this last opinion is without probability. The manner and the order in which Josephus cites them (Ant. xi, vii) show that they and his days, obtained currency among the Hellenistic Jews as portions of the book of Esther, as we know from the way in which he cites other apocryphal books that they were current likewise, with others which are now lost; for it was probably from such that Josephus de- rived his stories about Moses, about Samballat, and the
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EST, FAST OF (עָסָר הַיָּסֶר), so called from the fact that it was ordered by Esther to avert the impending destruction which at that time threatened the whole Jewish population of the Persian dominions (comp. Esther iv. 16, 17). The Jews to this day keep this fast on the 13th of Adar, the day which was appointed for the extermination, and which precedes the feast of Purim, because it was on this day that Esther and Mordecai, that it should continue a national fast, to be observed annually in commemoration of that eventful day (comp. Esther xix. 31). During the Macedonian period, and for some time afterwards, this fast was continued by a Royal Festival, which was instituted to celebrate the anniversary of the victory obtained by Judas Maccabeus over Nicanor on the 13th of Adar (comp. 1 Macc. v. 49; Josephus. Ant. xii. 10, 5; Megillah Tannith, c. xii; Joseph ben-Gorion, ii. 22, p. 244, ed. Breithaupt). But this festival has long since ceased to be celebrated, and as early as the ninth century of the Christian era we find that the fast of Esther was again duly observed (comp. Sheelothh of R. Achai, Purim 4), and it has continued ever since to be one of the fasts in the Jewish calendar. The Jew entirely abstains from drinking on this day, and introduce into the daily service penitential psalms, and offer prayers which have been composed especially for this occasion. If the 13th of Adar happens to be a Sabbath, this fast is kept on the Friday, because fasting is not allowed on the Sabbath day. Some Jews go so far as to fast three days, according to the example of Esther (comp. iv. 6). See CALENDAR, JEWISH.

Battenne. See STEPHENS.

Estius, Guilielmus (William Hesõlas van En), an eminent Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Gorcum, Holland, 1542, and studied at Utrecht and Louvain. He was for ten years professor at Louvain; in 1560 he became professor of divinity at Douai, and in 1603 chancellor of the University. Estius obtained great repute for learning and piety. Benedict XIV named him doctor fundamentis. He died at Douai Sept. 20, 1613. His principal writings are Commentarii in Epistolae Apostolicae (Douai, 1614-16; Col. 1631, 3 volumes, fol.); Exegetica ad locos sacros (in the Douai version, 2 vols., fol.); — in quat. libros sanctos commentarei (Par. 1638, fol.; Naples, 1720).—Ann. in praecipuus difficilli-"ris S. S. (Antw. 1621, fol.). His Commentary on the Epistles is extolled alike by Romanists and Protestants. He was made archbishop of Brindisi in the new edition, editor of Sausen (Mayence, 1841, 8vo).—Horae, Instr. Bib. Appendix, p. 134; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxiv, 488.

ETRANGELIO. See SYRIAC LANGUAGE.

E'tam (Hebrew Eysam'), צָעִיר, i.e. place of ravenous birds; Sept. Ηρυμ in Judges, Αἰγύν in 1 Chron. iv. 3, elsewhere Αἰγυς; Josephus Αἰγυς in Ant. x. 8, 8, and in antiqu. 1701, 10, 3; Hərûm in 1 Sam. vii., 3; Vulg. Etam), the name apparently of two places in Palestine.

1. A village (גָּדָרָה) of the tribe of Simeon, specified only in the list in 1 Chron. iv. 82 (comp. Josh. xix., 7), but that it is intentionally introduced appears from the fact that the number of places is summed as five, though this table called four; this place (hence its name, q. d. eagle's nest) was probably situated a "rock" (צָעִיר, τίρπα, σίλκα) or cliff, into a cleft or chasm (צָעִיר, Α. V. "top") of which Samson retired after his slaughter of the Philistines, in revenge for their burning the Timnite woman who was to have been his wife (Judg. xv. 8, 11). This natural stronghold (τίρπα ἐν ἔραυν ἐξώπην, Josephus, Ant. x., 8, 8) was on the territory usually assigned to the tribe of Judah, yet not far from the Philistine border; and near it, probably at its foot, was Lehi or Ramath-lehi, and En-hakkore (xv. 9, 14, 17, 19). As Van de Velde has, with great probability, identified Lehi with Lekiyeh, on the road between Philistine plain S.E. of Gaza (Narrative, ii. 141), he is probably also right in identifying this Etam at tell Kheischel, a little north of it (Memoir, p. 811), in the immediate vicinity of tell Hara or En-hakkore (q. v.). Schwarz's location of Etam at Khudna (he says Geuna, i. e. Utma, Palest. p. 124) is without foundation.

2. A city in the tribe of Judah, fortified and garrisoned by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 6). From its position in this list we may conclude that it was near Bethlehem and Tekoa; and in accordance with this is the mention of the name among the ten cities which the Sept. insert in the text of Josh. xvi. 50, "The city of Ephrathah, which is Bethlehem, Phagor and Etam (Airvav), etc." Here, according to the statements of the Talmudists, were the sources of the water from which Solomon's gardens and pleasure-grounds were fed, and Bethlehem and the Temple supplied. (See Lightfoot, on John v.) Hezekiah may perhaps be identified with that of Solomon's Pools at El-Buruk, near Bethlehem (see Schwarz, Palest. p. 268). See JERUSALEM; WATER. Josephus (Ant. viii., 7, 8) places it at fifty stadia (in some copies sixty) from Jerusalem and Bethania, and situates it on this river. He thus takes up the tradition of taking a morning drive to this favored spot in his chariot. It is thus probable that this was the site of one of Solomon's houses of pleasure, where he made him gardens and orchards, and pools of water (Ecc. ii, 5, 6). The same name occurs in the lists of Judah's descendants (1 Chron. iv. 8), but probably referring to the same place, Bethlem being mentioned in the following verse. See JEZEREKEL. 3. Dr. Robinson (Researches, i, 513; ii, 168) inclines to find Etam at a place about a mile and a half south of Bethlehem, where there is a ruined village called Cirus, at the bottom of a pleasant valley of the same name. Here there are traces of ancient ruins, and also a fountain, sending forth a copious supply of fine water, which forms a beautiful jearling roll along the bottom of the valley. This location is in accordance with all the foregoing notices. It was close to Solomon's Pools in common, Land and Book, ii, 431. Williams (Holy City, ii, 90) fully accredits the above Rabbinical account, and also states that the old name is perpetuated in a wady Etam, which is on the way to Hebron from Jerusalem, and that there are still connected with it the largest and most luxuriant gardens to be met with in the hilly region of Judaea.

Eternal is in general the rendering in the A. V. of the Heb. צָעִיר, Αἰγύς, and the Greek Αἰγύς or Αἰγύς (both frequently "everlasting," "ever," etc.).
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For the first indication on this point, Lev. xviii, 5; Ezek. xx. xi, xviii, 21; Habak. ii, 4 (comp. Gal. iii, 11, 12); Psa. xxxiv, 18 (comp. 1 Pet. iii, 10) are to be referred to.

2. In the N. T. it is of frequent occurrence. In the first three evangelists we find ζωή αἰώνιος (eternal life), or something like it; (life), reservoir of life, as the object and destiny of man, e. g. Matt. vii, 14; xviii, 8, 9; Luke x, 28; comp. ver. 25, and xviii, 18. The resurrection of the dead precedes it (Luke xiv, 14). It therefore comprises the whole future of the disciples, their full reward, and the idea is still connected with that of felicity (μετάνοια in τοις ορθοίς, reward in heaven, Matt. v, 12; reception into the άγια σκηνα, everlasting tabernacles, Luke xvi, 9).

In Matt. xix, xxix, 46; we find it opposed to κολασία αἰώνιος (eternal punishment).

Paul considers it as the dern, 1, 20; and the object of our faith (1 Tim. v, 16), and of saving grace (Rom. v, 21), and consequently also the object of our hope (5, 8, 9, 11, 12), and the purpose of the subject is to apply the only limitation is shown by the fact that while the term is used of God in the widest sense, both of the past and future (Gen. xxix, 38; Isa. xi, 28; Dan. xii, 7), it is also employed hyperbolically of Christ (John x, 28; Acts xxvii, 22, 24), in an apostle (Rom. xii, 14), especially in salutations and invocations (1 Kings i, 3); Neh. ii, 3). In all these significations and applications it is often used in the plural (σωτήρες), whether past (Isa. vi, 9; Dan. ix, 24; Eccles. i, 19 or future (I Kings i, 5; Ixvii, 6, 6), etc.), and this is sometimes a reduplicated form, like "ages of ages" (αιώνια) or "eternal life (αιώνιον). Peculiar is the Rabbinical usage (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1690) for the world (so Greek αἰών), but only in Eccles. iii, 11.—Gesenius’s and First’s Heb. Lex. s. v.; Hommel, De vi ridicis βίβλοι (Wittgen.)

The Greek term αἰών corresponds remarkably to the Hebrew בֵּית (bed), near in all these senses, and is its usual rendering in the Sept. It is derived from αἰών, αἰωνιοῦσα, αἰωνιοῦσα (original αἰōn), αἰωνιοῦ, αἰωνιοῦσα itself an old dative from an obsoletē noun αἰῶνα or αἰῶνα = Lat. aera, probably derived from αἰών, and the same in the root with the English erer, and also, perhaps, aye), with the locative termination -ον appended to the root. The adjective αἰωνιώτατος, with which we here more directly concerned, follows almost the same principle. For the sense and conditions of the primitive. Its general import is enduring, perpetual.

In the N. T. it is spoken of the past in a restricted manner, in the sense of ancient or primeval (Rom. xvii, 2; 2 Tim. i, 2; Titus i, 2); or of the past and future absolutely (Rom. xvii, 26; Heb. ix, 14); elsewhere of the past, in an unlimited sense, endless (2 Cor. iv, 18; v, 1; Luke xvi, 9; Heb. xiii, 20; ix, 12; Rev. vii, 6; 1 Tim. vi, 16; Phil. ix, 15), as of the prospect of Christ’s kingdom (2 Pet. i, 11), but especially of the happy future of the saints in heaven (particularly in the phrase "life everlasting," Matt. xix, 16, xx, 46; and often), or the miserable fate of the wicked in hell (e. g. as punishment, Matt. xxvi, 46; condemnation, Mark iii, 29; judgment, Heb. vi, 2; destruction, 2 These, i, 9, or fire, Matt. viii, 11; xxv, 41; Judg. 7).—Robinson, Lex. of the N. T. s. v.; Leavitt, in the Christian Missionary, 10 (1837); Expositor, i, 29; x, 34, 166; xii, 97, 169; Stuart, in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, ii, 405; Cremer, Wörterbuch d. N. T. Grätz, p. 46.

Eternal Life (ζωή αἰώνιος).

1. Biblical Usage of the Terms.—I. In the O. T. we find this expression occurring only in Dan. xii, 2: Some shall awake in ζωή αἰώνιος, the others in διανοία αἰώνιον, Sept. εἰς ζωήν αἰώνιον, the others in διανοίαν αἰώνιον. For the first indication on this point, Lev. xviii, 5; Ezek. xx. xi, xviii, 21; Habak. ii, 4 (comp. Gal. iii, 11, 12); Psa. xxxiv, 18 (comp. 1 Pet. iii, 10) are to be referred to.

2. In the N. T. it is of frequent occurrence. In the first three evangelists we find ζωή αἰώνιος (eternal life), or something like it; (life), reservoir of life, as the object and destiny of man, e. g. Matt. vii, 14; xviii, 8, 9; Luke x, 28; comp. ver. 25, and xviii, 18. The resurrection of the dead precedes it (Luke xiv, 14). It therefore comprises the whole future of the disciples, their full reward, and the idea is still connected with that of felicity (μετάνοια in τοις ορθοίς, reward in heaven, Matt. v, 12; reception into the άγια σκηνα, everlasting tabernacles, Luke xvi, 9).

In Matt. xix, xxix, 46; we find it opposed to κολασία αἰώνιος (eternal punishment).

Paul considers it as the result of death, and in the resurrection of the original man (Rom. ii, 7; 1 Tim. vi, 19, 20), the result of continually walking in the holiness secured to us by Christ; the πίστις (Rom. vi, 22), the reward (Gal. vi, 8), as also the object of our faith (1 Tim. i, 16), and of saving grace (Rom. v, 21), and consequently also the object of our hope (5, 8, 9, 11, 12); and that this promise is discernible in the apocalyptic (promise of the life to come) (1 Tim. iv, 8), the receiving of the incorruptible crown of righteousness (1 Cor. ix, 25; 2 Tim. iv, 8), the preservation unto the heavenly kingdom (2 Tim. iv, 18), that is described as the αὐτοκτόνωσις, which consist in the αὐτοκτόνωσις, revealed as δοξα, and retained in heaven (1 Pet. i, 4, 9; v, 1, 10). James considers it as the promised crown of life and inheritance of the kingdom (Jas. i, 12, ii, 5). In the epistles to the Hebrews it is described as the Sabbath of the people of God (iv, 9; compare xii, 22 sq., etc.). While, however, life everlasting thus belongs to the future, we must not forget that, according to Paul’s exposition, it appears in its essence indissolubly connected with our present life. As our relation to God, as altered by sin, can but lead to death, so in the regeneration of the human nature there must necessarily, and, indeed, as an ethical religious principle, be ζωή (life) presented in the δικαιοσύνη, righteousness (Rom. v, 21; viii, 10; Gal. iii, 21); so that δικαιοσύνη, in its connection with ζωή (Rom. v, 16, δικαιοσύνη, justification of life), constitutes the very essence of the ρεγημα, imputed to the subject, even though in the Judaic epistles of the apostle the ζωή itself is dwelt upon more than the fundamental idea of the δικαιοσύνη. Christ is ζωή ζωής (our life); though yet concealed (Col. iii, 3, 4; Phil. iii, 10; Gal. ii, 15; Heb. xi, 40, 46), he is found in us (Gal. iv, 19): we have put him on, and become parts of his body (Eph. v, 30; Gal. iii, 27; Col. i, 18, etc.). From this it results that his life of glory must also become ours, which idea is presented to us in various ways (Rom. vi, 8; 2 Tim. ii, 11, 12; Rom. v, 17, 21; viii, 30; Eph. v, 5, 6).

The Spirit gives also the σωτήρ (Saviour, as the element of new life (Rom. viii, 2; comp. 2 Cor. iii, 17), the foundation of that life which overcomes that which is mortal (2 Cor. iv, 4, 5; Eph. i, 11); our mortal body is by it made alive (Rom. viii, 11); its results are peace and life (Rom. viii, 6, 10, 13). In this respect eternal life is the gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord (Rom. vi, 23). As λόγος ζωῆς (the word of life) (Phil. ii, 16), Christ has destroyed death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel (2 Tim. i, 10).

Aside from this evident connection between eternal life and the newness of life of the Christian derived from Christ (Rom. vi, 4), the ζωή αἰώνιος (eternal life) is still always considered in Paul’s writings as posterior to the mortal body, and the change of the corruptible for the incorruptible. The consequences of these premises in their full development are first presented to us, however, in the epistles.
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of John. Here we find the most important principle for the subject of the author of Christian Ethics, dr. mortuorum et viventium (he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life) (John iii, 36; iii, 15, 16; v, 24; vi, 47, 53-58; x, 28; xvii, 2, 3; xx, 31; John v, 12, 13). Having passed from death unto life, death has no longer dominion over him (John v, 24), and he is free to enjoy the spiritual gifts of the Holy Spirit, he becomes partaker of the fulness of salvation. On the contrary, those who do not hearken to the Son have not life, neither shall they see it, but the anger of God abides with them. Thus, while Paul distinguishes between the actual state of grace, with its accompanying hope and the future perfection of the object of our hope, John unites these in his conception of eternal life, and thus uses the expressions ζωή αἰωνίως (eternal life) and ζωή (life), which stand in the relation of form and contents, indiscriminately with or without the article (John iii, 36; v, 24; John iii, 14, 15; v, 11, 12, 13, etc.). The life of the faithful on the earth is inseparably connected with their eternal life, from the fact of their absolute deliverance from the sentence of death resulting from a state of estrangement from God (John vi, 55). It is a result of the birth of God's Spirit in John being His whose life is "in himself" (John vi, 57), and is Himself "eternal life" (1 John v, 20), the source of all life, yet the communication of life to the world, i.e. to mankind, has from the beginning, even before time began (John vii, 56), been irrevocably vested in the Son. He is the Logos (word) as well as the life and his relationship to God is in his relation to the world. He has received the fulness of divine life from the Father in such a manner that it belongs to him as thoroughly (John v, 26; John v, 11). Now, inasmuch as the Logos became flesh, the eternal life, which was of God, became manifested in him. It is, in the next place, the revealed light of faith. Christ, in his relation to the world, is therefore as well ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς (Christ) (John i, 1, 2; John i, 3, 4; vi, 33; xv; 11; xv, 21; xvii, 19; vii, 35, 38, 63; vii, 58, 89). From this it is easily seen how eternal life is designated in the N.T. as the command of the Father, the knowledge of God and of Christ, or also as the commandment of Christ (John xii, 50; comp. xviii, 3; xviii, 3; John ii, 25; iii, 14; John v, 23). Confirmations of this view, by which the ζωή comes to occupy the first place in the plan of salvation in Christ, are to be found in numerous passages of the N.T. Christ is represented as the ever-living (Rev. i, 18), the ἀμφισβατήσις τῆς ζωής (Acts iii, 13), the λόγος ζωής, by virtue of whom those who follow him become λόγοι ζωῆς, living stones (1 Pet. ii, 4, 5). In 1 Pet. iii, 7 (comp. iv, 6) we read of a κλήμονον γεράτος (and in the apocryphal description of the heaven- en Jerusalem we still read of a ποταμός ἀληθείας (river of the water of life) which flows from the throne of God and of the Lamb (Rev. xvi, 7). ζωή (tree of life) by the shores of the stream (Rev. xvi, 1, 2, 14, 19, 7). See the different interpretations given to John's ζωή αἰωνίως in Kaeffer, De bibl. c. a. notion., p. 22.

11. History of the Doctrine. — 1. The Talmudists speak only of the נֵּפֶל נְבֵי, in which all Israelites have part, but nowhere of an eternal life; while the Targumists make use of the expression, for instance, in Lev. viii, 5.

2. It was long before even the Christian Church was able to understand the full scope of the idea. In the early time, a "eternal life" was represented only as future happiness, to be fully accomplished only after the resurrection and the judgment of the world. Irenaeus (adv. Haer. i, c. 10) states what the per universum orbem usque ad fines terrae seminata ecclesia (the Church dispersed throughout the earth) believes on this point, the redemption — ut justitiae et sanctitae — incorruptibilem statum lustrat et vitam aeternam tribuat (coming of Christ to confer eternal life upon the righteous and holy). So also Tertullian (De praec. Hæret. c. xiii). Augustine (De Sp. et. Op. c. xxiv) says: "Cum seminatus sit aeterno, et semina semina exsurgant: ut in aeternum semina semina: ut itum praeium, cuius promissio nae" (that is, the complete reward, in the promise of which we joy) (De morib. eccl. cath. p. 25; De Trin. i, 13; Enchir. § 29, etc. Basil (Enarr. Psalm xiv) connects it with the eternal dispensation of heaven. The Apostle's Creed and the Athanasian Creed end the enumeration of their articles of faith with the dogma concerning eternal life as emanating from God, the absolute cause, and represent it as the final object of all ordained development (Const. Apost. vii, 41). John xx, 28 says: "Iam quia, Domine, in te salvi sumus, et per te salvi sumus, et in te salvi sumus, et per te salvi sumus, et per te salvi sumus, et per te salvi sumus, et per te salvi sumus, et per te salvi sumus, et through the waters; and the fathers speak of Christ merely ζωή, Ή ἐκεῖνος ζωή, but not ζωή αἰωνίως. Yet occasionally they touch upon nearly all the questions connected with that point, without, however, arriving at any definite system of doctrine. In their description of the state of the blessed they mention as the most important points its endless duration, freedom from evil, and absolute satisfaction. The latter was sometimes defined as complete knowledge, perfect moral liberty, inner and outer peace, or immediate intercourse with God and the saints, together with personal reunion with those who have preceded us; or, again, as a life of perfect happiness colored by the permanent influence of all human desire, or as several of these different points together. The finis desideriorum nostrorum is God himself, qui sine fine videbitur, sine fatoque amabilior, sine factuatione amabilior (Justin, Apol. i, 8; Origen, De princip. c. 3; Cyril, Ep. 53; Hieron, De orig. Naz. Orat. xvi, 9, vii; xxvi, 24; Greg. Nys. Orat. de Placita et Orat. de Mortuis; Basil, Hom. vi in Hexamet. et Hom. in Ps. cxiv; August. De civ. Dei, xxvi, 23; Chrysost. Hom. xiv in Ep. ad Rom.; Ambros. in Gal. vi; Cassiodor. De anima, c. xxii). The idea of different degrees of felicity in future life, as differences of reward, was widely prevalent, however, in making it lose its character as gratia pro gra tia (grace for grace) (August. Tract. xiii in John; Theodoret on Rom. vi, 23, and in Cividicam I). According to the ζῆς (desert) of every one, there are παλαιοὶ θησαυροί (John iv, 14, 15, 20; ἐκτικαὶ σειρία (John i, 1, 2, 11; Greg. Naz. Orat. xxvii, 8; xvi, 5; xvi, 7; xxix, 38; Basil in Eunom. i, 3; August. De Civ. Dei, xxxii, 30, 2; Hieron. ad. Jos. 2). The fathers say also very positively that the joys of heaven cannot be described, which is the whole truth of the Christian imagination [an approximative idea of them]. So Greg. Nys. (Inrat. Catech. c. xi). "Bona vita aeterna tam multa sunt unt numerum, tam magna ut mensuram, tam preposita ut estimationem omnem excedant" (August. De trip. ha b. c. 1, Conf. Orth.). (3.) The divines of the Middle Ages brought to light new truths on this point, but assembled those
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already recognised into a system. They also established a doctrinal distinction between vita eterna (eternal life) and beatitudine (happiness), defining them both. Anselm (De similib. c. xxvii) counts fourteen partes beatitudinis, seven of which relate to the glorifying of the body, and seven to the glorifying of the soul. The occupations of the saints are generally connected also with the number seven. Yet it was more customary to divide the different aspects of that state—or course subject to all kinds of occasional modifications—into twelve parts (Bonaventura, Ditia sanctorum, c. xxviii). Spec. conc. c. xi. Deo. Torre crem. Tract. c. xxi. (in reg.:) "Duodecim considerationes vitae aeternae: 1. Ila sola est vita vera; 2. Possidetur sanitas sicque quacunque infirmitate, molestia aut passione; 3. Fulcrutitudo sicut quacunque deformitate; 4. Copia omnium bonorum; 5. Satisfactio et adaequatio omnium desideriorum sicut quacunque defectus; 6. Securitas et pacis tranquillitas sinita timere quacunque; 7. Vizio beaclarissima et eundemissima divinitatis; 8. Delectionis tota summam; 9. Sapientia et plenissima cognitione absque ignorantia (an especially gratifying prospect for fut. c. iv). 10. Highest bonum et gloria; 11. Ineffablis is sweetness; 12. Endless praise.) Thomas Aquinas recognizes, besides, the general and common beatitudin, special dores, gifts. Thus, aside from the corona aurea, he reserves a special aureola to the martyrs and saints, and also to monks and nuns, as a sort of supererogated reward. The highest good is beatitudin, and the disfigurement of the blessings of future life is knowledges according to Scottus, the will. After the times of Anselm, and among the scholastics and mystics, we find very attractive descriptions of the blessed state, full of elevated ideas. "Præmium est," says Bernard (De mediæ vita c. xiv), "quod Deus, fuit in me sum Deae, esse in Deo, qui erit omnia in omnibus; habere Deum, qui est sumnum bonum; et ubi est sumnum bonum, ibi summa felicitas." (The reward is, to see God, to dwell with God, to exist with God and in God, who shall be in All; to possess God, who is the highest Good; and where the highest Good is, there is perfect bliss.) (1.) The Roman Catholic Church has simply gathered the teachings of the scholastics into a whole on this point, and has established them in a more fixed and dogmatic manner, as is shown in the exposition given in the Roman Catechism. According to it, the vita eterna (eternal life), by which believers are, after their resurrection, to attain the perfection after which they aim, is non magis perpetuitas vitae, quam in perpetuam beatitudinem, quod beatius est desierium expierl et non potest perpetuis; et non est in perpetuiu, in perpetue, satisfacere omnes desideria beatitudinis. It is evident, moreover, that the nature of the blessedness of the saints cannot be appreciated by our minds in any but an empirical, not an absolute manner. According to the scholastics, the eternal blessings can be described only by perfections of God in his nature and substance, and the consequent participation in his essence, which is identical with his possession. 2. Accessory; glory, honor, perfect peace, etc. They are expressly represented as incentives to lead, and not to seek, on their connection with good works in the Romanist system, see Council of Trent (Stos. vi. c. xxvii.) (2.) With the exception of the part relating to purgatory, the doctrine of the elder Protestantism on this subject does not essentially differ from that of the Romish Church. The symbolic books of the evangelical Church afford us but little information on this point. In general, the vita eterna continued to be considered as soluta nonre compensationem, speci mat. finis sibi (the goal of hope, the end of faith). By it was understood the position of the just, partly after this life in general, and partly after the resurrection. Comp. Augsburg Conf. art. 17; Apol. iv. 212; Cat. Min. ii. 5; Fidei Conc. Conc. oec. ss. 853; Conf. Belg. art. 67; Luther, Works, i. 860, 887, 997; xi. 1487; Melanchthon, loci, 1553, 75; Calvin, Institutes, iii. 9, 1.) Still the effects of a deeper study of Scripture (a result of the Reformation) became manifest in various ways, and especially in the idea of a beginning of eternal life in the heart of the believer, which was recognised as connected with regeneration (Apol. Confessionis, iv. 140, 148, 99, 187, 209, 210, 285, mostly in the German text; Buttmann, 445, 503; Zwining, Exp. ed. 12; P. Martyr, Loc. 442; Cat. Pal. 58; Alting, Expl. Catech. 280; Alsted, 769; Perkin, Cat. 778; Confessio Bohem. New ed. 1686; Cui corpus perirnamentale) adperses, Conv. Ec. c. 136, 976. Yet this truly evangelical view was not steadily persisted in, but, on the contrary, it was soon asserted again that the expression "eternal life" occurred only in Scripture to designate the reward of Christ's fidelity. Nevertheless, the fundamental idea of eternal life remained in the doctrine of a mystical union with Christ, and in the doctrine concerning the Eucharist. Many draw a distinction between the vita spiritualis (spiritual life), of which Christ is the alimentum (food), and the vita eterna (eternal life). The former was also designated as vivi gratiae (the life of grace), and the latter as vita glorii (the life of glory). There were three degrees of eternal life recognised: 1. Initialis, in this world; 2. Partialis, after the death of the individual; 3. Perfectionis, after the last judgment. So Pearson, On Faith and the Creed, Oxford, 1820), or the soul will be incorporeus corporis separate, postmodum vero eodem in die resurrectionis glorificari corporibus reuniate, ab omnibus miseriis, doloribus et malignis liberata. cum Christo, angelis sanctis et omnibus electis in sempiterna utitutia, gaudenitate, felicitate el infinito, et absolutissimom visione, perfecta sanctitate et justitiae ornate Deum a facie ad faciem sine fine videntec, sine fasitioso amant ac sine deslatitigatione glorific. (The early Protestant theologians speak of the felicity of the future life as incomprehensible and ineffable (Conf. Belg. 57; Bohem. in Niem. 846; Calvin, 3, 15, 10; Gerhard, 39, 340). Its blessings are partly privative, partly positive: the meeting again and recognition of Christians was considered one of them (Zwining In exp. ed. 12); this is called a positive blessing. That individual blessedness which will not be shared by the knowledge of the communion of others is called a privative blessing. In opposition to Rome, the influence of personal merit on the future state was denied by these theologians; but some of them, while admitting that blessedness is essentially the same for all, hold to several degrees of blessedness. A number of other discussions on the contemplation of God, or the knowledge of the blessed, the manner of the contemplation of God, if he shall be praised in word, etc., are generally treated by the ancient theologians after the example of Calvin, Inst. 3, 25, 6, as irrelevant, and of no religious importance. In later times they have been discussed anew. 7. Later Views.—The evangelical Protestant church probably would all agree that eternal life com-
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menseness in Christian experience in this world. So Wesley (Serm. ii, 181): "This is the testimony, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life [the eternal life here spoken of]; and he that hath not the Son hath not life." As if he had said, This is the sum of the testimony which God hath testified of his Son, that God hath given men only a title to, but the real beginning of eternal life; and this life is purchased by, and treasured up in his Son, who has all the springs and the fulness of it in himself, to communicate to his body, the Church. This eternal life, then, commences when it please the Father to reveal his Son in our hearts; when we first know Christ, being enabled to "call him Lord by the Holy Ghost;" when we can testify, our consciences bearing us witness in the Holy Ghost, "The life which I now live I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." And then it is that happiness begins—happiness real, solid, substantial. Then it is that heaven is opened in the soul, that the proper heavenly state commences, while the love of God, as loving us, is shed abroad in the heart, instantly producing love to all mankind; general pure benevolence, together with its general benevolence, mildness, meekness, patience, contentedness in every state; an entire, clear, full acquiescence in the whole will of God, enabling us to "rejoice evermore, and in everything give thanks." As to the nature of the blessedness of the future life, "the sum of what we are taught by reason and Scripture (a)"—especially those who may enter the abodes of the blessed without knowledge, or with only a small measure of it; e. g. children, and others who have died in ignorance for which they themselves were not to blame. On this subject nothing is definitely taught in the Scripture; but both Scripture and reason warrant us in believing that provision will be made for all such persons in the future world. A principal part of our future happiness will consist, according to the Christian doctrine, in the enlargement and correcting of our knowledge respecting God, his nature, attributes, works, and in the voluntary application of this knowledge to our own moral benefit, to the increase of our faith, love, and obedience. There has been some controversy among theologians with regard to the vision of God (rio Dei intutiuvoir, or sensatiu, or benificiua, or comprehensio); but Christ is always represented as one who will be personally visible by us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. And herein Christ himself places a chief part of the joy of the saints (John xiv, xvii, etc.). And so the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase "to sit with Christ." To his guidance has God intrusted he truth of heaven and on earth. And Paul says (2 Cor. iv, 6) we see the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ; he is "the visible representative of the invisible God" (Colos. i, 15). Paul says expressly (1 Thess. iv, 17) that we shall be with Christ, in company with our friends who died before us (γαρ σ�ν αναληθής); and this presupposes that we shall recognize them, and have converse with them, as with Christ himself. Paul advises that Christians should comfort themselves under the loss of their friends by considering that they are at home with the Lord, and that they shall be again united together" (Knapp, Christus, 7; Numb. sec. clx, p. 377). See also Cotta, Hist. Dogm. de Vita Eterna; Cotta, Theses Theol. de Vite eterna (Tubinga, 1768); Storli, Opuscula Academica, ii, 76; Wesley, Sermone, ii, 180 sq.; Baxter, Saints' Rest; Isaac Taylor, Physical Theory of another Life; Naville, Vie Eternelle (1865); Herzog, Real-Encyclopedia, viii, 254 (from which this article is in part a translation); Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, § 283-290. See Immortality; Resurrection; Heaven.

Eternity of God. See God.

Etham (Heb. Ethan). כֶּנֶ֜עָם, supposed by Jabin- sky (Synod. ed. te Water, ii, 157) to be i. q. Copic of ancient Greek name, κατακοπήν, "navigation of the sea." In a list of the 12 sons of Jacob, omit in Num. xxxiii, 8; Vulg. Etham), the third station of the Israelites when they left Egypt; a place described as lying "in the edge of the wilderness," where they encamped after the journey from Succoth (Exod. xxi, 20; Num. xxxiii, 6). This description, and the route pursued by them, seem to fix upon some point on the east of Egypt, north of the Red Sea, near the desert tract stretching thence along the whole eastern shore as far as Marah, to which the same name, "desert of Etham," is therefore naturally applied in the text of the New Testament. The late locality of Etham has been a matter of dispute, according to the various theories of the passage across the sea. No spot more likely has been indicated than a point in the valley of the bitter lakes opposite the foot of wady Abu-Zeid, in the direct route around the point of the sea, but from which there is a passage sharply deflecting, up wady Em-shesh, around Jebel Attaka, where the Israelites were at this point commanded to take. See Exodus; Desert. The sense of the passage Num. xxxiii, 6-8, is evidently this: At the end of the second day they had already arrived at the borders of the Arabah, which stretch from Etham, from which the entire country lying next to Egypt receives the name, desert of Etham; but, instead of advancing directly into the desert, they turned down again farther into Egypt, to the Arabian Gulf. Afterwards, instead of going round the coast, they climbed into the desert of Etham. See Shuh. Schwartz says (Polet, p. 211) that the part of the desert north of the Red Sea, near Suez, is still called Ethia, but this lacks confirmation.

Ethan (Heb. Ebyhm), "perpetuity, as often," the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Αἰβάχον. v. J-aclmnm and AieiK.) One of four persons ("Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol") who were so renowned for their sagacity that it is mentioned that the highest wisdom excelled theirs (1 Kings iv. 31 [Heb. v. 11]). Ethan being distinguished as "the Ezrahite" from the others, who are called "sons of Mahol;" unless, indeed, this word Mahol (q. v.) be taken, not as a proper name, but appellatively for "vagabond," "wandering," etc., in the same manner that would apply to Ethan as well as to the others. This interpretation is strengthened by our finding the other names associated with that of Ethan in 1 Chron. ii, 6, as "sons of Zerah," i. e. of Ezra, the same as Ezrahites, or descendants of the son of Judah. See Ezrahite. With this agrees the Jewish chronology, which styles them as prophets during this sojourn in Egypt (Soder
Olam Rabbé, p. 59), although the Jews have also a tradition
confounding Ethan with Abraham, Heman with Moses, and Chinokh with Joseph (Jerome, Comment. on
King, in loc.). In 1 Chron. ii, 8, Ethan's 'sons' are
mentioned, but only one name is given, that of Azariah.
B.C. post 1065. In the title to the 89th Psalm an
'Ethelbert' is mentioned, but there seems to be some confusion here in the latter epistle.
See No. 3 below.
2. (Sept. Αἴθαριν v. r. Oyspi.) Son of Zimmah and
father of Adahiah, in the ancestry of the Levite Asaph
(1 Chron. vi, 42 [23]). B.C. cir. 1585. In ver. 21 he
seems to be called the same person as Ethelbert.
(Joyce, xvi, 27). See JOAH.
3. (Sept. Αἴθαριν v. r. Αἴθαρις.) A Levite, son of
Kushai or Kushiah, of the family of Merari; appointed
one of the leaders of the Temple music by David (as
singer, 1 Chron. vi, 44 [29], or player on cymbals, xv,
17, 19). B.C. 1014. In the latter passages he is asso-
ciated with Heman and Asaph, the heads of two other
families of Levites; and inasmuch as in other passages
of these books (1 Chron. xxv, 1, 6) the names are
given as Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, it has been
conjectured that this last and Ethan were identical.
There is at least great probability that Ethan the sing-
er was the same person as Ethan the priest (comp. No. 1 above), whose name stands at the head of Ps.
Lxxxi, for it is a very unlikely coincidence that there
should be two persons named Heman and Ethan so
closely connected in two different tribes and walks of life. In fact, there is even more probability that the
Heman (q. v.), who, in the title to Psalm Lxxviii, is like-
wise expressly called an Ezrahite, and yet identified
in its authorship with the sons of Korah. Hengstenberg
supposes (Comment. on Psalms, Clarke's ed. iii, 89) that
both Heman and Ethan, although descendants of Ju-
dah, were adopted into the ranks of the Levites; but
this will not meet the above genealogy of this Ethan, who
is moreover classed with the Merarites, and not
with the Korahites. Comp. Heman, and see Ezra-
hite.
Eth'anim (Heb. Εθηναίμ, Αἴθαριν; Ezr 8:24), perennial
streams; Sept. 'Αστάρτη, another name for the month
Tisri (q. v.); so called from the fulness of the brooks
at that time of the year, being swelled with the au-
 tumnal rains (1 Kings viii, 2). See CALENDAR.
Eth'ball (Heb. Ethhâli, διαβροχή, with Baal, i. e.
enjoying his favor and help; Sept. ΕΣμπάλα, a king
of Sidon, in the genealogy of the infamous Ezechias,
son of Ahab (1 Kings xvi, 31). According to Josephus
(Ant. viii, 18, 1 and 2; Apion, i, 18), Ethbâl is called Tho-
bolus (τόβολος or θοβόλος, i. e. διαβροχή = Baal
with him) by Menander, who also says that he was a
priest of Astarte, and, having put the king of Phæth to
death, assumed the sceptre of Tyre and Sidon, lived
sixty-eight years, and reigned thirty-two (comp. Theo-
phil. Autol. iii, p. 132). As fifty years elapsed be-
 tween the deaths of Hiram and Phæls, the date of Ethbâl's
reign may be given as about B.C. 940-908. The
worship of Baal was no doubt closely allied to that of
Astarte, and it is even possible that a priest of Astarte
might have been dedicated also to the service of Baal,
and borne his name. We here see the reason why
Jesuel, the daughter of a priest of Astarte, was so zeal-
ous a promoter of idolatry, the taint of which, with
its attendant tyranny, eventually extended to the throne
of Judah the person of the Athalith; and as twenty-
one years after the death of Ethbâl, his granddaugh-
ter Dido built Carthage, and founded that celebrated
commonwealth (Josephus, as above), we may judge
what sort of a spirit animated the females of this royal
family. See AMAB. Another Phoenician king of the
same name (Διαβροχής or ΕΣμπαλαχ) appears as a
contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar (Josephus, Ant. vi,
11, 1; Apion, i, 21; Eusebius, Chron. Arm. 4782, i, 74).
See PHOENICIA.

Etelbert, king of Kent, was born A.D. 546 or
552, and succeeded to the throne about A.D. 560 (?).
About A.D. 590 he was acknowledged as Bretwalda
(president of the Heptarchy). In 570 he married Ber-
tha, a Christian, and daughter of Charibert, a Frank-
ish king. It had been agreed before her marriage that
she should be allowed to enjoy her own religion. The
most important event of his reign was the introduction
of Christianity into his kingdom by Augustine, who
landed in Kent in 596. See AUGUSTINE (vol. i, p. 544).
In 597 the king himself was baptized. He founded the
bishops' of Rochester and, with his niece Sebert, king of Essex, he consecrated the church of St. Peter, the
church of London. Ethelbert died in 616. — Mace, Christi-
ans Missions during the Middle Ages (1863), chap. v;
Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, i, 156 sq.

Ethelwold, the principal reformer of monastic
orders in England, was born in Winchester about 925.
From early youth he distinguished himself by his
learning, and obtained the favor of king Athelstan. He
was ordained priest simultaneously with Dunstan,
and when the latter was consecrated abbot of Glaston-
bury, about 947, Ethelwold entered his monastery and
became a companion of his studies. He distinguished
himself as a poet, grammarian, and theologian. He
is also reported to have been familiar with the me-
chanical arts, and to have constructed two bells. When
he declared his intention to go to Rome in order to
perfect himself in his studies, king Edred, who wished
that he retain in England, refused to him permission to
travel, and appointed him abbot of Abingdon. This
monastery was then in ruins, and was rebuilt by Eth-
elwold. In 963 king Edgar appointed him bishop of
Winchester. The great task of his life heretofore
was the reorganization of the Anglo-Saxon monas-
teries, which were at that time administered by
secular priests (clerici, canonici, presbyteri). The disci-
pline in the monastery was anything but severe, and
many of the priests were married. Ethelwold substit-
tuted for the secular priests regular monks, and
played great activity in rebuilding the monasteries
that had been destroyed by the Danes, and in repeo-
ting those that had been abandoned. The monastery
of Winchester, under: his direction, became a celebrated
school, from which preachers distinguished abbots
and bishops. He died Aug. 1, 994, at Win-
chester. The chief work of Ethelwold is an Anglo-
Saxon translation of the Latin rule of St. Benedict. It
has never been printed. He also wrote a mathematical
treatise, still extant in manuscript. — Hoefer, Nouv.
Biog. Générale, xi, 598; Wright, Biog.Brit., LIT. 485
sq. (A. J. S.)

Et'har (Heb. id. Αἴθαρις, abundance), one of the cit-
ies in the plain (Shephelah) of Judah (mentioned
between Libnah and Asan, Josh. xv, 42, Sept. 'Aśtiq v.
r. 132), eventually assigned to Simeon (mentioned
between Remmon and Ashan, Josh. xix, 7, Sept. 'Aśtiq
v. r. 132), and subsequently for Ether. In the
Omnimodatis Eusebius and Jerome men-
tion it twice (q. v. 'Ăśtiq, Ether; 'Ăśtiq, Jether)— in
the latter case confounding it with 'Ăśṭāq of priests,
which contained friends of David during his troubles
under Saul), and state that it was then a considerable
place (ἐν παλαιοτίτι), retaining the name of Jethira
(Ἰθηρία, Ἰθηρία), very near Malathas, in the interior
of the district of Daraem, that is, in the desert of Hermon, and
below Hermon about 15 miles to the east of Beer-sheba. At Belt-
hirin Van de Velde heard of a tell Akhar in this neigh-
borhood, but could not learn its distance or direction
(Memoir, p. 811). For the present, we may conjectu-
really place it at Belt-Aker, in the vicinity of the asso-
ciated localities of Beth-Shean and Betharabah, a
ruined village, covering low hills on both sides of the
path, and exhibiting foundations of hewn stones,
leading to the inference that it was once an extensive town (Robinson, Researches, iii, 10).

**Etheridge, John Wesley, Ph.D., a Methodist minister and eminent scholar, was born at Grange-woods, Isle of Wight, February 24, 1804, and died at Camborne May 24, 1866. His parents were Methodists, and he was brought up with religious care. In 1827 he entered the ministry of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and was appointed to the London Circuit. In 1888 his health failed, and he became "supernumerary." In 1846 he was able to return to the itinerant ministry, in which service he remained until his death. He was an eminently holy man. Whether in the pulpit or in the social circle, he appeared clothed with humility, and his influence was radiant with Christian benevolence. Constrained by the love of Christ, he lived only to promote the interests of the Church. He was "a burning and shining light," and consumed himself in the service of his Lord and Saviour" (Minutes, 1867).

Dr. Etheridge's devotion to letters, amid the engrossing labors of the Methodist ministry, were very remarkable. Early in life he showed extraordinary aptitude for languages, and by continued study he learned to read and write Hebrew and Syriac with facility. In the literature of these two languages he became peculiarly proficient before his death. His published writings include The Syrian Churches, their early History, Liturgies, and Literature (London, 1846, 12mo: this work contains a translation, also, of the four Gospels from the Peshitto)—The Apostolic Acts and Epistles, from the Peshitto, with the remaining Epistles and the Revelation (London, 1852, 12mo)—Hose Aramacea (London, 1843, 12mo: a useful series of Essays on the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac languages and literature)—Jerusalem and Tiberias, a Survey of the religious and scholastic Learning of the Jews, designed as an Introduction to Hebrew Literature (London, 1859, 12mo)—The Tanganyke, Odillo and Jonathan ben-Uzziel, etc. (London, 1862, 12mo). Besides these, he published Miscellanea, or Contemplations on the Mercy of God (Lond. 1842)—The Life of Dr. Adam Clarke (London, 1856: N. Y. 1860)—The Life of Dr. Thomas Coke (London, 1860)—The Life of the Rev. John Fletcher, Minutes of Conferences (English for 1867; Christian Examiner, Ivix, 346.

**Ethics**, from ἕθος, originally the Ionic form of θέος, in Germ. Stüttenlehre, in English moral philosophy, though this last phrase sometimes covers the whole science of mind. Ethics are related to law and duty, to virtue and vice. "Aristotle says that ἕθος, which signifies moral virtue, is derived from ἡθος, custom, and ἐθική, acts that are usual, which is a moral habit, is formed" (see Fleming's Vocab. Phil. p. 271). "Ethics, taken in its widest sense, as including the moral sciences or natural jurisprudence, may be divided into, 1. Moral philosophy, or the science of the relations, rights, and duties by which men are under obligations to one another. 2. Law of nations, or the science of those laws by which all nations, as constituting the society of the human race, are bound in their mutual relations to one another. 3. Public or political law, or the science of the relations between the different ranks in society. 4. Civil law, or the science of those laws, rights, and duties by which individuals in civil society are bound—as commercial, criminal, judicial, Roman, or modern. 5. History, profane, civil, and political" (Fenema, Intro. ad Philosoph. p. 86). "Ethics, then, cover the science of all that is moral, and relate to law or action, to God or the creature, to the individual or the state. It goes wherever the ideas of right and wrong can enter.

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

(a) Philosophical Ethics. The science in this aspect, must find its root and its life, its forms and its authority, in the depths of the human constitution. This leads necessarily to the idea of God. We do not affirm that ethics cannot be discussed at all without bringing in the notion of a supreme being. On the contrary, it is undeniable that we find in man a moral nature; whatever may be the character of his moraliti, the requirement about that implies and necessitates a moral. He manifestly has relations to virtue and vice, to right and wrong, to blame and praise, to guilt and innocence. True, if he does not accept the idea of God, morals seem to lose their foundation. Why should a man obey the dictates of his nature, even if it is to be right and the good, unless his nature is a product of wisdom, and reveals the law and the nature of an infinite intelligence? But truth is sternborn, and even a fragment of it, swinging in the air without a foundation, will live. Pulled up out of the soil of a doctrine of God, the moral ideas, however shorn of their strength and wielded, still assert their authority and insist on obedience, from motives of utility, or fitness, or happiness. A genuine philosophical ethics, however, will find a Creator from the study of the creature, and will raise from the nature of man a law which will ground itself in the idea of God.

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

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

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

Christian ethics, indeed, considered as speculative, is not infallible. God has given the ethical norm, but man is obliged to speculate for himself. Evidently the complete form of Christian ethics, considered as a philosophy, does not yet exist. Whether it need exist is yet unknown, whether it rest on the system of benevolence and beauty which shall settle down on the whole human race, at once an atmosphere.
of divine and filial love, and an antidote to discord, injustice, and all impurity.

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

"What has now been said of the relation between philosophical and theological ethics, holds of the latter only so far as it is conceivable of as speculative. In other modes of treating theological ethics, especially in the traditional, it is easy to conceive that the relation would be different. . . . It must be distinctly affirmed that a Christian character belongs to philosophical ethics throughout the Christian world. We do not mean that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so; but that every instance of what is so. But, in spite of all the confident assertions of the contrary, we cannot doubt that from the specifically Christian consciousness of God, which is the subject treated here, sin and redemption should be deduced as a logical necessity" (Roth, *Theologische Ethik*, 57).

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

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

"Dogmatics and ethics are as certainly independent discipline as God and man are separate beings. Only a point of view like that of Spinoza, in his Ethics, which denies the existence of a real creation, and asserts that dogmatics, as the science of the good, can correct the independent position of ethics by the side of dogmatics" (idem).

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

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

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

IV. The Ethical Standard. — Its nature, according to Christianity, to be found in the Scriptures, but there is still in the sphere of science a wide diversity as to their meaning. But when the standard is supposed to be understood on a given question, and the conscience submits to it, there must follow a perfect self-abnegation; degradation must result from disobedience. In the case of a conflict between the conscience and the law of the state, for example, in which case the conscience of the lawgiving majority collides with the individual conscience, who shall yield? The answer, from the very nature of the case, is, neither. They must fight it out. The state, from its nature, is supreme, and cannot yield; but for the man the conscience is also supreme. The man can only die, or make some other atonement, and thus maintain allegiance to the higher law of the state.

V. History of Ethics. (a.) The sources of knowledge here are Christ, his person and teaching; also the writings of the apostles, as shown in the New Testament. In the Old Testament the whole contents are authoritative, except as modified or repeated by the New Testament. By the side of these objective sources we have a subjective source in the New Covenant; it is the influence of the Holy Spirit. This is the case in Barnabas, Justin, and Clement of Alexandria bear witness. This life of the Spirit in the man is not only subject to the supposed efficacy of ordination, by which the Spirit was bound to the priesthood exclusively. There came now an outward law of the Church to modify the New Testament, and it controlled the ethical consciousness of Christendom until the Reformation.

(a.) Ethical materials are found in the apostolical fathers, who base ethics on individual personality, on marriage, the family, etc. The most effective of the earlier writers was Tertullian (220). His ethical writings were very numerous, such as concerning spectacles, concerning the resting of virginum, monogamiae, reviviscit, patience, etc. His idea of Christianity was that it was of the first and the least power, separated from all the heathen customs of the Old World, and resolved to bring upon that world the judgment of Heaven. Cyriacus, with his high claim for the episcopate, exercised great influence on the ethical sphere of the Church. He concentrated the truth of the Church in the episcopacy, in which he saw the vehicle of the Holy Ghost, and the instrument by which unity and the holy spirit should be assured to the Church forever. He carried this idea of the dignity of the episcopate, and the sanctity and sanctifying power of orders, to a ridiculous extent. His doctrine of the efficacy of orders and the dignity of bishops was set over against certain sects — not Montanists, Donatists — who held that the holiness and unity of the Church demanded that none but holy persons should be members. Augustine fell heir to this controversy. As the Church grew into an earthly kingdom, her ethics took more and more the direction of a so-called higher wisdom. Luther forms a most vigorous, poverty, conventional life, and self-imposed torture.

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

The Reformation not only conquered the prevailing errors by leading men back to the holy Scriptures, but it established positively the real principle of Christian ethics. It did this through justifying faith, which, working by love, creates the possibility of Christian ethics; by the springing from faith, is the fulfilling of the law. It is ethics in the soul, ready to take shape in noble action. This, working in the community inwardly, proceeds to mould all relations, private and public — marriage, family, church, state, science, art, and culture. The great reformers did not write complete ethical tracts, though they discussed many ethical subjects, such as prayer, oaths, marriage, etc.; but they especially discussed ethics in their explanations of the Decalogue, in the Catechism. Indeed, the original form of Christian ethics is in the Catechism of the Council of Trent (1563). See Paul of Emin, Ethica, lib. i. Thomae Vactarius, De Virtute Christiana, lib. iii. comp. Schwartz, Thomas Venatorius, and the beginnings of Protestant ethics, in connection with the doctrine of justification, Stud. u. Krit. (1850), heft. 1. See also Melanchthon, in his Philosophia Hioralis (1589), his Enarratio aliqua libros Aristoteli (1545), and his Physical. Add to these Keckermann, Systema Theologiae (1614); Weigel, Johann Arnhold, Valentin Andreae, Spenzer, Nitzsch, Henry Müller, Schriver, and others, all mystics. The Reformed have also done something in this line, especially G. Voetius, C. Vittingius, H. Witsius, Ameius, Amalarius (Morale Christiann, 1669).

Three men, according to J. A. Dornier (in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. iv, 194), form the transition stage to the emancipation of philosophy — Hugio Grotius (De juris pacis et bello), Puffendorff, with his school, and Christian Thomasius. Then come Wolf, Moerbeke, with his Moralvm, vol. 1. Steinhart, B. Klopstock, Ch. Aug. Crusius, and J. F. Reuss (Elementa theologica Moralia, 1767). Even the Roman Catholic Church of the last two centuries has felt the influence of the modern
philosophy; the following Romanist writers are Wolf-
lions: Lubii, Schwarzthuber, Schanzia, and Stadler; and
the following are Kantians: Wanker, Mutschelle,
Hermes, with his disciples Braun, Elvenich, and Vog-
gelsang; in his Schellingian, independent, and,
at the same time, mild and evangelical, pious and
rich in thought, are Michael Sailer and Hirscher.
Geissbühler is a Fichtian.
Kant's "practical reason," the metaphysics of eth-
ics; as in the display of the most impor-
tant place, and, notwithstanding certain defects, it
has the immortal honor to have discovered that the
certainty of all things is the conscience in its rela-
tion to the practical reason, and to have made an end of the
ecumenism of ethics by means of the majesty of the
law of moral, which he combines with the glory of
the stary heavens. To his "categorical impera-
tive" certain rationalistic Kantians adhere; for exam-
Some of the supernaturalists, as Staudin and Tief-
trunk, Ammon and Vogel, incline to Jacob's philoso-
phy. See also Richter, System der Moral (1797). To
the Jacob-Febrius school belong De Weite (Chris-
tliche Stütehre, 4 bde. 1819-23), Kähler, and Baumgarten-
Crusius. To the school of Hegel belong Michelet
(System der Philosoph. Moral, Berlin, 1828), L. V. Hen-
ning (Jüngere Geschichte der moral. Ethik, 2 bde.
Tafel, Von der mensch. Freiheit im Verhältnis zu Sünde und Gnade, 1843); Marheineke (Chris-
tliche Moral, 1847), Daub (Christliche Moral, 1840).
Of this school, yet more under the influence of Schleiermacher,
are Martensen (System. Moral Philos. 1841), Wirth (Sys-
tral. Ethik, 1841); H. Herer (System. Stütehre, nach den
Grundzuständen des Protestantismus, etc., 1841).
The activity of Schleiermacher in Christian ethics,
as in other departments of theology, was immense.
From 1819 he published his treatises on "the idea of
virtue," the "idea of duty," and on "the relation
between the moral law, which he combines with the glory of
the stary heavens. On this point of view may be "allowed" and the "chief
good." His system was not further published by him-
sell, but after his death A. Schweizer edited his Philos.
Ethik in 1855, and Jonas his Christ. Sitt in 1845. See
also Sarrottius, Heil. Liebe, Harless, Chrisitliche Ethik,
and especially Richter, System der Ethik (2d edit. 1867).
To the school (translated by Morrison, Clark's Library, Ed-
inburgh, 1868, 8vo) seeks to combine Hegel's stand-
point of objective knowledge with Schleiermacher's
fine moral tact and organizing power, and to excel them
both. The leading representative of this school
is E. Rüttkenick's Christ. Stütehre (1845); Gelzer, Die Rel-
tion im Leben, etc. (1854); Schwarz, Eun. Cruc. Ethik
(1886, 3d ed.); Wendt, Kirchliche Ethik v. Standpunkt
v. Christ. Freiheit (2 vols. 8vo, Leipzig 1864-65); Cal-
man, D. Christliche Ethik (Stuttgart, 1884-85, 2 vols.
8vo). This sketch of the history of ethics is chiefly
condensed from Donner's article (Ethik) in Herzog,
Real-Encyclop. iv, 165 sq. (B. H. N.)

Appendix.—It is proper to add to the above a brief
account of the history of ethics, or moral philosophy,
in England. A survey of this field will be found in
Mackintosh, General View of the Progress of Ethical
Philosophy (Encyc. Britannica, Prelim. Diss.), sepa-
rately printed in his Miscellaneous Works (Lond. 1851,
12mo), and in a separate volume (Phila., 1882, 8vo); also
in Whewell, Leaonard's Philos. of Science, and the
Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art, i, 821 sq. (Lond. 1865, 3
vols. 8vo). From this and other sources we con-
dense the following sketch:

The modern ethical theories may be classed as
selfish or disinterested, according as they found their
value on a selfish or a benevolent principle. The
selfish theory is advocated by Hobbes († 1679), who
makes self-love the exclusive passion, and consid-
erns pleasure the only motive to action (see his Hu-
man Nature, his Leviathan, and our article HOBBS).
The same theory is adopted in substance by Jeremy
Bentham († 1832), who assumes Hobbes's principle as
self-evident, that every object is indifferent for its
fitness to produce pleasure or pain, which he de-
clares are the sole motives to action. "Bentham is
the most distinguished proponent of the principle of
utility as the basis of morals, a principle explained by
him as 'sympathy and antipathy,' by which he meant to
describe all those systems, such as the moral-sense the-
ory, that are grounded in internal feeling, instead of a
regard to outward consequences. In opposing utility to
asceticism, he intended to imply that there was no
merit attaching to self-denial as such, and that the in-
duction of pain or the surrender of pleasure could only
be justified by the means of procuring a greater
amount of happiness than was lost" (Chambers, s. v.).
See Bentham, Treatise on Morals and Legislation; and
our article BENTHAM, JEREMY.
Locke († 1704) de-
nied the existence of an innate faculty for perceiving
moral distinctions. In his Essay on the Human Under-
standing (bk. i, ch. iii), he maintains that virtue is
approved of, not because it is innate, but because it is
profitable. Paley († 1805) also rejected the doctrine
of a moral sense, and held, in substance, the utilita-
narian theory that "virtue is a quality of mankind
subject to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for
the sake of everlasting happiness" (Moral and Politi-
ical Philosophy). The utilitarian theory is taught by
all the recent English writers of the materialistic
school; see Mill, An Essay on the Human Mind (Lon-
d. 1829; see Mill, JAMES; Austin, Province of Jurisprudence
understood (2d ed. London, 1861); John Stuart Mill, Dissertations and
Discussions (1859); and his Utilitarianism, reprinted from Fraser's Magazine
(1862; 2d ed. 1864); Bain, The Emotions and the Will
(Lond. 1885); and especially Mill, Analysis of the Human Mind
also his Mental and Moral Science (Lon. 1866, 8vo),
where he teaches that conscience is solely the product
of education. See also, in reply to these writers, The
North British Review, September, 1867, art. 1; The
British Quarterly, January, 1869, art. vi.

Opposed to the utilitarian and the teleological there are two
theories, which may be called the instinctive and the rais-
ional. The former refers the moral principle to the
sensitive or emotive part of man's nature; the latter,
to the perception of moral good and evil by the intellec-
tual. The subject will be considered in its original
aspect under the head of the "Theory of the Moral Sentiments" (Glasgow,
1758; London, 1790, and often) refers the moral sense to
sympathy. His view is thus stated by Mackintosh
(Ethical Philosophy, Philadelphia, 1832, p. 149): "That
mankind are so constituted as to sympathize with
each other's feelings, and to feel pleasure in the ac-
cordance of these feelings, are the only facts required
by Dr. Smith, and they certainly must be granted to
him. To adopt the feelings of another is to approve
them. When the sentiments of another are such as
would be excited in us by the same objects, we
approve them as the only proper way to obtain this
result, it becomes necessary for him who enjoys or suffers to
lower his expression of feeling to the point to which
the by-stander can raise his fellow-feelings, on which
are found all the high virtues of self-denial and self-
command; and the by-stander is always to be neces-
sarier to raise his sympathy as near as he can to the level
of the original feeling. In all unsocial passions, such
as anger, we have a divided sympathy between him who
feels them and those who are the objects of them.
Hence the propriety of extremely moderating them.
Pure malignity, it is to be conceived, is never bene-
because all sympathy is arrayed against it. In
the private passions, where there is only a simple sympathy,
—that with the original passion—the expression has
more liberty. The benevolent affections, where there
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is a double sympathy— with those who feel them and those who are their objects—are the most agreeable, and may be indulged with the least apprehension of finding sources of regret. It is with the gratitude of those who are benefitted by good actions prompts us to consider them as deserving of reward, and forms the sense of merit; as fellow-feeling with the resentment of those who are injured by crimes leads us to look on them as worthy of punishment, and constitutes the sense of guilt. These are apparently not only beneficial actions, but benevolent motives for them; being compounded, in the case of merit, of a direct sympathy with the good disposition of the benefactor, and an indirect sympathy with the person benefitted. These are the most opposite of all the sympathies. He who does an act of wrong to another to gratify his own passions must not expect that the spectators, who have none of his undue partiality to his own interest, will enter into his feelings. In such a case he knows that they will pity the person wronged, and be full of indignation against him. When he is cooled, he adopts the sentiments of others on his own crime, feels shame at the impropriety of his former passion, pity for those who have suffered by him, and a dread of punishment from general and just resentment. Such are the constituent parts of remorse. Our own self-interest is the all-important thing; else few of us would bear with those others feel concerning us. We feel a self-approbation whenever we believe that the general feeling of mankind coincides with that state of mind in which we ourselves were at a given time. We therefore use the sympathies of our own behavior, and endeavor to imagine whatever act would in this light produce in us. We must view our own conduct with the eyes of others before we can judge it. The sense of duty arises from putting ourselves in the place of others, and adopting their sentiments respecting our own conduct. In utter solitude there could have been no self-approbation. The rules of morality are a summary of those sentiments, and often beneficially stand in their stead when the self-delusion of passion would otherwise hide from us the unconformity of our state of mind with that which, in the circumstances, is the duty of the private person to hate is to be miserable; that affection is its own reward, and ill-will its own punishment; or, as it has been more simply and more affectingly, as with more serenely of authority, taught, that to give is more blessed than to receive, and that to love one another is the true idea of friendship. Bishop Butler († 1729) sets forth his moral doctrine in his Sermons (often reprinted), which have been recently published as a text-book by the Rev. J. C. McLennan. Butler was a great student of courses (Philadelphia, 1855, 12mo). He is undoubtedly the greatest of modern English writers on the true nature of ethics. "Mankind," he says, "have various principles of action, some leading directly to the private good, some immediately to the good of the community. But the private good is not self-love, or any form of it; for self-love is the desire of a man's own happiness, whereas the object of an appetite or passion is some outward thing. Self-love seeks things as means of happiness; the private appetites seek things, not as means, but as ends. A man eats fish for hunger, and not for appetite. If he believes, though he knows that these acts are necessary to life, that knowledge is not the motive of his conduct. No gratification can indeed be imagined without a previous desire. If all the particular desires did not exist independently, self-love would have no object to employ itself about, for there would be no happiness, which, by the very supposition of the opponents, is made up of the gratification of various desires. No pursuit could be selfish or interested if there were not satisfactions first gained by appetites which seek their own outward objects without regard to self, which satisfactions compose the mass which is called a man's interest. In contending, therefore, that the benevolent affections are disinterested, no more is claimed for them than must be granted to mere animal appetites and to malvolent passions. Each of these principles appeals to any thing for the gratification of gratifying its pleasure. This is the attainment, but no separate part of the aim of the agent. The desire that another person may be gratified seeks that outward object alone, according to the general course of human desire. Resentment is as disinterested as gratification or joy, but not more so. But the disinterested may be, as much as the purest benevolence, at variance with self-love. A regard to our own general happiness is not a vice, but in itself an excellent quality. It were well if it prevailed more generally over crav-
From this he argues that moral good must be perceived by a sense, because the senses alone are perceptive of simple qualities (see his Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, Glasgow, 1725, and often). Hume (Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals) asserts, indeed, that general utility constitutes a universal ground of moral dispositions and of all judgments of the utility of actions. But he asserts also that we approve of good and disapprove of evil in virtue of a primary sentiment of our nature (distinct from self-love), which he calls benevolence or humanity, but which is identical with conscience, or the moral sentiment. As to the idea of moral obligation, he makes it simply a judgment of the understanding that happiness flows from obedience to the moral faculty rather than from obedience to self-love. For the doctrines of Mackintosh, we must refer our readers to his admirable treatise (which often cited in this article) of the History of Ethical Philosophy.

Of the so-called Rational school, the distinctive characteristic is that it considers the idea of good to be an a priori conception of reason, in which the idea of obligation is necessarily and essentially implied. As to the nature of the idea, several different opinions have been held, viz. 1. that it is simple and immediate; 2. that it derives its explanation and authority from some higher notion of the intellect. The most distinguished representatives of the latter opinion are Clarke and Wollaston, while the former has found able advocates in Cudworth, Clarke, and Stuart, or col. (Blackburn). Dr. M'Cosh (American Presby. Review, Jan. 1868, art. i.) classes the modern views on ethics in Great Britain into the two schools of Sensational and Rational (or à priori), "corresponding to the two schools of philosophy which have divided Europe since Descartes and Locke." Under the head of the former school he includes Cudworth, Clarke, Coleridge, Reid, Stewart, and Sir W. Hamilton; "none of them, however, except Coleridge, taking up so high an à priori ground as Descartes and Cousin in France, or Kant and Hegel in Germany." The Protestants of England, in the main, at this time, according to the same writer, do not agree with those Roman Catholic writers who deny an independent morality apart from the authority of the Church; while, on the other hand, they do not agree with the philosophers who assert not only the indepen- dence of morality, but also its sufficiency, and hence, its self-sufficiency and autonomy. (See the article cited for a view of the relations of the modern sensational doctrine to theology and religion.)

Among American writers, Jonathan Edwards (1716) is first to be named in this field. In his Dissertation concerning the Unity of the Ground of Conscience, he could not avoid discovering that the being who possessed the highest moral qualities is the object of the highest moral affections. He contemplates the Deity through the moral nature of man. In the case of a being who is to be perfectly loved, 'goodness must be the simple actuating principle within him, this being the moral quality which is the immediate object of love.' The highest, the adequate object of this affection, is perfect goodness, which, therefore, we are to love with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength.' (Edwards.) 'We should refer ourselves implicitly to him, and cast ourselves entirely upon him. The whole attention of life should be to obey his commands' (Sermon xii. On the Love of God). Moral distinctions are thus presupposed before a step can be made towards religion: virtue leads to piety; God is to be loved, and to love God is to love; and it is only after the mind rises through human morality to divine perfection that all the virtues and duties are seen to hang from the throne of God' (Mackintosh, History of Ethical Philosophy, 110 sq.).

To the same school belong Hutchison (+ 1747), who taught that moral good is simply what the word itself expresses, which is not explicable by any other phrase.
by American writers, such as those of Adams, Way-land, Alexander, Haven, Alden, Hopkins, etc., for further mention of which we have not space. Hickok (System of Moral Science, 1853, 8vo) treats the subject from the a priori point of view, and also in its relations to Christian theology, in a very masterly manner. Dr. Adams, in an essay of its own. The voice of conscience is imperative. 'There is an awful sanctuaty in every immortal spirit, and man needs nothing more than to exclude all else, and stand alone before himself, to be made conscious of an authority he cannot desist nor delude. From its ascendancy springs the destiny of itself; its destiny of self; for its destination comes self-contempt. A stern behest is ever upon him that he do nothing to degrade the real dignity of his spiritual being. He is a law to himself, and has both the judge and executioner within himself, and inseparable from him. 'We may call this the imperative of the reason, the constraint of conscience, or the voice of God within him; but, by whatever terms expressed, the real meaning will be that every man has consciously the bond upon him to do that, and that only, which is due to his spiritual excellency.' To be thus worthy of spiritual approbation is the end of all spiritual discipline. The article, 'Moral Science,' may be worthily be given and righteously taken, but not righteously paid as price or claimed as wages. The good is to be worthy, not that he is to get something for it. The highest good — the sumnum bonum — is worthiness of spiritual approbation" (Moral Science, p. 48-49).

Christian ethics, as distinguished from moral philosophy in general, has not received the same attention from English and American writers as from German. The earlier books on Causality (q. v.) and Cases of Conscience, however, belong under this head. Most of the standard English and American writers coming into philosophical morals with Christian ethics. Butler brings out with clearness the relations of ethics to the Christian religion. Wardlaw's Christian Ethics (5d ed. Lond. 1887, Boston; 5th ed. Lond. 1882) asserts that the science of moral science has no province at all independently of theology, and that it cannot be philosophically discussed except upon theological principles (Boston ed. p. 867, note). Watson (Theod. Inst., pt. iii) treats of Christian ethics under the title 'The Morals of Christianity;' and denies the prior method (see Cocker, in Meth. Quart. Jan. 1861). Spalding (Phil. of Christian Morals, Lond. 1848, 8vo) has "recount both to science as derived from an examination of man's moral nature, and to revelation as derived from an examination of the Scriptures." The whole index Roman Catholic writers have generally confined themselves to the so-called Moral Theology (q. v.). The Cartesian school [see DES CARTES] cultivated Ethics in the new philosophical spirit; its best representative was Malebranche. Virtue is defined to be the love of universal order, as it existed in the divine reason, where every created reason contemplates it. Particular duties are but the applications of this love. He abandoned the ancient classification of four cardinal virtues, and for it substituted the modern distinction of duties toward God, men, and ourselves. The French school of Sensualism, of which Condillac was the head [see CONDILLAC], regarded all intellectual operations, even judgment and volition, as transformed sensations; and Helvetius, applying the theory to morals, held that self-love is the exclusive motive of man, denied all interested motives, made pleasure the only good, and referred to legislative rewards and punishments as illustrating the whole system of individual action. La Mettrie maintained an atheistic Epicureanism, and Condorcet wished to substitute an empirical classification of the sciences for the metaphysical religion and morality. The most complete and logical elaboration of the materialism, atheism, and fatalism of the period, which had pleasure for its single aim and law, was given in D'Holbach's Systeme de la nature. Of the later French writers, Jouffroy is perhaps the most important. He gave a peculiar explanation of good and evil. Everything is good in proportion as it aids in the fulfilment of our destiny. The problem of human destiny, therefore, lies at the foundation of all. There is a prior judgment as to the moral quality of actions, since that is relative to the agent, depending on the influence they may have on the destiny for which he was created. Good, in the case of any particular being, is the fulfillment of its own specific destiny. The destiny of each individual is the sum total of all beings; and an interruption in the accomplishment of destiny constitutes evil. His system of Ethics is chiefly laid down in his Cours du Droit naturel (2 vols., Paris, 1835; a third vol. was edited after his death by Damiron, 1842), his most eloquent work, which, besides ethics, treats of psychology and theology. Some points are more fully developed in a series of essays, which first appeared in periodicals, and of which subsequently two collections (Melanges philosophiques and Nouveaux melanges philosophiques) were published.

See, besides the authors named in the course of this article, the articles, 'Moral Science,' 'Ethics," in the introduction to St. Hilare's translation of Aristotelian's Politics (Politique d'Aristote, Paris); Meiners, Alma. Krit. Geschichte d. übrigen u. neueren Ethik (Göttingen, 1801, 2 vols.); Hagenbach, Encyclopa. d. Methodik u. Geschichte d. christl. Ethik (Gotha, 1846-52); Baume, Morale (Paris, 1842, 2 vols.); Damiron, Cours de Philosophie, vols. iii and iv (Paris, 1842); Jouffroy, Introd. to Ethics, trans. by Channing (Boston, 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Janet, Hist. des idees morales et politiques (Paris, 1856); Neander, Vorlesungen d. Geschichte d. christl. Ethik (Berlin, 1855, 8vo); Neander, Relation of Grecian to Christian Ethics; Christ. Exem. xix, 135; xxx, 145; Bibl. Sac. 1853, 476 sq.; article Ethics in Chambers's Encyclopedia, and in the Penny Cyclopedia, both in the interest of the sensation of the sensa- tional philosophy; North British Review, Dec. 1857, article: Wuttke, Handbuch der christl. Ethik (3vols. 8vo, 1861-62; 2d edit. 1866); Maurice, Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy; Maurice, The Conscience: Lectures on Causality (London, 1868). On the nature of evil, see Evil; Sin. On liberty and necessity, see Will. For the Roman Catholic way of treating ethics, see Moral Theology.

Ethiopia (1 Esdr. iii. 2; Est. xiii. 1, xvi. 1; Judith i. 10; Acts viii. 27; the Hebrew מְשּׁל, קָעֵשׁ, i. e. Cush, as it is generally rendered, Gen. ii. 13; 2 Kings xiv. 9, 13; xxvii. 20; xxviii. 13, 14; xxxv..Fixed: Isaiah liii. 4; Jer. viii. 1; xx, 3, 5; xxxvii, 9; xliv. 14; Ezek. xxx, 4, 5; xxxviii, 5; Nah. iii. 9), a country which, as thus designated by the ancients, lay to the south of Egypt, and embraced, in its most extend- ed sense, the modern Nubia, Sennar, Kordofan, and northern Abyssinia, and in its more definite sense the kingdom of Meroë, from the junction of the Blue and White branches of the Nile to the border of Egypt. In one passage in the description of the garden of Eden, an Asiatic Cush or Ethiopia must be intended (Gen. ii. 13), and the distribution of the descendents of Cush, with later Biblical historical indications, should be compared with the classical mentions of eastern and western Ethiopians, and other indications of profane history. In all other passages, the words Ethiopia and the Ethiopians, with one possible exception, "are to be understood as the same as near the Ethiopians" (2 Chron. xxvi, 16), which may refer to Arabs opposite to Ethiopia, may be safely considered to mean an African country and people or peoples. In the Bible, as in classical geography, but one limit of Ethiopia is laid down, its northern boundary, just south of the most southern town of Egypt. Egypt is spoken of as to be desolate 'from Migdol to Syene, even unto the
The inhabitants of Ethiopia were a Hamitic race (Gen. x. 6, and are described in the Bible as a dark-complexioned (Jer. xii, 23) and stalwart race (Isa. xiv, 9, 14: "men of stature, tall," and "men of stature, very tall"). Some substitute "tall"). Their stature is noticed by Herodotus (iii, 20, 114) as well as their handsomeness. Not improbably the latter quality is intended by the term in Isa. xviii, 2, which in the A.V. is rendered "peeled," but which may mean "fine-looking." Their appearance is described by the latter as "wearing the blue and royal houses (Jer. xxxiii, 7). The Ethiopians are on one occasion coupled with the Arabsians, as occupying the opposite shores of the Red Sea (2 Chron. xxxi, 16); but elsewhere they are connected with African nations, particularly Egypt (Isa. xviii, 31: Isa. xxv, 8, 9; Jer. xlv. 1, 2; Jer. xxxi, 8, 9; Jer. xlv. 13-14, Phut (Jer. xlvi. 10). And Lud (Ezek. xxxiii, 5), and the Sukkilm (2 Chron. xii, 9). They were divided into various tribes, of which the Sabians were the most powerful. See SEDRA; SUDAN.

The name Cush is found in the Egyptian kish, which is evidently applied to the same territory, though we have the same difficulty in determining its limits, save on the north. The classical Ethiopia (Aithiopia) may have the same origin, through the Coptic egypt, of which, unless it be derived from kish, "a dark and shining form," the Egyptian kish may have been a corruption and connect the classical with the ancient Egyptian name. The Greeks themselves regarded it as expressive of a dark complexion (from αἰθήρα, "to burn," and ἄφρα, "a countenance"). In the Bible there is no certain notice of any Ethiopian race but Cushites.

According to Strabo, the whole of that land above Egypt was TA-HERU-FET, or TA-KENS, corresponding to Nubia, and extending, under the Pharaohs, at least as far south as Napata. Dr. Brugsch supposes that TA-KENS was, in the earlier times, the whole tract south of Syene under Egyptian rule [therefore governed by the Nile, and, as it were, the Nile itself, being included in that country], and, in the later times, little more than the Dodecaschoson of the Potemies and Romans, the remains of the older territory (Geographische Inscriften, i, 100). As a name, Nubia, before the formation of the Ombye Nome, included Omoos, Silsils being probably the first city of the Egyptian Apollonopolitoe Nome. Although it is not impossible that at Silsils was anciently the great natural barrier of Egypt on the south, we think that this extension of Nubia was simply for purposes of government, as Dr. Brugsch supposes it. The identification of the names of the Nubia of the Pharaohs he places a region of which the name perhaps reads PET-NKI? NUPRE, which, however, was probably a district of the former country. Still further, and near Meroc, he puts the land of kish, and in and about Meroc the land of the NEHEH or negroes. Others, however, think that KISH commenced immediately above Egypt, probably always at the First Cataract, and included all the known country south of Egypt, TA-MERU-FET or TA-KENS, save as a name, being a part of it, the modern Nubia. Names of conquered negro nations, tribes, or countries occur on the monuments of the empire: of these, the most suggestive are the BARRHATA and TANKHER (see Brugsch, Geogr. Inscriften, i, 100-107, 150-154; ii, 4, 13, 20; iii, 3, 4, and indices s. v. 'Ethiopien, Res., etc.).

Ethiopia comprises two very different tracts. North of the region of the tropical rains, it is generally an extremely narrow strip of cultivated land, sometimes but a few yards wide, on both sides, or occasionally on one side only, of the Nile. Anciently the watered tract was much broader, but the giving way of a barrier at Silsils (Isael es-Silsileh) or Syene (Aswan) has lowered the level of the river for some distance above the First Cataract; exactly how far cannot be accurately determined, but certainly for the whole space below the Third Cataract. The cultivable soil which was
ethiopia

anciently productive is far above the highest level of the stream. The valley is, however, never broad, the mountains seldom leaving a space of more than a mile within the greater part of the region north of the limit of tropical rains. The aspect of the country is little varied. On either side of the river, here narrower than in its undulating course in Upper Egypt, rise sterile sandstone and limestone mountains, the former sometimes covered by yellow sand-drifts. At the First Cataract, at Kalabšheh, and at the Second Cataract, the river is obstructed, though at the second place not enough to form a rapid, by red granite and other graves, which especially are, the most beautiful objects in the scene, but its general want of variety is often relieved by the splendid remains of Egyptian and Ethiopian civilization, and the clearness of the air throws a peculiar beauty over everything that the traveller beholds. As he ascends the river, the scenery, after a time, becomes more varied, until on the east he reaches the Abyssinian highlands, on the west the long meadows, the pasture-lands of herds of elephants, through which flows the broad and sluggish White Nile. In this upper region the climate is far less healthy than below, save in Abyanis, which, from its height, is drained, and enjoys an air which is rare and free from exhalations. The country is thus for the most part montaneous, the ranges gradually increasing in altitude towards the S., until they attain an elevation of about 8000 feet in Abyanis.

The Nile is the great fertiliser of the northern regions of Ethiopia, which depend wholly upon its yearly inundation. It is only towards the junction of the two great streams that the rains take an increasingly important share in the watering of the cultivable land. In about N. lat. 12° 40', the great river receives its first tributary, the Atobaras, now called the Athabah. In about N. lat. 15° 40' is the confluence of the Blue and White Niles. The Blue Nile, which has its source in Abyanis, is a narrow, rapid stream, with high, steep mud-banks, like the Nile in Egypt; it is strongly charged with alluvial soil, to which it owes its dark color which has given it its distinctive name. From this stream the country below derives the annual alluvial deposits. The White Nile is a colorless river, very broad and shallow, creeping slowly through meadows and wide marsh-lands. Of the cultivation and natural products of Ethiopia little need be said, as they do not illustrate the few notices of it in Scripture. It has always been, excepting the northern part, productive, and rich in animal life. Its wild animals have gradually been reduced, yet still the hippopotamus, the crocodile and the ostrich abound, though the country is only second alone is found throughout its extent. The elephant and lion are only known in its southernmost part.

In the Bible a Cushite appears undoubtedly to be equivalent to a negro, from this passage, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his stripes? (Jer. xiii., 23); and it is to be observed, that wherever the race of Kish is represented on the Egyptian monuments by a single individual, the type is that of the true negro (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. i. 404, abridgment). It is therefore probable that the negro race extensively intermingled to the north than present, the whole country watered by the Nile, as far as is known, being now people by a middle intermediate between the negro race and the Caucasian. There is no certain mention in the Bible of this intermediate race in Ethiopia, but the Egyptian and Ethiopian monuments sufficiently show the indications of its ancestry, though probably it did not then extend as far south as now. At the present day, Ethiopia is inhabited by a great variety of tribes of this race: the Kuniz, said to be of Arab origin, nearest to Egypt, are very dark; the Nubes, the next nation, much lighter; beyond them are some fair Abyssinian, Bycaisan Abyssinians, with scarcely any trace of negro influence save in their dark color, and tribes as black as the true negro, or nearly so, though not of the pure negro type. The languages of Ethiopia are as various as the tribes, and appear to be the same intermediate between the Hamitic and the Nigritian, if we except the Ethiopian, which belongs to the former family. See ETHIOPIAN LANGUAGE.

In all that relates to the civilization of ancient Ethiopia we see the same connection with Egypt that is constantly shown in the Bible. So much is the Ethiopian away extended, which was probably, under the empire, as far as somewhat above the junction of the two Niles, the religion of Egypt was probably practised. While the tract was under Egyptian rule this was certainly the case, as the drains of the temples sufficiently shows. We do not know how far the Tirhakah in his Ethiopian as well as his Egyptian sculptures, and this is also the case with the later kings of Ethiopia who held no sway in Egypt. There were evidently local differences, but apparently nothing more. Respecting the laws and forms of government the same may be supposed. We have very little evidence as to the military matters of the Ethiopians, yet, from their importance to Egypt, there can be little doubt that they were skilful soldiers. Their armies were probably drawn from the Egyptian or intermediate race, not from the negro. Of the domestic life of this race we have but slight hints. Probably they were more civilized than are their modern successors. Their art, as seen in the sculptures of their kings in Ethiopian temples from Tirhakah downwards, is merely a copy of that of Egypt, showing, after the manner developed by their conquerors, first, an art in style inferior to the counter part of the original art. Their character can scarcely be determined from scanty statements, applying, it may be, to extremely different tribes. In one particular all accounts agree: they were warlike, as, for instance, we equally see in the defiance the Ethiopian king sent to Casmymes (Hered. iii. 21), and in the characteristic inscription of Kalabšheh of Silco, "king (毵敢w) of the Nubades and all the Ethiopians" (Modern Egypt and Tibeis, ii. 311, 312), who is to be regarded as a very late Ethiopian king or chief in the time of the Roman empire. The ancients, from Homer downwards, dace it them than as a happy and pious race. In the Bible they are spoken of as "secure" or "careless" (2 Esd. xxi. 9), but this may merely refer to their state when danger was impending. From the modern inhabitants of Ethiopia give us a far better picture of their predecessors than we can gather from the few notices in which we have alluded. If we compare the Nubians with the representations of the ancient Egyptians on the monuments, we are struck by a similarity of type, the same manner of wearing the hair, and a like scantiness of clothing. There can be
no question that the Nubians are mainly descended from an Egyptianized Ethiopian people of two thou-
sand years ago, who were very nearly related to the Egyptians. The same may be said of many tribes
further to the south, although sometimes we find the Arab manner and language in the time of
the Ethiopian monuments show us a people like the ancient Egyptians and the modern Nubians. The northern
Nubians are a simple people, with some of the vices, but most of the virtues of savages. The chastity
of their women is celebrated, and they are noted for their excellence. But they have a hard, restless,
and cruel, and lack the generous qualities of the Arabs. Further south manners are corrupt, and the national
character is that of Egypt without its humanity, and untouched by any but the rudest civilization.

In speaking of the history of the country, we may include what is known of its chronology, since this is
no more than the order in which kings reigned. Un-
til the time of the 12th dynasty of Egypt we have
neither chronology nor history of Ethiopia. We can
only speculate upon the earlier conditions of the coun-
try which we would soon reach if we were to follow
the Bible connections. The first spread of the descendents of Cush seems to be
indicated by the order in which the Cushite tribes, families,
or heads are enumerated in Gen. x. All the names, excepting Nimrod, might be thought to indi-
cate a colonization of Southern and Eastern Arabia, with a relation to Cush, or that of Cush (Sheba,
though elsewhere mentioned with Sheba (Psa. Lxxvii, 10), is connected with Ethiopia, and is probably the
Hebrew name of the chief Ethiopian kingdom from the
time of Solomon downwards. (Josephus calls
Meroe Saba, Ant. ii. 10, 2, and Seba of Cush he calls
Saba, lib. xvi. 1.) But these, it would be remark-
able that Nimrod is mentioned at the end of the
list and Seba at the beginning, while the intervening
names, mostly if not all, are Arabian. This distribu-
tion may account for the strongly-Caucasian type of the
Abyssinians, and the greater indication of Nigrarian influence in all the other Ethiopian races; for a curve
drawn from Nimrod's first kingdom—there can, we
think, be little doubt that the meaning in Genesis is,
that he went northward and founded Nineveh—and
and extending along the South Arabian coast, if carried
in that direction, would form the Abyssinian Empire.
Continu-
Eon of Southern Arabia and Abyssinia has been so strong
for about two thousand years that we must ad
mit the reasonableness of this theory of their ancient
colonization by kindred tribes. The curious question of the direction from which Egyptian civilization came
cannot be said to be solved. It is likely that they have descended the Nile, as was, until lately, sup-
pported by many critics, in accordance with statements of
the Greek writers. The idea or tradition on which these
writers probably build may be due to the Nigrarian
origin of the low nature-worship of the old Egyptian
religion, and perhaps, as far as it is picture-writing, of
some hieroglyphic system, of which the characters are
sometimes called Ethiopic letters by ancient writers.

The history of Ethiopia is closely interwoven with
that of Egypt. The two countries were not unfre-
quently in contact, and the history of Egypt is the
story of the foreign capital, Napata; and again we find the
kingdom of the Nubians was established by a
supremacy over Ethiopia, and erecting numerous
temples, the ruins of which still exist at Semna, Amada,
Soleb, Abuessimel, and Jebel Berkel. The tradition of the
successful expedition of Moses against the Ethio-
pians, recorded by Josephus (Ant. ii. 10), was doubtless
found on the edges of the future king of Egypt, the
mother of the kings and the Cushites. Under the
12th dynasty we find the first materials
for a history of Ethiopia. In these days Nubia seems
to have been thoroughly Egyptianized as far as be-

beyond the Second Cataract, but we have no indication of
the existence at that time in Ethiopia of any race but
the Egyptian. We find an alliance to the negroes
to Egypt in the 12th dynasty, and in the name of a king of that period, which reads Ra-
Nebh, or "the Sun of the Negroes," rather than
"the Negro Sun?" (Tertul. Papyrus of Kings, ap. Lepi-
sus Königbuch, pl. xviii, 397; xix, 278). The word
Nebh is the constant designation of the negro race in
hieroglyphic and cursive writing.

Before passing to the beginning of the 18th dynas-

ty, when the Egyptian empire definitely commenced
[see Egypt], we may notice two possible references to the
Ethiopians in connection with the Exodus, an
event which probably occurred at an early period
of that empire. In Isa. xxxii, though relating to the
future, also speaks of the past, and especially men-
tions or alludes to the passage of the Red Sea (see par-
picularly ver. 16, 17), Ethiopia is thus apparently
connected with the Exodus: "I gave Egypt [for] thy
ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." It can
scarcely be supposed that this is an emphatic rel
phasis of the future events, and it is difficult to connect it
with any other known past event, as the conquest of Egypt
by Sennacherib, which may have already occurred.
If this passage refer to the Exodus, it would seem
to favor the idea that the Israelites were driven out of Egypt,
empire, for then Ethiopia was ruled by Egypt, and
and would have been injured by the calamities that befell
that country. In Amos there is a passage that may
possibly connect the Ethiopians with the Exodus:
"[Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, 0
children of Israel? saith the Lord. Have I not
brought up Egypt out of the land of Egypt? and the
Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?"
(ix, 7). But the meaning of the passage may be that the Israelites
were no better than the idolatrous people of Cush.

At the beginning of the 18th dynasty we find the
Egyptians making expeditions into Ethiopia, no doubt
into its farther regions, and bringing back slaves. At
this time the Egyptians seem to have intermarried
with people of Ethiopia, probably of the intermediate
race, darker than the Ethiopians, but not of the negro
race of the Cushites. One of the wives of Ame
Amose. The first king of the 18th dynasty, is represented as black,
though not with negro features. A later sovereign
of the same dynasty, Amenophis III, is seen by his stat-
tues to have been partly Ethiopian, and this may have
been one cause of his identification by the Greeks with
the Pharaoh Memnon. It may be that the 18th dynasty preceded it, the 19th, we have no proof that the regu-
larly-governed Egyptian dominions extended beyond
Napata, but it is probable that they reached a little be-

between the junction of the White and Blue Niles. There
be no doubt that Ethiopia remained subject to
Egypt as late as the reign of Ramesses VI, soon after
whom the proper Egyptian empire may be said to have

closed, having lasted three centuries from the begin-
ing of the 18th dynasty. Under that empire, Ethio-
pia, or at least the civilized portion, was ruled by a gov-
ernor called the "High Steward of the Four Lands of the
Foreign," literally "Royal son," "of Cush," etc. The office
does not seem to have been hereditary at any time, nor is
it known to have been held by a son of the reigning
king, or any member of the royal family.

After the reign of Ramesses VI, the feudalism of
the later Theban kings may have taken the place of
Ethiopia, and we know that in Solomon's time there was
a kingdom of Seba. Shishak, the first king of the 22d
dynasty, probably made Ethiopia tributary. When
this king, the Sheshonk I of the monuments, invaded
the kingdom of Judah, he is said in his dynasty "the
Cushite and the Cushites" (2 Chron. xii, 13). The
Lubim are a people of Northern Africa, near
Egypt, and the Sukkim are of doubtful place. The
inductions are of an extensive dominion in Africa: for, though the Lubim and Sukkliam may have been mercenaries, it is unlikely that the Cushim were also. There can be no doubt that Shishak was a powerful king, especially as he was strong enough to invade Judah, and it is therefore probable that he restored the influence of the Egyptians in Ethiopia. See Shishak.

Zerah the Ethiopian, on account of his army being of Cushim and Lubim, and thus, as well as in consisting of chariots, horsemen, and foot, of like composition with that of Shishak (2 Chron. xvi. 8; xiv. 9, 12, 13; xii. 2, 3), seems certainly to have been either a king of this dynasty, or an Asa general of such a king. In the former case he would probably correspond to Osorkon II. The names Osorkon and Zerah seem very remote, but it must be remembered that Egyptian words transcribed in Hebrew are often much changed, and that in this case it is probable that both Egyptian and Hebrew forms, if they be two orthographical representations of one word, come from a third source. The style "Zerah the Cushite" is unlike that applied to kings of Egypt who were foreigners, or of foreign extraction, as in the cases of "So, king of Egypt," and "Shishak, king of Egypt." On this account, and especially from the form of the word, or any royal appellation, though we cannot infer positively from the few instances in Scripture, Zerah may be rather supposed to have been a general, but the army that he commanded must, from the resemblance of its composition to that of Shishak's, have been that of a king of the Cushite line. Mr. Kempe has rather too hastily remarked as in the term Cushite, that "no king of the Bulastaite [224] dynasty could have been so designated," and is at some pains to explain what he considers to be a mistake (Ancient Egypt, ii. 257 sq.). It is recorded that Asa had an army of 300,000, and that Zerah the Ethiopian came against him with 1,000,000, and 300 chariots. These high numbers have been objected to; but the history of our times shows that war upon this large scale is not alone possible to great kingdoms, but also to states of no very large population which, put forth their whole strength. It is to be noticed that Asa was evidently struck by the greatness of the hostile army, to which the prophet Hanani alludes, reproving him at a later time (2 Chron. xvi. 8). See Number. Asa encountered Zerah "in the valley of Zephathah at Mareshah," and, praying for God's aid against this huge army, he was put to the rout, and he pursued it to Gerar, and smote all the cities round Gerar, which seem to have been in alliance with the invaders, and took much spoil from the cities, and also smote the tents of cattle, from which he took a very large amount of spoils (1 Kings x. 26). This great overthrow may have been a main cause of the decline of the power of the 22d dynasty, which probably owed its importance to the successes of Shishak.

See Zerah.

During the later period of this dynasty, it is probable that Ethiopia became wholly independent. The 23d dynasty appears to have been an Egyptian line of little power. The 24th, according to Manetho, of but one king, Bocchoris the Satte, was probably contemporaneous with it. In the time of Bocchoris, Egypt was conquered by Sabaco the Ethiopian, who founded the 25th dynasty of Egyptian kings. The chronology of this period, as well as that of the former, is obscure. See Necho for the list of the chronology, with a few necessary corrections in the length of the reigns, in the following table [see Egypt].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Sheshen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9th year</td>
<td>Treaty with Hoses, B.C. 724.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>SHENETER, OF SHENEB II.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9th year</td>
<td>War with Sennacherib, B.C. 713.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>This same of TIRHAKA.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>End of Dynasty.</td>
<td>966.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.—III.
tily continued in a titular or titular position, as the Sethos of Herodotus, an Egyptian king of the time of Tirhakah, appears to be the same as Zet, who, in the version of Manetho by Africanus, is the last king of the 26th dynasty, and is very near to the Ptolemies. Psammetichus I of the Saite 26th dynasty are shown by the monuments to have preceded him in the time of the Ethiopians, and probably to have continued the line of the Saite Becchoris. We think it probable that Sabaco is the "So, king of Egypt," who was the cause of the downfall of Hoshea, the last king of Israel. The Hebrew name נם, if we omit the Masonic points, is very near to the name of the Pharaohs. It was at this time that Egypt began strongly to influence the politics of the Hebrew kingdoms, and the prophecies of Hosea, denouncing an Egyptian alliance, probably refer to the reign of So or his successor; those of Isaiah, of similar purport, if his book be in chronological order, relate to the reign of Tirhakah. Tirhakah is far more fully commented on by monuments than his Sethos, against whom the Nubian sculptures, and at Jebel-Berkel, Napata, one temple and part of another. There seems to be no doubt that Sethos (Zet?) was at least titular king of part of Egypt, or the whole country, under Tirhakah, on the following evidence. In the Bible, Tirhakah is mentioned by the name of penti; for the name Cushi, he is called "king of Cush (Ethiopia)," and a Pharaoh is spoken of at the same period (1 Sam. xxxvi, 2, 3, 36; xxvi, 6; 2 Kings xviii, 21); in the Assyrian inscriptions a Pharaoh is mentioned as contemporary with Sennacherib; and the Egyptian monuments indicate that the two were royal contemporaries, that at one time Tirhakah was in the 26th dynasty. The only event of Tirhakah's reign certainly known to us is his advance against Sennacherib, apparently in fulfilment of a treaty made by Hezekiah with the Pharaoh whom we suppose to be Sethos. This expedition was rendered needless by the miraculous destruction of the Assyrian army, but it is probable that Tirhakah seized the occasion to recover some of the cities of Palestine which had before belonged to Egypt. Herodotus gives a traditional account of Sennacherib's overthrew, relating that when Egypt was ruled by Sethos, a priest-king, the country was invaded by Sennacherib, against whom he fell in a battle, who had offended the military class, marched with an army of artificers and the like, and encamped near Pelusium, where in the night a multitude of field-mice gnawed the bow-strings and shield-straps of the Assyrians, leaving thus unable to defend themselves, took to flight (ii, 141). It has been well observed that it is said by Horapollo that a mouse denoted "disappearance" in hieroglyphics (Hierog. i, 60). Here we have evidently a confused tradition of the great overthrow of the Assyrians. Strabo, on the authority of Magantheus, tells us that Tirhakah, in his extensive expeditions, ravelled Sospiria, and went as far as the Pillars of Hercules (xiv, 686). The beginning of the 26th dynasty was a time of disaster to Egypt. Tirhakah was either dead or had retired to Ethiopia, and Egypt fell into the hands of several petty princes probably the dodecarchs of Herodotus, whose rule precedes, and perhaps overlaps, that of Psammetichus I, who is said to have been at first a dodecarch. In this time Esarhaddon twice invaded and conquered the country; but, after his second invasion, Psammetichus seems to have entirely thrown off the yoke, and so returned somewhat of its ancient power. There are several passages in Scripture which probably refer to these invasions, and certainly show the relation of Ethiopia to Egypt at this time. The prophet Nahum, warning Nineveh, describes the fall of Thebes, " Art thou better than he that dwelleth in the house by the river, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall from the sea? Cush and Mizraim [were] her strength, and [it was] infi-

nite; Put and Lubim were in thy help" (iii, 8, 9). The sack and captivity of the city are then related. The exact period of Nahum is not known, but there is much probability that he lived about the time of the invasion of Judah by Esarhaddon (2 Kings xviii, 11, 32). We know nothing of the future of Ethiopia and Egypt, and it is probable that they contain what is virtually one connected subject, although divided into a prophecy against Ethiopia, the burden of Egypt, and the record of an event shown to prefigure the fall of both countries, these divisions having been followed by those who separated the book into chapters. The prophecy against Ethiopia is extremely obscure. (See the version above.) It appears to foretell the calamity of Ethiopia to its farthest people, to whom messengers should be sent in vessels of Tyre, by the sea of Egypt, the Nile, the Nubian sculptures, and at Jebel-Berkel, Napata, one temple and part of another. It seems to be the same as the prophetic word in the 26th dynasty. The only event of Tirhakah's reign certainly known to us is his advance against Sennacherib, apparently in fulfilment of a treaty made by Hezekiah with the Pharaoh whom we suppose to be Sethos. This expedition was rendered needless by the miraculous destruction of the Assyrian army, but it is probable that Tirhakah seized the occasion to recover some of the cities of Palestine which had before belonged to Egypt. Herodotus gives a traditional account of Sennacherib's overthrow, relating that when Egypt was ruled by Sethos, a priest-king, the country was invaded by Sennacherib, against whom he fell in a battle, who had offended the military class, marched with an army of artificers and the like, and encamped near Pelusium, where in the night a multitude of field-mice gnawed the bow-strings and shield-straps of the Assyrians, leaving thus unable to defend themselves, took to flight (ii, 141). It has been well observed that it is said by Horapollo that a mouse denoted "disappearance" in hieroglyphics (Hierog. i, 60). Here we have evidently a confused tradition of the great overthrow of the Assyrians. Strabo, on the authority of Magantheus, tells us that Tirhakah, in his extensive expeditions, ravelled Sospiria, and went as far as the Pillars of Hercules (xiv, 686). The beginning of the 26th dynasty was a time of disaster to Egypt. Tirhakah was either dead or had retired to Ethiopia, and Egypt fell into the hands of several petty princes probably the dodecarchs of Herodotus, whose rule precedes, and perhaps overlaps, that of Psammetichus I, who is said to have been at first a dodecarch. In this time Esarhaddon twice invaded and conquered the country; but, after his second invasion, Psammetichus seems to have entirely thrown off the yoke, and so returned somewhat of its ancient power. There are several passages in Scripture which probably refer to these invasions, and certainly show the relation of Ethiopia to Egypt at this time. The prophet Nahum, warning Nineveh, describes the fall of Thebes, " Art thou better than he that dwelleth in the house by the river, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall from the sea? Cush and Mizraim [were] her strength, and [it was] infin-
temple of Abu-Simbel, not far below the Second Cataract, is one of the Greek merkaries on their return from an expedition up the river, "king Psammetichus" having, as it seems, not gone beyond Elephante. This expedition was probably that which Herodotus mentions Psammetichus as having made in order to bring back the rebels (ii, 30), and, in any case, the temple is the earliest of the 26th dynasty which has been found above the First Cataract. It does not prove, more especially as the king remained at Elephantine, that he governed any part of Ethiopia. The next event of Ethiopian history is the disastrous expedition of Cambyses, defeated at Pelusium, and, not liking the civilized nation. From this time the country seems to have enjoyed tranquillity, until the earlier Ptolemies acquired part of Lower Nubia that was again lost to them in the decline of their dynasty. When Egypt became a Roman province, Syene was its frontier town to the south; but when, under Augustus, the garrison of that town had been overwhelmed by the Ethiopians, the priest Petronius invaded Ethiopia, and took Napata, said to have been the capital of queen Candace. The extensive territory subdued was not held, and the name of some of the temples of Lower Nubia, in the temples of Lower Nubia, in Strabo's time Syene marked the frontier. This part of Ethiopia must have been so unproductive, even before the falling of the level of the Nile, which Sir Gardner Wilkinson supposes to have happened between the early part of the 15th dynasty and the beginning of the 18th, that it may well have been regarded as a kind of neutral ground.

The chronology of the kings of Ethiopia after Tirhakah cannot yet be attempted. Professor Lepsius arranges all the Ethiopians under four periods: 1st. 21st dynasty, first and second kings of Napata, beginning with Tirhakah, who, in his opinion, retired from Egypt, and made this his capital: of these kings, one, named Nastese-sen, or Nastese-sen, has left a tablet at Dongolab, recording the taking in his war of enormous booty in cattle and gold (Lepsius, Denkmale, v., 16; Brugsch, Geogr. Gesch. 1, 163, 164). 2d. Older kings of Meroë, among whom is a queen Kena, in whom Candace is immediately recognised, and also Mi-amen Abru and Arkamem, the later Ergemenes, the contemporary of Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to Cambyses Siculus, received a Greek training, and changed the customs of Ethiopia (iii, 6). Some of these princes had an extensive dominion. The name of Ergemenes is found from Lower Nubia to Meroë. 4th. Later kings of Me-roë, some, at least, of whom ruled both Meroë and Napata, though the former seems to have been the favour- ite capital in the later period (Königsbuch, pl. lxxi, lxxii, lxxiii). The importance of queens is remarkably characteristic of an African people. See MEROE.

The spread of Christianity in Ethiopia is a remarkable event in the history of the country, and one in which the truth of "the sure word of prophecy" has been especially evident. In this case, as in others, the Law may have been the predecessor of the Gospel. The pious eunuch, "Ebed-melech the Ethiopian," who befriended Jeremiah (xxviii, 7-18; xxxix, 15-18), may perhaps be one of many converts from paganism, but it is scarcely likely that he was out of the customs of his own land to their native land. The Abyssinian Jews, being probably a colony of those of Arabia, were perhaps of later origin than the time of the introduction of Christianity. But in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, who had charge of all the treasures of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, and who, on his return from worshipping at Jerusalem, was baptised by Philip the deacon, we see evidence of the spread of the old dispensation in Ethiopia, and of the reception there of the new (Acts viii, 26-39). In Psalm lxviii (31), in Isaiah (xlv, 14), and probably in Zephaniah (iii, 10), the calling of Eth-
save those of Abyssinia, which can scarcely be called ancient, showing that the country was thoroughly Egyptianized. Lepsius has published the Ethiopian monuments in his Denkmäler (pt. v; pl. 1-75), as well as the inscriptions in Ethiopian demotic (pt. vi; pl. 1-11; see also 13, 15).

For the Chaldean history and relations of Ethiopia, see Tittelmann, De secl. religione et moribus Ethipionum (Antwerp, 1534); De Goes, id. (Par. 1641, and since); Dresser, De statu eccles. Ethiopicae (Lipsia. 1684); De Vetra, Historia de Ethipia (Valentia, 1590); Predicacores de Ethipia (1611); Goldschmidt, Geschichte der Ethio einischen Kirche (Leipsic, 1639); Lucas, De rebus in Ethipia (Paris, 1624-6); Da Viega, Christ. religio in Ethipia (Laus. 1628); Dannhauer, Ecclesiae Ethiopicae (Argent. 1664); Ludov, Historia Ethiopica (Fr. ad M. 1681; with the supplemental Specimen, ib. 1687; Commentariss, ib. 1691; and Adlendel, ib. 1698; the original work in English, Lond. 1684; abridged in French, Par. 1694); Cavates, Descriprio Congo, Matambe et Angola (Bon. 1687); Geddes, Hist. of Ethiopia (Lond. 1689); Windham, Einleitung in d. ethiop. Theologie (Helmst. 1719); Lobo, Iter hist. in Abyssiniam (publ. only in a transit. Ed. at Par., 1701); Strachs, Iter d' Abyssinie (Str. 1730); La Croze, Christianisme d'Ethiopie (Hague, 1739, in Germ. 1740); Oertel, Theologia Ethiponica (Wittemb. 1740); Kocker, Fasti Habesiorum (Berne, 1760); Bruce, Travels in Abyssinia (Edinb. 1790). See ABBY.

Ethiopian (אֶתְיוֹפִיִּק, Acts viii, 27; רָוֹב, Kushi). Num. xii, 1; 2 Chron. xiii, 5; xiv, 9, 12, 13; xv, 8, 10, 15; xxiii, 15; Dan. xxii, 4; Amos ix, 7; Zeph. i, 12; I. e. Cushite; elsewhere as a rendering of the simple רָוֹב, Kasaḥ, an inhabitant of the land of ETHIOPIA (q. v.) or Cush: properly "Cushite" (Jes. xxiii, 23); used of Zerah (2 Chron. xiv, 9 [Sy]) and Ebeneleach (Jer. xxxviii, 7, 10, 12; xxix, 16). See also Cushi.

ETHIOPIAN EUUCH (אֵֽעִוֹךְ, aEthiopic, אֲוֹךְ). a person described (Acts viii, 27) as a chief officer (vizier) of the Ethiopian queen Candace (Queen of the Ethiopians; "Queen of the Ethiopians"), who was converted to Christianity through the instrumentality of the evangelist Philip (q. v.). Ethiopic tradition calls him Ḥarāk (see Bovii Annal. ad 1624, p. 542; but comp. Ludov, Hist. Ἑθ. iii, 2), and Irenaeus (i, 12) and Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. i, 1) make him the founder of the Coptic Church, and Arabia Felix and Egypt. According to Sophronius he preached in the island of Ceylon, and suffered martyrdom there. His official title does not necessarily indicate an emancipated person [see Eucuch], but probably here denotes a prime minister of state rather than a simple scribe or chamberlain (q. v.). Kunoīl (ad loc.) thinks he was a Jew of the Diaspora; and certainly he was at least a proselyte (q. v.). As to the place of his power, it is not quite certain that the passage in Pliny (Hist. Nat. vi, 5) refers to Merco as the seat of government of the female sovereign (comp. Ptolemaic Arabia, xvi, 2, 3); but possibly rather to Napata (Tawārī, Dion Cass. lvi, 5), the capital of a different part of Ethiopia (Rawlinson, Herodotus, ii, 35), or perhaps an uncertain locality (Ritter, Erde, i, 592). On the historical elements of the question, see Laurent, Notices des. Statuen. Staat. des Éthiopiens (Études Éth., 4), p. 140 sqq. (Edinb. 1867); July, 1866, p. 515; on the religious teachings of the narrative, see Sam. Smith, Sermon on the Eth. Euchus's Conversion (Lond. 1882). See CANDACE.

ETHIOPIAN WOMAN (Heb. קָעָר, רָוֹב, fem. of Cushite; Sept. Αἰθιοπίσσα, Vulg. Ἐθιοπίσσα). Zipponah, the wife of Moses, is so described in Num. xii, 1. She is elsewhere said to have been the daughter of Midianite (Exod. i, 21, compared with 16), and, in consequence of this, Ewald and others have supposed that the allusion is to another wife whom Moses married after the death of Zipporah; but the Arabian ETHIOPIANS is probably referred to in this case. See ZIRPORAH.

ETHIOPI&PIANS (Σήνεα, Isa. xx, 4; Jes. xli, 9; Zeph. i, 2; Sept. Αἰθιοπικά, Vulg. Αἰθιοπικά, Αἴθιοπικά), properly "Cush" or "Ethiopia" in two passages ( Isa. xx, 4; Jes. xli, 9); elsewhere "Cushites," or inhabitants of Ethiopia (2 Chron. xii, 3; xiv, 11 [12], 13 [12]); xvi, 8; xvi, 16; Dan. xii, 43; Amos ix, 7; Zeph. iii, 12). See also EUCUCH.

Ethiopic Language. As it is maintained by competent judges that the Amharic and the Tigré are really dialects of the ancient Ethiopian or Geez (which is doubted by Adelung and Vater in the Mihrirades), it may be expected, from the recent progress of comparative grammar, that future scholars will apply them to elucidations of the structure of the old, and the reception of the languages. At present, however, as even the Amharic is not yet able to boast of adequate and accessible means for its study, and as neither possesses any ancient version of any part of the Bible, the Geez is the only one which forms a particular notice here. See AMHARIC.

The ancient Ethiopian or Geez, which is the only one of the three dialects that either has been or is now generally used in written documents of a sacred or civil kind, is to be classed as an ancient branch of the Arabic. The grammar is evident from its agreement with the grammatical structure of the language; it is confirmed by the relation of its written character to that of the Himyarite alphabet; and either supports, or is supported by, the assumption that Habesh or Abyssinia was actually peopled by a colony from Southern Arabia. The grammatical structure of the Geez shows a largely predominant identity with that of Arabic; but it also possesses some traits which are in closer accordance with the other Syro-Arabian idioms, and some of which are peculiar to itself alone. The main features of its structure are as follows: The verb possesses the first ten conjugations of the Arabic, with the exception of the eighth and ninth; besides these it has two other conjugations which are unknown to the Arabic. There is a special conjunctive mode; the double infinitive is often used as a noun, irrespective of the absolute or comparative. The verbal auxiliary (v.) is accompanied by the so-called broken plurals of the Arabic grammar. The "construct state," and that relation of the noun which is equivalent to our objective case, are expressed by changes in the final vowels, or by employing the relative pronoun; the dative is indicated by prepositions. The comparative and superlative are expressed by means of particles. There is no form for the dual number either in the verb or the noun. With regard to the vocabulary of the language, one third of the roots are to be found in the same state in Arabic; by making allowance for inflections and transpositions, many other roots may be identified with their Arabic correspondents: some of its roots, however, do not exist in our present Arabic, but are to be found in Arabic dialects. This is why it has been too peculiar to itself; it has adopted several Greek words, but shows no traces of the influence of Coptic. The alphabet possesses twenty-six consonants, arranged in a peculiar order, twenty-four of which may, however, be regarded as essentially equivalent (although though with different sound) to the letters in the Arabic alphabet. The remaining two are letters adopted to express the Greek φ and ω.
## ETHIOPIAN ALPHABET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>With a</th>
<th>With ä</th>
<th>With e</th>
<th>With ê</th>
<th>With ê</th>
<th>With ô</th>
<th>With û</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Heb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoi</td>
<td>u ha</td>
<td>ù hâ</td>
<td>û he</td>
<td>û hê</td>
<td>û hê</td>
<td>û hû</td>
<td>û hû</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawi</td>
<td>ë la</td>
<td>ë lâ</td>
<td>ë le</td>
<td>ë lê</td>
<td>ë lê</td>
<td>ë lû</td>
<td>ë lû</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hhaut</td>
<td>ë hâs</td>
<td>ë hâs</td>
<td>ë hâs</td>
<td>ë hâs</td>
<td>ë hâs</td>
<td>ë hâs</td>
<td>ë hâs</td>
<td>hh</td>
<td>ה ח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mai</td>
<td>ë mä</td>
<td>ë mä</td>
<td>ë mä</td>
<td>ë mä</td>
<td>ë mä</td>
<td>ë mä</td>
<td>ë mä</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çaut</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ç Fr.</td>
<td>ç Fr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees</td>
<td>ë ra</td>
<td>ë ra</td>
<td>ë ra</td>
<td>ë ra</td>
<td>ë ra</td>
<td>ë ra</td>
<td>ë ra</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Shat</td>
<td>ë shâ</td>
<td>ë shâ</td>
<td>ë shâ</td>
<td>ë shâ</td>
<td>ë shâ</td>
<td>ë shâ</td>
<td>ë shâ</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaf</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>ë qa</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>ë ba</td>
<td>ë ba</td>
<td>ë ba</td>
<td>ë ba</td>
<td>ë ba</td>
<td>ë ba</td>
<td>ë ba</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thawi</td>
<td>ë the</td>
<td>ë the</td>
<td>ë the</td>
<td>ë the</td>
<td>ë the</td>
<td>ë the</td>
<td>ë the</td>
<td>th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Tjawi</td>
<td>ë tje</td>
<td>ë tje</td>
<td>ë tje</td>
<td>ë tje</td>
<td>ë tje</td>
<td>ë tje</td>
<td>ë tje</td>
<td>tj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharm</td>
<td>ë khe</td>
<td>ë khe</td>
<td>ë khe</td>
<td>ë khe</td>
<td>ë khe</td>
<td>ë khe</td>
<td>ë khe</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahas</td>
<td>ë nã</td>
<td>ë nã</td>
<td>ë nã</td>
<td>ë nã</td>
<td>ë nã</td>
<td>ë nã</td>
<td>ë nã</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Gnaahas</td>
<td>ë gnaã</td>
<td>ë gnaã</td>
<td>ë gnaã</td>
<td>ë gnaã</td>
<td>ë gnaã</td>
<td>ë gnaã</td>
<td>ë gnaã</td>
<td>gn Fr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alph</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaf</td>
<td>ë ka</td>
<td>ë ka</td>
<td>ë ka</td>
<td>ë ka</td>
<td>ë ka</td>
<td>ë ka</td>
<td>ë ka</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chaf</td>
<td>ë cha</td>
<td>ë cha</td>
<td>ë cha</td>
<td>ë cha</td>
<td>ë cha</td>
<td>ë cha</td>
<td>ë cha</td>
<td>ch Ger.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawe</td>
<td>ë wa</td>
<td>ë wa</td>
<td>ë wa</td>
<td>ë wa</td>
<td>ë wa</td>
<td>ë wa</td>
<td>ë wa</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ain</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>ë 'a</td>
<td>'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zai</td>
<td>ë zã</td>
<td>ë zã</td>
<td>ë zã</td>
<td>ë zã</td>
<td>ë zã</td>
<td>ë zã</td>
<td>ë zã</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Jai</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaman</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>ë jã</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Djent</td>
<td>ë dje</td>
<td>ë dje</td>
<td>ë dje</td>
<td>ë dje</td>
<td>ë dje</td>
<td>ë dje</td>
<td>ë dje</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geml</td>
<td>ë gã</td>
<td>ë gã</td>
<td>ë gã</td>
<td>ë gã</td>
<td>ë gã</td>
<td>ë gã</td>
<td>ë gã</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tait</td>
<td>ë tã</td>
<td>ë tã</td>
<td>ë tã</td>
<td>ë tã</td>
<td>ë tã</td>
<td>ë tã</td>
<td>ë tã</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Tshait</td>
<td>ë thã</td>
<td>ë thã</td>
<td>ë thã</td>
<td>ë thã</td>
<td>ë thã</td>
<td>ë thã</td>
<td>ë thã</td>
<td>tsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pait</td>
<td>ë pã</td>
<td>ë pã</td>
<td>ë pã</td>
<td>ë pã</td>
<td>ë pã</td>
<td>ë pã</td>
<td>ë pã</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsaddai</td>
<td>ë sã</td>
<td>ë sã</td>
<td>ë sã</td>
<td>ë sã</td>
<td>ë sã</td>
<td>ë sã</td>
<td>ë sã</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzappa</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>ë dã</td>
<td>dz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af</td>
<td>ë a</td>
<td>ë a</td>
<td>ë a</td>
<td>ë a</td>
<td>ë a</td>
<td>ë a</td>
<td>ë a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ë sa</td>
<td>ps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DIPHTHONGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ë qua</th>
<th>ë qua</th>
<th>ë que</th>
<th>ë qua</th>
<th>ë gUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ë khuas</td>
<td>ë khuas</td>
<td>ë khue</td>
<td>ë khuas</td>
<td>ë khuas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë kuas</td>
<td>ë kuas</td>
<td>ë kue</td>
<td>ë kuas</td>
<td>ë kuas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë guas</td>
<td>ë guas</td>
<td>ë gue</td>
<td>ë guas</td>
<td>ë guas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Separatrix of words.

* Exclusively Amharic.
The vowel-sounds, which are seven, are not expressed by separable signs, as in the Hebrew and Arabic punctuation, but are denoted by modifications in the original form of the consonants, after the manner of the Dēwānāgārī alphabet. The modem writing is from left to right. The position of the accent depends upon many complicated rules. As for the written characters, Gesenius has traced the relation between some of them and their equivalents in the Phoenician alphabet.

There is, however, the most striking resemblance between the latter and those in the Himyarite inscriptions, a circumstance which accords well with the supposed connection of Southern Arabia and Babylonia. Moreover, Lepsius, in an interesting essay, Uber die Anordnung und Verwandtschaft des Semitischen, Indischen, Aethiopischen, etc. Alphabets (in his Zwei sprachervergleichende Abhandlungen, Berlin, 1836, 8vo, p. 74), has added some striking arguments to prove that the Dēwānāgārī alphabet must have had some influence on the development of the Gezē.

The literature of the Gezē language is very scanty indeed, and that little is almost exclusively of a Biblical or ecclesiastical character. Dr. Laurence has lately added considerably to this by the publication of the Book of Enoch (q. v.), the Ascension of Isaiah (q. v.), and the first Book of Esdras (q. v.), in the Ethiopic version. There also exist in Ethiopic Christian Book of Adam (in Germ. by Dillmann, Gott., 1833), and several other apocryphal works relating the miracles of Christ, Mary, etc. It possesses nothing, not even an imitation of the national poetry, nor of the lexicographical and grammatical works of the Arabs. Some few historical works in the shape of chronicles, and a few medical treatises, contain in the main body of their prose portions the praiy fingers of the sovereign by the Amharic. It still continues, however, to be the language used in religious rites, in domestic affairs of state, and in private correspondence. See Ludolf, Grammatica Ethipica (2d edit. Frec. 1702, 4to); his Lexicon Ethipicolum-Latinum (2d edit. ib. 1699, 4to, originally Lond. 1661, 4to); Hasse, Prakt. Hdb. d. arab. u. Ethip. Sprache (Jena, 1793, 8vo); Hupfeld, Exercit. Aethiopicae (Lips. 1682, 4to); Gesenius, in Erach und Gruber's Allgemeine Encyclopädie, s. v. Aethiopische Sprache; Dillmann, Lexicon Ling. Aethiop. (Lpz. 1862 sq., 4to); Christo- mathia Ethipica (Lpz. 1865, 8vo); Castell, Lexicon Nagybalatonum (Lond. 1669, fol.); Schrader, De Lingua Aethiop. indole (Vien. 1800 sq., 4to). See Schematic Languages.

Ethiopic Version. The libraries of Europe contain some, although very rarely complete, manuscript copies of a translation of the Bible into the Gezē dialect (see Ludolf, Historia Aethiopica, Lond. 1684; also Plinio (Città del Vaticano, 1626, 4to). This version of the Old Testament was made from the Greek of the Septuagint, according to the Alexandrian recension, as is evinced, among other things, by the arrangement of the Biblical books, and by the admission of the Apocrypha without distinction. Tradition assigns Gregory of Nyssa as the author, but it probably proceeded from various Christian hands. Dorn supposes (De Psalterio Ethiopicum, Lips. 1825) that the translator consulted the Heb. original, but this is disputed by Gesenius and Rödiger (Algem. Litt. Zeit. 1832). It is divided into four parts: The Law, or the Octateuch, containing the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth; The Kings, in thirteen books, consisting of two books of Samuel, two of Kings, two of Chronicles, two of Ezra (Ezra and Nehemiah), Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, the Psalms; Solomon, in five books, consisting of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, and Sirach; Prophets, in eighteen books, consisting of Isaiah, Jeremiah's prophecy and Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve minor prophets; lastly, they have also two books of the Maccabees. Besides this, they possess an apocryphal book of Enoch, which they place next to that of Job. The critical uses of this version is almost exclusively confined to the evidence it gives as to the text of the Septuagint. The version of the New Testament was made directly from the Greek original (see Bode, N. T. Eth. ein Griecco collatum, Brunsv.ck, 1753). It follows the verbal arrangement of the Greek very closely, and has mistakes that are only to be explained by the confusion of words which resemble each other in that language. It is difficult to determine what recension it follows, but it frequently agrees with the Peshito and the Itala. It is impossible to ascertain the date of the execution of either of these translations, but they may both be ascribed with much probability to the beginning of the fourth century.—Khtito, s. v. Although there are several MSS. in Europe containing the Ethiopic version entire, only parts have yet been printed: the Psalter, first by Potken, along with Canticles (Rom. 1513, 4to); also by the Bible Soc. (Lond. 1815), with notes by Ludolf (Frec. 1701, 4to); the Canticles alone, by Nissel (Lund. 1690, 4to); Jonah, in Lat. by Petrus (ib. cod. 4to); Ruth, by Nissel (ib. cod. 4to); Malachi, in Lat. by Petrus (ib. 1661, 4to); Joel, by the same (ib. cod. 4to); first 4 chapters of Genesis, by Bürcklin (Frec. 1696, 4to); Jonah, with a glossary, etc., by Stadler (ib. 1796, 8vo); various fragments, by Bode (Helmst. 1755, 4to). Dillmann is publishing for the first time the O. T. entire (Biblia V. T. Ed., Lips. 1860 sq., 4to). The whole New Testament has, however, appeared. It was first published by three Abyssinians (Home, 1549-9, 9 vol. 4to), reprinted with a Latin gloss (London, 1857, fol.; vol. v. with a Latin version, also 1698). Platt has edited the entire O. T. in Amharic (Lond. 1840, 4to). The Gospels were edited anew from MSS. by Platt (Lond. 1826, 4to), and the whole N. T. by the same in 1839. Bode published transla-

Ethma (Ethan. v. r. Noa, Vulg. Nobcl), given (1 Esd. x, 35) as the name of the head of one of the families of Israelites, several of whose “sons” divorced their Gentile wives after the exile; apparently a corruption of Nehro (q. v.) in the Heb. list (Ezra x, 49).

Ethnan (Heb. Ethan), a gifted; Sept. Eshavai (v. r. Esbeachi; Vulg. Etheum), a descendant of Judah; one of the sons of Helah, the father of Ashur, “the father of the tribe of Asher” (1 Chron. viii, 17). B.C. post 1618.

Ethnarch (Ethnarchos), properly ruler of a nation; hence generally a prefect of a district or city (Lucian, Macrob. 17). E.g. Simon Maccabaeus, as head of the Jewish commonwealth (1 Macc. xiv. 47, “governor”; xv. 1, 2, “prince”; Josephus, Ant. xiii. 6, 6); Archelaus, appointed by his father’s will and the emperor’s ratification, his viceroy in Judaea (Josephus, War, ii, 6, 8), of the national head (modern “patriarch”) of the Jews in Egypt (Josephus, Ant. xiv. 7, 2; comp. Strabo, xvi. 798). Spoken of the “governor” or mayor of the city of Damascus (2 Cor. xi. 32), under the Arabians (Acts, xvi. 6). (See Walch, Dissertation in Acta Apost. i, 85.)

Ethnarch (Heb. Edom), a judge, magistrate, Sept. Aduv (v. r. Aduuvi), son of Zerah and father of Adahiah, of the Levitical family of Gershon (1 Chron. vi. 41 [26]). B.C. cir. 1420. In ver. 21, the same person appears to be designated by the name of Jerahmeel. See ARAPH.

Ethnology may be defined as that branch of modern science which treats of the various nations of the earth with respect to their races, i.e. their relative origin, family of stock, language and distribution; and it is thus distinguished from political geography, which discusses their association under their several civil governments. In the Bible, this subject, like all other scientific questions, is rather touched upon incidentally as connected with the history of mankind than in any formal and exact manner; yet the information thus afforded is of inestimable value, being, in fact, the only trustworthy guide to the investigator through the labyrinth in which later complications, and especially recent speculations, have involved the whole subject. Infidelity has striven hard to impugn the statements of Scripture on this ground especially; and it is therefore satisfactory to know that the most candid and general researches strongly tend to corroborate the positions of Holy Writ relative to all the main points involved in the discussion. These, so far as the Bible is directly concerned, all centre in one cardinal topic, the unity of the human race; and they bear upon this chiefly in two lines of argument, namely, 1st, the analogous and common elements of various languages, showing an oinem from one source; and, 2ndly, the manner in which men are distributed, or rather have been distributed, over the surface of the earth, as illustrating the ethnological chart laid down in the tenth chapter of Genesis. This last only, or the “Dispersion of Nations,” we propose to discuss in the present article, referring the other two to the article Adam, and, especially, the families and languages, to the article Creation, in the individual’s mature age, and on account of some personal concern which he had in the commencement or progress of the separation. But the specification usually given is by no means a matter of indubitable certainty. The verb occurs only in the two passages mentioned (Gen. x, 8, 19), “divided their tongues,” and Job xxxviii, 25, “who hath divided a channel for the torrent” (produced by a heavy thunder-shower). Respectable philologists have disputed whether it refers at all to a separation of man-
kind, and think that the event which singularly marked
Peleg's life was an occurrence in physical geogra-
phy, an earthquake which produced a vast chasm,
separating two considerable parts of the earth in or
near the district inhabited by men. That earthquakes
and dislocations of land have taken place in and around
that region at various times before the historical pe-
period, the present very different levels, and other
results have been noted. The
possibility, therefore, of some geological convulsion
cannot be denied; or that it might have been upon a
great scale, and followed by imperfect effects upon
the condition of mankind. The transmogrification of some
comparatively local interest, however, would seem a
more appropriate occasion for the breaking up of an individ-
ual than so world-wide an occurrence as the general
distribution of mankind. But if the race was as yet
confined to a narrow circle and a single community,
the breaking up of that society would be a very signal
event to celebrate in his name. See Peleg.

But neither the affirming nor the rejecting of this
interpretation of the "earth's being divided" can af-
fect the question upon the primeval separation and
migratory distributions of men. The reasons which
we have mentioned render it certain that some such
event followed by successive events, has taken place
without the usage of the passage of disputed interpretation,
it is evident that Gen. x. and xi. assume the fact, and
may be considered as rather a summary recognition of
it than as a detailed account. Thus (ix. 19), "These
are the three sons of Noah, and from these all the earth
was scattered over" (ךנソフト). Again (x. 9), "These are
the fathers of the earth's generations, and from these
generations, in their nations; and from these the na-
tions were dispersed (ךנSoft) in the earth after the
Flood." Here another verb is used, often occurring
in the Old Testament, and the meaning of which ad-
mits of no doubt. We find it also at vers. 5, "From
these the isles of the nations were dispersed (ךנSoft)
in their lands, each [according to its] language, [accord-
ing to] their families in their nations." The Biblical
date thus assigned to the dispersion is not inconsistent
with the most careful estimate of the antiquity of na-
tions, such as Egypt and Assyria. See CHRONOLOGY.

In the latest composition of Moses is another pas-
sage, which, in this inquiry, must not be neglected (Deut. xxxii. 6, 9): "In the Most High's assigning al-
locating the earth's parts to the sons of Adam, he fixed boundaries to the peoples according to the
number (ךנSoft, numeration) of the sons of Israel:
for the assigned portion of Jehovah is his people;
Jacob, the lot of his inheritance." Of this 8th verse
the Septuagint translation is remarkable, and it thus
became the source of extraordinary interpretations:
"When the Most High appointed nations, when he
scattered abroad the sons of Adam he fixed boundaries
of nations according to the number of the angels of
God." There might be a reading (El or Elohim in
stead of Israel) which would yield meaning from com-
parison with Job 6. 6; 1. xxxvii.; etc. Also the Alexanderine translators misread among a word. The
reasoning for the rendering, that it might haply serve
as a protection from the danger of the Macedonian-
Egyptian government, taking up the idea that the
Jews claimed a divine right of supremacy over all oth-
er nationalities. This reasoning, how near it was in accordan-
to the Greek fathers (Justin Martyr, Origen, Eusebius,
etc.) to maintain the doctrine of a later Jewish origin,
that the grandsons of Noah being seventy, each was
the ancestor of a nation, each nation having its own
language derived from the confusion of Babylonia,
and each nation speaking a distinct language (Deut.
nor, the nation of Israel, of which Jehovah him-
self was the tutelary deity. The only real difficulty of
this passage lies in its seeming to assert that the
nascet population was distributed into groups with
the express design of effecting a numerical correspond-
ence with the Israelitical family eight hundred years
after. The theory assigned by some to that effect is,
the sons (rather tribes or nations) of Noah's three
sons, are, Japheth, Ham, and Shem twenty-five, making seventy; and the whole family of
Jacob, when it came to be domiciliated in Egypt, was
seventy (Gen. xxi. 26; Exodus, i. 5; Deut. xii. 22).
Some have also found a parallel in the original
(Exodus, xxiv. 1, 9; Num. xi. 16, 24, 25; see also Kitto,
"Pictorial Palestine", Civil History, Index, "Elders"). These purerities might have been suggested by God's believing men considered that הובא does not signify merely an arith-
metical amount, but is used to denote an exact nava-
raton (Judg. vii. 15). The passage is in the highly po-
etical style of the magnificent ode in which it occurs,
and, reduced to plain terms, simply declares that the
Almighty Sovereign, in whose hands of necessity lies the
disposal of human birth-places, had so arranged these,
in mapping out the world, as best to subsist the
future occupancy of Canaan by his chosen people.
But the main passage of Scripture usually relied
upon to prove the fact of a sudden and violent disrup-
tion of primeval society into the germs of the early
nations, as well as to explain its circumstances and
cause, is the account of the building of the tower of
Babel (Gen. xi, 1-9). In which the enterprise engaged in
this enterprise has been regarded as a part of the
disseverance commemorated in the name of Pe-
leg. There are, however, some objections to this view
of the narrative. In the first place, these two events
are not thus connected in the account itself. The spo-
radic variation of the magnificence of the con-
dition between the different tribes that have founded
the ancient monarchies and cities, had not yet appeared;
nor could they be accounted for in this manner if the
original community had already begun to separate into
the more modern states. The only supposition that
would make the occurrence comprehensible is that the
connection, is that the whole body of the Noachites, while
in process of migration westward (_RowSoft, RowSoft,
with a view to settling in different localities, were arrested
by the inviting character of the plain of Shinar, until
their purpose of diffusion (_RowSoft, the same word in ver.
4 and 8) was renewed by the divine interference.
In the second place, it is not certain that either of the
incidents thus associated is of so cosmopolitan a char-
acter as this tale, they being probably local and distinc-
land, or region, instead of "earth," the whole aff-
air is reduced to a petty dispute or misunderstanding
among the workmen engaged upon a public edifice,
and a consequent dissolution of that particular cluster
of inhabitants. Certain it is that all the dialects of
this polyglot globe cannot be referred to a single inci-
dent or occasion like this. Such, at least, are in sub-
stance the arguments that have been offered against
interpreting the sacred narrative here as having a
general application to the whole race, nor can it be de-
ominated that they possess a certain degree of plausibility
(see Bryant, Ancient Mythology, 8d edn. iv. 28-44, 29
sq.). On the other hand, if, as everything in this con-
text seems to require, we conceive the descendants
of Noah to have been at this time (say about the birth
of Peleg, i. e. one hundred years after the Flood) quite
limited in numbers and extent (as the longevity of the
patrach and their pastoral habits being in all likelihood),
we shall find no particular difficulty in taking the entire
statement in its broadest and most literal sense, as the
opening wedge of that universal split, which has since
widened more and more, and in language and abode, among
the sons of men. This narrative, then, of the Disper-
sion begins with the remarkable statement: Now
the whole earth was of one language and of one
speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from
or 'in' the East, that they found a plain in the land
of Shinar; and they dwelt there" (Gen. xii, i, 2). The
expressions "language" (lip) and "speech" (words) are too precise to be understood (as Vitringa, Ode, et c., ch. ix., p. 109) as indicating merely an agreement in purpose. The journeying together shows that the time spoken of was before the Noachiants had ceased to be a single nation, and perhaps when they formed a great tribe, and were journeying (22:2) to pull up stakes and start for Canaan) the manner of the Arabs across the plains watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. It cannot be doubted that Shinar was Babylonia. The name, indeed, is perhaps traceable in Medopotamian in the modern Sinjar, and it is noticeable that the ancient Egyptian transcription of Shinar (22:2) is SANKART (this & corresponding to the Hebrew ס, as though the ס had been pronounced like the Arabic س). But there is no evidence that the Hebrews called any country except Babylonia "the land of Shinar." The direction of the journey, if it be indicated as "from the East," probably would only mark the previous halting-place of the Noachiants, not the place at which they first began to repeople the earth. The narrative then relates the attempt to build a city and a tower in order to prevent the scattering of mankind, and the punishment of the builders by the confusion of their language and their being scattered abroad from the unfinished city Babel, or Confusion. Leaving the subject of the Confusion of Tongues for later discussion, we must observe the general agreement of popular tradition, the antiquity of Babel, and the reminiscence of the Tower in the towers of the Babylonian temples. The Pyramids of Egypt and those of Mexico should be compared with these towers; and, in the case of the former, on account of their extreme antiquity, the comparison is very important. The exact relation of the scattered tribes is difficult to infer. The cause, according to the ordinary explanation of the narrative, was the confusion of Tongues, but some have supposed the latter to have been the consequence of the Dispersion. From ver. 4 compared with ver. 9, it would appear to have been but a resumption of the original plan of immigration, now that their holding together had become impossible, for the want of a common medium of vocal communication. Whatever difficulties we may discover in this and the preceding chapter of Genesis, "it is no longer possible to accept ... that the whole race of man proceeded from Tiras [the proper and native name of Persia and some connected regions] as from a centre, whence they migrated first in three great colonies; and that those three branches grew from a common stock, which had been miraculously preserves' in view of the confusion of languages of this globe." (Sir William Jones, On the Origin and Families of Nations, Works, ed. by Lord Teignmouth, 5 vols., iii., 1806.) There is, perhaps, no distinct reference to the building of the Tower and the Dispersion in the traditions of any heathen nation. The Greek story of the giants who piled mountains one upon another to reach Olympus is perhaps the most probable trace. Unlike the case of the Flood, there is no clear evidence that the Dispersion made a strong impression upon the minds of those who witnessed and shared in it. This would indicate that it was unaccompanied by any great catastrophes of the order larger, and was the immediate consequence of such difficulties as would arise from the sudden division of mankind into tribes speaking different languages or dialects. See Babel (Tower of). 2. It cannot be affirmed with certainty that we are here presented with a complete Table of Nations, even as existing in the time of Moses. Of each of the sons of Noah it gives the sons; but of their sons (Noah's great-grandsons) it makes mention that all are mentioned, and we have no possible means of ascertaining how many are omitted. Th. Thus, of the sons of Japheth, the line is pursued only of Gomer and 5avan: Magog, Madai, Togal, Mehech, and Tiras are dropped without any mention of their issue; yet we have evidence that that nations of great importance in the history of mankind have descended from them. Ham had four sons: of three of them the sons, or rather clannish or national descendants, are specified; but to Phut, the fourth, no posterity is assigned. Shem had five sons, but the descendants of only two of them are reported. It cannot be supposed that those whose sequence is thus cut off died without children; for, as we shall presently see, nations of great historical interest may be traced up to them. For the investigation before us have an aid, invaluable both for its ample comprehension and its divine authority, in the account of the traffic of the Phrygian (Cilician) language. 4. The list is, in one aspect, a kind of geographical table: many names in its descents are found in later places of Scripture as geographical terms designating nations, or at least important tribes. Therefore— (1) We must not look for a name in that of a town. There is no exception, probably not the only one, in the case of Sidon, the city of the Sidonians, who were doubtless a Canaanitish tribe, but to trace names in general in those of towns is very hazardous. (2.) The tracing of a nation or tribe to a name in the list is hazardous, unless neighboring or kindred nations, or nations otherwise marked in connection with it, can also be traced to the same part of the list. (3.) Preference must always be given to the oldest documents in seeking for identifications. Next to the O. T., the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian monuments must be consulted. It is true that sometimes notices nearest in point of time are always likely to be the best commentators; for it must be remembered that migrations and deportations are less likely to affect evidence the earlier it is. Although the list is geographical, its form is genealogical; and it does sometimes, and may frequently, state or convey the name of the founder of a nation or tribe—thus, all those terminating in the plural inc, and those specified by the Gentilian adjective, the Jebusite, the Hivite, etc. Yet (1) We must not attempt to identify a founder's name in the traditions of nations except when it is distinctly mentioned there as such. (2.) As before, we must not be satisfied unless the identification is supported by the geographical position of the founder's nation, or its ethnological character, and else by some marked characteristics connecting it with other names identified in the same part of the list. III. The Immediate Sons of Noah. Shem is always mentioned first of the three sons of Noah when their names occur together, the order being Shem, Ham, and Japheth. In Gen. x. 21 he is called "the elder brother of Japheth," which the A. V. incorrectly trans-
lates "the brother of Japheth the elder," where a comma after "Japheth" gives the correct sense. In the list of that chapter, notwithstanding the occurrence of the usual order in ver. 1, the sons of Japheth are first mentioned, then those of Ham, and lastly those of Shem, the order being inverted. It is usually supposed that this was put at the head of the list in order that the insertion of the other descendants of Noah might not form a digression in the history of the Shemites and their Hebrew branch. The Japhethites may have been put at the head of the list as the most widely spread, and so the most distant; and, for a like reason, the Hamites may have preceded the Shemites, the order being that of the extent of colonization. Or, again, the order may be geographical, from west to east, in accordance with the western, central, and eastern positions of the three great stocks. We shall see that the details favor the last view.

Shem (גֵּרְשָּׁם) signifies "name, good name, fame;" Ham (יְרָם), "hot, warm;" Japheth (גֵּרְשָׁא), "spread," from נָרָם. The names are probably prophetic of the future renown of the Shemites, of the hot land of the Hamites, and the spread of the Japhethites. The prophecy of Noah (Gen. ix. 25, 26, 27) indicates the appropriateness of Japheth's name to his future; and a prophetic sense of the names of his brethren may therefore be conjectured. But there is no distinct allusion to any such sense in their cases. It might be thought that the appropriateness of Shem's name as illustrious could be traced in the prediction that his should be the believing stock, but there is no indication whatever of any moral signification in the name of Ham.

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

2. Ham.—The name of Ham has been connected with an appellation in Egypt in Hebrew, only occurring in two passages in the postexilic books—"the land of Ham" (Psa. lxxxvii, 51; cv, 22; evl, 22), and with the most usual Egyptian name of the country, Kam, "the black (land)." The former term we cannot doubt contained the patriarch's name. Is the latter identical with it? The significations of Ham and Kam are sufficiently near. Ham is sufficiently near. Kam, the black; he or it was warm, and compared with Dm, be on it or black; and the Arabic, black, of the same significature as the last, and, compared, "black fiddi mud" (Kâmîn), or "black mud" (Sîkhâk MS.). Kam cannot be taken for an Egyptian transcription of Ham, but it may be a word of cognate origin (comp. Kar, "a circle," Karî, Karî, "he or it turned, turned round;" Karî, "a furnace," Karî, "it burned;" Kna, "to bend," Karî, "he or it bowed down, inclined"). There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that the Egyptian name of the country is identical with the Hebrew name of the patriarch. Are they of separate origin? We must either suppose this, or that "the land of Ham" became changed to "Ham-land," or "black land." The genius of the Egyptian language would account for such a change, which seems not improbable. That Ham should have given his name to the country might be accounted for by the supposition that, except the Canaanites, the Hamites penetrated into Africa, and at first established themselves in Egypt. See Ham.

3. Japheth.—It is impossible not to see the name of Japheth in the Dick Japheth this of Ura- nus and Ge, and the supposed ancestor of the human race; for, as we shall see, the Greeks, or at least those of the Hellenic stock, are classed among the Japhethites in the list of Genesis. See Japheth.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Tubal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cimr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tiras.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Gomer.—This name occurs in but one later place in connection with geography, as that of a nation or tribe allied with Magog, and it is there mentioned immediately before Togarmah, distinguished as northen (Ezek. xxxviii, 6). It has therefore been supposed to point to a remote northern nation, Scythic, or perhaps European. Two great gentile names have been compared, the Cimmerians of the Tauric Chersonese, who invaded the west of Asia Minor early in the 7th century B.C., and Cymbris of Cymri, whose ethnic and nominal identity cannot be doubted. Considering the migratory character of the Cimmerians and Cymri, it is reasonable to suppose that they had the same origin. In the cuneiform inscriptions of Darius Hystaspes, Gimiri occurs as the Semitic equivalent of the Aryan name Suku (Zoroast.). (Sir J. C. Rivet, in Rawlinson's Herodotus, iii, 150, note 1.) See Gomer.

a. Askenaz.—In a single later mention Askenaz occurs, in a confederacy against Babylon, with Ararat, Minni, and Middai (Jer. iii, 27, 28). It was therefore a nation in the direction of Armenia.

b. Riphath, written in i Chron. i, 6, Diphath, does not occur elsewhere in Scripture. It has been compared with the Riphean Mountains of Greek geography; but the statement of Josephus, commenting on this list, that the Paphlagonians were anciently called Riphathians, is worthy of notice (Ant. i, 6, 1).

c. Togarmah is mentioned in Ezekiel among the traders with Tyre, after Tarshish, Javan, Tubal, and Meschech, all Japhethites, and before Dedan, here probably the country of which the inhabitants, called Dedanim, are classed among the sons of the Japhethite Javan (Ezek. xxvi, 12-15); and, in the fragmentary, "the house of Togarmah, of the north quarters," follows Gomer in the list of the army of Gog, prince of Magog (xxxviii, 6). These particulars point to a northern people not remote from Greece. Togarmah traded with Tyre "with horses and horsemen, and mules" (xvii, 12); and we may suppose shep-herders came by land. All the indications agree very well with the opinion that Togarmah may be connected with the Armenians.

2. Magog is elsewhere mentioned by Ezekiel only, first among the countries ruled by Gog, and especially associated with Rosh, Meschech, and Tubal (Ezek. xxxviii, 2, 3), and apparently spoken of as dwelling "in the isles" (xxxix, 6). The term "isles" certainly must not be taken necessarily to indicate islands. But it is apparently limited to maritime, transmarine, and very remote regions. It has generally been held that Magog, used for a nation, is applied to the Scythians of the Greeks, though perhaps in a restricted sense. Certainly, in the time of Ezekiel, the Scythians who invaded Western Asia were the most powerful nation of the country to which the confederacy mentioned by the prophet may reasonably be assigned; and the agreement of Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 1) and Jerome (Quest. in Gen. x, 2) in the identification is not to be overlooked. See Magog.

3. Madai, always later applied to the country Medi- dia, very appropriately follows Magog, if, in the latter, when used geographically, indicates the Scythian neighbors of the Medes. Madai, like other names of
terwards employed for a country rather than a people, many names only have been a man's name (comp. Mtrras, infra). See Madai.

4. Javan.—Except where applied to an Arabian place or tribe (Ezek. xxvii, 19; and perhaps Joel iii, 6), this is, in all later places, the name of the Greeks, or at least of the Hellenic Greeks. The Persians, like the Hebrews, called all the Greeks Ionians. See Javan.

a. Elishah, at the head of the descendants of Javan, is to be looked for in Hellenic geography. It is mentioned in Ezekiel as trading with Tyre, "Blue and purple, from the isles of Elishah, was that which covered them" (xxvii, 7). The name has been associated with Elis, Hellas, and the Eolians. Etymologically the first and third are equally probable, but other circumstances seem almost decisive in favor of the latter. The coast of the Eolian settlements in Asia Minor produced purple, and the name of so important a division of the Hellenic nation would suit better than that of a city which never was rich and powerful enough to be classed with Sidon, Tyre, or Carthage.

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

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

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

5. Tubal, and, 6. Meshech, are in later places mentioned together (Ezek. xxvii, 13; xxxviii, 2; 3; xxxix, 1), and were evidently northern nations (xxxix, 2). They have been traced by the Mosch and Tzibari mentioned together by Herodotus (iii, 94; vii, 78), and as Muskai and Tupali, in the Assyrian inscriptions (Rawlinson's Herodotus, i, 380), which inhabited the northern coast of Asia Minor towards the Caucasus.

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

V. Descendants of Ham, or Hamites:

2. Seba.
3. Havilah.
4. Sabtah.
5. Raamah.
7. Dedan.
8. Sabtecah.
10. Marseim.
11. Ludim.
13. Lehabim.
15. Pathrusim.
17. Luzim.
18. Caphtorim.
19. Phut.
20. Canaan.
21. Sidon.
22. Heth.
25. Girgasite.
27. Arkite.
28. Sinite.
29. Arvadite.
30. Zemarite.
31. Hamathite.

1. Cush is immediately recognised in Kias, the ancient Egyptian name of Ethiopia above Egypt. With this identification all geographical mentions in Scripture, except that in the account of Paradise (Gen. ii, 13), agree. The latter may refer to a primeval Cush, but an Asiatic settlement is positively indicated in the history of Nimrod, and we shall see that the settlements of Cushites existed from African Ethi
apia to Babylon, through Arabia. See Cush.

a. Seba is connected by Isaiah with Egypt and Cush (xiii, 3; xliv, 14), and the statement of Josephus that the island and city of Merod lore this name is therefore to be noticed. In the ancient Egyptian geographical lists, SABA and SAABA occur among names of tribes or places belonging to Ethiopia (Brugsch, Geogr. Journ., ii. p. 9, pl. xii, k. 1).

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

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

d. Raamah, in the Sept. 'Pey'ah, is well traced in the 'Pyya of Ptol. (vi, 7), and 'Pyyah of Steph. Byz. (s. v.), a city of Arabia on the Persian Gulf.

1. Sheba, and, b. Dedan, bear the same names as two descendants of Keturah (Gen. xxv, 3), from which it has reasonably been supposed that we have here an indication of a mixture of Cushite and Arabian Arabs, like that of Cushite and Joktanite Arabs inferred in the case of the two Havilahs. It is to be remarked that the name of Dedan has been conjecturally traced in the modern name of the island of Dā
dan, on the east coast of Arabia, and that of Sheba in the ruins of an ancient city called Seb, in the neighboring island of Awâl.

e. Sabtecah is not identified.

f. Nimrod is generally thought to have been a re
tom der descendant of Cush than son, and this usage of Hebrew genealogies may be held to sanction it. He is the first and only known instance in the list of the leader of a dynasty rather than the parent of a nation or tribe. His name is followed by a parenthetical passage relating to his power and the establishment and extension of his kingdom. It is probable that this narrative is introduced to mark the commencement of the first Noachian monarchy. It may be com
pared with the notices of inventions in the account of Cain's descendants (Gen. iv, 20–22). The name of Nimrod is probably Semitic, from נבר "he was re
distinguished." It occurs in ancient Egyptian, in the form NAMHER, in the family of the 25th dynasty, which was certainly, at least in part, of foreign origin.
like names Sheshenek, Usanken, Tekerb, appear to be Semitic.

2. Mizraim, literally "the two Mazors," is the common name of Egypt in the Bible; the singular, Mazor, being rarely used. It has been thought to be purely geographical name, from its having a dual form, but it has been discovered in ancient writings, as the name of a Hittite or kindred chief, B.C. c. 1300, contemporary with Rameses II, written in hieroglyphics Mathmka, where the ma is known to express the Hebrew dual, as in Mahanaim for Mahanaim. That it should be Nahash is only a time, a proper name of a ma, suggests that the fact that Egypt was so called may be due to a Noachian's name having had a dual form, not to the division of the country into two regions. If, however, we suppose that in Gen. x Mizraim indicates the country, then we might infer that Ham's son was in fact called Mazor. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be equivalent to Ham: as we have seen, the meaning of the latter is evidently "hot" or "black," perhaps both, and a cognate word is used in Arabic for "black mud." To understand the meanings of mit, the Arabic equivalent of Mazor, the Kermite appears to have given "red earth or mud." Thus Ham and Mazor or Mizraim would especially apply to darkness of skin and earth; and, since both were used geographically to designate the "black land," as cultivated Egypt always was from the blackness of its alluvial soil, it is not surprising that the idea of earth came to be predominant in their significance. If the geographical names as the Mizraim were purely geographical in the list, then we might perhaps suppose that it was derived from Mazor as a Semitic equivalent of Ham. It is certainly remarkable that all the descendants of Mizraim are mentioned as tribes in the plural of gentile nouns. See Mizraim.

a. Ludim, perhaps mentioned in passages of the prophets as Lud or Ludim (Isa. lxvi, 19; Jer. xlv, 9; Ezek. xxvii, 10; xxxviii, 6; xxx, 4, 5), where, however, the Semitic Lu might be intended. There would be many passages in which a general term is used, e.g., (Ezek. xxx, 4, 5), where Egypt, and, as far as they are identified, African nations or countries are spoken of, the Ludim are those of the Mizrite stock, were it not possible that under the term Ludim or Lydian the Ionian and Carian mercenaries of the Pharaohs may be intended.

b. Anamim, a nation as yet not identified.

c. Libahim, no doubt the same as the Libim or Libyans mentioned in later places of Scripture as allies or mercenaries contributing to the armies of the Pharaohs, and supporting or dependent on Egypt as a race in various relations. The correspondence of the Rehavi or Lihu of the Egyptian inscriptions, western neighbors of Egypt, conquered by the kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties.

d. Naphtuhim strikingly resembles the Coptic name of the westernmost part of Lower Egypt, the territory of the city Marseis, probably the old Meroitic name Nephisa or Nophasha, a plural form commencing with the definite article n.

e. Pathrusim, a tribe of which the territory, "the country of Pathros," is mentioned in later places. The latter has been compared with the Egyptian Pathri or Phuthri or Phustirie Name; in Coptic popo'rus, poposura; in ancient Egyptian PA-HAT-HER; the chief objection to which identification is, that the geographical importance of the name seems scarcely sufficient.

f. Casluhim, not as yet identified.

g. Caphtorim, and the land of Caphtor, have given rise to much discussion. Toole has proposed as the equivalent of Caphtor the ancient Egyptian name of Coptos, Kebtu, Kebta, Kebher, probably pronounced Kubi, Kabit, Kebhor, the Coptic Keft, Keprai, Kepti, Kebeto, Kebiot, Gr. Kóptos, Arab. Kyft, and ventured to compare Agyptos with מֵכַת נָעַר. See CAPHTOR. It must be remembered that the city Coptos, or its name, has given its name to the whole nation of Egyptians, who were known as Copts by the Arabs at the time of the conquest. But good reasons have been urged in favor of Cyprus, especially the circumstance of the Phyllistene name. It is

a. Philistines.-The Philistines are here said to have come forth from the Caaluhih; elsewhere they are called Caphtorim, and said to have come out of Caphtor. It is not allowable to read that the Philistim and Caphtorim came from the Casluh. Perhaps there is a transposition in the text. The origin of the Philistines from a Mizraite stock is a very important fact for the explanation of the list.

b. Phut.-In later places, Put or Phut occurs as the name of an African country or nation, closely connected with Egypt, like the Liburn. It may be compared with those geographical names in the ancient Egyptian inscriptions in which the element HET, "the bow," occurs. Nubia was called the "bow-land," the "bow," where it is usual to read ru-wenn, but the bow has not the sound leenu elsewhere; and it is probable that a part of Nubia was called Kensi, and that the bow was written as ni in the Egyptian written names. If this were the case, the name Kensi was included in the "bow-land," but the question is full of difficulties. See Phut.

c. Canaan, in Gen. ix (18, 22, 25, 26, 27), is distinctly mentioned as the son of Ham. It has been thought that his name means the "degraded," "the subdued," "the dweller," for both senses are possible. See CANAAN.

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

e. Heth, ancestor of the "Children of Heth," or Hittites, a very important nation of Palestine and Syria. There are indications in Scripture of Hittites out of Palestine, and the ancient Egyptians were with the Kheti in the valley of the Orontes, whose names show how widely they spoke a Semitic language. The Egyptian monumental representations show that their armies were composed of men of two races, the one apparently Semitic in type, the other beardless, and resembling the Tartar type. See HITTITE.

f. The Jebusite, d. Amorite, e. Girgasite (properly Girgasne), f. Hivite, all inhabitants of Palestine; but the Amorite, like the Hittite nation, seems to have had a wider extension, for the territory in which stood Keshesh, the great stronghold of the Kheti on the Orontes, is called in Egyptian "the land of Ammi" (Brucheg, Geostr. Inscr. ii, p. 21, 22, pl. xviii, 44, 47).

The Arkite, compared with the Phoenician town of Arca.

A. The Sinite, not satisfactorily identified. Perhaps one of their settlements may be traced in Sin or Palu-

B. The Arvadite, no doubt the people of Arudus.

C. The Sidonite, well known to have been seated in Upper Syria, where Hamath, on the Orontes, was long a capital of an important kingdom.
VI. Descendants of Shem, or Semites:

1. Elam.
2. Assur.
3. Arphaxad.
   a. Salih.
   a. Eber.

4. Lud.
5. Aram.
   a. Uz.
   b. Hul.
   c. Gehir.
   d. Mash.

1. Elam, when used geographically, held to correspond to Susiana, not to Persia Proper.
2. Assur, afterwards the Assyrian nation. In the cuneiform inscriptions Assur is the chief object of worship of the kings. See Assur.
ETHELNOLOGY

8. Arphaxad, probably well traced in the province Arrapachitias.

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

b. Eber.—It is impossible here to discuss the difficult question whether to this patriarch the name of the Hebrews owed its origin. The argument based on the mention in this list that Sheem was "the father of all the children of Eber" (x. 21) seduces us as almost unanswerable on the affirmative side. See EXEG.

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

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

(e.) Almad, supposed to be traceable in Arabian names.

(f.) Seleph, traced in El-Yemen.

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

(h.) Cush, not certainly identified, and (e.) Hadoram, not traced.

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

(j.) Ditlah, (b.) Obal, (l.) Abmael, not traced.

(k.) Sheba is the same name as the Arabic Seba, the oldest name of El-Yemen. The most recent kingdom of El-Yemen.

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

(m.) Jobab, not certainly identified.

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

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

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

b. Lud, Uz, and, c. Gether, are not identified; d. Mash is but conjecturally traced in Meass war, in Lower Babylonia, or Moos Misas, at the north of Mesopotamia.

VII. Results.—These are twofold:

1. CAUSAN.

I. Shemitic (as Hebrew).

II. Aramaic (Greek).

III. Phoenician.

IV. Egyptian.

II. Lower Nipotie (Egyptian).

III. Nipotian (Negro).

IV. Tatar (Chinese).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hur</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobul</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maanab</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saba</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Nipotie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Order of Names.—The Japhethites seem to be placed first, as the most distant names. In the list of the Hamites, the southern, and, therefore, most distant Cushites, are arranged from west to east, Seba (Merose) being followed by Cush (in Arabia), and the series closing with Nimrod, who ruled in Babylon and Assyria. North of Cush is Mizraim, in the enumeration of whose tribes the western Levahim (Libyans) are followed after an interval by the easternmost Philistim, apparently the only Mizraites of Palestine. The list of the Canaanites begins with Sidon, the Phoenicians of the sea-coast north of the Philistines; then mentions under Heth the Hitites, perhaps on account of their southern settlement, and, going northwards, enumerates tribes near Lebanon, closing with the Syrian Hamathites. The Semitic tribes begin in the east, extending regularly from Sidon to Arabia, and then ascending to Syria. Lud may be an exception, but, as we have seen, the Lydians may primavally have been settled near Syria, otherwise Lud may be mentioned between the Arabs and Aram as an outlying Semitic tribe, to be spoken of before the enumeration of the names of the Arap-Palestinians.

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

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

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

4. Durt.—The list of Gen. x contains certain statements which now only in Deut. ii., in order to infer the date to which the document refers. It is said, "Afterward were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad" (x, 18); which may indicate the formation of the great Hittite settlement in the valley of the Orontes, or other like extensions. In any case it points to an event, or series of events almost certainly prior to the establishment of the Israelites in Palestine. So, too, the definition of the otherwise unknown Resen, as "the great city" (Gen. x, 12), indicates a period anterior to that of the kings who ruled at Ashur (Kalh Shem, Gen. xii, 25, E.); the rest of whom was placed about B.C. 1200. At the time of the Egyptian empire the capital appears to have been Nineveh, and the date of the list would therefore be anterior to that time, or at least to the reign of Thothmes III., to whom it was tributary about 1450 B.C. It would appear, therefore, that the list was either written or put into its present form not long after, or at the time of Moses, if not earlier, and that it refers to a yet earlier period—that of the first spread of the Noachians.

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

1. Emim, Rephaim, succeeded by Moabites (Deut. ii, 9-11).
2. Horim, succeeded by Edomites (ver. 12, 22).
3. Canaanim, elsewhere called Gezim (Gen. xiv, 5), Rephaim, succeeded by Ammonites (Deut. ii, 19-21).
4. Amorites succeeded by Caphitorim, that is, Philistines (ver. 28).
5. Azinim, here mentioned as Rephaim (ver. 10, 21), still occupying the south of Palestine at the time when the Israelites entered it. The Avim were probably also a Rephaim nation, for as late as David’s time giants were found among the Philistines. Elsewhere in Palestine the Israelites seem to have found, besides "the three sons of Anak," or the Anakim of Hebron, Og, the king of Bashan, who "remained of the remnant of Rephaim" (II, 11), a man of gigantic stature. The position of these Rephaim is that of a few powerful chiefs among the Canaanites and Philistines, representing tribes destroyed by Hebrews, the only exceptional case being that of the Philistines, if, as we suppose, the Avim were Rephaim, for in that case the former must have first attacked the latter, but finally changing their position, have been excluded from annihilating the older population.

At an earlier time we find a very different condition of the country. The powerful confederacy of which Chedorlaomer was chief, attacked and conquered, besides the kings of the cities of the plain, the Repli-aim, Zuzim, Emin, Horim, Amalekites, and Amorites. Here the Canaanites occupy a very inferior position in the south and east of Palestine, but one Canaanitar nation being mentioned, and besides undoubted Rephaim, the Horim probably of the same stock, and the ancient and pedigreeless nation of Amalek. We thus find an indication of an old population of Palestine, and that these peoples, from a very early time, are not only remarkable for their great height. That they were in race still more remote from their successors than has usually been held, has been argued from the Anakim’s being spoken of as "of the Rephi-aim" (Num. xiv, 8), the term applied to the giants before the Flood, when it is said "the Nephilim were in the earth in those days" (Gen. vi, 4). On this subject, compare Poole, The Genesis of the Earth and of Man, 2d ed. p. 80-82, 284, 285, where it is maintained that the Nephilim were a pre-Adamite race.

IX. Literature. —Bochart, Phaethon et Cumaean, sive Geographia Sacra (Cadori, 1646); Michelle, Speleologium Geographicum exterum Hebræorum (Gottling. 1769, 1780); Forster, Epistolae ad J. D. Michaelium (Gottling. 1772); Volney, Recherches nouvelles (Paris, 1814), ch. xviii; Feldhoff, Volksfesten der Genesis (Erlberg. 1887); Hohlenberg, Comment. de cap. a Genesee (Hain. 1829); Elchhorn, De Cynischen Varietate Amid (Amst. 1774); Krebeh, De divisione Phlegriae (Lip. 1750); Nagel, Comment. in Act. xvii, 20 (Altd. 1749); Zachariah, Dissert. philosoph. in loc. eund. (Hal. 1754); Schultz, Das Paradies (Züür. 1816); Krücke, Erklär. d. Volksfesten in exeget. usw. (Leipz. 1818); Gerber, Die Athleten und das Thurissem. I, 1, 22 sq.; Knoebel, Die Volksfesten der Genesis (Giss. 1860); Müllenhoff, in the Götting. Ann. 1835, 1851, p. 17 sq.; Joseph v. Görres, Die Japhitiden und die Auswanderung aus Armenien (Regensburg. 1849); Becker, Originen Biblicum (Lond. 1842); Forster, Histor. Geograph. of Arabia (Lond. 1841); Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses (in Clarke’s Library): Brace, Races of the Old World (N. Y. 1868). Comp. Dispersion of Mankind; Division of the Earth; Man.

Bta-Abho. See THICK-TREE.
Bta-Gopher. See Gopher-WOOD.
Bta-Hadar. See GOOLY-DREE.
Btahmadsim, a remarkable Armenian convent in Erivan, a Transcaucasian province of Russia, and about 16 miles west of the town of Erivan. "It is of great extent, is surrounded by a wall 30 feet in height, and 1½ miles in circuit. This wall incloses several distinct churches, each of which is presided over by a bishop; is cruciform in shape, and is surrounded by a kind of cupola crowned by a low spire. For many centuries this has been the seat of the Catholics (the head or patriarch of the Armenian Church). This patriarch presides at the synodical meetings, but cannot pass a decree without its having the approval of the moderator, an official appointed by the Russian emperor, in whose hands the control of the convent virtually rests. In the convent library there are 688 manuscripts, 462 of which are in the Armenian language."
Bta-Shemen. See OIL-TREE.
Bttewin, John, a distinguished divine of the Missouri Church, was born June 29, 1721, at Freundentshar, in Prussia. In 1747 he came to America, where for nearly half a century he labored as an evangelist, as a member of the executive board, and finally as a bishop, to which latter office he was appointed in 1784. He travelled thousands of miles, often afoot, and preached the Gospel in eleven of the original thirteen states, and also in what is now the state of Ohio, to white people, negroes, and Indians. In 1775 he was the leader of the Christian Indians on their exodus from the Susquehanna country in Pennsylvania to the Tuscarawas in Ohio, exposing himself to great dangers and privations. During the Revolu-}


of Congress; and when the general hospital of the American army was transferred to Bethlehem, Pa., he devoted himself with singular disinterestedness to the spiritual wants of the sick, in spite of his many other duties. To him, too, must be ascribed the honor of inventing, in 1830, the Society of United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, which still exists, and now has a large funded capital, and to which Congress made a grant of several thousand dollars. The United Brethren are now a part of the Universalist churches, and a sect of the Universalist denomination. Ehrenreich, Baron.

Eubulus (Εὐβούλου, good in counsel), a Christian at Rome whose greeting Paul sent to Timothy during his last imprisonment (2 Tim. iv. 21), A.D. 64.

Buchari, one of the names of the Lord's Supper, from ἐκάτερος, giving of thanks. See Lord's Supper.

Buchel, Isaac Ben Abraham, a Jewish scholar, born in 1576, was a distinguished member of the Society for the Promotion of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, which was formed in the days of Mendelssohn (q.v.). He is the author of a very learned treatise on the ancient mode of burial among the Jews, "Ist nach jüdischem Groaten das Uebernehmen der Toden wirklich vorzabin?" (Breslau, 1797). He published also a translation of the Jewish Prayers, פֵּיתָה בְּעָילָה, מִשְׁכְּנֵי בֵיתָה, or Mosen Mainim's Mosen Nebuchim, with the Commentary of Moses Narboni, called מִשְׁכְּנֵי בֵּיתָה, and others (Sulzbach, 1628, 3 vols. 4to), a history of the life of Moses Mainim (Berlin, 1796, 8vo; 11, in 1812); and as part of the great Bible work started by Mendelssohn, Die Sprüche Salomo's im Original ins Deutsche ubersetzt und in Briefen kommentirt (8vo, Berlin, 1789, 1790, and often).—Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, p. 239; 269; Kittel, Cyclop. of Biblical Literature, s. v.

Buchelaton, the oil of prayer, a ceremony in the Greek Church answering to extreme unction in the Latin. To such penitents as are conscious of the guilt of any "mortal sin," as adultery, fornication, or pride, this sacrament is administered by the bishop or archbishop, assisted by seven priests, who commence with this prayer: "O Lord, who with the oil of thy mercies hast healed the wounds of our souls, do thou sanctify this oil, that they who are anointed therewith may be freed from their infirmities, and from all corporeal and spiritual evils." The oil of prayer is pure and un mixed, having in it no other ingredient than a sufficient quantity to serve for the whole year is consecrated on Wednesday in the Holy Week by the archbishop or bishop. In the administration, the priest dips some cotton at the end of a stick, and thereby anoints the penitent in the form of a cross on the forehead, on the chin, on each cheek, and on the backs and palms of the hands; after which he repeats this prayer: "Holy Father, physician of souls and bodies, who hast sent thine only Son Jesus Christ, healing infirmities and sins, to free us from death, heal this thy servant of corporeal and spiritual infirmities, and give him salvation and the grace of thy Christ, through the prayers of our more holy lady, the mother of God, the eternal virgin, through the assistance of the glorious, celestial, and incorporeal persons, through the virtue of thy life giving and holy cross, of the holy and glorious prophet, the forerunner, John the Baptist, and the holy and glorious apostles."—Farrar, Eccles. Dictionary, s. v.; Pinkerton, Present State of the Greek Church, 139.

Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the 5th century, was born of a noble family at Lyons. He was a senator, happily married, and the father of two sons, Ve ranus and Salonius, who at an early age were sent to the court of St. Eucherius to adorn his house and to prepare them for the profession of the faith. In 422 Eucherius entered the same convent as a monk, having obtained the consent of his wife Gallia, who likewise devoted herself to monastic life. Soon after, Eucherius retired into solitude on the island of Leró (St. Marguerite). In 434 he was, in consequence of the reputation of his great piety, elected bishop of Lyons, and, as such, was present at the two synods of Orange (441 and 442). He died in 454 (according to the younger Eucherius, 457). He was an ardent advocate of the True Cross, which he consecrated on the 16th of November. He was followed on the see of Lyons by his son Varianus, while the second, Salonius, became bishop of Geneva. Eucherius wrote, about the year 427, Epistola proromstica de contentu literarum et sacris; commentaria solitaria (edit. by Rhenanus, Basel, 1516, and by Erasmus, Basel, 1590):—Liber formularum spiritualis intelligitatis: Institutionum libri II:—Exhortatio ad Monachos; and several homilies. Several other works are wrongly attributed to him. It seems that he sympathized with the Semiarians. A collection of all his works was published by Braccianus (Basel, 1631), in the Biblioth. Patr. Max. Lugd. tom. vi and xxvii; and in Migne, Patrol. Lat. tom. i. See Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xix, 490.

Buchites. See Messenians.

Bucchologian (βυκχολογία), the common name of the liturgical books of the Greek Church, containing the services for the sacraments, conferring of orders, and other religious offices. There is an edition by Goar, entitled Bucchologion, sive Ritualis Graecarum, com pectens ritus et ordines divinae Liturgiae, officiorum, sacramentorum, et, jussa sacerdomi Orientis eccelestis (Paris, 1647). See Neil, History of Rome and the Church of the Greek Church (London, 1722, fol.), chaps. ii, iii; Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, pt. i (London, 1850), i, 317.

Eudemion, John Andrew, a Greek Jesuit, was born at Canes, in Canda, about 1560. He derived his descent from the imperial family of the Paleologi; went to Italy when very young, and in 1569 entered the Society of Jesus. After having taught philosophy at Rome and theology at Padua, he was appointed rector of the Greek College, which pope Urban VIII had just established at Rome. He accompanied, as theologian, the papal legate, cardinal Barberini, to France, and died at Rome in 1626. He wrote a large number of controversial works against Casaubon, Bright man, John Barclay, Robert Abbot, and many others. Pamphlets against Henry IV and Louis XIII were also ascribed to him.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Genr. xvi, 668.

Eudemonism (Gr. εὐδήμων, happiness), a principle in philosophical ethics according to which the attainment of happiness is represented as the true aim of life. Those who hold this view are called Eudemonists. Opposed to eudemonism are all those systems of ethics which regard not the pleasure of the individual, but the recognition of some universal law as the higher principle. Eudemonism lay at the basis of the Cyrenaic school founded by Aristippus, and of the Epicurean philosophy (q.v.). It was developed to its utmost consequences by Hegesias, who taught that if no enjoyments are to be expected by men, death is preferable. Essentially different from this class of Eudemonists is the system of Aristotle, who regarded virtue as a spiritual enjoyment, and in this sense represented ethics as the doctrine of seeking and finding a happy life. This view has found adherents among Christian writers on ethics, who define and treat ethics as the doctrine of a happy life. Others have combined with eudemonism common usefulness, moral sentiment, and perfection, and thus have purified and ennobled it. Belonging properly to the schools of Aristippus and Epicurus are in modern times the different systems of sensualism (q.v.) and materialism (q.v.). An ennobled form of this last appears in some representatives of the Scotch school, who, in opposition to the self-love of Hobbes, develop the longing for universal happiness as the supreme
Eudes, Jean, founder of the congregation called the Eudists, was born at Béziers, Hérault, on November 14, 1601, and died at Caen, August 19, 1680. At 14 he commenced his studies under the Jesuits at Caen, entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1623, and was ordained priest in 1625. From 1627 to 1632 he was engaged in missionary labors among the plague-stricken people of Normandy, and in 1632 he became superior of the Congregation of the Oratory at Caen. Much of his time was spent in missions throughout France to reform the clergy. In 1648 he organized a new society, which took the name "Eudists," or the "Congregation of Jesus and Mary," and soon had many branches in France. Its members were devoted to the education of young candidates for the priesthood, and to "missions" (in the Roman Catholic sense) among the clergy. Eudes wrote a number of books of devotion. The Eudists were scattered at the Revolution, but were revived by the abbe Blanchard in 1826. They have a college, called St. Gabriel's, in the State of Indiana.

Eudists. See Eudes.

Eudo de Stella. See Eon de Stella.

Eudocia, wife of the emperor Theodosios II, was the daughter of Leontius, an Athenian sophist. She was called Athanais, and was carefully instructed by her father in Greek letters. She was also noted for personal beauty. On the death of her father, the jealousy and avarice of her brothers compelled her to go to Constantinople, where she appealed to Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II, who was so fascinated by her beauty and talent that she induced Theodosius to marry her. A.D. 421. She was baptized under the name of Eudocia, and received great influence in the imperial court. In A.D. 438 she made a splendid pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Soon after she was charged with aspiring to the government of the Eastern empire; and later, with an intrigue with one Paulinus, a courtier. About A.D. 449, the emperor, through jealousy, dismissed all her court, and had her exiled to Palestine, where she continued to reside after his death. She there embraced the opinions of Eutyches, and supported by her liberality and influence the monk Theodosius, who forced himself into the see of Jerusalem, and striving against the orthodox bishop, and kept it by force of arms. A.D. 450, the emperor Marcusianus. Euthymius, called the Saint, by his reasonings brought back Eudocia to the orthodox faith, after which she spent the remainder of her days at Jerusalem, where she died in 460, defending her faith under the cross that her husband had charged her." Eudocia wrote several works: (1) Pho- tius quotes a translation in verse of the first eight books of the Old Testament. (2) There is also attributed to her a Life of Christ, composed of some verses from Homer, translated into Latin by Echard, and published under the title of Homeri Opera in the 15th century. (3) Homeros et Cenoms (Gr. and Lat. Francof. 1541, 1544; Par. 1578, 12mo; Lips. 1798, 8vo); an account of the martyr- dom of St. Cyrilian Greek and Latin, ed. by Bandini, in his Greco Eccles. et. Romana, 1, 130-168. — Hoff- mann, Bibl. Lec. ii, 68; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ch. xxxii. 

Eudoxia, wife of the emperor Arcadius, was born in the year 375, and was married to Arcadius in 395. She was the mother of Theodosii II, or the younger. Her name is found hereon only in connection with certain states with Chrysostom. She used her influence for the banishment of Chrysostom, against whom her hatred was incited by the unspur attacks which he made against all evil-doers, and especially, it is said, by his declaration that she was a new Herodias, triumphing after the blood of John." She died in C. 416. Wetzer and Welte, Kirchen-Lezebien, iii, 736; Hoefner, Nowelle Biog. Generale, xiiii, 867; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (Harper's ed.), iii, 345 et seq.

Eudoxians. See Eudoxius.

Eudoxius, an Arian, and bishop of Constantinople, was born at Arabissus, in Armenia, first mentioned as bishop of Germencia (near Mount Taurus). About 356 he obtained by artifice the patriarchate of Antioch, where he soon came forward as a patron of the Arians (Theodoret, H. E. bk. ii, chap. 25, 26). Sozomen says that "when Eudoxius found himself in possession of the Church of Antioch he ventured to uphold the Arian heresy. He assembled all those who held the same opinions as himself, among whom were Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, and Uranias, bishop of Tyre, and rejected the terms of 'like substance' and 'con-substantial,' under the pre- text that they had been denounced by the Western bishops" (H. E. bk. ii, ch. 19). Although he was deposed at the synod of Seleucia, yet he does not appear to have ever vacated his see; and on Macedonius being ejected from the see of Constantinople, says Sozomen, Eudoxius, who now despised that of Antioch, was promoted to the vacant bishopric (H. E. bk. ii, c. xiii.). Although he was deposed, Eudoxius continued in the see of Constantinople in 390, and retained it until his death in 370. Some fragments remain of a treatise of his De Incarnatione Dei Verbi.—Book, Eccl. Biog. v, 7; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 408-11; Cave, Hist. Lit. (Geneva, 1720), i, 138.

Hnvrgetes (Βενεργητης, a benefactor; see Jose- uphos, War, iii, 9, 8; Dioec. Sic. xi, 26; Xenoph. Anab. vii, 6, 26; sometimes Angilicius Euvgegetes), a common surname and title of honor (comp. Plato, Gorg. p. 506 C, and Stalib. ad loc.) in Greek states, conferred at Athens by a public vote (Demosth. p. 475), and so notorious as to pass into a proverb (Luke xxii, 25). It was perhaps given by those who had conferred benefits upon them, and was taken by several kings. See Ptolemy; Antiochus.

A king is mentioned by this title in the 2d prologue to Ecclesiasticus, wherein the translator states that, having gone into Egypt in the 88th year of king Euer- getes, and been there some time, he found this book by his grandfather ('Εν γαρ τ' ουδιόν και τραγουδιον ἵνα ἴτι ἐκ τοῦ Εβραίου βασιλέως παραγηγήσης εἰς άγγλι- τον, και συγγραφίας, εύορον ου μηκός παλαιός ἄφι- μαν). There can be no question that a king of Egypt is here meant; for, though a king of Syria was intended by this title, Alexander I, Antiochus VII, and Demetrius III being shown by their coins to have been styled Euergetes, no one of them reigned more than a few years. It is more probable, on prima facie grounds, that an Egyptian Euergetes is here spoken of, be it supposed that the text was self driven away by order of the emperor Marcusianus. Euthymius, called the Saint, by his reasonings brought back Eudocia to the orthodox faith, after which she spent the remainder of her days at Jerusalem, where she died in 460, defending her faith under the cross that her husband had charged her." Eudocia wrote several works: (1) Pho- tius quotes a translation in verse of the first eight books of the Old Testament. (2) There is also attributed to her a Life of Christ, composed of verses from Homer, translated into Latin by Echard, and published under the title of Homer's Works in the 15th century. (3) Homeros et Cenoms (Gr. and Lat. Francof. 1541, 1544; Par. 1578, 12mo; Lips. 1798, 8vo); an account of the martyr- dom of St. Cyrilian Greek and Latin, ed. by Bandini, in his Greco Eccles. et. Romana, 1, 130-168.—Hoff-
great difficulty has arisen in the attempt to decide which of these kings is intended. Everything hinges upon the manner in which the reigns were reckoned. There is no satisfactory evidence for supposing that Euergetes I counted his regnal years from a time before his accession; the evidence of the inscription at Abydos, the Pharaoh's tomb, is against it. The figure of a high date as the 27th year, is wholly inconclusive (p. 382, 388); besides, the 27th year is far short of the 38th.

To ascertain the official reckoning of the years of Euergetes II, during the latter part of his rule, and thus to determine from what date he then counted his regnal years, we must examine theMNEo-262_24020012 apxayW of his reign. From these Dr. Young collected a list of dates which appeared thirty years ago in his posthumous Rudiments of an Egyptian Dictionary. These dates are year 29, 34, 45, 46, 47 or 48, 52, 58 (p. 27-31). It is thus proved incontrovertibly that Physcon composed his years from such the commencement of his joint reign with Philometer, without any separate reckoning from his accession as sole king of Egypt. The hieroglyphic inscriptions, as we would expect, follow the same reckoning. Thus one of the Aps tablet gives the dates of the 26th, 27th, 31st, and 52nd years of the reign (Lepsius, The 2nd Egyptian Royal Dynasty, transl. by Dr. Bell, p. 41). We must not pass by the idea of Jahn (Einleitung, ii, 930 sq.), that the 38th year refers to the translator's age instead of a king's reign. It would be better to suppose an era. Three seem possible, the era of Simon, the era of Simopicus, that of Maccabaeeus, and the era of Dionysius used in Egypt. The era of the Seleucidae began B.C. 812, and its 38th year is therefore too early for the reign of Euergetes I; the era of Simon the Maccabaeeus begun B.C. 145, or a little later, and its 38th year is too late for the reign of Euergetes II. The era of Dionysius commenced B.C. 285 (Lepsius, Königslisth, i, c.), and its 38th year was therefore the last of Ptolemy II, Euergetes I coming to the throne in the next year. The construction that does not allow the year of the reign of Euergetes I to be intended, and thus necessitates some such the commencement of his joint reign, is certainly the more correct; but as Dr. Davidson, who has laboriously collected upon this question much criticism which we have shown to be needless, observes, we need not here look for correct grammar (Ihorn's Introd. 1856, ii, 102-106, 314), in this admission of his reading cannot be doubted, and the date mentioned would be B.C. 133. Other evidence for the time of the composition of Ecclesiasticus, which, of course, can be approximately inferred from that of the translation, is rather in favor of the second than the first Euergetes. See Ecclesiasticus; Jesus, Son of Sira.

Eugenius, a Greek theologian, lived in the first half of the 15th century. He began public life as an instructor in rhetoric, but his learning and eloquence soon procured him the first positions in the Church, and towards 1430 he was made archbishop of Ephesus. Two years later he accompanied the emperor (John Paleologus) to the Council of Florence. Here he not only represented his own diocese, but acted also for the patriarchs of Antioch and of Jerusalem. A zealous defender of the Church and against the innovations of the Roman, Eugenius was the only one who, at the close of the council, refused to recognise the pretensions of the pope and to sign the acts of the council. On his return to Constantinople the people received him with great enthusiasm. Even upon his death-bed in 1447, he solemnly adjured the Sultan to be merciful to his fellow-countrymen and to renounce the strife against the Latins. The numerous writings of Eugenius are of a polemical nature, directed against the Latin Church and those prelates of the Greek Church who were favorable to the former. Many have never been published, but they are recorded by Fabricius. We make mention here only of his printed works: Letter to the Emperor Paleologus, in which he advises the Greeks against the Council of Florence, and exposes the intrigues of the Latinists. This letter has been translated into Latin, with a reply by Joseph of Methone, in Labbe, Concilia, xiii, 617. An encyclical letter upon the same subject in Labbe, Concilia, xiii, 714; A Treatise on Liturgical Topics; A Profanity of the Pious; a fragment translated by Allatius, De Consens., iii. 8. — Hoefer, Nouv. Bioig. Gen. xvi, 706; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, xi, 670; Oudin, Script. Eccles. iii, 2934.

Eugenius Bulgaria, See Bulgaria.

Eugenius I, Pope, a son of the Roman Rufianus, was elected by the Romans Sept. 8, 654, as successor to Martin I, who had been sent into banishment to the barbarian tribe of the Franks by an order of the Council of Constantinople, and to Constantine II, who favored the schism of the Monothelites. Martin dying in the following year, Eugenius continued in dispute with the court of Constantinople till he died, June 1, 657, and was succeeded by Vitalianus. In order to establish peace with the Greeks, his legates made an arrangement with Peter, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, that instead of one or two wills in Christ three should be assumed—one substantial, the two others natural.—Bower, History of the Popes, iii, 70.

II. Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded Paschal I Feb. 14, 924, in a period of great disorder, which occurred at Rome, owing to the corrupt state of the clergy and the administration of that city. To reform these, the emperor Louis the Good sent his son Lotharius to Rome, who corrected many abuses, which, by the account of Eginhard and other chroniclers, had grown to an enormous extent. He confirmed the right of electing the pope to the clergy and people of Rome; and the Council of Rome, which he convoked on Nov. 1, 826, issued many beneficent decrees for the restoration of Church discipline, for the establishment of schools, and against the worldly occupations of clergymen. He died Aug. 827. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 214; Bower, History of the Popes, iv, 265.

III. Pope. He was a monk of Citeaux, disciple and friend of St. Bernard, and afterwards abbot of St. Anastasius. He was elected to the pontifical chair of Rome Feb. 27, 1145. He appears to have been a very sincere disciple of Bernard, and anxious, like him, to reform the manners of the clergy and consolidate the papal power. Through the greater part of his pontificate, owing to the turbulence of the Roman people [see Arnold of Brescia], he was unable to reside in the city. This circumstance, however, did not hinder his being so indulged as pope, as he was also invested with the functions of his office. During his reign the second crusade, under the preaching of St. Bernard, was undertaken. See Crusaders. Shortly after its mortifying failure the pontiff died at Tivoli, July 8, 1153. See Neander, Bernard und d. Zelt. 190-196; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 214.

IV. Pope, Gabriele Condolomicre, a native of Venice, succeeded Martin V as pope March 8, 1431. At the early age of twenty-four he was made by pope Gregory XIII, with whom he was related, bishop of Siena, and soon after (1408) cardinal. "He was a most amity pontificate. He drove away the powerful family of Colonna, including the nephews of the late pope, from Rome, charging them with having enriched themselves at the expense of the papal treasuries. He afterwards made war against the various lords of Romagna, who were supported by the Visconti of Milan. But the greatest annoyance to Eugenius proceeded from the Council of Basle, which had been convoked by his predecessor, and which protracted its sittings year after year, broaching doctrines very unfavorable to the papal supremacy. See Basle, Council of. Eugenius, who had been obliged to escape from Rome in disguise on a horse, returned to her, and took up his residence at Bologna in 1437, issued a bull dis-
solving the council, recalling his nuncio who presided at it, and convoking another council at Ferrara. See Ferrara. Most of the fathers assembled at Basle refused to submit, and summoned the pope himself to appear before them, to answer the charge of simony, schism, and others, and after a time proceeded against him as contumacious, and deposed him. Eugenius maintained the pope's powers, and pleaded for greater zeal on his part. Council met at Ferrara in February, 1438, in which, after annulling all the obnoxious decrees of the Council of Basle, he launched a bull of excommunication against the bishops who remained in that assembly, which he characterized as "a satanic conclave, which was spreading the abomination of desolation into the bosom of the Church." The Catholic world was divided between the two councils; that of Basle proceeded to elect a new pope in the person of Amadeus VIII of Savoy, who assumed the name of Felix V, and was solemnly crowned at Basle. Eugenius encouraged the Hungarians and Poles to break the peace they had solemnly sworn with the Turks, under pretence that their oaths were not valid without the sanction of the pope; he even sent cardinal Julian as his nuncio to attend the Christian army. The result was the battle of Varna, in which a large part of the Christian forces were annihilated, and king Ladislas of Poland and cardinal Julian lost their lives. Eugenius died at Rome Feb. 28, 1447. He left the Church in a state of schism between him and his competitor Felix, his own states a prey to war, and all Christendom alarmed at the progress of the Turkish Turks (Empiria Cypriaca). See Bowen, History of the Popes, viii, 238.

Eugippius, or Eugyppius, a learned monk, who lived at the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century. He seems to have been the descendant of an Italian family, and was at first monk in the monastery of St. Severin (q.v.) at Farina, in Noricum (near the present Fuchlarn, in Austria), subsequently in the monastery of Castiello del Novo, belonging to the city of Naples. He is sometimes called "abbot," but it is doubtful whether he was, in the later years of his life, abbot of Lucullanum, or whether the name was only given him as an honorary title. He is the author of a life of his teacher, St. Severinus (Vita St. Severini, publ. by Caninius, Antig. Leg. t. vi, in Acta Sanctorum, Jan. 8; and by Welser, Augsb. 1504), which is a very important contribution to the Church history of Germany. He also compiled a collection of Thoughts and Sentences from the Holy Fathers of St. Augustine (Thesaur. Augustinianus, Basle, 1512; Venice, 1543), which was dedicated to the Roman virgin Proba. The author of the second work was formerly believed by some writers to be a different person from the author of the life of St. Severin, but this opinion has now been generally abandoned. Among the letters of Fulgentius (q.v.) or Ruspe, there is one addressed to Eugippius; a letter of Eugippius to Fulgentius is lost. Eugippius was also in literary connection with Dionysius Eusebius. There is a monastic rule which is ascribed to Eugippius, but it was early superseded by that of St. Benedict—Hieron, Real-Encyklop., iv, 217.

Euhemerus, a Greek historian, philosopher, and teacher, born about 500 B.C. He was not exactly known whether he was born at Messina (in Sicily), at Tegea (in the Peloponnesus), on the island of Cos, or at Agrigentum. He belonged to the Cyrenaic school, well known for its scepticism in religious matters. As a teacher of philosophers of this school, and more systematic, Euhemerus proposed a general interpretation of the myths, which has been justly compared with modern German Rationalism. An exposition of his doctrine is given by Diodorus Siculus. "Euhemerus," he says, "friend of Cassander (king of Macedon, B.C. 350-296), was instructed by this prince with certain missions to some of the southern countries. On his way he passed in the Indian Ocean a group of isles, of which the largest was called Pandiaxia. The Panchesans were distinguished for their piety, and honored the gods by sacrifice and offerings of gold and silver." They worshipped Jupiter, and such other gods as we meet with in Grecian mythology; but all these gods were but men (Lactantius, De Fatis Relig., i, 1). He then traveled to Greece, and finally to Athens and to the temple of Ennios. Of this translation only ninety-five lines now remain (Amsterdam, 1707). This work contains the history of the gods of the Panchesans, of the people and their manners, Euhemerus himself leaning in fact to the doctrines of the Panchesans. The form in which he presented his system was not entirely new, for he had adopted a similar course in his Republic; the germ of the system itself is to be found in some passages of Herodotus and Thucydides. The originality of Euhemerus consists in exaggerating, and in carrying out even to absurdity, the idea that Mythology was full of historical truths. He is the first who solved all mythology into history, maintaining that the gods were "originally illustrious kings, deified after death either by the spontaneous reverence of the people or by the cunning of the rulers." But mythology could not have been influenced from this, so much that bears on astronomy, the physical sciences, metaphysics, and, most of all, so much of fiction, that it is next to impossible to determine what in this confusion is truly historical. Some historians, like Diodorus Siculus, who have attempted to interpret mythology after the plan of Euhemerus, have proceeded only in subordinating the fanciful fiction for the imaginative popular legends. The pagan writers generally treat Euhemerus with severity. After the origin of Christianity, the views of Euhemerus, as containing the satires of a pagan on pagan religion, were made great use of in argument by the Church fathers against paganism, with some exaggerations, perhaps, of the doctrines of Euhemerus. Terullian, Clement of Alexandria, Minucius Felix, Cyriac, Lactantius, Crysostom, in arguing against paganism, adopt the view of Euhemerus, that the worship of great men was the original source of all idolatry, and was the birth to all the pagan divinities. In 1614, Vossius, following an idea of Tertullian, sought to show that the gods of paganism were the patriarchs of the O.T.: Seraph was Josep, Janus, Noah; Melchisedec, Naumi, etc. Huet, bishop of Avanches, discovered the O.T. in the Persian and Babylonian Aramaic, and in many other pagan divinities. Euhemerism, as a method of interpreting the ancient mythology, was supplanted by the symbolism of Kreuzer, a system infinitely superior to the other two above mentioned, but still containing much that is illusory and erroneous.—Hoekoff, Nover. Bisag. Generale, xvi, 828; Donaldson, History of Christian Literature and Doctrine (see Index); Gerlach, Historische Studien (Hamb. 1841, 8vo); Locky, History of Rationalism, i, 327; Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philosoph. i, 604 sq.; Clinton, Parti Helenici (Oxon, 1830), ii, 491; Meiners, Hist. d. d. Ges. Cc. xii, 1867; Porcher, Historia Greca, iii, 616; Hoffman, Bibliographisches Lexikon, i, 65; Milman, History of Christianity (New York, 1866), i, 49, note. See Mythology.

Eulalia, a saint of the Church of Rome, born at Merida, Spain, in other places. She was a descendant of a noble Christian family. When the general persecution of Christians began under Maximian, Eulalia, contrary to the directions given by the Church, voluntarily sought martyrdom by presenting herself to the prefect of Ilustania, demonstrating with him against idolatry and the persecution of Christianity, and by personally insulting him (spitting in his face, etc.).
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She was consequently burned alive Dec. 10 (or 12), 308 (or 304). Her relics were preserved at Merida, and many miracles were ascribed to them at the time of the invasion of the Goths and Vandals. Barcelona also claims the possession of the relics of St. Eulalia, and the legend of this saint is so much like that of Eulalia of Lyons that it is generally believed that the two are only one person, and that, as is common in the Church of Rome, the relics are claimed by two cities.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Génér. xi, 708.

Eulalia, anti-Pope, lived in the first part of the fifth century. Created arch-cardinal by Innocent I, he was, after the death of pope Zosimus, near the close of the fourth century, through the influence of Simmacus, elected pope in opposition to Boniface I, who had been elected by a legal majority. For several months he contended against Boniface, but finally the emperor Honorius decided in favor of Boniface, being persuaded that Eulalia had been illegally elected, and gave orders to Simmacus, the governor of the city of Rome, to drive Eulalia from the city, and to put Boniface in possession of the see. Eulalia thereupon left Rome, and became bishop of Nepi. After the death of Boniface, at the election of Celestine I, the friends of Eulalia continued to fight against his election, but he promptly declined the papal dignity.—Bower, History of the Popes, i, 358 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gén. xi, 709; Wetzler and Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 756; Jaffé, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum. (J. H. W.)

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

(2.) Eulogia was one of the early titles of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and appears to have been taken from the language of Paul when he says, 'The cup of blessing which we bless'—τὴν ποτήριον τῆς αὐλογίας. Down to the time of Cyril and Chrysostom, εὐλογία is used synonymously with σωματικία, but after the fifth century the term was appropriated to the bread set apart from the oblations for the poor and the clergy. To this custom we may refer the origin of private masses, and of communion in one kind. (3.) The practice of giving the eulogia to the poor has tended to explain the custom of non-communion which sprang up in the Church about the same time. The faithful who did not communicate retired from the assembly before the celebration of the Lord's Supper began, but without receiving the benediction of the minister. The eulogia were soon divided into two classes—communnicantes and non-communicantes—of which the Church knew nothing in earlier ages. The Council of Nantes, about A.D. 890, ordered the presbyters to keep some portions of the oblations in a proper vessel, so that those persons who were not prepared to communicate might, on every festival and Lord's day, receive some of the eulogia, previously blessed with a proper benediction.—Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. x, ch. ii, § 16; bk. xv, ch. iv, § 3; Ridley, Christ. Antiquities, p. 543, 578.

Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria from 561 to 608. Pope Gregory I makes particular mention of him as a successful polemic against the Nestorians, Severians, Theodolians, Cainites, Asephtalians, and Agnoetans. Photius preserves numerous fragments of his writings. He died in 608.—Wetzler and Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 753, 754; Fabricius, Bibl. Græca, (ed. Harles), x, 753.

Eulogius of Cordova was in 859 elected archbishop of Toledo, but, by the opposition of the Moors, he was not permitted to enter upon the duties of his office. He was a learned and brave defender of Christianity against Mohammedanism, and sealed his love for the cause by his own blood, being beheaded by the Moors, March 11, 859, for the assistance which he had rendered a young girl who had been converted and by her baptized in the Christian faith. His writings are: Memoriale Sanctorum sive libri iii (a Syriac translation of a work in which the glory of the Spanish martyrs of his time is recorded;—Exortatio ad martymrium sive documentum martylia re Floram et Marianum virgines confessorum;—Apologieus pro martyribus adversus columbanii), in which he denies the assertion that the Christians desired martyrdom. He addressed letters to the bishop William of Pampeluna, his friend Alvarus, and others. His remains are to be found in Schott, Hispania Illustrata, vol. iv; in the Bibliotheca Patrum, xxiv, 242; also in Migne, Patrol. Lat. tom. cxv. A biography of Eulogius, written by his friend Alvarus, is also in Migne, t. cxv.—Callier, Hist. des Aut. St. &c. xiv, 212; Wetzler u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 754, 755; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gén. vi, 719; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 220; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graecia, iv, 257; Clarke, Sacred Literature, vol. ii.

Eulogius. See FUNERAL.

Bu'nat'an (Bu'natan, t. El'ana, Vulg. Eman-
gos), given (2 Esd. viii, 45, where it is perhaps but an original mishap of the word Emmaam), was the special representative of the king of Persia, and the principal deputy directed by Ezra to procure priests for the returning party of exiles; apparently a corruption for the second El'hamath (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 16).

Bu'Cash (Bu'shach, good victory, originally the name of one of the Nenadis), the mother of Timothy, and the wife of a Greek; spoken of (2 Esd. i, 6) as possessing unfilled faith, and described in Acts xvi, 1 as a believing Jewess (יוועו ותאיא פור). A.D. ante 47. See TIMOTHY.

Bu'menēs (Bu'menes, well-disposed) II, king of Pergamus, and son of Attalus I. His accession to the throne is fixed by the death of his predecessor to B.C. 197 (Clinton, F. H., ii, 408). He inherited from his father the friendship and alliance of the Romans, and when peace was made in B.C. 196 with Philip V, king of Macedonia, he was presented with the towns of Oreus and Eretia in Euboea (Livy, xxxiii, 34). In B.C. 191 Eumenes obtained the censure of Antiochus (Livy, xxxvi, 43-45), and, seeing more than ever the policy of adhering to the Romans, he, in the following year, rendered them valuable assistance at the battle of Magnesia, commanding his own troops in person (Livy, xxxvii, 39-44; Justin, xxxi, 8; Apian, Syr. 137). As a reward for his services he was appointed governor of Syria (Livy, xxxvii, 39). Eumenes set out for Rome to ask some rewards for his services. The senate were pleased with the modesty of his behavior, and conferred upon him the Thracian Chersonese, Lyssamachia, both Phrygias, Mysia, Lycocnia, Lydia, and Ionia, with some exceptions. One province only would he much enlarged his do-
misions, but by this large addition to his territory he found himself one of the most powerful of monarchs (Livy, xxxvii, 56; xxxviii, 39; Polyb. xxii, 27; Apian, Syr. 44). About the same time he married the daughter of Attalus I, king of Paphlagonia (Livy, xxxviii, 39). Eumenes continued in good favor with the Romans for several years, and repeatedly sent emba-
lises to them. In B.C. 172 he again visited Rome, and in returning nearly lost his life through the treach-
eroy of Perseus, king of Macedonia (Livy, xiii, 11-16). In B.C. 164 Eumenes and the Romans entered into a corre-
spondence with Perseus, by which act he lost the favor of the Romans (Polyb. Frag. Vat. xxix, Didot ed. p. 39, 40), and two years after he was forbidden to enter Rome (Livy, Epit. xlvii). The latter part of his reign was disturbed by frequent wars with Prusias, king of Bithynia. The Romans favorably received his brother Attalus, apparently for the purpose of exciting him
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against Eunomius, who had sent him to Rome. "Attalus, however, was induced, through the entreaties of a physician named Stratus, to abandon any such ideas. Eunomius thus managed to keep on friendly terms with his brother and the Romans till his death (Liv y, 19, 29; Polyb. xxxi, 1-3; xxxi, 9; xxxii, 5). The exact place where he died is not mentioned by any writer, but it must have taken place in B.C. 159 (Clinton, F. H., iii, 406). Eunomius II much improved the city of Pergamus by erecting magnificent temples and other public buildings. His greatest act was the foundation of a splendid library, which rose to be a rival in extent and magnificence to the library of Alexandria (Strabo, xiii, 4, Didot ed. p. 538; Pliny, xxii, 11 [see Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s. v.]. See Pergamus.

The large ascension of territory which was granted to Eunomius from the former dominions of Antiochus is mentioned I Macc. viii, 8, but the present reading of the Greek and Latin texts offers insuperable difficulties. "The Romans gave him," it is said, "the country of India and Media, and Lydia, and parts of his (Antiochus's) fairest countries (ἀπὸ τῶν καλῶν χωρῶν αὐτοῦ)." This is particularly out of the question, and a portion of Media evidently assigned to Antiochus or the Romans. Various conjectures have been proposed to remove these obvious errors; but, though they may reasonably be allowed that Mytilus had stood originally for Media (Ἰωνία for Ἰωνία, Michaelis), it is not equally easy to explain the origin of ἵππων ἱππότων from the same source, and standing to make everything clear, which was his principal aim. In short, he advocated an intelligent super-realism, in which a rationalistic tendency was concealed, something like what we find in Socinus" (Neander, Hist. of Dogma, ed. Ryland, i, 264). The following account of his confession of faith in Eunomius is given by Cave (vol. i, p. 140), from a manuscript in archbishop Tennison's library: "There is one God, uncreated and without beginning, who has nothing existing before him, for nothing can exist before what is uncreated; nor with him, for what is uncreated must be one, nor with God, for God is a simple and uncompounded Being. This one simple and eternal Being is God, the Creator and Ordainer of all things. For God created, begot, and made the Son only, by his direct operation and power, before all things, and every other creature; He was uncreated, and uncreated like himself, or imparting any part of his own proper substance to his Son; for God is immortal, uniform, and indivisible, and therefore cannot communicate any part of his own proper substance to another. He alone is unbegotten, and it is impossible that any other being should be formed of an unbegotten substance; therefore he used his own substance in begetting his Son, but his will only; nor did he beget him in the likeness of his substance, but according to his own good pleasure. He then created the Holy Spirit, the first and greatest of all spirits, by his own power and operation mediately, yet by the immediate power and operation of the Son. After the Holy Spirit, he created all other things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, corporeal and incorporeal, mediately by himself, by the power and operation of his Son."

The adherents of Eunomius, who were very numerous, were, together with those of Attius, condemned as heretics by the second Ecumenical Council. After the death of Eunomius, the Eunomians fully separated from the communion of the predominant Church. Some factions called themselves after prominent teachers, as Eutychius, Theophilus, and others. They gave them a number of nicknames, as ὁμοθεσία, ἀσυνομία, they baptized, not upon the Trinity, but upon the death of Christ. They did not exist long as a sect, but soon died out, in consequence of internal dissensions and numerous secessions to the dominion of the West.
EUNUCHS 351

EUPHRATES

case is prevalent at this day in Russia, among the sect of the Skoptzi (q. v.). In the Council of Nicæa persons of this class were condemned, and excluded from holy orders. See CELEBRY and VALERIANS.

Buo'diās, or, rather, Buodía (Eudocia, a good journey; for, as found in Phil. ix. 2, Eudocias is fem., since the name refers to the empress who is associated by name by αὐρατός and αὐρατίας), a female member of the Church at Philippi, who seems to have been at variance with another female member named Sintyche. A.D. 57. Paul describes them as women who had "labored much with in the Gospel," and implores them of others to mind (Philipp. iv. 2, 3).

Buodius. See EUDODIUS.

Euphemites. See MESSALIANS.

Euphratēs is the Greek form (Ἰππάρης) of the river designated in Heb. by the name Phrath or Phrathā (ךְֶּפֶר), which Gesenius regards as the "stream of water," referring to the present Arabic name Frāh as having that signif.; but Fürst refers to an obsolete root indicating the impetuous character of the stream), and is probably a word of Arain origin, the initial element being 'āth, which is in Sanscrit aṭu, in Zend āt, and in Greek αθό, and the second element being frōt, the particle of abundance. The Euphrates is thus "the good and abounding river." It is not improbable that in common parlance the name was soon shortened to its modern form of Frāt, which is almost exactly what the Hebrew literature expressions. But it is most frequently denoted in the Bible by the term עפרות, "broad stream," i.e. "the river," the river of Asia, in grand contrast with the shortlived torrents of Palestine, being by far the most considerable stream in that part of the continent. Thus, in Exod. xxi. 31, we read, "from the desert unto the river." (comp. Isa. vii. 7). In like manner, it is termed in Deut. i. 7 "the great river." The Euphrates is named in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.).

1. It is first mentioned in Gen. ii, 14, where the Euphrates is stated to be the fourth of the rivers which flowed from a common stream in the garden of Eden. Its celebrity is there sufficiently indicated by the absence of any explanatory phrase, such as accompanies the names of the other streams. See Eden. We next hear of it in the covenant made with Abraham (Gen. xv. 18), where the whole country from "the great river, the river Euphrates," to the river of Egypt is promised to the chosen race. In Deuteronomy and Joshua we find that this promise was then well established and at the time of the settlement in Canaan (Deut. i. 7; xx. 4; Josh. i. 4); and from an important passage in the first book of Chronicles it appears that the tribe of Reuben did actually extend itself to the Euphrates in the times anterior to Saul (1 Chron. v. 9). Here they came in contact with the Hagarites, to appear upon the Middle Euphrates in the Assyrian inscriptions of the later empire. It is David, however, who seems for the first time to have entered on the full enjoyment of the promise by the victories which he gained over Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and his allies, the Syrians of Damascus (2 Sam. viii. 6; 1 Chron. xviii. 8). The object of his expedition was "to recover his border," and "to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates," and in this object he appears to have been altogether successful, in so much that Solomon, his son, who was the king of war, but only in and by the service of his father's dominions, is said to have "reigned over all kingdoms from the river (i.e. the Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines and unto the border of Egypt" (1 Kings iv. 21; comp. 2 Chron. ix. 26). Thus, during the reigns of David and Solomon, the dominion of Israel actually attained to the Euphrates, as the result of the original promise, the Euphrates forming the boundary of their empire to the north-east, and the river of
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Egypt to the south-west. This wide-spread dominion was lost on the disruption of the empire under Rehoobam; and no more is heard in Scripture of the Euphrates until the expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against the Babylon, from the reign of Josiah. The "Great River" had meanwhile served for some time as a boundary between Assyria and the country of the Hitites (see ASSYRIA), but had repeatedly been crossed by the armies of the Ninevite kings, who gradually established their sway over the countries upon its right bank. The crossing of the river was always difficult, and at the point where certain natural facilities fixed the ordinary passage the strong fort of Carchemish had been built, probably in very early times, to command the position. See CARCHEMISH. Hence, when Nebuchadnezzar attempted to establish the permanent conquest of Syria, his march was directed upon "Carchemish by Euphrates" (2 Chron. xxxv, 20), which he captured and held, thus extending the dominion of Egypt to the Euphrates, and renewing the old glories of the Bameside kings. His triumph, however, was short-lived. Three years after his "day of battle" (1 Kings xxiv, 7) had inherited the Assyrian dominion in these parts, -made an expedition under Nebuchadnezzar against Necho, defeated his army, "which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish" (Jer. xlv, 2), explored all Syria to and from the kings of that country came no more out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken from the river Euphrates unto the river Euphrates all that pertaineth to the king of Egypt"

These are the chief events which Scripture distinctly connects with the "Great River." The prophets make use of the River Euphrates as a large and picturesque description of the Assyrian power, as the Nile with them represented the power of Egypt; thus, in Isa. viii, 7, "The Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria" (Jer. ii, 18; comp. Rev. ix, 14; xvi, 42). It is included among the "rivers of Babylon," by the side of which the Jewish captives were remembered Zion and "weep" (Psa. cxxxix, 1); and no doubt is glanced in at the threats of Jeremiah against the Chaldean "waters" and "springs," upon which there was to be a "sorrows" that should day of Babylonia (Jer. i, 19; ii, 26). The fulfilment of these prophecies has been noticed under the head of CHALDEA. The river still brings down as much water as of old, but the precious element is wasted by the neglect of man; the various water-courses along which it was in former times conveyed dry in the main channels have dried up, and the water stagnates in unwholesome marshes. It is remarkable that Scripture contains no clear and distinct reference to that striking occasion when, according to profane historians (Herod. i, 191; Xenoph. Cyrop. vii, 5), the Euphrates was turned against its mistress, and used to effect the ruin of Babylon. The brevity of Daniel (v, 50, 51) is perhaps sufficient to account for his silence on the point; but it might have been expected from the fulness of Jeremiah (ch. 1 and ii) that so remarkable a feature of the siege would not have escaped mention. We must, however, remember, in the first place, that a considerable part of it has been purposely withheld, in order that the Babyloni"... and the entire text continues.
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Ush stream; for, except in the height of the flooded season, it approaches 5 miles an hour; it varies from 24 to 93 feet in width, and during the height of its course under 3 than above. Its general description for some distance below Erzingan is that of a river of the first order, struggling through high hills, or rather low mountains, making an exceedingly tortuous course as it winds round its upper portion, is inclosed between two parallel ranges of hills, covered for the most part with high brushwood and timber of moderate size, having a succession of long, narrow islands, on several of which are moderate-sized towns; the borders of this ancient stream being still well inhabited, not only by Bedouins, but by permanent residents. The following towns may be named: Sumeis-at, Haoram, Rimkala, Bir, Giaber, Deir, Rava, Anna, Hadisa, El-Uus, Jibba, Hit, Hillah, Lemun, Korna, and Bussora. The scenery above Hit, in itself very picturesque, seems greatly heightened by the occurrence of ancient irrigating aqueducts, beautiful specimens of art, which are attributed by the Arabs to the Persians when fire-worshippers: they literally cover both banks, and prove that the borders of the Euphrates were once thickly inhabited by a highly civilized people. The greater part of the stream below Hit is the last of these. The country now becomes flatter, with few hills; the river winds less; and the banks are covered with Arab villages of mats or tents, with beautiful mares, cattle, and numerous flocks of goats and sheep. From Hit to Babylon the bed of the river is almost the only kind of habitation to be seen. This distance is cultivated only in part; the rest is desert, with the date-tree showing in occasional clusters. In descending, the irrigating cuts and canals become more frequent. Babylon is encircled by two streams, one above, the other below the principal ruin, beyond which they unite and produce abundance. For about thirty miles below Hillah both banks have numerous mud villages, imbedded in date-trees: to these succeed huts formed of bundles of reeds. The country lower down towards Lemun is most elevated above the river; irrigation is therefore easy: in consequence, both banks are covered with productive cultivation, and fringed with a double and nearly continuous belt of luxuriant date-trees, extending down to the Persian Gulf. At one mile and a half above the town the Deuwania is the first considerable deviation from this high river; irrigation here begins. Another takes place 22 miles lower; and nine miles farther—at Lemun—it again separates into two branches, forming a delta not unlike that of Damietta, and, when the river is swollen, inundating the country for a space of about 40 miles in width with a shallow sheet of water, forming the Lemun marshes, nearly the whole of which is covered with rice and other grain the river recedes (in June). Here mud villages are swept away by the water every year. Below Lemun the Tigris sends a branch to the Euphrates, which is thus increased in its volume, and, turning to the east, receives the chief branch of the Tigris, thence running in united stream, under the name of the Shat-ul-Arab, as far as the sea (the Persian Gulf). In this last reach the river has a depth of from 3 to 5 fathoms, varies in breadth from 500 to 900 yards, and presents banks covered with vegetable cultivation, having an appearance at once imposing and majestic. The length of that part of the river, reckoning from Bir to Bussora, navigable for large vessels at all times of the year, is 143 miles. It is very abundant in fish. The water is somewhat turbid, but, when purified, is pleasant and salubrious. The Arabian sets a high value on it, and name it Morad-Su; that is, Water of desire, or longing.

The annual inundation of the Euphrates occurs in the month of May. The river begins to rise in March, and continues rising till the latter end of May. The consequence increase of its volume and rapidity is attributable to the early rains, which, falling in the Armenian high mountains in winter, are swiftly conveyed and also, in the main, to the melting of the winter snows in those lofty regions. About the middle of November the Euphrates has reached its lowest ebb, and, ceasing to decrease, becomes tranquil and sluggish. The greatest rise of the Tigris is earlier, since it drains part of the snows of the southern chain of mountains. The Tigris scarcely ever overflows [see Hiddekel], but the Euphrates inundates large tracts on both sides of its course from Hit downwards. The great hydraulic works ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar (Abyden. Pr. 8) had for their great object to control the inundation by turning the waters through sluices into canals prepared for them, and distributing them in channels over a wide extent of country. "When the Euphrates," says Rich, "reaches its greatest elevation, it overflows the surrounding country, fills up, without the necessity of embanking, a vast number of miles below Hit, and the reception of its waters, and thus admirably facilitates the operations of husbandry. The ruins of Babylon are then inundated, so as to render many parts inaccessible, the intermediate hollows being converted into marshes" (Babylom and Persepolis, p. 54). Babylon, to which the waters of the Euphrates are most loaded with mud, are in the first flocks of January; the gradual melting of the snows in early summer, which preserves the high level of the waters, does not at the same time contribute much sedimentary matter. From numerous experiments made at Bir in December and January, 1886, I found the maximum of sediment mechanically suspended in the waters to be equal to one eightieth part of the bulk of fluid, or every cubic inch of water contained one eightieth part of its bulk of suspended matters; and from experiments made at the river's source, are finally deposited in the Lemun marshes. In navigating the river in May, 1886, the water flowing into the marshes was colored deeply by mud, but left the marshes in a state of comparative purity" (Recherches, p. 110, 111).

The Euphrates has at all times been of some importance as furnishing a line of traffic between the East and the West. Herodotus speaks of persons, probably merchants, using it regularly on their passage from the Mediterranean to Babylon (Her. i. 185). He also describes the boats which were in use upon the stream (i. 194), as means for conveying "the wine, which seems to have thought was furnished by Armenia. It was, however, more probably Syrian, as Armenia is too cold for the vine. Boats such as he describes, of wicker-work, and coated with bitumen, or sometimes covered with skins, still abound on the Euphrates (Chambers' Euphrates ii. 590-591). Men wishing to swim across or along the stream simply throw themselves upon an inflated skin and thus float, precisely in the manner described by ancient writers, and depicted on the Assyrian sculptures (Botta, Nivesi, a, p. 238 sq.). Alexander appears to have brought to Babylon by the Euphrates route vessels of some considera
EUPHRATES

The circumstances of this gale are described with much particularity, and they admit abundant illustration from the experience of modern seamen in the Levant. In the first place it came down from the island (εἰς ἀναβρ.). And therefore must have blown more or less from the southeast, since it was heeling along the south coast, not far from Mount Ida, and on the way from Fair-Havens towards Phenicis. So Captain Spratt, after leaving Fair-Havens with a light southerly wind, fell in with a strong northerly breeze blowing direct from Mount Ida" (Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck, p. 141). The wind is described as being like a typhoon (mod. τυφόν, I. e. "striker") or whirlwind (ψυκτικός, A. V. "tempestuous"); comp. τύφων, Aristot. Meteor. 1; De Mundo, iv, 18); and the same authority speaks of such gales in the Levant as being generally "accompanied by loud thunder and by terrific gusts and squalls from the southeast" (Conybeare, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1856, ii, 401). It is also observable that the change of wind in the voyage before us (xxvi, 13, 14) is exactly what might have been expected; for Captain J. Stewart observes, in his remarks on the Archipelago, that "it is always safe to anchor under the lee of an island with a northerly wind, as it dies away gradually, but it would be extremely dangerous with southerly winds, as they almost invariably shift to a violent northerly wind" (Purdy's Sailing Directory, pt. ii, p. 61). The long duration of the wind in the fourth book should enable us to describe the overclouded state of the sky ("neither sun nor stars appearing,") ver. 20, and even the heavy rain which concluded the storm (τοίρον τέρων, xxvii, 2), could easily be matched with parallel instances in modern times (see Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck, p. 144; Conybeare, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, i, p. 118; ii, p. 188). We have seen how this wind was more or less northerly. The context gives us full materials for determining its direction with great exactitude. The vessel was driven from the coast of Crete to Claudia (xxvii, 16), and apprehension was felt that she would be driven into the African Syrtis (v. 17). Combining these two circumstances with the fact that she was less than half way from Fair-Havens to Phenicia when the storm began (v. 14), we come to the conclusion that it came from the N.E. or E.N.E., and hence might fitly be termed north-easter. This is quite in harmony with the natural swell of the Euripus (Vulg. Euro-epaulet), i.e. north-east wind, the modern Greek term νότιος Ευρυκός (of those seas), which is regarded as the true reading by Bentley, and is found in some of the best MSS.; but we are disposed to adhere to the received text, more especially as it is the more difficult reading, and the phrase used by Luke (ἐν ἐκτιβοκήσει) seems to point to some peculiar word in use among the sailors. Alford thinks that the name of the wind was εὐρυκός, but that the Greek sailors, not understanding the Latin terminations, corruptly read the word into εὐρακοκός, so Luke wrote it (Comment. in loc.). Such winds are known to modern mariners in the Mediterranean by-
the name of Lecanenti. They are not confined to any single point, but blow in all directions from the north-east round by the north to the south-east. The "great wind" or mighty tempest experienced by the prophet Joseph, and Joppa to Tarshish (1, 4; comp. the destructive "east wind" of Ps. xxlii, 7) appears to have been one of these gales (comp. Josephus, War, iii, 8, 3, who calls it the "black north wind," μαυρομπήσων). See Wind.

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

I. It is separated from America on the west and northwest by the Atlantic; from Africa on the south by the Mediterranean; and from Asia by the Archipelago, Sea of Marmora, Black Sea, Caucasian ridge, Caspian Sea, Ural River and Mountains, and the Kara River. It is in the form of a huge peninsula, projecting from the north-west of Asia. Its extent from Cape St. Vincent on the south-west to the mouth of the Kara River on the north-east is 8400 miles; and from Cape Nordkust, the most northerly point of the Scandinavian main land, to Cape Matapan, the southernmost point of Greece, 2400 miles. The continent of Europe, irrespective of islands, lies within lat. 32° 1° — 71° 6' N., and long. 9° 30' W. — 69° 30' E. Its area is estimated at nearly 5,800,000 square miles; and its coastline is 54,200 miles. In proportion to the area, it contains more than half of any other great natural division of the globe, is estimated at 19,500 miles, giving a proportion of 1 linear mile of coast for every 190 square miles of surface. It had in 1888 a population of 330,000,000, which gives an average of about 87 for every square mile.

II. Church History.—Europe early received the seed of Christianity from the apostles themselves. The territory embraced in what is now Turkey, Greece, and Italy was for many years the scene of the apostolic labors of Paul, who founded a number of churches in Europe, and sent the Gospel to the Romans, Thessalonians, and Thessalonians. Whether he visited Spain, England, and other countries of Europe, as has been asserted by some writers, is doubtful. Peter is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church to have been for twenty-five years bishop of Rome. The fact of his having been in Rome, and having resided for several years centum over the Church there, is generally recognised by most of the historians. The share of the other apostles in the Christianization of Europe is doubtful, and the accounts of their missionary labors rest more on legends than historic documents (see the articles on each of the apostles, and each of the Evangelical Churches); but it is a well-established fact that, even before the close of the first century, numerous churches were established in Turkey, Greece, Malta, Italy, France, Spain, and Southern and Western Germany. The growing authority of the bishops of Rome [see Roman Catholic Church] soon made Europe the centre of the Christian world. When Constantine became a Christian, the Christianization of all that portion of Europe which belonged to the Roman empire made rapid progress, and was soon completed. In the fifth and sixth centuries, Spain, France, Scotland, England, and several German tribes became Christian. Christianity steadily advanced in all directions, but it was not until the sixteenth century that every pagan people of Europe had adopted the Christian doctrine. In the mean while, however, part of the Christian territory on his east from Rome to Constantinople, and several German tribes became Christian. Christianity steadily advanced in all directions, but it was not until the sixteenth century that every pagan people of Europe had adopted the Christian doctrine. It will be seen from the above table that the Eastern churches (or, more particularly, the Greek Church) prevail in Russia, Turkey, and Greece. In Turkey the government is Mohammedan, but the majority of the population belong to the Greek Church. The Roman Catholic Church prevails in Portugal, Spain, France, the South German States, Austria, Italy (inclusive of the Papal States, San Marino and Monaco), and Belgium, while Protestantism is the prevailing religion in the North German Confederation, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. (A. J. S.)

Eusebius, a name given to the Arians from Eusebius of Nicomedia. See Eusebius of Nicomedia.

Eusebius, the only pope of this name, and, according to a tradition, the son of a physician, became bishop of Rome in 310, after the death of Marcellus. The time of his pontificate is variously stated at from four and a half to eight months, and the name of his pontificate is recorded as Bishop of Rome. According to an epitaph published by Baronius (but which Baronius himself refers, not to the pope, but to some priest of the same name), the lapsus (q. v.) in Rome demanded immediate absolution, which Eusebius refused. Tumults arose, in consequence of which Eusebius was exiled by the usurper Maxentius to Sicily. He is remembered as a saint on the 26th of September. Several decrees circulating under his name, as well as three letters to the bishops of Gaul, to the Egyptians, and to the bishops of Tuscia and Campania, are spurious. Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, iv, 738; Acta SS., 26 Sept.; Pagli, Breveinum pontific. Roman. (i. p. 65); Bower, Hist. of the Popes; Ersch u. Gruber, Allgem. Lexikon. (sect. i, vol. xli. p. 445).
EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA. I. In the Eastern churches, a number of homilies, ascribed to one Eusebius of Alexandria, enjoyed a great reputation, especially during the 6th and 7th centuries. They are ei-
ther authentic, as part of the liturgy of the Eastern Church, or discussions of moral and practical ques-
tions. Their author is variously designated as monk, bishop, archbishop, or papa; most frequently bishop or archbishop of Alexandria. An ancient biography, published by cardinal Mai (Scrip. Rom. ix, p. 105), represents him as a saintly monk living near Alex-
dria, and endowed with the faculty of working mir-
cles, who became successor of Cyril in the see of Alex-
dria, transferred his episcopal functions, after seven years (another reading says twenty years), to a noble Alexandrine named Alexander, and died in the retire-
ment of Aegyptus, and 'That this account is false we
know from the list of bishops of Alexandria, which no-
where leaves room for a bishop Eusebius. According
to Thilo (Oeber die Schriften des Eusebii von Alex-
drien und des Eusebii von Emesa, Halle, 1882), the au-
thor was either a Montano or an Origenist. He
was known for his controversial writings on the name of the four "tall brothers," and distinguished among the monks of the Nilotic desert for pietistic and theological learning, or a presbyter at the court of Justinian I, who, honor-
ed with the title Papa, took an active part in the dog-
matic controversies of the 6th and 7th centuries (see Herzog's Real-Encyklop., s. v.) thinks that neither of those two men has all the qualifications which one
would expect from the author of the Homilies. The
only thing certain, in his opinion, is that the homilies
were compiled in the 5th or 6th century. The number of references that are present in the collection is twenty-one.
Some of them were published at Paris, 1575, and Ant-
werp, 1692. Augusti (Euseb. Emes. que superuent opus-
cula, Elberfeld, 1829) wrongly attributed three of the homilies (of the dramatic class) to Eusebius of Emesa. Thilo, in the work already mentioned, combated the view for the present, and Eusebius of Emesa it is that, in 1834, he added an edition of a new homily on astrology. His
views were confirmed by cardinal Mai (Scrip. Rom.
ix), who, from a Vatican manuscript, published a num-
ber of homilies for the first time. A homily on time,
which has never been printed, is to be found in the
Vienna Imperial Library.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop., iv,
226; Fabricius, Bibliocr. (ed. Harles), vii, 409. (A.
J. S.)

II. Eusebius, bishop of Laodicea, being a native of
Alexandria, is sometimes called Eusebius of Alexan-
dria. EUSEBIUS, with the surname BRUNO, after 1047
bishop of Angers. Little is known of his early life. Soon after becoming bishop he was suspended with a
number of other bishops, being suspected, it is thought,
of simony. But he seems to have fully justified him-
self, for in 1049 he was present at the reformation of
the council of Rheims, and was chosen a member of the
committee to welcome pope Leo IX in the name of
the council. In a letter written from Rome (1049), he
complained of the measures taken by the pope against
Berengar, who, in his opinion, was free from any her-
ey. Berengar himself counted Eusebius among his
patrons, and it was the advice of Eusebius which in-
duced him to take, at the Synod of Tours in 1064, the
oath which the synod demanded from him. One of the
reformed bishops, who is known as the "saint" of the
heresy, calls Eusebius one of the chief renewers of
the heresy which finds in the Lord's Supper nothing
but a shadow and an image of the body of Christ. But
when count Geoffroi d'Anjou, the powerful protector
of the French heretics, died (1069), the courage of Eu-
sebius was at an end. At the Episcopal Convention
of Angers in 1062 he showed an inclination to accept
the doctrine of the Church, though he still made a
profession of personal friendship for Berengar. The
same indecision shows itself in the celebrated letter,
written between 1068 and 1066, in which Eusebius de-
clines to act as arbiter at a theological disputation
which Berengar desired to hold with the priest Gasp
frid Marnis near St. Omer. He expresses his regret in the
letter (which is regarded by Lessing as the abstruse the-
ological essay of the 11th century) deprecates new
dogmatic explanations concerning the Eucharist, and
declares that we ought not to appeal to the fathers, but
to adhere to Scripture, and abide by the simple
wordings of the sacred books; and he asserts that the body and blood of Christ as a duty of pious faith. The letter may be
found in Menandrus (Augustini c. Iuliani operum imper-
fecti l. 2 priores), with arbitrary alterations in De Roye
(Vita, heres. et poenit. Berenger.), and Boulay (Hist.
Univm. Paris.). Two other letters of Eusebius are given by a modern (Ber. T. P., 12). Eusebius, in 1071, died at
Angers Aug. 27, 1061.—Herzog, Real-Encyk. iv,
228; Lessing, Werke (ed. Lachmann), vol. vii;
Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Génér. xvi, 778; Neander, Church
History (Torrey), iii, 576; Neander, Hist. of Dogmas
(Ryland), ii, 460. EUSEBIUS OF CESAREA, the "father of Church his-
tory," was born about 270. The place of his birth is
not certainly known, but it is supposed to have been
Cesarea in Palestine. Coming to Antioch towards
the end of the 3d century, he there studied the Scrip-
tures under the care of St. Marcianus. Through the
blessings of God, it is said, the apostolic foundation
of his return to Cesarea he was ordained by Agapetus,
then bishop of that place. Here he became intimate
with Pamphilus, a learned presbyter, who was head of
a divinity school at Cesarea, and who had gathered
many books illustrative of Scripture and theology, es-
pecially the writings of Galen. In the 3d century his
life and his work were very fruitful. From the 4th cen-
tury, from the 4th century, from the 4th century, from
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was a considerable contest amongst the bishops relative to a creed or form of faith. Eusebius proposed a formula in accordance and orthodoxy, which received the general commendation both of the bishops and of the emperor himself. Something, notwithstanding, seeming to be wanting in the creed, to confute the impunity of the new opinion, the fathers of the Nicene Council determined that these words, 'Very God or Very Deity, untainted, being of one substance with the Father,' should be added. They also annexed anathemas against those who should assert that the Son of God was made of things not existing, and that there was a time when he was not. At first, indeed, Eusebius refused to admit the tenets of the church of Antioch, and the importance of the word was explained to him by the other bishops he consented, and, as he himself relates in his letter to his dioceses at Cesarea, subscribed to the creed (Socrates, H. E. i. 8).

Some affirm that it was the necessity of circumstances, or the fear of the emperor, and not the conviction of his own mind, that induced Eusebius to subscribe to the Nicene Council. Of some present at the synod this might be believed, but we cannot think it of Eusebius, bishop of Cesarea. After the Nicene Council, too, Eusebius always condemned those who asserted that the Son of God was not of the same essence as the Father, and he likewise affirms the same concerning him, and, though he frequently mentions that Eusebius subscribed to the Nicene Council, nowhere intimates that he did it insincerely. Had Eusebius subscribed to that council, not according to his own mind, but fraudulently and under pressure, we would not have so frequently heard that the letter we have mentioned to his diocese at Cesarea, and therein ingeniously profess that he had embraced the faith which had been published in the Nicene Council!" (For details, see Socrates, Hist. Eccl. i. 8, 9.)

After the deposition of Euthalithus (q. v.), A.D. 381, the see of Antioch was offered to Eusebius, but he declined the honor, probably in fear of tumult, and even bloodshed, from the excited state of the popular mind in Antioch. The conduct of Eusebius in this case greatly gratified the emperor Constantine, who wrote him a letter praising his prudence, and saying that he was worthy of being bishop, "not of the city, but of almost the whole world" (Socrates, H. E. i. 24).

In the course of the Arian dispute, Eusebius, though theoretically orthodox, substantially acted with the Arians to a great extent. Even in his Church History he mentions Eusebius of Nicæa as subscribing to the Arianism, and ending his book with A.D. 324. He presided at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335 (Epiphanius, Hær. ixvii. 7), summoned for the trial of Arians, and joined in the condemnation of that great man (see art. Athanasius, vol. i. p. 565). The prelates assembled at Jerusalem, and deputed Eusebius to the emperor Constantine, to obtain his approval of their decision, and he seems to have used his influence with the emperor to secure both the recall of Arius and the exile of Athanasius.

In his last years Eusebius lived in close intimacy with the emperor Constantine, who cherished the warmest esteem and affection for him. In A.D. 386 Eusebius wrote his Panegyric on Constantine. The emperor had assigned him the task of superintending the transcription of fifty copies of the Scriptures on parchment, for the use of the Constantinopolitans. This was the last literary labor in which he was engaged (Vita Constantin. iv. 85) before his death, which took place A.D. 340.

From the general tenor of his life as sketched above, it is not to be wondered that Eusebius has been charged with a leaning towards Arianism. "So thought, among the ancients, Hilary, Jerome (who otherwise speaks favorably of Eusebius), Theodoret, and the second Council of Nicea (A.D. 787), which unjustly condemned him, even expressly, as an Arian heretic; and so have thought, among moderns, Baronius, Petavius, Clericus, Tillemont, Gieseler; while the Church historian Socrates, the Roman bishops Gelasius and Pænigins, I. Valens, G. Bulling (who enters into a full vindication of Eusebius, in his Scriptorum, vol. i. 111), and Leo (and most Anglicans), have defended the orthodoxy of Eusebius, or at least mention him with very high respect. The Gallican Church has even placed him in the catalogue of saints. Athanasius never expressly wrote against him, although he warlike. He did not attack the faith to Ariamne, or to semi-Arianism, but frequently says that before 325 he held with Arius, and changed his opinion at Nicea. This is the view of Möhler also (Athanasius d. Grosso, p. 333 sq.), whom Donner (Christology, i, 792) inaccurately reckons among the opponents of the orthodoxy of the church of Antioch, the contradictions of the ancients for and against Eusebius are collected in Migne's edition of his works, tom. i. p. 68-98. Among recent writers, Dr. Samuel Lee has most fully investigated the orthodoxy of Eusebius in the preliminary dissertation to his translation of the Theophania from the Syriac, p. xxxv.-xxxi. he arrives at the conclusion (p. xxviii) 'that Eusebius was no Arian, and that the same reasoning must prove that he was no semi-Arian; that he did in no degree partake of the error of Origen, ascribed to him so positively and so grossly by the fathers; and that the fathers, and the first fathers, and the people of Christ's age, never in any way suspected him of being an Arian.'—Schoff, Hist. of the Christian Church, ii, 874. Compare also Dupin, Aut. Eccl. (Paris, 1683), ii, 1-15.

It is in the field of Church history that the merits and services of Eusebius stand pre-eminent among early writers. He had large opportunities, both of Christian and pagan learning, and used it, if not with critical or philosophical skill, yet with patient industry and with literary integrity. He was the first to collect the scattered annals of the first three centuries of the Church in his Ecclesiastical History, the most important of all his writings. He is the constant historian of Christianity from the advent of the Messiah to the defeat of Licinius. A.D. 324. In this work he rejects, with greater care than is usually attributed to him, the doubtful facts and the fabulous narratives. And this is not his only merit. A living sympathy for the fortunes of Christianity, as well as an earnest devotion for the heroism of its martyrs and confessors, inspires him throughout. "The history," he says in the beginning of the fifth book, "that compose historical narratives, would record nothing but victories in battle, the trophies of men, and the profligacy of the heathens, the bravery of soldiers, sullied with blood and innumerable murders, for the sake of children, and country, and property. But our narrative embraces that conversation and conduct which is acceptable to God —the wars and conflicts of a most pacific character, whose ultimate tendency is to establish the peace of both the soul." In Dr. Schaff's opinion (Ch. Hist. iii. 97), the Church History of Eusebius "gives a colorless, defectless, incoherent, fragmentary, yet interesting picture of the heroic youth of the Church, and owes its incalculable value not to the historic art of the author, but almost entirely to his copious and moral extracts from foreign, and, in some cases, now extinct sources."

In the 8th book of the Ecclesiastical History (c. ii) Eusebius states that it is no part of his plan to relate all the wickedness and dissensions of the Christians before the persecution, or to name those who were untrue to the faith; adding, "we shall only, upon the whole, introduce those events into our history that may be profitable first to us of the present day, and hereafter to posterity." In the Martyr. Palatin. (c. xii) he states as a historical principle that the "events most suitable to be recorded in a history of the martyrs are those which redound to their honor." Gibbon (Decline and Fall, c. xvi) remarks that "such an acknowledgment will naturally excite a suspicion that a writer who has so openly violated one of the fundamental laws of his-
EUSEBIUS

EUSEBIUS has not paid a very strict regard to the observance of the other. Certainly it was an error of judg-
manship for him to adopt the position which he ac-
counts. The Scripture might have taught him better; it does not omit the faults of patriarchs or saints. If nothing, moreover, is to be told of martyrs but "that what redounds to their honor," one's admiration of these heroes is not sustained by what he is kept back might counterbalance what is told. The principle of Eusebius is here historically bad. But Gibbon attacks Eusebius still more strongly in his

*Vindication of Chapters xv and xvi of his history.

Eusebius gives as the title of ch. xxxi, bk. xii, of the

*History of the Church.*

"It may be lawful to use falsehood as a medicine for the benefit of those who need such a procedure?"

He begins the chapter with a citation from Plato (De Legibus, ii, as follows: "A legislator of any value, even if the fact were not such as our discourse has just established it, if in any case he might make bold to deceive young persons for their advantage; could he possibly incul-
cate any falsehood more profitable than this, or more potent to lead all without force or compulsion to the practice of all justice? "Truth, my friend, is honorable but pernicious, indeed, it would be a very easy way of persuing." To this passage of Plato, Eusebius adds: "You may find a thousand such instances in the Scriptures, where God is described as jealous, or sleeping, or angry, or liable to other human affections, so expressed for the advantage of those who require such a means of persuasion."

"This is all that is said on the subject, and it may be interpreted to mean nothing more than that one's statements must be adapted to the understanding of his hearers or readers. But the use of the word "falsehood" in the heading of the chapter shows that, in the mind of Eusebius, either there was no just ap-
preciation of the difference between "falsehood" and "accommodation," or else that his moral sense as to
veracity had been vitiated by the ecclesiastical casu-
istry which even in his time had begun to show itself. It is easy to be seen, however, that Gibbon really misleads his readers by his statement of the case: "In this chapter," says he, "Eusebius alleges a passage of Plato which approves the occasional practice of pious and salutary frauds; nor is he ashamed to justify the sentiments of the Athenian philosopher by the exam-
ples which he finds in the Old and New Testament. This is not warranted by the passage, which is fully cited above. We adopt, nevertheless, the remark of Wad-
dington (History of the Church, ch. vi, ad fin.): "It was disgraceful to the less enlightened fathers of the second and third centuries that, even in the midst of the intensity of mind and the glow of reasonableness which had ever been characteristic of the profession of falsehood; but the same ex-
pedient was still more shameful to Eusebius, who flourished during the prosperity of the Church, whose age and more extensive learning left him no excuse in ignorance or superstition, and whose great name and unquestionable piety gave sanction and authority to all his opinions. There can be no doubt, then, that the publication of that detestable principle in any one of his writings, however modified and limited by his explanation, must to a certain extent disturb our con-

*Eusebius, B. Apologie, C. Dogmatic; D. Exegetical.*

A. Historical.—I. The Ierapoa lexapmarrq, Ecclesiastical History, in ten books, beginning with the incarna-
tion of Christ, relates the history of the Church, in-
cluding accounts of writers, martyrs, persecutions, etc., up to A.C. 324. It was probably composed before the Nicene Council (325), as, near its close, Cris-
pus, the emperor of Constance, this historian is not mentioned, which could hardly have happened after the execution of Crispus (325). The best editions of the History, with the Greek text, are Valesius, with life of Eusebius prefixed (Par. 1659-1673, 8 vols., often reprinted); Reading's edition of Valesius's Euse-
bius (1862, 2 vols.); Heinichen, Hist. Eccles., Reading's edition of Valesius's, with Struth's notes, and additional notes and indices by the editor (Leips. 1827-8, 8 vols. 8vo; also see below); Burton, Hist. Eccles. (Gr.) (Oxon, 1838, 1845, 1856, 8vo), also An-
notations Variarum, 2 vols. 8vo (Oxon, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); cheap edition by Schwengler (Tubing. 1823, Svo); Laemmer, Hist. Eccles., cum tabulis specimina cod. vi. vii. cont. (Schaafhausen, 1862, large 8vo, pp. 806, with tables in fol.).

English Translations.—Hammer, Ch. History of Euse-
bius, Socrates, and Evagrius, with the Life and Pan-
degyric of Constantine (Cambridge, 1857, and often. fol.);

the same, with Salmon's translation of The Life of Constantine (1860, fol., 1868, 8vo); also An-
notations Variarum, 2 vols. 8vo (Oxon, 1865, 8vo); also in Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library, Lond. 12mo; and in Bagster's Greek Ecc. Historia, Lond. 1842, 8vo.)

*Eusebius, B. Apologie, C. Dogmatic; D. Exegetical.*

8. The Life of Constantine, παραλεγενητος ιστορια, of which four books only are preserved. They give mostly allegorical interpretations of Old-Test. Messiahic passages (edited by Gaisford, Oxf. 1842, 8vo; and possibly by Migne, Patrologia Graeca). (6) The five books of The Theophania, ουρανος, preserved in a Byz. translation, long lost, but discovered by Tattam in 1889 in a Nitrian monastery, and published under the title Eusebius on the Theophania, or divine Manifestation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, translated from an ancient Syriac Version of the Greek Original now lost, with Notes, and a Vindication of the Orthodox and prophetic View of the Author, by Prof. S. Lee (Camb. 1843, 8vo). Dr. Lee assigns the MS. (now in the British Museum) to the year A.D. 411. The Greek fragments, with Lat. version, compared also with Lee's edition, are given in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, xxiv., 607 sq. See a full treatment of the subject in Cellier, Aut. Sacr. (Paris, 1865, 2 vols.), p. 258 sq.

8. The small work, Against Hierocles, προς τον Ηιεροκλην της Σοφοκλην τον Τουραια αντιπαραγενητης ενεργης εις την Κυκλωσμην του Χριστου συμπεριληφθηκαν τον Κυκλωσμην, generally cited Adversus Hieroclem, is considered by the ancients as a work of Paulinus and a philosopher Apollonius of Tyana cannot bear comparison with Christ. It is to be found in Morell's Philostratus (Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1868); edited, with new transal. and notes, by Olarrius (Leips. 1709); and, with the libri contra Marcellum, ed. by Gaisford (Oxon, 1832, 8vo); also in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, xxxii., 795 sq.


2. The three books, Of the Ecclesiastical Theology, περι της εκκλησιας θεολογιας, Of ecclesiastical theology, are likewise intended against Marcellus, as θεολογια here means sermo de Filio Dei ejusque nature divina, with a biblically-dogmatical proof of the hypothetical existence of the Son. It is given in Grec. and Lat. by Retberg (Cologne, 1744); in Cont. Hierol. ed. by Kocks (Oxon, 1832, 8vo); and in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, xxiv., 826 sq.

8. The short treatise, περι της του πατρα τηρησης, De solemnisitate paschalium, treats of the typical character of the Jewish Passover, and of its consumption in the new covenant. It is in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, xxiv., 694 sq.

14. Fourteen smaller treatises, among which the most important are, De fide adae. Sabellium, De resurrectione, De incorporali anima; quod Deus Pater incorporali est, which remain only in Latin, and are all contained in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, xxvi. 770 sq.

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

1. The Πατηματος, τον των τον πατηματος ιστοριαν των Θεωρων, a topographical and alphabetical index of the names of places occurring in the Bible. It was translated into Latin by Jerome, and edited in Greek by Bonfrereius (Paris, 1631 and 1659, fol.) and Gr. and Lat. in Hieron. Opera, t. iv (Paris, 1689); by Clericus (Amst. 1707, fol.) by Lar- row and Farthby (Berlin, 1628, 8vo).

2. Evangelical commences, a kind of Gospel harmony, to
be found in the editions of the N. T. by Erasmus, Stephens, and Mill; also in Migne, Patrolog. Graec. xxii. 1875.
5. Žižmarae et Ἀγίων. Questiones evangelicæ, in three books, containing solutions of seeming contradic-
tions of the evangelists; edited by Mai in his Collect.
Script. Vet. (1825, 4to), i. 101 sqq.
4. Commentaries on the Psalms and On Isaiah, which are preserved to a great extent, and given in Migne, Patrolog. Graec. tom. xxiv and xxv. Of his commen-
taries on Solomon’s Song, Proverbs, Daniel, and Luke, only fragments are left us, which are given in Migne, Patrolog. Graec. tom. xxiv, which prints also Mai’s newly-
discovered fragments from his Nov. Patr. Bibliotheca, vol. i. 302 sqq.
There is no absolutely complete edition of the works of Eusebius. The nearest to such are Eusebius Pamphili Opera Latina, Basii, 1842, 4 vols. fol.; Paris (1818, fol.) most complete of all (following Vitae seu Montfaucon, Mai, and Gaisford), Migne, Patrolog. Graec. vols. xiii—xxii. A new edition of the Script. Heresi. Christi, by H. P. 1867 (vol. i, 8vo, the Histo. Eccl. ii, of the Opera
lat. Dindorf (Leipsic, 1845—67, vols. i—iii, 8vo).
See Cave, Histo. Eccl. ii. 111; Dupin, Autorum Eccle.
Eusebius of Dorylaeum, born at the end of the fifth century, began his public life as a lawyer, and obtained the place of imperial commissioner (agenis in rebus). Evagrius (Hist. Eccle. iv, 41) says of him that, “while still practising as a rhetorician, he was the first to expose the blasphemy of Nestorius.” He seems to have been he who blasphemed Nestorius in a sermon about A.D. 490 (when he denied Mary the title Theou- 
șëvokou), by crying aloud “Martha.” This Logos him-
self subjected himself to a second birth.” This, at least, is the conclusion of Neander (Church History, Torrey’s transl., ii. 504). He also thinks it probable that Eusebius was the author of the formal complaint publicly posted against Nestorius in the church of Constantinople, comparing him to Paul of Samosata (Neander, l.c.). It is possible that it was as a reward for this zeal that he was made bishop. At all events, he entered into orders, and became bishop of Dorylaeum, in Phrygia. In the year 448, at the Convoc. Eccl. vi, 455, 650). See Eutyches. At this synod Eutyches was banished, but in the following year, at the Council of Eusebius. Some homilies are of a more recent date. See EUSEBIUS of ALEXANDRIA. A biography of Eusebius, by bishop George, of Laodicea, is lost. A work on Eusebius and his writings has been written by Augusti (Euseb. Emesa, opuscula quod superius, inibid. ed. 1889); and some of the statements in this work have been retold by Thilo (Uber d. Schriften des Euseb. v. Alex. u. des Euseb. von Emessio (Halle, 1822). Some of the homilies as-
cribed to Eusebius of Cæsarea are attributed to Euse-
bius of Emesa.
Eusebius, a Nitrian monk (beginning of 5th century), one of the “four brothers” condemned by Thephylius, bishop of Alexandria, for holding the opinions of Origen. The three others were Dioscorus, Ammonius, and Euthymius. They retired first to Je-
EUSEBIUS

rusalem and Scythopolis, and then to Constantinople, where Chrysostom received them kindly, but did not admit them to communion. They were 'pious men, though not wholly exempt from a certain fanatical ascetic tendency.'—Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 691; Sozomen, Hist. eccl. viii, 12, 13; Socrates, Hist. eccl. vi, 7.

EUSEBIUS OF LAODICEA, a native of Alexandria, and therefore sometimes called Eusebius of Alexandria. As deacon in Alexandria, he accompanied his bishop, Dionysius, in the Valerian persecution of Christians before the proconsul Eulamianus (257), and by nursing the imprisoned Christians and burying the martyrs gave a shining testimony of his undaunted faith. When (from 260 to 263) a terrible epidemic and civil war devastated Alexandria, Eusebius again distinguished himself by his zeal in nursing the sick, both pagan and Christian, and, in union with his friend Anatolius, procured relief to thousands of inhabitants who were threatened with starvation. In 264 he attended, as the representative of bishop Dionysius, whom old age and sickness retained in Alexandria, the Synod of Antioch, which was to take action on the heresy of Paul of Samosata. Subsequently he became bishop of Laodicea in Syria, where he died in 270. He was succeeded by his friend Anatolius.—Hertzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 240; Eusebius, Hist. eccl. vii, 36 (A. D. 376).

EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA, who may be called the leader, if not the organizer, of the Arian party in the fourth century, was a distant relative of the emperor Julian, and was born about A.D. 324 (Ammianus Marcellinus, Hist. xxii, 9). He was first bishop of Berytus, in Phoenicia, but got himself translated to Nicomedia. Theodoret says (i, 19) in violation of the canons—by the influence of Constantius, sister of the emperor Constantine, whose confidence he had completely won. After the excommunication of Arius by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 321), Eusebius took Arius (who had written him a letter asking his aid) under his protection, offered him an asylum in his own house, and wrote urgently, though at the present time respectfully, in his favor, to Alexander, the patriarch of Alexandria (for details, see Arianism, vol. i, p. 389).

As Eusebius had been a disciple of Lucian, he probably held the opinions of Arius at the time. Socrates says that "Eusebius of Nicomedia and his partisans, with such as embraced the sentiments of Arius, demanded by letter that the sentence of excommunication, which had been pronounced against him should be rescinded, and that those who had been excluded should be readmitted into the Church, as they held no unorthodox doctrine" (Hist. eccl. i, 6; see also Sozomen, i, 15).

At the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325), Eusebius and his friends used all possible efforts first to carry their own opinions through, and then to hinder a definitive sentence. Their opposition was finally concentrated against the application of the term οὐκ εἶσαι (consubstantial) to the Son. All opposition failed, and the orthodox doctrine was established by the council. See Arianism, vol. i, p. 389; Nicæa, Council of. Eusebius, finding himself standing nearly alone, affixed his signature at last. Philostorgius (i, 9) asserts that instead of the term οὐκ εἶσαι (of the same essence), Eusebius and his friends secretly introduced the semi-Arian term οὐκ ἐστίν (of like essence); but the statements of Philostorgius are not to be implicitly believed. The decree of the council contained not only the name of Eusebius himself, but also an expression of certain propositions of Arius. This last Eusebius refused to sign, declaring to the council that he "submitted to their determinations concerning the faith, and consented to subscribe to it, even admitting the word consubstantial, according to the genuine signification of it, and completely the belief of the council; but that as for the condemnation of Arius, he could not subscribe to it; not that he had a mind to reject the points of faith which they had decided, but because he did not think that he, whom they accused, was in the error that they laid to his charge: that, on the contrary, he was entirely persuaded, by the letters which he received from him, and by the conferences which he had with him, that he was a man whose sentiments were entirely different from those for which he was condemned." Theognis of Nice, Thomas of Marmora, and Secundus of Ptolemais, agreed with him in this. The council condemned them as heretics, and Constantine condemned them as having committed But Arius, Theognis, and Secundus having submitted, Eusebius and Theognis finally signed, and were forgiven by the emperor.

Soon after the close of the council "Eusebius showed a desire to revive the controversy, for which he was in danger of his life and health, and received permission on this occasion Constantine addressed a letter to the people of Nicomedia, censuring their exiled bishop in the strongest manner as disaffected to his government, as the principal supporter of heresy, and a man wholly regardless of truth (Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. i, 20). But he did not remain under the imperial censure. Indeed, he subsequently so completely regained Constantine's favor as to be selected to baptize him, not long before his death (A.D. 337). His Arian feelings, however, broke out again. He procured the deprivation of Eustathius (q. v.), bishop of Antioch, and, if we may believe Thaddaeus (i, 21), Theodoret (i, 21), he tried to bring a woman to against him a false accusation of the most infamous kind. He was, perhaps, the most bitter opponent of Athanasius (see Athanasius), and exerted himself to procure the restoration of Arius to the full privileges of churchmanship, in league with Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, with whose opinions, unless he at once admitted him to the holy communion, in which he would have succeeded but for the sudden death of Arius. In 339 Eusebius managed to procure his election to the see of Constantinople, in defiance of a canon against translations agreed to at Nicæa. He died about A.D. 342. Though Eusebius lies under the disadvantage of having his character handed down to posterity almost entirely by the description of theological enemies, yet it is difficult to imagine that he was in any way deserving of esteem. His signature to the Council of Constantinople, with its defects, can not be considered to have signed it merely as an article of peace, since he was ever afterwards a zealous opponent of its principles. It can scarcely be doubted that he was worldly and ambitious. Athanasius considers him as the teacher rather than the disciple of Arius; afterwards, when he was divided among themselves into parties, those who maintained the perfect likeness which the substance of the Son bore to that of the father (Homoioousian) against the Consustantialists on the one hand, and the pure Arians or Homoousian on the other, pleaded the authority of this Eusebius. The tenets of this party were sanctioned by the Council of Seleucia, A.D. 359" (Smith, Dict. of Biography, s. v.). See, besides the works already cited, Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev.) i, 118; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 367 sq.; Newman, History of the Arians i, 263 sq.; Lardner, Works (idx. 1843), ii, 369 sq.

Eusebius of Vercelli, was born in Sardinia; was baptized in Rome by pope Eusebius; and became lector, or ecclesiastical reader at Rome. He was ordained bishop of Vercelli, in Piedmont, A.D. 349, with the unanimous consent of clergy and people. He was the first in the West who united the monastic life with the clerical (Ambrose, cited by Ceillier, v. 500). Pope Liberius requested him to go with Lucifer of Cagliari, and other legates, on an embassy to Constantinus, by whom the number of Athanasius had been sanctioned. They visited the emperor (at Arles or Valence), and prevailed on him to summon the Council III.—12*
of Milan, which met A.D. 355. The Eusebians (Ari- 
ans) at this council urged the condemnation of Atha-
nasius, and the emperor sided with them. Eusebius of 
Vercelli having received the emperor's order to sign 
the condemnation of Athanasius, refused, but expres-
sed his willingness to subscribe the Nicene Creed. Lu-
cifer of Cagliari and Dionysius of Milan refused also. 
The third session was held in the palace, the Arian 
party fearing the violence of the people. The em-
peror himself then sent for the three above-mentioned 
bishops, to confer with them, to either recommend 
them to prepare for banishment; they, on their part, 
earnestly entreated him to remember the account he 
would be called upon to give in the day of judgment, 
and besought him not to introduce the heresy of Arian 
into the Church; but all, of course, Eusebius, Dionysius, 
and Lucifer were sentenced to ban-
ishment. At Scythopolis, in Palestine, his place of 
exile, he was warmly welcomed, and also encouraged 
by an embassy from his people at Vercelli. But at 
alast he was brutally outraged, dragged naked through 
the streets, and imprisoned. From there he was 
then transferred to Capadocia, and thence to the 
Thabrads (Theodore, Hist. Eccl. iii. 4; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 
v. 12). After the death of Constantius, his successor, 
Julian, issued an edict recalling the exiled bishops. 
Eusebius went first to Alexandria, where he stood 
by the council of Nicene II. He was then taking 
measures to heal the Arian schism. See EUSTA-
THIANS. The council sent him to Antioch to end 
the strife there, but the ordination of Paulinus (q. 
v.) by Lucifer of Cagliari had made matters worse 
than ever. After travelling through the East he 
reached Rome, where he was called the en-
thusiasm, particularly in his own diocese. He show-
ed himself, in the latter years of his life, a great ad-
mirer of monasticism, and introduced among the cler-
gy of his diocese the common life. Having learned 
that the bishop of Ancyra, Eusebius, of that 
support of the emperor Valentinian, was very actively la-
Bcribing for the triumph of Arianism, Eusebius, in 364, 
was suddenly appeared in Milan to attack Arianism in 
its stronghold, but the emperor soon ordered him back 
to his diocese. He died in 371. An inscription on 
his tomb calls him a martyr, and, as a later le-
gend, he was killed by the Arians; but the writers that 
are best informed about him (Ambrose, Gregory of 
Touria, etc.) know nothing of his martyrdom. 
The Church of Rome formerly commemorated him 
as a martyr on the 1st of August, and now on the 16th 
of December. The works of Eusebius are three Epistola 
Eusebius: 
1. Ad Constantium Augustum.—2. Ad presbyteros et ple-
bes Italice, written on the occasion of his banishment, 
which to is attached Libellus facti, a sort of protest 
against the violent conduct of the Arian bishop 
Philipus, who was in some sort his jailor during his resi-
dence at Scythopolis.—3. Ad Gregorianum Episc. Hier., 
found among the fragments of Hilary (xi, § 5). He 
executed also, a translation of the Commentary of his 
namesake, Eusebius of Cesarea, on the Psalms; and 
an edition of the Evangelists, from a copy said to 
be translated by his own hand, preserved a cancelled, 
was published at Milan (1748, 4to) by J. A. Ircoles; and 
again by Bianchini, at Rome, 1748. This edition is given 
also in Migne, Patrol. Lat. vol. xii. The Epistola 
will be found in Bibl. Patr. Gallend. vol. v; part of them in 
Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. v; and all in Migne, Patrol. Lat. 
v. 24. Eusebius was appointed bishop of Samosata in 361, 
and in the same year was present at the Synod of Ant-
ioch, at which both Arians and Catholics elected Me-
leitus patriarch of Antioch. The document of elec-
tion, signed by both parties, was deposited with Euse-
bius. When Meletius, in his very first sermon, de-
clared himself strongly in favor of the doctrine of the 
Council of Nice, the Arians induced the emperor to de-
mand from Eusebius the certificate of election. On his 
refusal he was threatened with having his right hand cut off; but he resolutely held 
out both hands, declaring his readiness to lose both 
his hands rather than resign a document containing 
so manifest a demonstration of the impiety of the 
Arian dogma. Eusebius, (Hist. Eccl. iv. 29.) During 
the persecution of the orthodox by Valens, he trav-
elled, disguised as a soldier, through Syria, Phoeni-
cia, and Palestine, everywhere consecrating orthodox 
priests, and confirming the people in the Nicene faith. 
At the disputed election of a bishop for Cesarea, in 
Capadocia (370), he aided in securing the succession 
of the orthodox Basil (q. v.). He ever after remained 
an intimate friend of Basil, and with him, in 372 and 
375, took a leading part in the effort to secure, with 
the support of the Western churches, the success of 
the Nicene party also in the East. He was, there-
fore, a special object of hatred to the Arians, who 
in 378 prevailed upon the emperor to exile him to 
Thracia. After the death of Valens (378) Eusebius 
was allowed to return to his diocese. He at once be-
gan to display an extraordinary activity in appointing 
church councils in the Nicene sense; in taking 
measures for the town of Dolica for this purpose in 379 (or 
380), he was killed by a stone thrown by the hand of 
some Arian woman (Theodore, Hist. Eccl. v. 4). The 
Church of Rome venerates him as a saint on July 21, 
and the Greek Church on July 22.—Herzog, Real-Enzy-
clopaed., iv. 319; Theiner, Autorsa Sacros (Paris, 1869), 
v. 1 sq. (A. J. S.)

EUSEBIUS, bishop of Thessalonica, A.D. 601, wrote 
against the Aphthartodoci, especially in reply to a 
monk Andreas, who taugh that Christ's body 
became incorruptible when joined to his divinity; that 
Adam's body was not created liable to corruption; and 
that the world, in its original form, was incorruptible 
also. The Church of Rome received this book 
and forbade it to be read; but, in the end, Andreas 
attained to post his books by further defences, which 
induced Eusebius to write ten books against the positions 
he had before attacked, showing that Andreas had man-
derstood the truths of the faith and quite misunderstood 
the others. These works are no mere examples except what are 
are preserved by Photius in his Biblioth. Cod. 162.—Cave, 
Hist. Lit. (Geneva, 1720), i, 578; Clarke, Succ. Sac. Lit. 
i, 576.

EUSTATHIANS. 1. Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, 
was deposed at the Arian Council of A.D. 381. See 
EUSTATHIANS. The orthodox people of Antioch 
refused to receive an Arian bishop as his successor, 
and kept aloof, thereby gaining the name of "Eustathians." In 
A.D. 390, Meletius (q. v.) was transferred by the 
Arians from the see of Sebaste to Antioch; but, though 
he adhered to the Nicene Creed, the "Eustathians" 
would not recognise him, as they refused to regard 
an Arian or an orthodox bishop of the Eastern Church 
as compatible with the hope of salvation. They wore a particu-
lar habit; appointed Sunday as a fast, and taught 
that the ordinary fasts of the Church are needless after
people have attained to a certain degree of purity. The sect probably derived its name from Eustathius, semi-Arian bishop of Sebasta (§ 360), who was condemned at Gangra in 341, and exiled to Saphagonia, where he lived between the years 326 and 341. But it has been strongly argued on the other hand that the Eustathians who founded the sect was a different person, an Armenian monk. Walch (Hist. d. Ketzerien, iii, 536) has treated the subject at large.—Murd. Mosheim, Ch. Hist. bk. iv, pt. ii, ch. iii, § 319, n. 88; Socrates, Hist. i, 42; Sozomen, H. E. i, 13; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 419; Dupin, Hist. Eccl. cent. iv; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. xxii, ch. i, § 8. See EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE.

Eustathius of Antioch was born at Sida, in Pamphylia (Hieron. Catal. 85). He was for some time bishop of Beres, from whence he was translated to the see of Antioch in 325 by the unanimous suffrage of clergy and people (Theodoret, H. E. i, 7). At the Council of Nice, in 325, he earnestly opposed the Arians, who, at the (Arian) Synod of Antioch, A.D. 381, took their revenge upon him. Eusebius of Nicomedia (or Cyrus of Beres) charged him with Sabellianism (Socrates, H. E. i, 24); but, according to Sozomen (H. E. ii, 15), the prelate was saved from his deposition only for his confession that he "had defiled the priesthood by unholly deeds." The synod deported him, and the people of Antioch was stirred by the act almost to the point of sedition. This angered Constantine, who, moreover, was now, under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, favorable to the Arians. Eustathius was deprived of the will of Eusebius of Cesarea, whom he charged with unfaithfulness to the Nicene Creed. He was banished to Thrace, where he died before A.D. 387 (Socrates, i, 24, 25; Sozomen, l.c.). His innocence as to the charge of immorality was fully shown by the consecration of the women who had sworn against him. The orthodox people of Antioch refused to acknowledge any other bishop, and, so long as they remained in this separate condition (until the fifth century), they were called Eustathians (Neander, Ch. Hist. Torrey's, ii, 411). Eustathius was a thorough opponent of the school of Origen, and this constituted one of the points of antagonism between him and Eusebius of Cesarea. He was a copyist, but only one work of his known to be genuine is now extant, viz. Κατά τοῦ καταμετασχηματισμοῦ τῆς γένους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, against Origen, on the subject of the Pyrexia, § 5. Condemned by Sozomen, 381, as an apologist of Arianism, he was accused by the orthodox sect of being the spirit of Eudocia, and Eustathius refutes him with great acuteness, but also not without an unworthy disdain in replying to so great a man. This treatise is to be found at the end of l.c. at the edition of the Hippommon (1629, 4to, improperly ascribed to Eustathius). It is also given in the Crónica Sacra, viii, 381 sq., and in Biblioteca Max. Parv. xvii. There are fragments of a treatise of his on The Soul, and of his Homilies; all of which, with the treatise against Origen above named, are given in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, xlvii, 634 sq. See Fabricius, Bib. Graeca, ed. Harles, ix, 131 sq.; Oudin, Script. Eccl. i, 317 sq.; Ceillier, Auctores Sacris, Paris, 1865, iii, 188 sq.; Cave, Hist. Lit. Genev. 1720, i, 119; Lardner, Works, iv, 149; Dorner, Person of Christ, Edinburgh transl., div. i, vol. ii, p. 518 sq.

Eustathius of Thessalonica, one of the most learned bishops of the Greek Church in the Middle Ages, was a native of Constantinople. He was at first a monk, subsequently a deacon of the church of St. Sophia, and a teacher of elocution. He also held a position at the court, having charge of all petitions, and in this capacity presented to the emperor a petition of the city of Constantinople on the occasion of a great scarcity of water. In this period of his life Eustathius compiled his celebrated commentaries on Greek classics, which give proof of an immense amount of reading, and are the more valuable as they contain many extracts from works which are now lost. It is especially the commentary on Homer (Rome, 1542-50, 4 vols.; Basle, 1559-60, 3 vols.; with register by Devotius, edited by Stallbaum, Leips. 1825-30, 6 vols.), which is a rich storehouse of learning. In the second edition of the formula of adjuration which the converts from Mohammedianism had to pronounce, Eustathius, at the synod, firmly opposed the emperor, who was greatly displeased with this opposition, but nevertheless remained a patron of Eustathius' work, which, in 1186, Thessalonica was conquered and plundered by the Normans under William II of Sicily, Eustathius was indefatigable in his efforts in behalf of the city. His theological writings were for the first time published by Dr. Tafel (Opuscula s. codd. Basili. Paris. Veneto, nunc primam editis Tb. L. P. Tafel, Francof. 1832; with an Appendix, Tafel, De Thessalonico, Berlin, 1889). They are noted for outspoken evangelical sentiments. Of special importance in this respect is the work Meditationes on the Monastic State (συρροχή τοῦ μοναχού), transl. into German (Betrachtungen über d. Mönchseis) by C. l. P. Tafel, Berlin, 1873. Some of his commentaries on John of Damascus are still extant in MS. Eustathius died in Thessalonica about 1194.—Hertzog, Real Encycl. i, 247; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 771; Neander, Charakteristik des Eustathius in seiner reformatorischen Richtung, in Neander, Wissenschaftliche A. kundl. (Berlin, 1857, i., 170, 171.)

Eustathius, semi-Arian bishop of Sebasta, in Armenia, in the fourth century, was a great advocate of monasticism, which he introduced into Armenia. The ascetic fanatics called Eustathians are supposed to have taken their name and their practices from him (but see EUSTATHIANS, 2). He also founded in Sebasta a hospital for the poor, over which he placed Αἰρίου, then his devoted friend. But later Aërius charged him with avarice, and they quarrelled. See Αἰρίανος. Eustathius died about A.D. 380.—Socrates, Hist. Eccl. ii, 48; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. iii, 14; Neander, Church Hist. Torrey's transl. ii, 942; Hefele, Conciliarius, iii, 565 sq.

Eustochium, Julia, was born at Rome about A.D. 365. A daughter of Paula (q. v.), she imitated the ascetic piety of her mother. In 382 she took the vow of virginity, and put herself under the direction of Jerome, who gave her instructions relative to the life she had chosen. It was for her that he wrote (383) his treatise on a young man's duty. On his departure from Rome, Paula and Eustochium accompanied him, and settled near him in a monastery near Bethlehem. After the death of Paula (404), Eustochium succeeded as superior of the monastery. So greatly was she profited by Jerome's instructions that she gained a knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages. To her Jerome dedicated his Commentaries on Ezekiel and Isaiah. He translated also the rules of Pachomius into Latin for the use of the members of the monastery at Bethlehem. In 416 the Pelagians burned this monastery and outraged the inmates. She is celebrated as a saint in the Roman Church Calendar, 29th of September.—Hoefer, Newe. Biog. Gräz., vi, 792; Butler, Lives of the Saints, ix, 775; Millman, Hist. of Christianity (N. Y. 1866), iii, 284.

Euthalius, bishop of Sulce, 5th century, is supposed to have been the first to divide the N. T. into verses. Some of the poetical parts of the O. T. had been arranged by him. After his death (483) divided Paul's epistles into verses. Afterwards he so arranged Acts and the Catholic Epistles. The division into chapters had been made by a previous writer (A.D. 890), and Euthalius adopted it. Erasmus,
In his N. T., inserts the Arguments of Euthalius to the Acts and to Paul's epistles. His Prologue to St. Paul's Epistles, including a sketch of Paul's life, was published by J. H. Bocclerus at the end of his N. T. (Arguentor. 1644, 1660). All the remains of Euthalius are given in Euthalius, ed. Odiot, Vol. I. (Oudin, Rome, 1688, 4to).—Horne, Introduction, pt. i., ch. ii., § 3; Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev. 1720), i.

Euthymius Zigabenus (or Zigebeinu), a Greek monk and theologian of the 12th century. He lived in the time of the emperor Alexius Comnenus (about A.D. 1120), and was his intimate friend. Of his life little is known, except from the Alexius of Anna Comnena (v. 470), who praises his talent and scholarship. The following writings of his have been published: (1) Πισχώνα διομάντης, Panoplia Dogmatica, against all heretics, written by the order of Alexius Comnenus, and divided into two parts and 24 sections, each treating of a heresy. It consists chiefly of digest of the preexisting translated by Zinns (Venice, 1555, fol.; reprinted at Lyons, 1556 and 1580, 8vo); also in Bibli. Patriar. (Lyons, xiv). This translation omits the 12th and 18th titles "against the Pope and the Italians." The Greek original was published at Tergouvia, in Wa. Bibl. Patr. (Lyons, fol.), and it very closely omits the last title, which is contained in Syrburg's Saracenic, p. 154. (2) Victoria et triumphus de impia Mussalennorum secta, etc. (Victory and Triumph over the impious, manifold, and execrable sect of the Mussalensians, etc.): a work, with fourteen parts, the first thirteen, edited, Gr., with Latin version and notes, by Pallis, in his Insignia Itinera Italic. (Tract. ad Rhen. 1696, 4to); also in Gallandii Bibl. Patriar. xiv, 293. (3) Commentaries in Psalms (Commentary on all the Psalms of David); Latin version by Saulus (Verona, 1530, fol.; often reprinted); also (Gr. and Lat.) in Theophylact's Opera Omnia, vol. iv (Venet. 1783, fol.). (4) A Commentary on the four Gospels, his most important work, compiled from St. Chrysostom and other fathers; Latin version by J. Hentenius (Louvain, 1544, fol.; Paris, 1547, 1566, and 1602, 8vo); best edit. by C. F. Matthaei, Gr. (Lips. 1792). Ziegabenus is still considered one of great value. See Matthaei's preface for full notices of Euthalius, and for the judgments of the learned concerning his writings. Many of his writings yet remain in MS. All his published works are given in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, vol. cviii-xxxi. (Paris, 1844-51); or (Gr. and Lat.) in Theophylact's Opera Omnia, i., l., of 976; Lardner, Works, v., 164; Ullmann, in Thol. Stud. u. Krit., 1883, p. 947 sq.

Euthyches, a friend of Euthychianism, though the opinions advocated by him existed before (see Selig, De Euthychianismo ante Eutychen). His name Euthyches means "the Fortunate," but his opponents said he should rather have been named Atheychus, the Unfortunate. He must not be confused with the deacon Eutyches, who attended Cyril to the Council of Ephesus. Leo the Great, in his renowned letter to Flavian, calls him very "ignorant and unskilled," "multum imprudens et nimirum imperitus, et justius attributus eius error quam imperitius quam veritatis." So also Petavius and Hierole (ii, 800). His relation to the Alexandrian Christology is like that of Nestorius to the Antiochian; that is, he drew it to a head, brought it to popular expression, and adhered obstinately to it; but he is considerably inferior to Nestorius in talent and learning. His connexion with this contradictory system is, in a great measure accidental" (Schaaff, Hist. of Christ. Church, iii, 758). He led, from his early age, an ascetic life, for thirty years archimandrite of a monastery near Constantinople, and had reached his 70th year without being known for anything except his illiterate fanaticism, his intimate relations with the all-powerful Chrysippos, minister of Theodosius, and his influence with the monastic party which blindly followed the lead of Cyril of Alexandria. He used his influence in favor of Cyril at the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, a copy of the minutes of which was sent to him by Cyril. After the death of Cyril he was on in- tercourse with his successor, Docius (q. v.). In 448 Eutyches wrote a letter to the Bishop Leo to prejudice him against the school of Antioch (q. v.), which he inanuished, was bent on reviving Nestorianism. To counteract his operations, patriarch Damasus, of Antioch, in 448 charged Eutyches with renewing the controversy of Apollinaria. Notice seems to have been taken at the imperial court of this charge; but the charges brought against him before the Synod of Constantinople (448) by his former friend Eusebius, bishop of Dorylaum (q. v.), had more effect. Patriarch Flavian, of Constantinople (q. v.), wished to have given to the council the name of Euchilus prevailed upon the synod to summon Eutyches. The latter, after making several excuses, obeyed the third summons, and presented himself before the synod, attended by a large number of monks and imperial officers. He defended his views in a long speech, but the synod, after some consisting of adherents of the Antioch school, found him guilty of heresy, and, in spite of all the secular pressure brought to bear upon them in favor of Eutyches, deprived him of his position of archimandrite, and excommunicated him. Eutyches, with the aid of his friend Chrysippos, obtained from the emperor permission to hold the trial of the case before the general council to be convoked at Ephesus. Flavian and Leo of Rome strenuously opposed the holding of the council. Leo, who had been unwilling to hold it at both parties, was only willing to do this by this circumstance to claim a right to de- nounce the council, and for this purpose wrote the celebrated epistle to Flavian (Mansi, v. 1836 sqq). See the article CHALCEDON, vol. ii, p. 196; and Leo. But, owing to the influence of Eutyches and Dioscorus of Alexandria, the council was held, under the presidency of Dioscorus, and, amidst scenes of unheard-of violence, which he had given to the council, the name of the Robber Council, the bishops were compelled to restore Eutyches to the Church and his former position, and to condemn the prominent men of the Antioch school. See EPIPHANUS, ROBER-COUNCIL OF. The emperor promptly sanctioned this decision, and thus Eutychianism, in which was the point of view of the predominant doctrine of the Eastern Church, when the death of Theodosius (450) gave a new turn to the controversy. The empire of the church and her husband Marcellus sympathized with the opponents of Eutyches, recalled the exiled bishops, and convened the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (451), which condemned the views held by Eutyches, and declared that "in Christ two distinct natures are united in one person, and that without any change, mixture, or confusion." See CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF. Even before the meeting of the council Eutyches had again been excommunicated by patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, and expelled from his monastery by Marcellus. The council did not again condemn him by name. Of the last years of Eutyches we only know that he died in exile. —Herzog, Real-Encyclopedia, iv, 251; Baur, Lehre von d. Diakonostigmen, 1860; Nippery, Church History (Torny's), iii, 501-503; Donner, Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. i and ii; Waterland, Works (Oxford), iii, 411, 481. (A. J. S.)

Eutychianism, the name of a doctrinal system called after Eutyches, according to which there was in Christ only one nature, the human nature, his human nature having been absorbed in a manner by his divine nature. Eutyches, like Cyril, laid chief stress on the divine in Christ, and denied that two natures could be spoken of after the incarnation. In our Lord, after his birth, he worshipped only one nature, the nature of God become flesh and man: μην γάρ παρεσκευάζεται και ταῖς θεοῖς παρακαθιστῶν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρακαθιστῶν.
EUTYCHIANISM

EUTYCHIUS, as he declared before the synod at Constantinople, "in the same subject, nature, person, style of words, and substance of the Logos, even as and in the same sense of words as the Logos himself, in every human, for it is by no means the same substance (μορφονωσις) with, but a divine body. All human attributes are transferred to the one subject, the humanized Logos. Hence it may and must be said, God is born, God suffered, and God died. There is, therefore, on the one hand, the capability of suffering and death in the Logos-personality, and, on the other hand, the defilement of the human in Christ. The other side imputed to Eutychianism the doctrine of a heavenly body, or of an apparent body, or of the transformation of the Logos into flesh. So Theodoret (Ps. 118, iv. 13).

Eutyches said Christ had a σωμα αν-
ηρωσιμου, but not a σωμα ανθρωπου, and he denied the consubstantiality of his προς with ours. Yet he expressly guarded himself against Docetism, and against all speculation: Φυσιολογιαν εμαυρων υπω τη-
τος σωματος. He neither a theologian, nor a philologian, but only insisted on some theological opinions and points of doctrine with great tenacity and ob-
stancy" (Schauf, History of the Christian Church, ii. 757 sq.).

The Holy Forbes cites Photius and Johannes Damas-
cenus aptly on Eutychianism as follows, viz. : "If there be one nature in Christ, it is either the divine or the human nature; if it be only the divine nature, where is the human? and if there be only the human, you cannot escape from denying the divine. But if it be God, and not different from these (for this is the only other alternative they have, and they seem to lean that way), how shall not in that case Christ be of a different nature, both from his Father and from us? Can anything be more impious or absurd to say that the Word of God, who is God, became man, to the cor-
ruption of his divinity, and to the annihilation of the humanity he assumed? For this absolutely follows with those who have dared to speak of Christ as of neither nature, but of one besides these" (Photius, Ep. i, cont. Eutychi. ch. Suicer). The "two natures were not without convertus or alteration, so that his body is both the divine nature and the divine nature did not depart from its own sim-
plicity, nor did the nature of man turn into the nature of God, nor was it deprived of existence, nor was one composite nature made out of two; for a composite nature cannot be consubstantial with either of those natures, but is composed of two. Therefore, according to the heretics, Christ exist in one com-
pounded nature after the union, he is changed from a simple into a compounded nature, and is not consub-
stantial with his Father, who is of a simple nature, nor with his mother, for she is not made up of the Godhead and manhood. And he will be neither in the Godhead nor in the manhood, nor will he be called God or man, but Christ only; and Christ will be the name not of his person, but of his own nature, as they deem. But we do not hold Christ to be of a composite nature, for he woul not make the man, but we believe and confess that he is of the Godhead and manhood; perfect God and perfect man from and in two natures. Were he of one nature, the same nature would be at once created and increase, simple-and composite, mortal and immortal. And the union of two natures is an union in such a way that he is neither by disorder (φωσιμως) nor by mixture (συνηρματια), as Eutyches, Dioscorus (of Alexandria), and Severus say; neither is it personal (προσωποςωμος) nor relative, nor σαρα δεινος, nor from identity of will, nor from equality of honor, nor from the same name, as Nestorius, Dioscorus (of Tarsum), and Theodorus (of Mopsuestia) said; but by synthesis; or personally (ενεργειατος), immutably, inconformly, unalter-

ably, inherently, inexpressibly, in two perfect natures in one person. And we term this union essential (ιναρη
γη), that is, true and not fantastic; essential, not in that one nature is made of the two, but that they are mutually united in truth into one composite person of the Son of God. And their substantial differences are preserved. For the whole body of Christ is both God and man, and that which is increase remains increase; the mor-
tal remains mortal, the immortal abides immortal. The one shines forth in miracles, the other submits to injuries; and the Word appropriates to itself that which the flesh appropriates to itself. Which Ephesians, though the first were performed according to one nature, the latter endured according to the other. Thus we know that his one person and his two natures are preserved. By the difference of the natures he is, on the one hand, one with the Father and Holy Ghost; on the other hand, he is one with his mother and with us. And these two natures are joined in one composite person, in which he differs as from the Fa-
ther and the Holy Ghost, so from his mother and us also" (Joh. Damascenus, Fid. Ort. iii, 8, abr.). Bishop Forbes adds: "Now we are to turn our attention to Eutychianism. It gets over a great difficulty in the reception of truth to believe the humanity of our Lord destroyed. For faith now requires of us to believe that the human body of Jesus Christ still is, and that to it the Word is hypostatically joined, and that be-
gone the spheres and systems of which we are cogni-
zant, it, partaking of our nature, is at the right hand of God" (On the Nicene Creed, Oxford, 1852, p. 201 sq.).

The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) adopted the doctrine stated by pope Leo in his letter to Flavius (Epistle Leo), viz. the "creed Leo," which is "the same as the Creed in Christ two distinct natures were united in one person, without any change, mixture, or confusion." The Creed of Chal-
cedon states that "the one Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood—likewise in the one person of our Lord Jesus Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in two natures, without confusion, without conception, without division, without separation—the difference of the natures not being taken away by reason of the unity, but the propriety of each being preserved and joined together to form one person. The creed of the council was not by any means universally re-
ceived in the East. But the name Eutychianism gave way to that of Monophysitism. The ecclesiastical or-
ganizations adhering to the heresy are commonly known by the names of Jacobites, Armenian Church, Copts, and Abyssinian Church (see the special articles on these churches). For a sketch of the fortunes of the theory known as Eutychianism, see Mono-
physites. See also Chalcedon; Christology; Eut-
yches; Dioscorus; and consult Pearson, On the Creed, i, 256 sq.; Schaff, CH. History, i. c.; Waterland, Works (Oxford), iii, 115, 411; He-
fele, Conciliengeschichte, ii, 249 et al.; Baur, Dogmengeschichte, i, 2, 256 sq.; Cunningham, Historical The-
ology, ch. x, § 1.

Eutychianus, pope and martyr, succeeded Felix I, bishop of Rome, Jan. 275; died as martyr or con-
fessor Dec. 8, 283. Some decreals are ascribed to him,
EUTYCHIUS of CONSTANTINOPLE was originally a monk of the town of Amaseia, where he was sent by his fellow-citizens to Constantinople as proxy for their bishop. The great talent he displayed in the theological controversy gained him general admiration, and the emperor, in A.D. 553, raised him to the highest dignity in the Church at Constantinople. In the same year he accordingly presided at an ecumenical synod which was held in that city. In A.D. 556, he incurred the anger of the emperor Justinian by refusing to give his assent to a decree respecting the incorruptibility of the body of Christ previous to his resurrection, and was expelled from his see in consequence. He was at first confined in a monastery, then transported to an island, Prinopos, and at last to his original convent, Amaseia. In 578 the emperor Tiberius restored him to his see, which he henceforth retained until his death in 585, at the age of 78. There is extant by him a letter addressed to pope Vigilius on the occasion of his elevation in A.D. 538. It is printed in Greek and Latin among the Acta Synodi quinta Concil. v. 425, etc. He also wrote some other treatises, which, however, are lost" (Smith, Dict. of Biography, s. v.).—Eutychius. Hist. Eccl. iv, 88; Cave, Hist. Lit. (Gener. 1720) i. 941.

Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, was born at Fostat (ancient Cairo) in 576. His Arabic name was Sooud-Es-Batrak. He was originally a physician, applied himself to the study of theology in the last years of his life, and was elected Melchite (or orthodox) patriarch of Alexandria in 938, and died about A.D. 946. He wrote in Arabic, a Chronicle or Annales from the creation of the world to A.D. 937, under the Arabic title Nudh-e-Enqushar, String of Pearls: translated and edited by E. Pottok under the title Historiae Alexandrinarum, sive Annales, Arab, et Lat. (Oxonii, 1658-59, some copies 1658-64, 2 vols. 4to).—Fragmenta duo de Paschate, et de SS. Euchariae institutione (in Mai, Script. Var. i. 623). Seldan published an extract in the title Ecclesiasticus orientales, ex Arabico cum vers. Lat. (Lond. 1642, 4to), to which Abraham Eschelena replied in Eutychius Vindicatus, sive Responsio ad J. Sel- demi Origines (Rom. 1661, 4to.—Hoefr. Nouv. Bih. Gener. xi. 810; Grasseau, Trésor de Littérature Rares, 1. 580.

Eutychius (Eutychius, of good fortune, a frequent name; see Josephus, A. D. 47-41, vi. 5, 4. 4), a young man of Troas, who sat in the open window of the third floor while Paul was preaching late in the night, and who, being overcome by sleep, fell out into the court below, May. A.D. 55. He was "taken up dead (καταπληκτος); but the apostle, going down, extended his hand upon the body, and raised it, like the prophets of old (1 Kings xxvii. 21; 2 Kings iv. 34); and when he felt the signs of returning life, restored him to his friends, with the assurance that "his life was in him." Before Paul departed in the morning the youth was brought to him alive and well (Acts xx, 5-12). All the intimations of the narrative forbid us for a moment to entertain the view of those critics who suppose that animation was merely suspended (Bloomfield, Hackett, in loc.). See Paul.

Mr. Jowett states that, during his residence at Hai- vali in May, 1819, the house in which he gave him a correct idea of the falling of Eutychus from the upper loft while Paul was preaching at Troas. "According to our idea of houses," he remarks, "the scene of Eutychus's falling from the upper loft is very far from intelligible; and besides this, the circumstance of preaching generally leaves the person on the loft to the readers the notion of a church. To describe this house, which is not many miles distant from the Troad, and perhaps, from the unchanging character of Oriental customs, nearly resembles the houses then built, will fully illustrate the narrative. On entering my host's door, we find the ground floor entirely used as a store; it is filled with large barrels of oil, the produce of the rich country for many miles round; this space, so far from being habitable, is sometimes so dirty with the dripping oil, that it is difficult to make a clean footing from the door to the first step of the staircase. On ascending, we find the first floor, consisting of a humble suite of rooms, not very high; these are occupied by the family for their daily use. It is on the next story that all their expense is lavished; here my courteous host has adorned my lodging; here his curtains, and mats, and cushions to the divan, display the respect with which they mean to receive their guest; here, likewise, their splendor, being at the top of the house, is enjoyed by the poor Greeks with more retirement. As to the chance of molestation from the intrusion of the Turks; here, where the professor of the college waited upon me to pay their respects, they were received in ceremony and sat at the window. The room is both higher and also larger than those below; it has two projecting windows; and the whole floor is so much extended in front beyond the lower part of the building, that the projecting windows considerably overhang the street. In such an upper room—secluded, spacious, commodious—Paul was invited to preach his parting discourse. The divan, or raised seat, with mats or cushions, encircles the interior of each projecting window. A lamp has marked, that where a lamp is, companies is numerous, they sometimes place large cushions behind the company seated on the divan, so that a second tier of company, with their feet upon the seat of the divan, are sitting behind, higher than the front row. Eutychus, thus sitting, would be on a level with the open window, and, being overcome with sleep, would easily fall out from the third loft of the house into the street, and be almost certain, from such a height, to lose his life. Thither Paul went down, and comforted the alarmed company by bringing up Eutychus alive, and is noted that there were many lights in the upper chimney; here, where the professors of the oil in this neighborhood would enable them to afford many lamps; the heat of these and so much company would cause the drowsiness of Eutychus at that late hour, and be the occasion likewise of the windows being open."—See House.

Eutychius (Eutychius, good fortune, monk and ascetic writer, was born at Ierapetra, on Crete, about A.D. 345. He was made deacon by Gregory of Nyssa or Gregory of Nazianzum, and received his theological culture to some extent under the latter, who took him to Constantinople in 379 or 380, and made him archdeacon. In the Origenistic controversies he took the side of Origen. After some time at Rome, in the dangers of personal beauty and vanity, he renounced the world, assumed the monastic garb, and departed for Egypt in 388 or 384, where he lived as an ascetic up to the day of his death in (probably) 399. Socrates speaks very highly (H. E. iv. 28) of his character and writings, in which there remain, L. Macarius (in Cotelier, Mon. Greg. iii. 68);—2. Apollogénios (in Pallud. Vita Chrysost. p. 349)—3. Rurum Monachalium raionhen; and a few other tracts, collected in Galland. Biol. Patrist. vii. 553; also in Migne, Patrolog. Gr. xi. 1219 sq. See Tillmont, Mémories, x. 368; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. iii. 7; iv. 28; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. vi. 90; Cave, Hist. Lit. Anno 380.

Eutychius Scholasticus, the Church historian, was probably born at Epiphania, on the Oronites, in or about A.D. 536, and had a good education. He lived in Antioch, where he was a lawyer (scholasticus), whence his surname. He rendered essential service to the patriarch Theophilus, whom he defended (against charges of adultery and incest) at a synod in Constantinople, A.D. 589. He was made questionarius, as a reward for his professional skill, by the emperor Tiberius. Eutychius wrote An Ecclesiastical History, in con-
Evangelialium. See EVANGELISTARY.

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

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

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

Evangelical Alliance is the name of an association of Christians belonging to the denominations collectively called Evangelical, and having for its object to represent the unity of these churches in all the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separate and local organization. The Alliance was originated in Great Britain, and the rupture in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland seems to have greatly contributed to its establishment. On Aug. 5, 1845, a number of persons belonging to different denominations drew up a proposal of closer union. The advantages promised by such a movement were at once appreciated in England, and an assembly was convoked at Liverpool Oct. 1, 1845, which was in session three days, and at which were present 216 persons, representing 20 different religious societies. The first General Assembly of the Evangelical Alliance was held in Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street, London, and lasted from Aug. 19 to Sept. 2, 1846; 921 Christians from all parts of the world took part in its 26 sessions; among them were 47 from the European continent, and 87 from America and other parts. Among them we find the names of Dr. Barth, of Calw, in Würtemberg; Dr. Baird, of New York; Rev. Dr. Bonnet, of Frankfort on the Main (editor of the letters of Calvin); Dr. Buchanan, of Glasgow; Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh; William Jones, president of the Tract Society; Dr. Marriott, of Basel; the missionary Mögling, of St. Louis; Rev. Dr. Oncken, of Hamburg; Rev. Dr. Panchaud, of Brussels; Rev. Baptist Noel, of London; and Dr. Tholuck, of Halle. Some fifty different denominations were represented, some of which, however, as the reformed churches of France and Geneva, and the Lutheran churches of North America and Würtemberg, differed only on local points. In the presence of the several preachers, who, in the main, represented the different parts in the proceedings. Sir Culling Eardley (q. v.) was chosen as chairman, and remained the head of the Alliance until his death. The platform was clearly and unanimously defined: 'the Evangelical Alliance is not to the things of the world second place. Neither is it its aim to bring about such as its result: its object is only to promote Christian feelings, loving, friendly intercourse between the different denominations, and an effective co-operation in the efforts to repulse the common enemies and dangers. As the means of effectually purposing purpose, the part of official or semi-official representative assembly of the different denominations, but rather the union of individuals. It is to be a Christian union, not a Church union; one in which a number of earnest, faithful, Christians of the different denominations may join. Both union of Christians, and the opening of the doors of the Evangelical Alliance are open to all who admit the fundamental principles of Christianity, without inquiring into the minutiae of their particular confessions. It only asks its members to accept (whether in an individual act of faith or in the spirit of their Christian profession) the fundamental principles and doctrines of the Gospel. This naturally led to a definition of these fundamental principles, the admission of which should be considered the basis of the Alliance. On the motion being made by Dr. Edward Bickersteth, the following nine articles were, after mature deliberation, received as the fundamental principles of the Evangelical Alliance:

"The parties composing the Alliance shall be such parties only as hold and maintain what are usually understood to be evangelical views in regard to the matter of doctrines underated, namely: 1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures. 2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. 3. The unity of the Headship, and the trinity of persons therein. 4. The utter depravity of human nature, in consequence of the Fall. 5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners and mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign. 6. The justification of the sinners by faith alone. 7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner. 8. The immortality of the soul. 9. The body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked. 9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and necessity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.'

These principles were embodied in a document entitled Societas Evangelicae constitutiones et statutum exposito breviter. The members bind themselves to pray zealously for the Holy Spirit to descend upon all believers, and to employ jointly the morning of the first week-day as a season of prayer, as also the first week of each year; also to use Christian circumspection in their speech and writings when touching on points of difference. The Alliance was organized on the 20 of September. They organized a series of seven branch associations: 1. North of Scotland; 2. The Free Churches of North America; 3. France, Belgium, and the French portion of Switzerland; 4. Northern Germany; 5. South Germany, and the German portion of Switzerland; 6. British North America; 7. West Indies. These branch associations went into actual operation from forwards. The Alliance is now represented in France, Switzerland, and Belgium, without agreement with its definition of the evangelical creed being insisted on. It met with
much opposition in Germany from the Lutherans, who did not find the creed sufficiently explicit on certain points, and the president of the Synod who disapproved of some of the articles. A second assembly was held in Paris in 1855 on the occasion of the World's Exhibition. The third meeting was held in Berlin in 1857. The fourth was held in Geneva in 1860. The fifth meeting was held at Amsterdam in 1866, and was attended by delegates from France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, the United States, the British American provinces, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. The sixth was held at Brussels in 1867. The fifth General Conference actually took place at Amsterdam on Aug. 18, 1867, and was greatly attended. There were delegates from France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, the United States, the British American provinces, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. The sixth meeting was held in Catwijk presided over by Prof. Van Oosterzee. Among the subjects discussed were the religious condition of the Church in England, the Scotch churches, the connection of missions with civilization, Christianity, and literature, and art and science; the methods of operating missions; the religious condition of Germany, France, Holland, Belgium, and Italy; and the origin of missions. The reports of the conferences were received with the approval of the conference, and it has since been the aim to promote the cause of missions and the spread of the gospel in all parts of the world.

A letter of co-operation was read from the secretary of the British branch of the Alliance. The Hon. William E. Dodge was elected president of the Allied Branches in the British branches of the Alliance. At a meeting held in New York Nov. 12, 1868, it was resolved to convene a new General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance in the city of New York in the autumn of 1869. The British branch only of the national branches has been in the practice of holding annual meetings, but this branch

"Among the results already attained by the Alliance as incidental and secondary to its great object may be mentioned, The supply of an obvious want, namely, the existence of an organized body with and by whom correspondence and co-operation may be easily and effectually carried on; the diffusion of knowledge in different parts of the world, and which may greatly aid in uniting Christians in this country separated by ecclesiastical differences and other causes; the holding of conferences of Christians from all parts of the world, for the examination of questions which would tend to the degradation of the Lord's day; the origination and extension of circulation of prize essays on the Sabbath, and on Popery and infidelity; and the encouragement and assistance of the friends of pure evangelical doctrine in their struggles against Rationalism or infidelity; the unifying of evangelical Christians in different countries for fraternal intercourse and for mutual protection; opposition, in common with other bodies, to the progress of popery and the ecclesiastical bodies which would tend to the degradation of the Lord's day; the origination and extension of circulation of prize essays on the Sabbath, and on Popery and infidelity; and the encouragement of societies established on the principle of united action among evangelical Christians, such as the American Evangelical Alliance, the Turkish Evangelical Alliance, and the Committee for Religious Liberty, Christian Vernacular Education Society for India, and German Aid Society. Although these practical results are thus referred to, yet it is to be understood that, even if no such secondary objects had been accomplished or attempted, the great value of the Alliance would still remain in its adaptation to promote and manifest union among Christians. The preceding is from an authoritative statement made by the Alliance" (Eadie, Eclectic Evangelical Encyclopaedia, s. v.).—Hersig, Real-Encyklopädie, p. 270; Schem, American Ecclesiastical Alliance for 1868; the full reports of the General Assemblies of the Alliance; Dr. Massie, The Evangelical Alliance, its Origin and Development (London, John Snow, 1847); L. Bonnet, L'unité de l'esprit par le biais de la paix; Lettres sur l'alliance républicaine (Paris, Delay, 1847).—Am. Church Observer, Oct. 18, 1854; Dec. 1856, p. 967; Princeton Rev. Oct. 1846 (A.J. S.).

Evangelical Association, an ecclesiastical body which took its rise in the year 1800, in the eastern part of Pennsylvania, and resulted from an organization into classes and congregations of the disciples of Rev. Jacob Albright, a native of Eastern Pennsylvania, who, being impressed by the general decline of religious life, and the corruption of doctrines and morals that prevailed in the German churches in that portion of country, undertook, about 1790, to work a reform among them. The effect of his first labors encouraged
him to travel through a great part of the country at his own expense, preaching the Gospel as he had opportunity in churches, schools, private houses, on public roads, etc. Although he commenced his labors without any ulterior design of forming a distinct ecclesiastical organization, yet he soon found it necessary to have an established church government over several counties, into small societies for mutual support and sympathy. At a meeting called for the purpose of consulting upon the best measures to be adopted for the furtherance of a cause in which they all felt a deep interest, the assembly, without reference to the teachings of High-Churchism respecting a valid ministry, unanimously elected and ordained Mr. Albright as their pastor or bishop, authorizing him to exercise all the functions of the ministerial office over them, and declared the Bible to be their rule of faith and practice. This organization, incomplete at first, was soon after considerably improved by the adoption of a creed and rules for Church government. In course of time, as laborers increased and the society spread, annual conferences were held; and in 1816, sixteen years after the first organization of the Church, a general conference was held, at the first Union Church, Union County, Pa., which consisted of all the elders in the ministry. Since 1828 a general conference, composed of delegates elected by the annual conferences from among their elders, has held quadrennial sessions. For the first forty years of its existence the society struggled against violent opposition; but during its later years it has made rapid progress, so that it now (1868) comprises 14 annual conferences, and 1193 itinerant and 634 local preachers, whose field of labor extends over the Northern, Western, and Pacific states, and into Canada and Europe. The membership approximates 193,000, all adults; the number of churches is 1886 and parsonages 2572, valued together at $4,672,500; Sunday-schools 2348, and scholars 162,857; catechetical classes, exclusive of those connected with Sunday-schools, 341, with 3539 catechumens. In the year 1868 a missionary society was formed, which has up to this time supported about 600 home missions, most of which are now self-supporting stations, circuits, or even conferences. At present this society supports 942 missions in America and Europe. For a number of years it has been gathering funds for similar missions, and has entered Japan with success. There is also a Sunday-school and tract society in operation, publishing Sunday-school books and religious tracts. A charitable society was founded in the year 1865, which has received funds amounting to $20,000, by bequests and interest of which is annually applied to the support of the widows and orphans of poor itinerant preachers. There are also church-building societies established in several conferences. The North-western College, a flourishing institution of learning located at Naperville, Ill., has been founded, and is supported by the Western conferences of the Church, and an endowment is being collected which now amounts to $100,000. Several seminaries are also patronized by the Church. An orphan institution, favorably located at Flat Rock, Ohio, has been established within a short time. A prosperous publishing-house at Cleveland, Ohio, issues four periodicals: one, its German organ, Der Christliche Botehafte, a large weekly, and the oldest German religious paper published in America; another, its English organ, The Evangelical, also a weekly; and the third and fourth, Der Christliche Kinderfreund, and the Sunday-school Messenger, are monthly juvenile papers, intended chiefly for Sunday-schools. The weekly papers have together a circulation of 25,000, and the juveniles 30,000. Perhaps no other religious denomination in America is better organized, disciplined, and successful in its work than the Evangelical Association. In doctrine and theology this Church is Armenian; with regard to sanctification, Wesleyan; but generally holds the essential doctrines of the Gospel as they are held in common by the evangelical churches of the land, with all of whom it aims to cultivate a fraternal spirit. The ministry is divided into two orders, deacons and elders; and, faithful to the principles and examples of their Lord and Master, they hold no higher rank or privilege than an elder. The General Conference meets every four years, and constitutes the highest legislative and judicial authority recognized in the Church; then come the annual and quarterly conferences, whose transactions are mostly of an executive and practical nature for the promotion of the work. In its mode of worship and usages the Evangelical Association is Methodist; and preaching, originally in German, is now largely in English. (R. Y.)

The denomination is at present greatly divided. In Oct., 1872, two rival general conferences were held, one in Indianapolis, the other in Philadelphia, each of which elected different bishops and other officers. This led to protracted litigation, which has not yet been fully settled.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>World Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Pennsylvania</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Pennsylvania</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate River</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>4830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evangelical Church Conference, the name of periodical meetings of delegates of the Protestant state churches of Germany. The object of these meetings is to have a free exchange of opinion on important questions of ecclesiastical life, to furnish a bond of union for the several Protestant state churches of Germany, and to advance their harmonious development. The impulse to meetings of this kind proceeded, in 1813, from King Wilhelm of Wùrttemberg. Invitations to a conference were issued jointly by the third and fourth, Der Christliche Kinderfreund, and the Sunday-school Messenger, are monthly juvenile papers, intended chiefly for Sunday-schools. The weekly papers have together a circulation of 25,000, and the juveniles 30,000. Perhaps no other religious denomination in America is better organized, disciplined, and successful in its work than the Evangelical Association. In doctrine and theology this Church is Armenian; with regard to
the periodical holding of conferences of this kind, confessions, liturgy, and Church constitution. The second meeting was to have been held at Stuttgart in 1848, but did not take place, in consequence of the disturbances attendant on the revolution. At the Church diets (q.v.) of Stuttgart (1850) and Elberfeld (1851), ecclesiastical officers of several countries deliberated on the resumption of the official Church conferences, and suggested the establishment of a central organ, which was to contain the decrees of all the supreme Church boards of the German States. Accordingly, the conference met again at Eisenach in June, 1852, and in the same year an official central organ of the German Church government was established at Stuttgart (Allgemeine Kirchenblatt für das evangel. Deutschland). Since then the conference has met always at Eisenach, in 1859, 1861, 1863, 1865, and 1888. One of the first results of the conferences was a compilation of 150 of the best German Protestant hymns (Kerkmälder), which was recommended to the several states as a proper basis of, or appendix to, the hymn-books of the several churches. In 1858 some of its resolutions, concerning the treatment and conduct of secessors by the state churches, were unanimously adopted. These resolutions declared against the principle of full religious liberty, but recommended that the members of secessors be allowed to contract valid civil marriages. The same conference adopted resolutions in behalf of a better education of the clergy, and of their training for the work of presiding at their congregations the right of co-operation (rotum negativum) in the appointment of ecclesiastical officers, and of introducing special liturgical devotions during the week of Passion. The conference of 1857 held important discussion on the revival of Church discipline, on reforms in the legislation concerning discipline on Christian burial. Among the results of the later meetings of the conference were the following: The introduction of a prayer for the German fatherland, to be used every Sunday in every Protestant church; resolution that the Lutheran and the Reformed portions of the service were to be used in all parishes; the revision of the Luther Bible, on the best way of collecting the statistics of the German Lutheran Church, on the constitution of evangelical churches, on the State-Church system, etc. An account of some resulting concerns concerning the treatment and conduct of secessors given in Mathesis, Aegaeus, Kirchliche Chronik, see also Herzog, Real-Encycl. iv, 278.

Evangelical Counsels. See Consilia Evangelica.

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

Evangelist (εὐαγγελιστής), the name of an order or body of men included in the constitution of the Apostolical Church (q.v.). The term is applied in the New Testament to a certain class of Christian teachers who were not fixed to any particular spot, but travelled either independently, or under the direction of one or other of the apostles, for the purpose of propa-gating the Gospel. The absence of any detailed account of the organization and practical working of the Church of the first century leaves us in some uncertainty as to the precise nature and function of the "evangelists" (evangelistai) (thus: κοινωνίας τῶν ἐν πολλάξις χώραις ποιητών τούτων, τῶν δὲ ποιητῶν εἰς ἑαυτούς, τῶν δὲ ποιητῶν καὶ ἀναδεικτών). Assuming that the apostles here, whether limited to the twelve or not, are those who were looked upon as the special delegates and representatives of Christ, and therefore higher than all others in their authority, and that the prophets were men speaking under the immediate impulse of the Spirit who were mighty in their effects on men's hearts and consciences, it would follow that the evangelists had a function subordinate to theirs, yet more conspicuous than that of the pastors who watched over a church that had been founded, and of the teachers who carried on the work of systematic instruction. This passage, accordingly, would lead us to think of them as standing between the two other groups—sent forth as missionary preachers of the Gospel by the apostles, and as such to plant the churches, and to organize and superintend the labors of the second. The same inference would seem to follow the occurrence of the word as applied to Philip in Acts xxii, 8. He had been one of those who had gone everywhere "preaching" (διογγελίζωμεν) the word of God (Acts viii, 4), now in one city, now in another (viii, 40); but he has not the power or authority of an apostle, does not speak as a prophet himself, though the gift of prophecy belongs to his four daughters (xxi, 9), and he exercises apparently no pastoral superintendence over any portion of the flock. The omission of mention of the list of evangelists, as if it were superfluous, may be accounted for on the hypothesis that the nature of Paul's argument led him there to speak of the settled organization of a given local church, which of course presupposed the work of the missionary preacher as already accomplished, while the train of thought in Eph. iv, 11 brought before his mind all who were instrumental in building up the Church universal. It follows, from what has been said, that the calling of the evangelist is expressed by the word ἐναγγελίας, "preach," rather than διδασάως, "teach," or παρακάτω, "exhort." It is the proclamation of the glad tidings to those who have not heard the word before, rather than the instruction and pastoral care of those who have believed and been baptized. This is also what we gather from 2 Tim. iv, 2, 5. Timotheus is "to preach the word;" in doing this he is to fulfill "the work of an evangelist." It follows, also, that the name denotes a work rather than an order. The evangelist might or might not be a bishop, elder, or a deacon. The apostles, so far as they evangelized (Acts xviii, 8; xiv, 7; 1 Cor. i, 17), might claim the title, though there were many evangelists who were not apostles. The brothers ("whose praise was in the Gospel") (2 Cor. xii, 18) may be looked upon as one of Paul's companions in this work, and probably known by the same name. In short, the itinerant and temporary character of their calling chiefly serves to distinguish them from the other classes of Christian laborers. In this, as in other points connected with the organization (2 Cor. viii, 18) may be true of them as of Paul's companions in this work, and probably known by the same name. In short, the itinerant and temporary character of their calling chiefly serves to distinguish them from the other classes of Christian laborers. In this, as in other points connected with the organization (2 Cor. viii, 18)
EVANGELISTARIUM

EVANS

Evangelistarium (Book of the Gospels), the name given in the earlier ages to a volume containing the portions appointed to be read from the Gospels. If the four Gospels were complete in the book called Evangelistarium, then Proter. Common Proper, p. 9; Siegel, Afterkümmer, iii. 249. See Manuscripts of the Bible.

Evangelium Etternum (Everlasting Gospel), the name given to a book published in the 13th century (A.D. 1254), which was properly entitled Introductio in Evangelium eternum, probably written by the Franciscan Gerhardus. The idea of a new "eternal Gospel" was one of the peculiar notions of Joachim of Floris (1292), who attacked the corruptions of the Church, and predicted an approaching renovation. See Joachim of Floris. These predictions were appropriated by the Franciscans as really referring to the rise and character of their order, which was founded by Francis of Assisi six years after Joachim's death. An apocalyptic party arose among the Franciscans, which seems to have been led by Gerhardus, and by Johannes of Parma (q. v.). The Introductio in Evangelium eternum seems to have been chiefly made from the writings of the seven "Concordiae Veneri et Noz. Test.; Post. decem Chorumurum; and Apocalypsis nova." It set forth Joachim's doctrine of the "dispensations" (status) of the Church, the last of which, the dispensation of the Spirit, was to be opened about A.D. 1200. The movement was a new form of Mecianism. Many vague notions were added about the Eternal Gospel of the Franciscans, arising from superficial views, or a superficial understanding of Joachim's writings, and the offspring of mere rumor of the heresy-hunting spirit. Men spoke of the Eternal Gospel as a book composed under this title, and circulated among the Franciscans. Occasionally, also, this Eternal Gospel was confounded perhaps with the above-mentioned Introductories. In reality, there was no book bearing under the title of the Eternal Gospel, but all that is said about it relates simply to the writings of Joachim. The opponents of the Franciscan order objected to the preachers of the Eternal Gospel, that, according to their teaching, Christianity was but a transitional thing, and a new, more perfect religion, the absolute form, destined to endure forever, was to succeed it. William of St. Amour (De periculis nosrisinorum temporum, p. 38) says: "For the past fifty-five years some have been striving to substitute in place of the Gospel of Christ another gospel, which is called the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, or the Everlasting Gospel;" whence it is manifest that the anti-Christian doctrine would even now be preached from the pulpits if there were not still something that withholds (2 Thess. ii. 6), namely, the power of the pope and the bishops. It is said in that accorded book which they call the Everlasting Gospel, which had already been made known in the Church, that the Everlasting Gospel is as much superior to the Gospel of Christ as the sun is to the moon in brightness, the kernel to the shell in value. The kingdom of the Church, or the Gospel of Christ, was to remain the last of all. The same writer points out the following as doctrines of the Everlasting Gospel: that the sacrament of the Church is nothing; that a new law of life was to be given, and a new constitution of the Church introduced; and he labors to show that, on the contrary, the form of the hierarchy under which the Church then subsisted was one resting on the divine order, and altogether necessary and immutable" (Neander, Church Hist. iv. 619). The Introductories has not come down to us, but its contents are partly known from a writing of Hugo of Caro, preserved in Quellen. Ezech., 42v. i. 92 sq., and partly from extracts given by the inquisitor Nicolas Eymere, in his Directorium Inquisitorium, pt. ii, qu. ix, No. 4. The theologians of Paris attacked the book upon its first appearance, and it was formally condemned by Alexander IV. A.D. 1255. Neander, Church Hist. iv. 619, calls it "the Everlasting Kircheng. Abhandlungen (Erlangen, 1885); Engelhardt in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv. 275; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. peri. iii. § 70.

Evans, Caleb, D.D., son of the Rev. Hugh Evans, was born at Bristol about the year 1737, and was educated at the Homerton Academy. In 1767 he became colleague to his father as pastor of the church, and tutor in the academy at Broadmead. In 1779 he originated "The Bristol Education Society," to supply the dissenting congregations, and especially the Baptist, with able and evangelical ministers, as well as missionaries for propagating the Gospel in the world. From this time to the period of his death, August 9, 1791, Dr. Evans continued to discharge the duties of president of the society. He published an Answer to Dr. Prieley's Appeal, and a small volume entitled Christ Crucified, or the Scripture Doctrine of the Atone- ment (Bristol, 1780, sm. 8vo), besides occasional sermons. On the breaking out of the American War, he advocated the freedom of the colonies, and wrote A Letter to John Wesley, in reply to his Calm Address to the American Colonies (London, 1775, 12mo); also a Re- ply to Fletcher's Vindication of Wesley's Address (Bristol, 1776, 12mo).—Jones, Christian Biography, p. 144; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s. v.

Evans, Christmas, an eloquent Welsh preacher, was born at Llandysul in Cardiganshire. His father was poor, and he had no school education. At seventeen he was converted, and joined
the Baptist Church. He then first learned to read the Welsh Bible, and soon after began to exhort. His first settlement as a preacher was at Llyen; two years after he went to Anglesea to labor as an evangelist at ten preaching places, on a salary at first of £27 a year. He died at Sandford, 1738. He was a man of a singularly high, oratorical powers, but in Anglesea he began to be a wonder. For a series of years he made preaching tours through South Wales, and the memory of his sermons remains to this day. The following sketch of one of his sermons is given by his biographer, the Rev. D. M. Evans:—"In his general hum and restlessness the preacher had read for his text, 'And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblamable, and acceptable in his sight.' His first movements were stiff, awkward, and wrestling, while his observations were perhaps crude and commonplace rather than striking or novel; but he had not proceeded far before, having thus prepared himself, he took one of his wildest flights, bursting forward to the extreme margin of the wonderland of all-piercing shrieks under which his hearers often confessed his resistless power. Closer and closer drew in the scattered groups, the weary loungers, and the hitherto listless among the motley multitude. The crowd becomes dense with eager listeners as they press on inexorably on the preacher. He gets into the thickening plot of his homily but dramatic representation, while, all forgetful of the spot on which they stood, old men and women, accustomed to prosy thoughts and ways, look up with open mouth through smiles and tears. Big burly country folk, in whom it might have been thought that the faculty of imagination had long since been extinguished, became engrossed with ideal scenes. Men 'whose talk is of bullocks' are allured into converse with the most spiritual realities. The preachers present become dazed and their hearts set on the horizon; they start on their feet round the strange young man, look hard at him in perfect amazement; loud and rapturous confirmations break forth from their lips: 'Amen,' 'Ben didedig,' 'Diolch byth,' fall tumultuously on the ear; the charm swells outwards from the extreme margin of the wonderland of the crowd; and to the occasional loud laugh there has now succeeded the baptism of tears. The excitement is at its highest; the preacher concludes, but the weeping and rejoicing continue till worn out nature brings the sermon to an end.' His chief qualities as preacher were they 'include passion, orard excited feeling, a dramatic imagination, and grotesque humor. The published scraps of sermons which remain, and have been translated into English, illustrate these qualities, and almost only these.'—*Christian Spectator* (London.) Sept. 1693, reprinted in *The Theolog. Eclectic*, I, 147; *Evans, Memoir of Christmas Evans* (1862); *Stephen, Life of Christmas Evans* (London, 1847); *Sermons of C. Evans, with Memoir by Jas. Cross* (Philadelphia, 1854, 8vo).

**Evans, John, D.D.**, an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born in 1860, at Wrexham, in Denbighshire. He was the father of the minister of Wrexham on the death of Mr. Timothy Jollie. He was ordained and settled at Wrexham, August 18, 1702. "Dr. Daniel Williams, of London, hearing that Mr. Evans was invited to Dublin to be one of the English Episcopalian bishops to the metropolis, where he first assisted the doctor, afterwards became co-pastor, and at length succeeded him at his death. In the Ariam controversy he refused to subscribe to any articles, but maintained the orthodox consistencies. In the public service of the dissenters he was often called to preach, and was appointed to assist in completing Matthew Henry's *Commentary*, of which he supplied theEpistles to the Romans so well, that Dr. Doddridge says, 'The exposition of the Romans, begun by Henry, and finished by Dr. Evans, is the best I ever saw.' He was for some years preparing to write a history of non-conformity from the Reformation to the civil wars, but, by his death, the work was interrupted. He died May 16, 1730." Besides a number of separate sermons, he published *Discourses concerning the Christian Temper, 38 Sermons* (4th ed. London, 1737, 2 vols. 8vo), with *Life by John Erskine* (1825, 8vo), which are called by Dr. Wallis 'the most complete history of those duties in the life of the Christian life,' and by Dr. Doddridge 'the best practical pieces in our language.' See *Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters*, ii, 364; *Jones, Christian Biography*, p. 148; *Skeats, Free Churches of England* (London, 1868, 8vo), p. 249.

**Evans, Edward**, a minister of the Church of England, was born at Warrington, Lancashire, in 1751, and was educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he passed M.A. in 1778. In 1788 he became vicar of South Mimms; in 1779, rector of Tewkesbury. He soon began to manifest doubts about the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. For a sermon preached in 1771 he was prosecuted. In 1778 he resigned his preferments in the Church, and retired to Mitcham, where he kept a school. He died Sept. 25, 1805. Among his writings are, *On the Oberseer of Sunday* (Ipswich, 1792): — *The Disobedience of the Four Evangelists, and their Authority* (Gloucester, 1805, 8vo). In this work Dr. Evans rejects all the Gospels but Mark, and also Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, James, Peter, John, and Jude. It was refuted by Falconer, *Bampton Lectures*, 1810.

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

**Evarts, Jeremiah, secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, was born in Sunderland, Vt., Feb. 8, 1781, and graduated at Yale College in 1802. He studied law, and practised it at New Haven up to 1810, when he removed to Charlestown in order to edit The Panoplist, which he continued up to 1818. In 1811 he entered the service of the American Board as treasurer. He continued in that work, first as treasurer, then as secretary (in 1821), during the rest of his life. In 1820 The Panoplist was discontinued, and the publication of The Missionary Herald was begun by the American Board, with Mr. Evarts as its editor. He died in Boston, S. C. (whither he had gone for the benefit of his health), May 10, 1831. The Reports of the Board during his connection with it were generally from his pen, and that of 1830, the last which he wrote, is a document of great power. His essays, under the signature of William Penn, on the rights and claims of the Indians, were published in 1829. See *Tracy, Memoirs of Jeremiah Evarts* (Boston, 1845); *Christian Review*, xi, 20; *Spirit of Pilgrims*, iv, 599.

**Eve (Heb. 'Evarot),** was the first in order of life or living, so called as the progenitor of all the human family; Sept. accordingly translates Zoon in *Gen* iii, 20, elsewhere *Eruv*, *N. Test.* *Eora, Josephus Eivis, Ant. i, 2, 4*, the name given by Adam to the first woman, his wife. (Gen. iii, 20; iv, 29.) The account of her creation is found at *Gen* ii, 21, 22. It is supposed that she was created on the sixth day, after Adam had reviewed the animals. Upon the failure of a companion suitable for Adam among the creatures which were brought to him by his hand, he was put into a deep sleep to fall upon him, and took one of his ribs (according to the Targum of Jonathan, the thirteenth from the right side!), which he fashioned into a wom
an, and brought her to the man (comp. Plato, Sympos. p. 189, 191). The Almighty, by declaring that "it was not good for man to be alone," and by providing for him a suitable companion, gave the divine sanction to marriage and to monogamy.

"This companion was taken from his side," remarks an old commentator, "to be his help to her, and to be with him as another flesh. Not from his head, lest she should rule over him; nor from his feet, lest he should tyrannize over her; but from his side, to denote that species of equality which is to subsist in the marriage state" (Matthew Henry, Commen. in loc.). Perhaps that which was created for him was, by it the likeness of the image upon which the union between man and wife is built, viz. identity of nature and oneness of origin. Through the subtility of the serpent (q. v.), Eve was beguiled into a violation of the one commandment which had been given them by the Almighty. It was a thankless task of the fruit of the forbidden tree and gave it her husband (comp. 2 Cor. xi, 3; 1 Tim. ii, 13).

The Adam seems to intimate (1 Tim. ii, 14, 15) that she was less aware than her husband of the character of her sin; and that the pangs of maternity were to be in some sort an expiation of her transgression. The different aspects under which Eve regarded her mission as a mother are seen in the names of her sons. At the birth of the first she said "I have given a man from the Lord," or, as some have rashly rendered it, "I have given a man, even the Lord," mistaking him for the Holy Spirit. When the second born, finding her hopes frustrated, she named him Abel, or easily. When his brother had slain him, and she again bare a son, she called his name Seth, and the joy of a mother seemed to outweigh the sense of the vanity of life: "For God," she said, "has appointed me another seed instead of Abel, for Cain slew him." See Abel.

The Eastern people have paid honors to Adam and Eve as to saints, and have some curious traditions concerning them (see D'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale, s. v. Havva; Fabricius, Pseudoap. V. Text. i, 108 sq.). There is a remarkable tradition preserved among the Rabbits that Eve was not the first wife of Adam, but that prior to her creation one had been created in the same way, which, they sagaciously observe, accounts for the number of a man's ribs being equal on each side. Lātāh, or Lātā, for this was the name of Adam's first consort, fell from her office of innocence without tempting, or at all events, without successfully tempting her husband. She was immediately ranked among the fallen angels, and has ever since, according to the same tradition, exercised an inveterate hatred against all women and their children. Up to a very late period she was held in great dread lest she should destroy male children previous to circumcision, after which her power over them ceased. When that rite was solemnized, those who were present were in the habit of pronouncing, with a loud voice, the names of Adam and Eve, and a command to Latiah to depart (see Eisenmenger, Enedicae Judenhum, ii, 421). She has been compared with the Pandora of classical fable (Bauer, Myrikol, i, 96 sq.; Buttmann, Mythologus, i, 48 sq.; Haese, Enedicking, i, 25). See Olmsted, Our First Mother (N. Y. 1859); Reinecke, De Adamo androgono (Weism.1725); Thilo, Filius matris euentian in virum Jevoham (Erlangen, 1748); Köcher, Comment. philol. ad Gen. ii, 18—20 (Jena 1779); Schultes, Exeg. theolog. Forschungen, i, 421 sq.; Bastard, Doctrine of Genesis, ii, 61; Hughes, Female Characters, p. 1.

Evelyn, John, was born Oct. 31, 1620, at his father's seat of Wotton, in Surrey. He was educated at Batiol College, Oxford, served a short time as a volunteer in the Low Countries, and returned at the breaking out of the Civil War to rejine the king's forces. In the king's defeat at Gloucester, he left England, and during the rest of the troubles he travelled in France and Italy. In 1652 he returned to England, and on the restoration he took an honourable part in public business. He died Feb. 27, 1706. He was one of the original members of the Royal Society, and a frequent contributor to its transactions. His most valuable work was Syrinx, or a Discourse on Forest Trees. His Diary (not published till 1618) is excessively useful for the knowledge it conveys of the times in which Evelyn lived. The Diary and Correspondence has lately been re-edited, with much new matter (Lond. 1850—52, 4 vols. 8vo). His History of Religion, a Rational Account of the true Religion, was also first published from the MSS. in 1650 by the Rev. Mr. M. Moore, from a copy in the hand-writing of Mrs. Godolphin (from MSS.) published by bishop Wilberforce.—Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s. v.

Evening (אֶבֶּנֶּבֶּן, 'eb, duke; מַצֶּרָה, 'ōpati, 'ōpi), the period following sunset, with which the Jewish day (נְצָה, nēṣā) began (Gen. i, 5; Mark xiii, 35). See DAY. Some writers have argued that the first creative day (Gen. i, 5) is reckoned from the morning, when light first appeared (ver. 5), as if "evening" then designated not a portion of time, but a termination of the first creative period or age; but this does violence to the whole order of the narrative, in which a period of night invariably precedes one of daylight, precisely in accordance with the conventional Hebrew expression of a נָצָה or "evening—morning," and as the terms are expressly defined in the former clause of ver. 5. If "evening" in the phrase in question be distinguishable from the "night" as a terminus, it is certainly a terminus a quo, as dating the latter from the aboriginal "darkness," ver. 2, and not a terminus ad quem of the ensuing day. See Night.

The Hebrews appear to have reckoned two evenings in each day; as in the phrase בּעַדָּבָה יָבֹא, between the two evenings (Exod. xvi, 12; xxx,8), by which they designated that part of the day in which the paschal lamb was to be killed (Exod. xii, 6; Lev. xxvii, 5; Num. ix, 3, 5; in the Heb. and marg.); and, at the same time, the evening sacrifice was offered, the lamps lighted, and the incense burned (Exod. xxix, 39, 41; Num. xxvii, 4). But the ancients themselves disagreed concerning this usage: for the Samaritans and Corautes (comp. Reland, De Samarit. ii, 22, in his Diss. Miscell. vol. ii, Trigland, De Korumpt. chap. iv) understood the time to be that between sunset and twilight, and so Aben Ezra at Exod. xii, 6, who writes that it was about the third hour (9 o'clock P.M.) the Pharisees, on the other hand, as early as the time of Josephus (Antiqu. viii, 3), and the Rabbins (see Eliahu the Prophet, 230, 2); and it is thought that the "first evening" was that period of the afternoon when the sun is verging towards setting (Gr. ἐλαία πρωίας, "the second evening" the precise moment of sunset itself (ἐλαία δύσης), according to which opinion the paschal lamb would be slaughtered from the ninth to the eleventh hour (3 to 5 o'clock P.M.). The former of these opinions seems preferable on account of the expression in Deut. xvi, 6, "when the sun goeth down," וּשְׁכַר בֹּא, and also on account of the similar phraseology among the Arabs (Boehneldini, Enchronica Studiorum, viii, 56, ed. Caspin, Lips. 1888; Kamz, p. 1917: on the contrary, see Pococke, Ad Clemen Tagoui, p. 71; Talmud Hieros. Berach, chap. i; Babyl. S. ii, 346, fol.; Bochart, Hieros. i, 634, Lips.). See Passover.

EVENING SACRIFICE. See DAILY OFFERING.

Even-Song, the form of divine service appointed to be "said or sung" in the evening of each day in the Church of England, the expression "sung" meaning not an intonation of the voice, but the service as it is now generally read, but the chanting of the service, as in cathedrals.—Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s. v.

Everett, Joseph, an early Methodist Episcopalian
Evidence

Evidence is the rendering in the A.V. of πρότεινος, so pake, a book (as usually rendered), or writing (q.v.) generally, hence a document of title, l. c. deed, or title, or sale (sor. xxxii. 10, 11, 14, 44); Đrāyec, proof (Heb. xi. 4); i.e. reproof, 2 Tim. iii. 16. l. a. conviction.

II. Evidence is defined by Blackstone "to signify that which demonstrates, makes clear, or ascertains the truth of the very fact or point in issue, either on the one side or the other. (Ch. ii. 2376) Everything evidence comprehends all first truths, or principles of common sense, as 'every change implies the operation of a cause;' axioms in science, as 'things equal to the same thing are equal to one another; and the evidence of consciousness, whether by sense, or memory, or thought, as when we touch, or remember, or know, or feel anything. Evidence of this kind arises directly from the presence or contemplation of the object, and gives knowledge without any intervention of other parts. Deductive evidence is distinguished as demonstrative and probable. Demonstrative evidence rests upon axioms, or first truths, from which, by ratiocination, we attain to other truths. It is scientific, and leads to certainty. It admits not of degrees; and it is impossible to conceive the correctness of the premises on which it establishes. Probable evidence has reference, not to necessary, but contingent truth. It admits of degrees, and is derived from various sources; e.g. experience, analogy, and testimony" (Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, v.).

The Scotch school of metaphysics presents the doctrine of evidence as follows: "The theory of evidence was not unknown to Aristotle and the ancient writers, but it is chiefly to the researches of modern logicians, from Bacon downwards, that we are indebted for a complete exposition. The grounds on which we believe a statement to be either true or false, forms the evidence. The grounds on which we believe are capable of being established with undoubted certainty; others, again, admit of a proof more or less strong. It is of great importance, therefore, to distinguish the kind of evidence any fact or statement can be support, ed, and thus we may readily ascertain to what extent our belief in it may be carried. The two great classes into which all kinds of evidence are usually reduced are intuitive and deductive, the former calling for immediate and irresistible belief, independence of any process of argumentation whatever; the latter requiring for its proof various consecutive steps of reasoning. Some writers are in the habit of dividing evidence into three classes: intuitive, deductive, and demonstrative, and the evidence of testimony. Under intuitive evidence, which commands instant and irresistible belief, are generally included, besides those à priori truths which are necessarily involved in an act of consciousness, the evidence of sense, of memory, and of axioms or general principles. It is well, however, to bear in mind that intuitive and demonstrative evidence are convertible terms, and that in no sense entitled to be considered as resting on intuitive evidence which is not involved in an act of consciousness. This view of the subject no doubt limits the number of intuitive, and therefore dogmatically certain truths; sufficient, however, to establish a foundation for all future reasonings of every kind. And this is all that ought to be desired. Those truths only are entitled to be ranked as intuitions which we cannot deny without involving ourselves in an obvious contradiction. What is essentially necessary to the operation of our intellectual and moral nature is intuitive. We cannot think, for example, without being subjected to the influence of the evidence of consciousness. To these, then, in so far as man is concerned, dogmatical certainty belongs. He cannot doubt their truth without dissolving the nature with which he has been endowed. The evidence of intuition, or consciousness, is certain in itself, but from its truths no other truths can be deduced. Hence the distinction drawn between this and all the other species of evidence, which are classed under one head, termed de dictive. Demonstrative evidence, or that which is independently available in the evolution of unknown from known truths, is usually distinguished into two kinds, demonstrative and moral, or probable evidence, giving rise to a corresponding distinction in modes of reasoning. It is of great importance to note, that while demonstrative and probable evidence be kept constantly in view, that we may be prevented from confounding two species of truth so completely distinct from
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one another. The evidence of demonstration applies to necessary, moral or probable evidence to contingent, truth. The great mass of objects upon which our judgment and reasonings are exercised rests upon probable evidence. Demonstrative evidence is very limited in the range of its application, extending no farther than the relations of numbers and geometric figures, which are capable of being expressed in language so strictly definite as to admit of no misunderstanding or mistake. On the strict definition of terms rests the whole certainty of mathematical truth, which is not an absolute certainty, but a hypothesis of absolute certainty; and to the great mass of phenomena, and events with which we are familiarly conversant, such a mode of reasoning would be altogether inapplicable. The language employed is too vague and ambiguous to admit of strict definition; and such is the imperfection of language that, however able it might be to have words used in a fixed meaning, it is impracticable.

The idea has, no doubt, been entertained of reducing words, expressive of our views on general subjects, to a fixed and certain signification; and even the illustrious names of Leibnitz and Locke are found in connection with such a plan, and yet we fear that the experience of all past ages must pronounce it utopian. However advantageous, indeed, such a plan in some respects might be, it is very doubtful whether it might not so fetter and constrain the mind that no scope would be given for the exercise of those powers which the laws of emotion and the existing probable evidence summons into action. It is very injurious to the mind to enthrall too strong a partiality for one species of evidence rather than another. We thereby lose sight of the important fact that the same kind of evidence is not applicable in all cases, and that therefore we ought only to require such evidences as the particular circumstances of the case admit. Instead, therefore, of being dissatisfied with the kind of evidence adduced, it ought to be our chief inquiry whether, in any given case, we have obtained the strongest evidence that the circumstances of the case permit.

On the distinction between probable and demonstrative evidence, see Butler, Analog of Religion (Introduction). See also Gardner, Christian Cyclopedia, p. 352; Bergier, Dict. de Theologie, ii, 554; Brown, On Cause and Effect, notes E, F; Avercombie, On Intellec-
tual Virtue; On Experience, p. 471; Gambia-
ner, On Moral Evidence (London, 1824, 8vo); Locke, Essay, bk. iv, ch. 15.

Evidences of Christianity, the title generally given by English writers to the proofs of the divine origin of the Christian revelation. This branch of theology does not include demonstration of the being of God against the atheists, but is directed against all who deny the divine authority of Christianity and of the Scriptures on which it rests. The term Apologetics has been adopted in Germany for the name of this science, and under that title and that of Apology we have given an account of the forms which the proofs and defences of Christianity have assumed in the various periods of Church history. In this article we give (1.) a summary of the evidences as they are commonly stated by English writers; (II.) a summary of the views held by continental writers as to the relative value of the several branches of evidence.

I. Summary of Christian Evidence.—The evidences of Christianity are usually classified by English writers under three heads—External, Internal, and Collateral.

The External evidences are those which demonstrate the authenticity, credibility, and divine authority of the Scriptures, including the arguments from miracles and prophecy. The internal evidence is drawn from the excellence and beneficial tendency of the doctrines and morals of Scripture, from the character of Christ, and from the consistency, harmony, and inspiration which are inherent in the record. The Col-

lateral evidence is drawn from the history of Chris-
tianity itself, from its marvellous diffusion, its effects upon human nature, upon the progress of society, and upon what is generally called civilization. One of the best sketches of the evidences, according to this classi-
fication of them, is that given by Watson (Institutes, vol. i).

Preliminary to a consideration of these direct evid-
ences is the question whether any evidence is necessary. Evidence, of which the following is a brief outline.

Man is universally admitted, by all who admit the being of God, to be a moral and responsible agent, under the dominion of the law of God. But deists assert that there is no such endowment, and that revelation is unnecessary. It can be shown, on the other hand, that human reason, unaided, has never af-

forded to man any clear standard of moral quality for actions, and that, even if it could do so, its decisions lack authority to control the will; they are, at best, no more than whether he be revelation or not, we speak.

History shows that sober views of religion have been found nowhere since the times of the patriarchs, except in the writings of the O. and N. T., and in writings drawn from them; and that whatever truth has been found in the religious systems of the heathen has been borrowed from these. It can be shown that the very rudimentary doctrines of religion, e.g. God, providence, immortality, etc., clearly show the neces-
sity of revelation. Admitting, then, the presumption that a revelation should be given in some way, we may say, a priori, that it must (1) contain a definition of the divinity of the object; (2) that it must accord with the principles of former revela-
tions; (3) that it must have an external authentication; and (4) that it must contain provisions for its own effectual promulgation. All these conditions are ful-

1. The external evidences include miracles and prophecy. "We need not inquire whether external evidence of a revelation is in all cases requisite to him who immediately and at first receives it; for the question is not whether private revelation or not, but whether it has been made by God to individuals, and what evidence is re-
quired to authenticate them, but what is the kind of evidence which we ought to require of one who pro-

fesses to have received a revelation of the will of God, with a command to communicate it to us, and to enjoin it upon us as the rule of our conduct? If God has high and excellent nature of the truths he teaches; in other words, that which is called the internal ev-

evidence cannot be that proof. For we cannot tell whether the doctrines he teaches, though they should be capa-
bile of a higher degree of rational demonstration than any delivered to the world before, may not be the fruits of his own mental labor. He may be conscious that they are not, but we have no means of knowing that of which he is conscious except by his own testi-
mony. To us, therefore, they would have no author-

ity but as the opinions of a man whose intellectual at-

tivities and powers we might admire, but to whom we could not submit as to an infallible guide, and the less so if any part of the doctrine taught by him were either mysteriou-
s or above our reason, or contrary to our in-

terests, prejudices, and passions. If, therefore, any person who claims to have received a revelation from God to teach to mankind, and that he was directed to command their obedience to it on pain of the divine displeasure, he would be asked for some ex-

ternal authentication of his mission; nor would the reasonableness and excellence of his doctrines be ac-

cepted in place of this. And to be satisfied with this would be thought a ground sufficiently strong for yielding to
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him an absolute obedience. Without it he might reason and be heard with respect, but he could not commanding. On this very reasonable ground the Jews on one occasion founded the question, "By what word or manner of things did you utter your saying that the earth is the habitation of God?" Agreeably to this, the authors both of the Jewish and Christian revelations profess to have authenticated their mission by the two great external proofs, Miracles and Prophecy, and it remains to be considered whether this kind of authentication be reasonably sufficient to command our faith and obedience.

The question is not whether we may not conceive of external proof of the mission of Moses, and of Christ and his apostles, differing from those which are asserted to have been given, and more convincing. In whatever way the authentication had been made, we might have conceived of modes of proof differing in kind, or more ample in circumstance; so that to ground an objection upon the absence of a particular kind of proof, for idle and base purposes, would be trifling. But this is the question: Is a mission to teach the will of God to man, under his immediate authority, sufficiently authenticated when miracles are really performed, and prophecies actually and unequivocally accomplished? We have, then, to first show that these performances are performed as expected, and their performance as expected, their credibility can be established by human testimony, and that, when thus authenticated, they afford the necessary evidence of revelation. These topics will be treated under the heads of Miracles and Prophecy (q. v.). The records of both miracles and prophecies are written in the Old and New Testaments. The antiquity of these writings is demonstrated by the very fact of the existence, on the one hand, of the Jewish polity, and, on the other, of the Christian religion, as well as by the concurrent testimony of ancient profane authors. These books can be shown, by the circumstances attending them, could there possibly be room for delusion? Acts i., xii., the weight of authority, and with regard to any other ancient records, to be substantially the same now as when originally written, nay, that they have come down to our times without any material alteration whatsoever. The credibility of the testimony of the sacred writers themselves is fairly proved by the character of the men, by the circumstances under which they wrote, and by the entire absence of motive for falsification. Allowing, then, the New Testament to be genuine, it follows, "1. That the writers knew whether the facts they state were true or false (John i., 8; xii., 58; Acts xvi., 11)." 2. That the character of these writers, so far as we can judge by their works, seems to render them worthy of regard, and leaves no room to imagine they intended to deceive us. The manner in which they tell their story is most happily adapted to gain our belief. There is no air of declamation and histrionics; nothing that looks like artifice and design: no apologies, no concoction, no characters, no reflections, no digressions; but the facts are recounted with great simplicity, just as they seem to have happened, and those facts are left to speak for themselves. Their integrity, likewise, evidently appears in the freedom with which they mention those circumstances which might have exposed their Master and themselves to the greatest contempt amongst prejudiced and inconsiderate men, such as they knew they must generally expect to meet with when they were driven to escape their persecutors, especially of the Romans (Mark vi.; Luke xiv.); and, Mark vi.; Matt. viii., 39; John xii., 48). It is certain that there are in the writings the most genuine traces not only of a plain and honest, but the most pious and devout, a most benevolent and generous disposition, as every one must acknowledge who reads their writings. 3. The apostles were under no temptation to forge a story of this kind, or to publish it to the world knowing it to be false. 4. Had they done so, humanly speaking, they must quickly have perished in it, and their foolish cause must have died with them, without ever gaining any credit in the world. Reflect more particularly on the nature of those grand facts, the death, resurrection, and exaltation of Christ, which were never heard of by any but their immediate hearers, as first exhibited to the apostles. The resurrection of a dead man, and his ascension into an abode in the upper world, were such strange things that a thousand objections would immediately have been raised against them, and some extraordinary proof would have been justly required. A belief based on the manner in which the apostles undertook to prove the truth of their testimony to these facts, and it will evidently appear that, instead of confirming their scheme, it must have been sufficient utterly to have overthrown it, had it been itself the most probable imposture that the wit of man could ever have contrived. See Acts i., iii., ix., xiv., xix., etc. They did not merely assert that they had seen miracles wrought by Jesus, but that he had endued them with a variety of miraculous powers; and these they undertook to display, not in such solid and important works as appeared worthy of divine interposition, and entirely superior to human power. Nor were these things undertaken in a corner, in a circle of friends or dependents; nor were they said to be wrought, as might be expected, in the presence of a certain number of their own countrymen. They were done often in the most public manner. Would impostors have made such pretensions as these? or, if they had, must they not immediately have been exposed and ruined? Now, if the New Testament be genuine, then it is certain that the apostles pretend to miracles which have wrought miracles in the very presence of those to whom their writings were addressed; nay, more, they profess likewise to have conferred those miraculous gifts in some considerable degrees on others, even on the very persons to whom they write, and they appeal to their consciences as to the truth of it. And it is as certain that the New Testament beggars this argument. It is likewise certain that the apostles did gain early credit, and succeeded in a most wonderful manner. This is abundantly proved by the vast number of churches established in early ages at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Colossae, etc. 6. That, admitting the facts which they testified concerning Christ to be true, then it was reasonable for their contemporaries, and is reasonable for us, to receive the Gospel which they have transmitted to us as a divine revelation. The great thing they asserted was, that Jesus was the Christ, and that he was the Messiah who was promised. The only way of receiving this in the right spirit was in him, and by miracles wrought by him, and by others in his name. If we attend to these, we shall find them to be no contemptible arguments, but must be forced to acknowledge, that the premises being established, the conclusion most easily and necessarily follows; and this conclusion, that Jesus is the Christ, taken in all its extent, is an abstract of the Gospel revelation, and therefore is sometimes put for the whole of it (Acts viii., 37; xvii., 18)."

2. The internal evidence of Christianity is drawn from a consideration of the doctrines of Scripture, of their consistency with the character of God, and their tendency to promote the virtue and happiness of men. It takes note also of the morals of Christianity, and of their superiority to all other systems of ethics; and of the influence which it has had in despotism and the arts of war, and in the intellectual and moral advancement of the world. The doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, transcending the highest imaginations of merely human moralists. "Of its just and sublime conceptions and exhibitions of the divine character; of the truth of that view of the moral state of man upon which its disciplinary treatment is founded; of the correspondence that there is between its views of man's mixed relation to God as a sinful creature, and yet pitied and cared for; and that actual mixture of good and evil, penalty and forbearance, which the condition of the world presents; of the connection of its
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY 377 EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY
doctrine of atonement with hope; of the adaptation of
its doctrine of divine influence to the moral condition
of revelation, nor are the laws for the atonement and the affect-
ing benevolence and consecration which it implies;
and of its noble and sanctifying revelations of the
blessedness of a future life, much might be said—they
are subjects, indeed, on which volumes have been writ-
ten, and they can never be exhausted. Nowhere ex-
ceed to the idea of a system of morals; and the deficiencies of pagan morality only
exalt the purity, the comprehensiveness, the practices
exalt the personality of our. The character of the Being acknow-
the supernal always impress itself upon
morality and justice, the obligation of which
the God of the Bible is 'boly,' without spot; 'just,' without partiality; 'good,' bound-
lessly benevolent and beneficent; and his law is the
image of himself, 'boly, just, and good.' These great
moral qualities are not made known to us merely
in the abstract, so as to be comparatively feeble in their
influence, but in the person of Christ, our God incor-
nate, they are seen exemplified in action, displaying
themselves amidst human relations, and the actual
conditions of human life. With pagans the au-

tority of moral rules was either the opinion of the
wise men, or the advice and assistance of
them. It is true, in some degree, by observation and experience;
but to us they are given as commands immediately
issuing from the supreme Governer, and ratified as his
by the most solemn and explicit attestations.

With them many great moral principles, being indistinctly
appreciated and even denied as of no account at all; with us,
the explicit manner in which they are given ex-
cludes both: for it cannot be questioned whether we
are commanded to love our neighbor as ourselves;
to do to others as we would that they should do to us, a
principle which ends almost all our moral
principle in one plain principle; to forgive our enemies;
to love all mankind; to live righteous and soberly, as
well as godly; that magistrates must be a terror only to
evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well; that
subjects are to render honor to whom honor, and tribute
to whom tribute, is due; that masters are to be
just and merciful, and servants faithful and obedient.
These, and many other familiar precepts, are too
explicit to be mistaken, and too authoritative to be dis-
pputed; two of the most powerful means of rendering
law effectual. Those who never enjoyed the benefit
of Christian instruction, were masters of a double joke;
comprehend their essential, or the elements of that moral
state of the heart from which right
and beneficent conduct alone can flow; and, therefore,
when they speak of the same virtues as those enjoined
by Christianity, they are to be understood as attach-
ging to them a lower idea. In this the infinite superi-
ority of Christianity displays itself. The principle of
obedience is not only a sense of duty to God and the
fear of his displeasure, but a tender love, excited by
his infinite compassion to us in the gift of his Son,
which shrinks from offending. To this influential mo-
tive as a reason of obedience is added another, drawn
from its end: one not less influential, but which has
then moralists never knew—the testimony that we
please God, manifested in the acceptance of our
prayers, and in spiritual and felicous communion with
him. By Christianity, impartiality of thought and desire
is restrained; an equal division of the sons of men,
in the lips and conduct. Humanity, meekness,
gentleness, placability, disinterestedness, and charity
are all as clearly and solemnly enjoined as the grosser
vices are prohibited; and on the unruly tongue itself
is impressed the law of kindness. Nor are the in-
junctions feeble: they are strictly LAw, and not mere
advice and recommendations: 'Without holiness no
man shall see the Lord,' and thus our entrance into
heaven, and our escape from perdition, are made to
depend upon this preparation of mind. To all this is
added possibility, nay, certainty of attainment, if we
use the appointed means. A pagan could draw, though
not with lines so perfect, a bemo ideal of virtue which
he never set his eyes upon; but that the 'law of
hope' is given by the religion of Christ to all who
are seeking the moral renovation of their nature, be-
cause 'it is God that worketh in us to will and to do
of his good pleasure.' When such is the moral nature
of Christianity, how obvious is it that its tendency,
both as a system of morals and as a system of
laws, and the highest sense beneficent! From every passion which
wastes, and burns, and frets, and enfeebles the spirit,
the individual is set free, and his inward peace renders
his obedience cheerful and voluntary; and we might
appeal to innumerable witnesses whether, if the moral
principles of a religion were not wrong, and the moral
qualities embodied in the conduct of all men, the world
would not be happy; whether if governments ruled,
and subjects obeyed, by the laws of Christ; whether
if the rules of strict justice which are enjoined upon
us regulated all the transactions of men, and in that
mercy to the distressed which we are taught to feel
and to practise came into operation; and whether,
if the precepts which delineate and enforce the duties
of husbands, wives, masters, servants, parents, children,
did, in fact, fully and generally govern all these
relations—whether the necessary connection between
the choice of moral good and the state of man's
beings by the poets would not then be realized, and Virgil's
Jarn reict et Virgo, reverent Saturnia regna.
[Now Astrea returns, and the Saturnian reign.]
be far too weak to express the mighty change? It
was in the reign of Saturn that the heathen poets fix
the origin of this Age. At the end of the Golden
Age, Astrea (the goddess of justice), and many other de-
ties, lived on earth, but, being offended with the wick-
edness of men, they successively fled to heaven.

Astrea staid longest, but at last retired to her native
seat, and was translated into the sign Virgo, next to
Libra, who has her superior balance. Such is the
character of Christianity. On immense numbers of individuals
it has superseded these moral changes; all nations,
where it has been fully and faithfully exhibited, bear,
and admitted to the vices, the impress of its hal-
lowing and benigne influence. It is now, in an active
exertion in many of the darkest and worst parts of the
earth, to convey the same blessings; and he who would
arrest its progress, were he able, would quench the
only hope which remains to our world, and prove him-
selves an enemy not only to himself, but to all mankind.

What, then, is the Christian religion? Is it the
Scriptures are worthy of God, and propose the very
ends which rendered a revelation necessary? Of the
whole system of practical religion which it contains
we may say, as of that which is embodied in our Lord's
sermon on the mount, in the words of one who, in a
course of sermons on that divine composition, has en-
tered most deeply into its spirit, and presented a most
instructive delineation of the character which it is
intended to form, 'Behold Christianity in its native
form, as delivered by its great author. See a picture
of God, as far as he is imitable by man, drawn by
God's own hand. What beauty appears in the whole!
How just a symmetry! What exact proportion in
every part! How desirable is the happiness here de-
scribed! How venerable, how lovely is the holiness!'

'If,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'wisdom, and mercy, and
justice, and simplicity, and truth, and the sublimity
and meekness, and contentedness, and charity be images of
God and rays of divinity, then that doctrine,
in which all these shine so gloriously, and in which noth-
ing else is ingrediunt, must needs he from God. If
the holy Jesus had come into the world with less splen-
dor of power and mighty demonstrations, yet the ex-
cellency of what he taught makes him alone fit to be
the master of the world;' and agreeable to all this has
been its actual influence upon mankind. Although,
says Bishop Porteus, Christianity has not always been
so well understood or so honestly practised as it ought
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tury there were Christians in the camp, in the senate, and in the palace; in short, everywhere, as we are informed, except in the temples and the theatres: they filled the towns, the country, and the islands. Men and women of all ages and ranks, and even those of the first days of the Church, could not have lived in the cities and modifications of life, and communicated its kindly influence to almost every public and private concern of mankind. It has insensibly worked itself into the finest frame and constitution of civil states. It has given a tinge to the complexion of their governments, to the institutions of social life. For this it has restrained the spirit of the prince and the madness of the people. It has softened the rigors of despotism and tamed the insolence of conquest. It has, in some degree, taken away the edge of the sword, and thrown even over the horrors of war a veil of mercy. It has descended into families; it has diminished the gentility of private tyranny; improved every domestic establishment; given tenderness to the parent, humanity to the master, respect to superiors, to inferiors ease; so that mankind are, upon the whole, even in a temporal view, under the beneficent influence of the Christian religion. It is the temper of the Gospel, and has reaped from it more substantial worldly benefits than from any other institution upon earth. As one proof of this, among many others, consider only the shocking carnage made in the human species by the exposure of infants, the gladiators and many other inhuman practices. The Church did nothing more than bring them into disuse, as it confessedly has done, the two former of these inhuman customs entirely, and the latter to a very great degree, it has justly merited the title of the benevolent religion. But this is far from being all. Throughout the more enlightened parts of Christendom there prevails a gentleness of manners widely different from the ferocity of the most civilized nations of antiquity; and that liberality with which every species of distress is relieved is a virtue peculiar to the Christian name. But we may ask further, What sanctions has it had on the mind of man as it respects his eternal welfare? How many thousands have felt its power, rejoiced in its benign influence, and under its dictates been constrained to devote themselves to the glory and praise of God! Burdened with guilt, incapable of finding relief from human help, the Christian turns to God in despair, and is enabled in beholding that sacrifice which alone could stone for transgression. Here the hard and imperious heart has been softened, the impetuous passions restrained, the ferocious temper subdued, powerful prejudices conquered, ignorance dispelled, and the obstacles to real happiness removed. Here the Christian, looking round on the glories and blashphemies of this world, has been enabled, with a noble contempt, to despise all. Here death itself, the king of terrors, has lost all his sting; and the soul, with a holy magnanimity, has borne up under a dying condition with a dying hope, a dying mind. Here, in the very jaws of death, Christianity shows itself so incomparable a thing, under the grace of God. The ten thousand who have been converted in the course of a year in Alexandria, are a most striking instance of the power of this great principle. This power has spread in a most surprising manner. The Gospel is not, as once it was, a most contemptible and despised thing. It has been spread over the empire of the Vandals. (Watson, Dictionary, s. v. Christianity.)

8. The Collateral evidence treats of the marvellous diffusion of the Gospel, and of its actual effects upon mankind and upon the history of civilization, as proofs of its divine origin. "Of its early triumphs, the history of the Acts of the Apostles is a splendid record; and in process of time it made a wonderful progress through Europe, Asia, and Africa. In the third cen-
of heathen mythology, and the existence of every object of their worship. It accepted no compromise; it admitted of no comprehension. If it prevailed at all, it must prevail by the overthrow of every status, altar, temple, and image. It was pronounced to be false, and all other worship vain. These considerations which must have strengthened the opposition to it, augmented the hostility which it must encounter, and enlarged the difficulty of gaining proselytes. It was essentially, when compared to the converts to Christianity in the earliest age, a number of persons remarkable for their station, office, genius, education, and fortune, and who were personally interested by their emolument and honors in either Judaism or heathenism, appeared among the Christian proselytes. Its evidences appeared themselves not only to the multitude, but to men of the most refined sense and most distinguished abilities, and it dissolved the attachments which all powerful interest and authority created and upheld.” (Watson, l. c.).

Paley’s View of the Evidences of Christianity for a long time held the first place as a text-book on evidences in England. Paley even goes so far as to say we can conceive of no way in which a revelation could be made except by miracles. “In whatever degree it is probable, or not very improbable, that a revelation has been sent to men; and in whatever degree it is probable, or not very improbable, that miracles should be wrought. Therefore, when miracles are related to have been wrought in the promulgation of a revelation manifestly wanted, and, if true, of inestimable value, the improbability which arises from the miraculous nature of the things related is not greater than the original improbability that such a revelation should be imparted by God.” The book is divided into two parts: I. The direct historical evidence of Christianity, and wherein it is distinguished from heathenism, and for other auxiliary evidences of Christianity. The first part is then divided into two propositions: (1.) “That there is satisfactory evidence that many, professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labors, dangers, and sufferings, voluntarily under- taken in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in those accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct.” (11.) “That there is not satisfactory evidence that persons pretending to originate or to be the authors of any singular miracles have acted in the same manner, in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in the truth of those accounts.”

The argument rests on the credibility of testimony, and aims to show that the testimony in this case is indubitable. The second part treats briefly the argument from prophecy, from the morality of the Gospel, and the internal evidences afforded both by the sacred writings, and by the doctrines and histories which they contain.

Coleridge, who disparaged the comparative value of evidence from miracles and prophecy, dictated to a friend the following scheme of evidences: (1) Miracles, as precluding the contrary evidence of no miracles. II. The material of Christianity, its existence and history. III. The doctrines of Christianity, and the correspondence of human nature to these doctrines, illustrated historically, as the actual production of the new world, and the dependence of the fate of the planet upon it; 2d, individually, from its appeal for truth to an asserted fact, which, whether it be real or not, every man possessing reason has an equal right to believe, with the man who will have which has more or less lost its freedom, though not the consciousness that it ought to be and may become free: the conviction that this cannot be achieved without the operation of a principle innately with itself; the evident rationality of an entire confidence in that principle, being the condition and means of its operation; the experience in his own nature of the truth of the process described by Scripture as far as he can place himself within the same frame of see- dent assurances of others as to the effects experienced by them, and which he is striving to arrive at. All these form a practical Christian. Add, however, a gradual opening out of the intellect to more and more clear perceptions of the vindication of the doctrines of Christianity, with the truths evolved from inflexions on its own nature. To such a man one main test of the objectivity, the entity, the objective truth of his faith, is its accomplishment by an increase of insight into the moral beauty and necessity of the process which it comprises, and the demonstration of that proof on the causes asserted. Believe, and, if thy belief is right, that insight which gradually transmutes faith into knowledge will be the reward of that belief. The Christian, to whom, after a long profession of Christianity, the mysteries remain as much mysteries as before that belief, he has the actual assurance of his arithmetical belief in the future in the working of the same miracle, and the past, present, and probable future of human nature; and in this state a fair comparison of the religion as a divine philosophy with all other religions which have pretended to revelations and all other systems of philosophy, both with regard to the totality of its truth, and its identification with the manifest march of affairs. I should conclude that, if we suppose a man to have convinced himself that not only the doctrines of Christianity, which may be conceived independently of history or time, as the Trinity, spirit-possession, etc., are the natural growth out of the human mind and experience, which reason, thus strengthened, has evolved from its own sources, but that the historical dogmas, namely, of the incarnation of the creative Logos, and his becoming a personal agent, are themselves founded in philosophical necessity, then it seems irrational that such a man should still believe in the actual occurrence of a religion strictly correspondent therewith, at a given time recorded, even as much as that he should reject Caesar’s account of his wars in Gaul after he had convinced himself a priori of their possibility. As the result of a conviction he will not scruple to receive the particular miracle recorded, inasmuch as it will be miraculous that an incarnate God should not work what must to mere man appear as miracles, inasmuch as it is strictly accordant with the ends and benevolent nature of such a being to commence the elevation of man above his mere senses by attracting and enforcing attention, first, through an appeal to those senses. But with equal reason will he expect that no other or greater force should be laid on those miracle as such; that they should not be spoken of as good in themselves, much less as the adequate and ultimate proof of that religion. Likewise, he will require that satisfaction should be found these miracles so wrought, and on such occasions, as to give them a personal value as symbols of important truths when their miraculousness was no longer needful or efficacious” (Coleridge, Works, N. Y., v, 555).

On the definition of Butler’s Analogy, see the article Butler (vol. i, p. 957).

II. As to the comparative value of the different classes of the Christian evidences there has been much dispute. Coleridge admitted the value of the testimony from miracles, and even as an emptying of Christianity, but considered that argument as much less valuable now than the internal evidence. “It was only to overthrow the usurpation exercised in and through the senses that the senses were miraculously
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Reason and religion are their own evidence.

The nature and ends in this world are revealed to the spiritual. He is fully risen, and while his glories are still under veil, he calls up the breeze to chase away the usurping vapors of the night season, and thus converts the air itself into the minister of its own purification: not surely a proof or elucidation of the external evidence, but to present the idea. Wherever, therefore, similar circumstances coexist with the same moral causes, the principles revealed and the examples recorded in the inspired writings render miracles supravisional; and if we neglect to apply truths in expectation of wonders, or under pretext of divination, which goes forth from that center which is the same reply which our Lord gave to the Pharisees on a like occasion. I shall merely state here what my belief is concerning the true evidences of Christianity. 1. Its consistency with right reason I consider as the outer court of the temple, the common area within which it stands. 2. The miracles, with and through which the religion was first revealed and attested, I regard as the steps, the vestibule, and the portal of the temple. 3. The sense, the inward feeling in the soul of each believer of its exceeding desirous value, is this, the strong foretokening that the redemption and the graces propounded to us in Christ are what he needs—this I hold to be the true foundation of the spiritual edifice. With the strong à priori probability that flows in from 1 and 3 on the correspondence of his heart to his will, and his will to his nature, we have the French, refuse or neglect to make the experiment without guilt. But, 4, it is the experience derived from a practical conformity to the conditions of the Gospel; it is the opening eye, the dawning light, the terror and the promise of spiritual growth, the blessedness of loving God as God, the present sense of sin hated as sin, and of the incapability of attaining to either without Christ; it is the sorrow that still rises up from beneath, and the consolation that meets us from above; the bosom treacheries of the principal in the warfare, and the exceeding faithfulness and long-suffering of the uninterested ally; in a word, it is the actual trial of the faith in Christ, with its accompaniments and results, that must form the arch roof, and faith itself is the completing key-stone. In order to an efficient belief in Christianity a man must have been a Christian, and lived in Christ. These four evidences I believe to be significative of all spiritual truths, to every subject not presentable under the forms of time and space, as long as we attempt to master by the reflex acts of the understanding what we can only know by the act of becoming. 'Do the will of my father, and ye shall know whether I am the Christ': These four evidences I believe to have been, and still to be, for the world, for the whole Church, all necessary, all equally necessary; but that at present, and for the majority of Christians born in Christian countries, I believe the third and the fourth evidences to be the most important; not excluding, but involving as a glad, unclouded faith in the two former' (Coleridge, Biographia Literaria, ch. xxiv).

Ullmann (Sinnlichkeit of Jesus, § 1) remarks 'that the nature of the case, and the necessities of their contemporaries, justified the apologist in proving the divine character of the initiates and the revelations of the Gospels and prophecies. But the necessity of the times and of individuals may in this respect vary; and although the Gospel in its essence remains the same, and contains eternal, unchangeable truth, yet in a different age a different method of proof may lead more immediately to the acknowledgment of this truth. In our own time it seems proper to fix our eyes especially upon the spiritual character of Jesus in order to obtain satisfactory proof of the divinity of his mission and instructions, not because the apostolic mode of proof has become untenable, but because the other mode has a more vital efficacy on account of the style of education prevalent at the present day. We do not find ourselves in an inductive, no direct connection with the spirit and mysteries of the Old Testament; the Jews were in the time of the apostles; we live among contemporaries to whom miracles are more a ground of doubt than of faith; we should not forget that the proof from miracles exerts its full power, properly so speaking, only in the eye of faith which conducts us to the desired conclusion only by a circuitous path. On the other hand, a vivid apprehension of the inward character of Jesus brings us nearer to the operative centre of Christianity, and at the same time makes us feel the influence of the moral power of his heavenly person, which rests immediately on himself; it is free, spiritual confidence in his person. As with his contemporaries everything depended on the yielding confidence with which they received the favours which he brought them, so likewise with us this confidence may be the element and a full belief in Christianity, and it, at all events, a condition of receiving benefit from our Redeemer.'

The tendency of German theology has gone against the external evidences of Christianity, but this very tendency or resistance to an open connection with the events above which German orthodoxy has only recently begun to emerge. On this point, see The New Review, iv, 141 sq.

See also bishop Butler's admirable discussion of the "particular" evidence for Christianity in his An Essay of Religion, ii, ch. vii. See also C. M. Fischer, Essays on the supernatural evidence of Christianity, p. 13 sq. Note that the rejection of miracles generally leads to a rejection of the doctrine of the personality of God. See, for a fuller treatment of this branch of the subject, the article MIRACLES. The chief task of the advocate for Christianity in the present age (apart from the obolistic conflict with Panaethus and Positivism, for which see articles under those heads) is to vindicate the authenticity and the early date of the books of the N. T. against the assuata not merely of avowed skeptics, but also of theologians within the Christian Church, such as those of the Többing school. But this dispute is in reality another, again, into that of vindicating the historical reality of the scriptural miracles. "The recent criticism of the N. T. canon, embracing the attempt to impeach the genuineness of various books, is only a part of the great discussion of the historical truth of the N. T.; it is difficult to accept the credibility of the Gospel historians without first disproving their genuineness" (Fischer, Essays, p. 14).

In the noted Essays and Reviews (Boston ed. 1865, 12mo), Prof. Baden Powell has an article on "The Study of the Evidences of Christianity," in which he undertakes to state the present condition of the discussion, and to indicate the true line of Christian evidences. He disparages the "professed advocates of an external revelation and historical evidence" by innuendo as well as by direct attack, and assumes the incoherency and impossibility of miracles. See also Scott's articles in the Journal of Theological Review, July, 1861, which closes as follows: "It is one thing to urge other evidences of Christianity as stronger and more satisfactory than that from miracles; it is another thing to reject all miracles as incredible and absurd. He who takes the former course may show an eminently Christian spirit, and for ourselves we cordially sympathize with his position; but he who takes the latter course, if not an infidel himself, is certainly playing into the hands of infidels and atheists."

One of the chief forms taken by recent Christian apologists is the argument drawn from the actual
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phenomena of Christianity, the existing facts which no
body can deny. The first of these is the character of
Christ, which has been so described by rationalistic
and infidel writers (e.g. Strauss, Renan, Schenkel) as
to bring the argument down almost, if not quite, to
the point whether Jesus was an impostor or no. The
result of these attacks within the twenty years
have brought with greater force than ever the eternal
light of evidence which the person and life of the Re-
deremer contain in favor of the whole system of Chris-
tianity. See the works on this subject of Neander,
Lane, Schaff, Pressensé, Ellicott, Young, Plumptre,
and others. Dr. Schaff gives a brief summary of a study
of Christ in one strong passage: "Jesus of Nazareth
is the one absolute and unaccountable exception to the
universal experience of mankind. He is the great
central miracle of the whole Gospel history; and all
the sciences are but the dark shadows, the mes-
ifestations of his miraculous person, performed with
the same ease with which we perform our ordinary
daily works." The second of these phenomena is
found in the books of the New Testament themselves,
as affording abundant internal evidence of reality and
truthfulness. The third is the apostolic doctrine,
which can be traced up (through the Epistles to the
Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, and Gal-
tians, the genuineness and early date of which are ad-
mitted even by the Tübingen school) to within thirty
years at the death of Christ. (See an excellent arti-
cle on the Unanimous and Evidence of Christianity
by Prof. Lorimer, in B. and F. Eev. Rev., Jan. 1865,
reprinted in The Theol. Eclectic, New Haven iii., 80
a.) Dr. H. Schmidt, of Meiningen, taking the
Tübingen critics at their word, undertakes to find in
the four undoubted epistles (Galatians, 1 and 2 Co-
rinthians, and Romans) a full vindication of the truth
and divine origin of Christianity. See his Der Pauli-
nische Christus (Weimar, 1867, 3vo).

The comparison of Christianity with heathen religions
is opening a new and rich mine of Christian evidence.
But this is the special field of the [127] Christian
school, which shall follow the general argument of this
paper. The same may be said of other Masters (Lond. x2 ed., 1863, 2 vols. 12mo),

On the question of the origin and dates of the several
gospels is treated under the separate articles Matthew,
Mark, Luke, and John. The Tübingen school,
who deny the existence of the synoptists, who date
forward into the second century. See TÜBINGEN SCHOOL.

On the questions involved, see Fisher, Essays, already
 cited; Westcott, On the Canon of the N. T. (Cambridge,
1853); Tischendorf, Wann wurdc unsere Evangelien
verfasst (Leipzig, 1865; transl. by W. L. Gage, under
the title Origin of the Four Gospels, Lond. 1869; Amer.
Tract Society, 1869).

The translation of Luthardt's and Torrige's (noticed
in vol. i., p. 305), entitled Apologetic Lectures on
the Fundamental Truths of Christianity (1867, crown 8vo) and Auberlen's Offenbannon (see
our vol. i., p. 301), entitled Die Diirere Revolution
(Edinburgh, 1867); Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels,
abridged edit. (Boston, 1867, 12mo); Barnes, Lectures
on The Evidence of the Genuineness of the Nineteenth Cen-
tury (New York, 1868, 12mo); McCoth, The Supernatu-
ral in Its Relations to the Natural; Westcott, Introduc-
tion to the Study of the Gospels (Boston, 1867), chap. iii;
Schaff, Person of Christ (Am. Tract Society); Plumpt-
red, On the Lord Jesus; Prebon, Les Sophistes et la Critique (Paris, 1864, 8vo); Prin-
ton Review, April, 1859, art. vi; Bartlett on "Christi-
anity and prominent Forms of Assault," in Bibliotheca
July, 1868, art. vi. See APologetic; APolo-
ly, Inspiration; Jesus; Miracles.

Evil is discord or disturbance in the order of the
universe. Leibnitz divides it into metaphysical evil,
by. Imperfection; physical evil, by suffering; moral
evil, by the evil results of man's conduct. But as all
true, by the natural
Evil is the only one now generally recognised
1. "Natural evil is whatever destroys or any way dis-
turbs the perfection of natural beings, such as blind-
ness, disappearance, etc. But as all
Evil is the nature of sin, or, as some have
supposed, only the penalty of it, such disturbance is not
necessarily an evil, inasmuch as it may be counter-
pointed, in the whole, with an equal if not greater good,
as in the afflictions and sufferings of good men. When
such disturbance occurs as the penal effect of con-
version, it is the necessary consequence of moral evil."

The tendency of modern thought is towards the doc-
trine that the (apparent) disturbances of the physical
world are likely to be reconciled with universal law
as scientific knowledge advances.

Moral evil is the recogni-
ment between the actions of a moral agent and the
rule of those actions, whatever it be. Applied to choice,
or acting contrary to the revealed law of God, it is
turned wickedness or sin. Applied to an act contrary
to a mere rule of fitness, it is called a fault (Buck,
av.)

On the origin of evil, and its relations to the gov-
ernment of God, see Sin; Theodicy.

Evil-merodach (Heb. Eril Merodak, עירל מרדך, Sept.
Eirilamarduk, Οιρλαμαρδαχ), son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who,
on his accession to the throne (B.C. 561), released the
captive king of Judah, Jehoiachin, from prison, after
57 years of incarceration, treated him with kindness
and distinction, and set his throne above the other con-
quered kings who were detained at Babylon (2 Kings
xxv, 27; Jer. iii, 31-34). See CHALDAEAN.

A Jewish tradition (noticed by Jerome on Isa. xiv, 29) ascribes
this kindness to a personal friendship which Evil-mer-
odach had contracted with the Jewish king when he
was but a child. His father had treated him kindly, who, on recovering from his seven years' monomania,
took offence at some part of the conduct of his son, by
whom the government had in the mean time been ad-
ministered. This story was probably invented to ac-
count for his change of policy. His name is mentioned
by other ancient authors (Eirilamardoucos by Berosus, in
Josephus, Apion, i, 20; Eirilamadochos by Megathes
and Abydunus, in Euseb. Chron. Armen. p. 28;
Aristarchos by Josephus, Ant. x, 11, 2). Hales
identifies him with the king of Babylon who formed a
powerful confederacy against the Medes, when
was broken up, and the king slain by Cyrus, then acting
for his uncle Cyrus. But this rests on the author-
ity of Xenophon's Cyropedid, the historical value of
which we estimate far too high. See CYRUS.

He is doubtless the same as the Istaradum of Ptolemy's
"Canopus," who reigned but a short time, having
ascended the throne on the day of Nebuchadnezzar
in B.C. 561, and being himself succeeded by Nergis-
sar in B.C. 559. See BABYLON. He thus appears
to have reigned but two years, which is the time assign-
ed to him by Abydunus (Fr. 9) and Berosus (Fr. 16).

At the end of this brief space Evil-merodach was
murdered by Nergilissar [see NERGAL-SHAALIK],
a Babylonian noble married to his sister, who then
seized the crown. The other ancient authorities as-
sign him different lengths of reign. According to
Berosus, Evil-merodach was the last Babylonian
knight government and intemperate. Perhaps the depar-
ture from the policy of his father, and the substitution
of mild for severe measures, may have been viewed in this light.

The latter half of the name Evil-merodach is that of a Babylonian god Marsusotur (q. v.). The name is explained to be the former part of his name attempted.

Since evil, as a Hebrew word, means "foolish," Simonis proposes to consider it the derivative of בִּן, in the Arabic signification of "to be first," affording the sense of "prince of Merodach." This rests on the assumption that the Babylonian language was of Syro-Arabian origin. Gesenius, however, the other Hebrew scholars, do not admit what Simon believes to be a Semitic-Germanic word, of similar sound, but reputable sense, is concealed under evil, and that the Hebrews made some slight perversion in its form to produce a word of contemptuous significance in Hebrew, just as is assumed in the case of Beelzebul.

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

1. Persons in the administration of justice may speak words which in private intercourse would be reproachful. 2. God's ministers may inveigh against vice with sharpness and severity, both privately and publicly (Isa. liviii. 1; Titus i. 13). 3. Private persons may reproach others when they commit sin (Lev. xix. 17).

Some vehemence of speech may be used in defence of truth and impugning errors of bad consequence (Jude iii). 5. It may be necessary, upon some important occasion, to explain to those who are judged guilty, or that have expressed disapprobation of notorious wickedness (Acts viii. 23). Yet in all these the greatest equity, moderation, and candor should be used; and we should take care, 1. Never to speak in severe terms without reasonable warrant or apparent just cause. 2. Nor beyond measure. 3. Nor out of bad principles or wrong ends; from ill will, contempt, revenge, envy, to compass our own ends; from wantonness or negligence, but from pure charity for the good of those to whom or of whom we speak. This is an evil, however, which greatly abounds, and which is not sufficiently watched against; for it is not where men are most guilty that they are most guilty, but even in speaking what is true we are in danger of speaking evil of others. There is sometimes a malignant pleasure manifested; a studious recollection of everything that can be brought forward; a delight in bringing anything spoken against others; a secret rejoicing in knowing that another's fall will be an occasion of our rise. All this is base to an extreme.

The impurity and sinfulness of evil-speaking will appear if we consider, 1. That it is entirely opposite to the whole tenor of the Christian religion. 2. Exceedingly condemned and prohibited as evil (Ps. lxiv. 8; James iv. 11). 3. No practice hath more severe punishments denounced against it (1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 10). 4. It is an evidence of a weak and disquatered mind. 5. It is even indicative of ill breeding and bad manners. 6. It is the abhorrence of all wise and good men (Ps. xxv. 9). 7. It is exceedingly injurious to society, and inconsistent with the relation we bear to each other as Christians (James iii. 6). 8. It is brandished with the epithet of folly (Prov. xviii. 6, 7). 9. It is perveting the design of speech. 10. It is opposite to the example of Christ, which we are commanded to follow. See SLANDER. (Baum, Works, vol. i. sermon xi.; Tillotson, Sermons, sermon xl.; Jack, Sermons on Evil Speaking; Seed, Sermons, p. 339; Campbell, Disquisitions, diss. iii. § 22.)

Evodusii, a Latin theologian, was born about the middle of the fourth century, at Tagaste, in Africa. He was a countryman of St. Augustine, and was united with him in an intimate and lifelong friendship. After following in his youth a secular profession, he became, in 386 or 387, bishop of Uzalis. Augustine assures us that while he was a priest and subdeacon by means of the relics of St. Stephen, which Orosius, in 415, had brought from Palestine. Evodus thus took an active part in the controversy against the Donatists and Pelagians, and in 427 wrote on this subject a letter to the monks of Adrumetum. He died about 480. We have from him four letters to St. Augustine (160, 161, 163, and 177 in the edition of the Benedictines); a letter addressed by him, conjointly with four other bishops, to Bishop Innocent I., of Rome (published in vol. vi. of the Benedictine edit. of the works of Augustine); fragments of a letter to the monks of Adrumetum (joined to the latter 216 of St. Augustine). His treatise on the miracles performed by the relics of St. Stephen is lost; for the Libri duo de Miracula S. Stephani, appended to Augustine's De Civitate Dei (in vol. vii. of his works), cannot be attributed to him. A treatise De Fide, or De Unitate Trinitatis contra Nestoriana, is by some likewise ascribed to Evodus. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xvi. 842.

Ewald, Johann Ludwig, theologian, was born at Dreieichenhain, Hesse, September 16, 1747. He studied at the University of Marburg. After serving two years as tutor to the children of the prince of Hesse-Philippsthal, he became pastor at Offenbach, 1768. He began preaching as a Rationalist, but in a few years he became a convinced Christian. In 1788 he was made a professor of ethics, and in 1797 became a member of the German Academy. He published De Jesus Christo, a work of great celebrity. He was appointed professor of theology in Göttingen, and in 1796 he accepted a pastoral charge at Bremen; and here, also, he greatly promoted the schools, visiting the establishments of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg, in Switzerland, to inform himself on their systems. In 1808 he was called to Heidelberg as professor of ethics, and in 1807 became church councillor at Carlsruhe, where he died, March 19, 1822. He was a voluminous author. Doering gives a list of eighty-nine different publications of his. The chief are, Predigerbefähigung (Leipsic, 1785-94, 9 vols.); Christenthum und Kneomophilismus (Leipsic, 1788-90, 2 vols. 8vo.); Soloma; Versuch einer psychologisch-biographischen Darstellung (Gera, 1800, 8vo.); Die Götterwidm. d. Christenthum (Bremin, 1800, 8vo.); Briefe über die alle Mystik u. d. neuen Mysticismus (Leipsic, 1822, 8vo.); besides numerous sermons and books on practical religion and education. — Doering, Die deutschen Kanzelredner, i, 46.

Evwé stands in the Ath. Ver. as the representative of the following Heb. words: בְּאֶ (rachêt), fem., a "cece" (Gen. xxxi. 18; xxxii. 14) or "sleep" generally (Cant. vi. 6; Isa. liii. 7); אֶ (ebh. masc. Exod. xii. 5, 8; fem. Jer. i. 17; Ezek. xxxiii. 20), a sheep or goat from a flock generally, variously rendered ("cattle," "sheep," "goat," "ewe"); בְּ (koshach) or בְּ (koshach, fem., so called from being fit for cropping), a "cece-lamb," i.e. one from one to three years old (Gen. xxix. 28, 29, 30; Lev. xiv. 10; Num. vii. 14; 2 Sam. xii. 3, 4, 6); בְּ (alokh, milk-giving, fem. plur.), milk ("ewes" with young), Ps. lxxviii. 71; Isa. xi. 11. See SHEEP, etc.

Ewer, or pitcher (q. v.) accompanying a wash-hand basin (q. v.). It is stated as a description of Elisha (2 Kings iii. 3, 6, 7), "which was a shew-bread, and water that ministered of Elisha." This was the act of an attendant or disciple; and it was so much his established duty, that the mere mention of it sufficed to indicate the relation in which Elisha stood to Elisha. It is also an indication that the Hebrews were accustomed to wash their
hands in the manner which is now universal in the East, and which, whatever may be thought of its convenience, is unquestionably more refreshing and cleanly than washing in the water as it stands in a basin, which is a process regarded by the Orientalists with great dislike. The hands are therefore held over a basin, the use of which is only to receive the water which has been poured upon the hands, and then to use it to wash the person’s face; persons successively, from the jug or ewer held above them (Lane, Modern Egyptians, l. 212). A servant or some other person approaches with the ewer in his right hand and the basin in his left; and when the hands have been placed in it, the man in the margin, which, being pierced with holes, allows the water to pass through, thus concealing it after it has been defiled by contact with them. The ewer has a long spout and a long, narrow neck, with a cover, and is altogether not unlike our coffee-pots in general appearance: it is the same which the Orientalists use in all the abcouts. It is evident that a person cannot conveniently thus wash his own hands without assistance. If he does, he is obliged to fix the basin, and to take up and lay down the ewer several times, changing it from one hand to the other. Therefore a person never does so except when alone. If he has too servant, he asks some one by-stander to pour the water upon his hands, and offers a return of the obligation, if it seems to be required (Kittre, Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). See Washing of Hands.

Ewing, Finis, one of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, was born July 10, 1778, in Bedford County, Va. His father was of Scotch-Irish descent, and both his parents were eminent for their piety, the father for many years being an elder in the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Ewing had but little early education: he was sent in the spring of the year he was born to a log school at a place where is not known. His biographer says, "Like Franklin, he seems early to have acquired a fondness for books. His varied and extensive reading made him emphatically a learned man, though not systematically educated, and the brilliancy of his success as a minister of the Gospel excelled intellectual endowments of a high order." His parents having died in Virginia, the surviving family moved to what was called the "Cumberland Country," and settled in Davidson County, Tennessee, near Nashville. On Jan. 16, 1793, he married the daughter of general William Davison, of North Carolina, a lady whose name (Davison), in honor of his many valuable services during the war of the Revolution. Here Mr. Ewing and his wife united with Rev. Dr. Craighead’s church, and lived in its communion some years before either of them knew they were of that religious persuasion. After the birth of their first child (but at what time is not known) Mr. Ewing removed to Kentucky, and settled in what was afterwards Logan County, near Red River Church, of which Rev. James M’Greedy was pastor. In the great revival of 1800, which swept over all the Western States, and out of which originated the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Mr. Ewing heard for the first time in his life the doctrines of regeneration and personal holiness insisted upon from the pulpit. He became satisfied that he had not a saving knowledge of the truth, and communicated his feelings to his wife, whom he found in a similar state of mind. After many prayers and tears, while engaged in family worship, he "became filled with the certainty of their great truth." Some time after this (the precise period is not known) he told his impressions to preach the Gospel to Transylvania Presbytery, which body, at the advice of Rev. David Rice, D.D., one of the oldest ministers in the presbytery, licensed Mr. Ewing and three others to do so. His success was great; several of sinners were converted wherever he went. His talents, piety, commanding language, and zeal carried everything before them. He was soon licensed to preach as a probationer, but the prevailing party in the presbytery opposed his licensure. He went on preaching very successfully, however, revival attending his labors wherever he travelled. His labor was so much called for, and so marked with success, that at the urgent call of several congregations he was ordained, in November, 1803, to the work of the ministry. The denomination continued to grow there for several years; in the mean time Kentucky Synod had pretended to dissolve Cumberland Presbytery, which had ordained him, because of alleged irregularities. The presbytery remained for four years not attempting to exercise its functions as a presbytery; after which time it was dissolved by the General Assembly, from the General Assembly, they determined to organize again, even contrary to the wishes of a majority of Kentucky Synod. On February 4, 1810, Mr. Ewing and two other ordained ministers united and formed the first presbytery in new Cumberland Presbyterian Church, giving it the name of the presbytery Kentucky Synod had dissolved, viz., Cumberland Presbytery; hence the name "Cumberland Presbyterians," Mr. Ewing removed after some years to Todd County, Ky., and became pastor of Lebanon congregation, near Ewing’s Creek. Here under his eye was sustained for many years a flourishing classical seminary of learning. In 1820, at the urgent call of many friends and brethren, he removed to the State of Missouri, and settled in what is now Cooper County. It was not long until he built up a large congregation called Ewing’s Church, which were the nucleus of Lebanon, which now contains two churches. Here he prepared and published his Lectures on Divinity, which have been extensively circulated and read, and which contain the germ of the peculiarities of Cumberland Presbyterians. He labored here with great faith and zeal. In 1846, he was removed to the town of Lexington, Lafayette County, Mo. Here he soon gathered a congregation, built a church, and, with others, was the means of extending the work of grace all over the vast incoming territories of the West. Mr. Ewing died here July 4, 1841, in his 68th year. He was tall, portly in appearance, had a keen, penetrating eye, always bore a dignified look, was a man of extraordinary pulpit talents, and of great success among all classes in winning souls to the Redeemer. In our troubled with Great Britain in 1812 he did not hesitate to give all the weight of his great influence in favor of his country. He was no politician, yet at one time, being an intimate friend and acquaintance of general Jackson, he was by him appointed register of the land office at Lexington, Mo. He died lamented by a large and growing denomination, not by many others, as a great and good man. His remains are in the cemetery at Lexington, Mo. (J. B. L.)

Ewing, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, and provost of the University of Pennsylvania, was born in Nottingham, Cecil County, Md., June 22, 1732, and graduated in 1754 in New Jersey College, of which he remained tutor for two years. Having completed his
EXACTOR

a. Dr. Ex. 17 of 1233, soppa', a driver (task-master, Exod. iii. 7, Job iii. 18, Isa. ix. 3; or simply driver of animals, Job xxxix. 7); hence exactor of a debt (or tribute, Dan. xi. 20, Zech. ix. 8); hence (in accordance with Oriental ideas and customs) a ruler, king, tyrant (Isa. iii. 12, xiv, 2; Zech. x. 4), as the parallel term "prince" in the above passage of Isaiah shows it to be the meaning.

Exaltation of Christ (status exaltationis), a theological phrase, including in its scope the resurrection of Christ, his ascension into heaven, his sitting at the right hand of God the Father, and his coming to judge the world at the last day. See articles on these heads; also on the relation of Christ to the Church (vol. ii. p. 291), Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, Smith's ed., ii. 352.


Example (ẹtúpọ, Judges 7), especially Christ's (ẹtúpọ oṣu, 1 Pet. ii. 21) for the imitation of his followers (ẹtúpọ tiye, John xiii. 15; elsewhere in other relations, Heb. iv. 11; viii. 5; ix. 23; Isa. v. 10; 2 Pet. ii. 6), and subordinate pastors for their flock (ẹtúpọ, Phil. iii. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 12; 1 Pet. v. 3, etc.). See Flatt, Das Beispielen Jesu (in the Magna. für chr. Dornat. i, 179 sq.); Keil, De Exemplo Christi (Lips. 1792; Opusc. i, 100-135); Oeder, De Christi imitatio (in his Obs. asc. i, 53-56); Schmid, De perpetuo Christi imitatio (Lips. 1710); Stöber, De exemplarum imitatio (Argent. 1782); Wolf, De ex- emplo caute adhibendi (Lips. 1785-6); Kempis, Imitation of Christ (often published).

Example, "a copy or pattern, in a moral sense, is either taken for a type, instance, or precedent for our admonition, that we may be cautioned against the faults or crimes which others have committed, by the bad example; or which have not been so; or example is taken for a pattern for our imitation, or a model for us to copy after. That good examples have a peculiar power above naked precepts to dispose us to the practice of virtue and holiness may appear by considering, '1. That they most clearly express to us the nature of our duties in their subjects and sensible effects. General precepts form abstract ideas of virtue, but in examples, virtues are most visible in all their circumstances. 2. That they are our duty, but examples assure us that they are possible. 3. Examples, by secret and lively incentive, urge us to imitation. We are touched in another manner by the visible practice of good men, which reproaches our defects, and obliges us to the same rule which laws, though wise and good, will not effect.'

The life of Jesus Christ forms the most beautiful example the Christian can imitate. Unlike all others, it was absolutely perfect and uniform, and every way accommodated to our present state. In him we behold all light without a shade, all beauty without a spot, all the purity of the law and the excellency of the Gospel. Here we see piety without superstition, and morality without ostentation; humility without meanness, and fortitude without temerity; patience without apathy, and compassion without weakness; zeal without rashness, and benevolence without prodigality.

The obligation we are under to imitate this example arises from duty, relationship, engagement, interest, and gratitude. See art. JESUS CHRIST. Those who set bad examples should consider, 1. That they are the ministers of the devil's designs to destroy souls. 2. That they are enemies to the enjoining proper for their private uses any portion of the revenue. 'The imposition of examples requires a reasonable cause, and limitation to what is necessary. State churches cannot impose an example without previously obtaining the permission of the state government.' Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv. 280.

EXARCH (ekarach). (1.) the title given, under the Byzantine emperors, to their viceroys in Italy and Africa, after Justinian's reconquest of those provinces. (2.) The title was adopted in the early Church for the highest orders of the hierarchy. Primates or metropolitan bishops were styled curia exarchus or curia exarchus, and the patriarchs were called έκαραχ της εκκλησιας. In the 6th canon of Sardica (A.D. 344) the former title (exarch of the eparchy) is given to primates; the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, forbade its use (Riddle, Antiquities, bk. iii. ch. iii). The exarch, as primate, was "inference of the patriarch, and superior to the metropolitan. In the third century there were three exarchae, viz. Ephesus, with the diocese of Asia, 12 provinces and 300 sees; Heraclea, with the diocese of Thrace, and 6 provinces; Cesarea, 15 provinces and 104 sees. The privileges of these exarchae were transferred by the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) to the patriarch of Constantinople. (3.) The exarch in the Greek Church at the present day is the patriarch's deputy, whose duty it is to visit the provinces under his inspection, to inform himself as to the lives and morals of the clergy; to take cognizance of ecclesiastical causes—the manner of celebrating divine ordinances, the sacraments, particularly confession, the observance of the canons, monastic discipline, affairs of marriages, divorces, etc.; but, above all, to take account of the revenues which the patriarch receives from several sources. Bingham, Orig. Eccles. Bohn's ed. i, 61, 67.

EXCHANGER (προμισσωρ, so called from the table used for holding the coin [see CHANGER OF MONEY]), a broker or banker (i.e. cash-man [see BANK]), one who exchanged money, and also received money on deposit at interest, in order to loan it out to others at
EXCOMMUNICATION

更高的税率 (Mat. xxv. 27). (See Smith's Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Menæstir.) See Money-changer, Loan.

Excommunication, the judicial exclusion of offenders from the religious rites and privileges of the particular community to which they belong. It is a power founded upon a right inherent in all religious societies, and analogous to the power of capital punishment, banishment, and excommunication which are exercised by political and municipal bodies. If Christianity is merely a philosophical idea thrown into the world to do battle with other theories, and to be valued according as it maintains its ground or loses it by conflict of opinions, excommunication, and ecclesiastical punishments and discipline are unreasonable. If society is a thing in its existence any body of doctrine and any code of morals, a spiritual my kingdom of God on earth, is the declaration of the Bible; and that the Jewish Church was at once a spiritual and a temporal organization is clear. Among the Jews, however, excommunication was not only an ecclesiastical, but also a civil punishment, because of the connection of civil and religious privileges or penalties. Excommunication, in the Christian Church, consisted at first simply in exclusion from the communion of the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts; "with such a one, no, not to eat" (1 Cor. v. 11). It might also include a total separation from any body of doctrine to which he was liable in civil life, neither did it withhold from him any natural obligations, such as are founded on nature, humanity, and the law of nations, Ecclesiastical penalties are oftenonymous for which it was inflicted. They are various, and range in heinouslyness from the offence of keeping a flock dog that to of taking God's name in vain. Elsewhere (Talm. Bab. Moed Kadosh, fol. 16, 1) the causes of its infliction are reduced to two, termed money and epicurism, by which is meant debt and wanton insolence. The offender was first cited to appear in court, and if he refused to appear or to make amends, his sentence was pronounced — "Let M. or N. be under excommunication." The excommunicated person was proscribed from the bath, or from the convivial table, and all who had to do with him were commanded to keep him at four cubits' distance. He was allowed to go to the Temple, but not to make the circuit in the ordinary manner. The term of this punishment was thirty days, and it was extended to a second and to a third thirty days when necessary. If at the end of that time the offender was still contumacious, he was subjected to the second excommunication termed תֶּבֶז (cherem), a word meaning something devoted to God (Lev. xxvii. 21, 28; Exod. xxvii. 20 [19]; Num. xviii. 14). Severer penalties were now attached. The offender was not allowed to teach or to be taught in the law, or to be called to be signified. He was not permitted to perform any commercial transactions beyond purchasing the necessary of life. The sentence was delivered by a court of ten, and was accompanied by a solemn malediction, for which authority was supposed to be found in the "Curse ye Meros" of Judg. v. 33. Lastly followed נֵכַף (shammâthâ), which was an entire cutting off from the congregation. It has been supposed by some that these two latter forms of excommunication were undistinguishable from each other. See CHURCH.

The punishment of excommunication is not appointed by the law of Moses. It is founded on the natural right of self-protection which all societies enjoy. The case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Num. xvii), the curse denounced on Meros (Judg. v. 29), the commission and proclamation of Ezra (vii. 26; 8, 6), and the reformations of Nehemiah (xiii. 32), are all striking instances that the Talmudists as precedents by which their proceedings are regulated. In respect to the principle involved, "the cutting off from the people" commanded for certain sins (Exod. xxx. 38; xxxi. 14; Lev. xvii, 4), and the exclusion from the camp denounced on the leper (Exod. xxix. 20, Num. xiii. 14), are more appropriate.

In the New Testament, Jewish excommunication is brought prominently before us in the case of the man that was born blind and restored to sight (John ix). "The Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. Therefore said Jesus unto him, According to thy faith, be it unto thee. For verily I say unto thee, if thou shalt say, 'My Lord, the Son of God,' ver. 22, 28. "And they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out" (ver. 34, 35). The expressions here used, ἄνωθεν γίγνεται—ἐξακολουθεία αἰεόν ἔχων, refer, no doubt, to the first form of excommunication, or nidda. Our Lord warns his disciples that they will have to suffer excommunication at the hands of their countrymen (John xvi, 2), and the fear of it is described as sufficient to prevent persons in a respectable position from acknowledging their belief in Christ (John xii, 42). In Luke vi, 22, it has been interpreted by our Lord referring "to the three forms of Jewish excommunication," Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company [ἀγωγόιτευματίς], and shall reproach you [αὐθιναίων], and cast out your name as evil [ἰδιθοιων], for the Son of man's sake."

The three words, nidda, niddut, and cherem, are more accurately expressed as separate separation, the additional malediction, and the final exclusion of niddut, cherem, and shammathâ. This verse makes it probable that the three stages were already formally distinguished from each other, though, no doubt, the words appropriate to each are occasionally used inaccurately. It is used inaccurately in Latin on Jewish excommunication by Musculus (Lips. 1708), Opitze (Kilon. 1680).

II. In the New Testament. —Excommunication in the New Testament is not merely founded on the natural right possessed by all societies, nor merely on the example of the Jewish Church and nation. It was instituted by our Lord (Matt. xviii, 15, 18), and it was practised by and commanded by Paul (1 Tim. i, 20; 1 Cor. v, 11; Tit. iii, 10).

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

2. Apostolic Example.—In the Epistles we find Paul frequently claiming the right to exercise discipline over his converts (comp. 2 Cor. i, 23; xii, 10). In two cases we find him exercising this authority to the extent of cutting off offenders from the Church. One of these is mentioned in the text here: "Ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v, 2-5).

This passage is significant in that it states: "Holding faith and a good conscience, which some, having put away concerning faith, have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i, 19, 20). It seems certain that this is a passage, or rather a section, concerning the excommunication of the persons indicated and others similar to them. The other expression, "the others for hire," shows that the phrase meaning "delivered unto Satan" is qualified. All agree that this expression is contained in it, whether it implies any further punishment, inflicted by the extraordinary powers committed especially to the apostles, has been questioned. The strongest argument for the phrase meaning no more than excommunication may be drawn from a comparison of Col. i, 13. Addressing himself to the "saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse," Paul exhorts them to "give thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The conceptualization of the text here is of man lying in the realm of darkness, and transported from thence into the kingdom of the Son of God, which is the inheritance of the saints in light, by admission into the Church. What he means by the power of darkness is abundantly clear from many other passages in his writings, that he be subjected to evil spirits. (Eph. vi, 12: "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.") Introduction into the Church is therefore, in Paul's mind, a translation from the kingdom and power of Satan to the kingdom and government of Christ. This being so, he could hardly more naturally describe the effect of excluding a man from the Church than by saying, "he delivered unto Satan." The idea being that the man ceasing to be a subject of Christ's kingdom of light, was at once transported back to the kingdom of darkness, and delivered therefore into the power of its ruler, Satan. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the terms in which Paul describes the consequences. Here again the act of excommunication is compared to a translation, of which the Church, is pronounced to be a translation from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. Conversely, to be cast out of the Church would be to be removed from light to darkness, to be withdrawn from God's government, and delivered into the power of Satan (so Balsamon and Zonaras, in Basili. Can. 7; Estius, in 1 Cor. v; Beveridge, in 1 Cor. xxvi, 18). If, however, the word delivery means more than excommunication, it would imply the additional exercise of a special apostolic power, similar to that exerted on Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v, 1), Simon Magus (vii, 20), and Elymas (xii, 10). (So Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Hammond, Grocius, Lightfoot, and others.)

3. Apostolic Precept.—In addition to the claim to exercise discipline, and its actual exercise in the form of excommunication by the apostles, we find apostolic precepts directing that discipline should be exercised by the rulers of the Church, and the stronger cases excommunication should attend to: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," writes Paul to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. iii, 14).

To the Galatians: "I would they were even cut off from trouble you" (Gal. v, 12). To Timothy: "If any man teach otherwise, . . . from such withdraw thyself" (1 Tim. vi, 20). To the Corinthians: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject" (Tit. iii, 10). John instructs the lady to whom he addresses his second epistle not to receive into her house, nor bid God speed to any who did not believe in Christ (2 John 10); and we read that in the case of Cyprian he acted himself on the precept that he had given (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii, 28). In his third epistle he describes Diotrephes, apparently a Judaizing presbyter, "who loved to have the pre-eminence, as "casting out of the Church," I. e., refusing Church communion to the stranger brethren who were travelling about preaching to the Gentiles (3 John 10). In the addresses to the Seven Churches the angels or rulers of the church of Pergamos and of Thyatira are rebuked for "suffering" the Nicolaitans and Balaamites "to teach and to seduce my servants, and to exhort them to things which are not according to the doctrine which ye have received, and to abandon them" (Rev. ii, 20). There are two passages still more important to our subject. In the epistle to the Galatians, Paul denounces, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. i, 8, 9). And in the second epistle to the Corinthians: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha!" (1 Cor. xvi, 22). It has been supposed that these two expressions, "let him be Anathema," "let him be Anathema Maranatha," refer respectively to the two later stages of Jewish excommunication—the chair and the shammashah. This requires consideration.

The words anathema and anathema have evidently the same derivation, and originally they bore the same meaning. They express a person or thing set apart, laid up, or devoted. But whereas a thing may be set apart by way of honor or for destruction, the words, like the Hebrew 'anathema, place it under God's curse. One who came to have opposite senses—to anathematizōν θεοῦ, and to ἀναθηματίζων θεόν. The Sept. and several other ecclesiastical writers use the two words almost indiscriminately, but in general the form anathema is applied to the votive offering (see 2 Macc. xxvi, 5; Apocalypse xxii, 6; and ch. vii, 17, xx, 4, and Rom. xiv, 14), and the form anathema to that which is devoted to evil (see Deut. vii, 26; Josh. vi, 17; vii, 13). Thus Paul de-
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clarifies that he could wish himself an ἀδιάθημα from Christ if he could thereby save the Jews (Rom. ix. 3). His meaning is that he would be willing to be set apart as a vile thing, to be cast aside and despised, if only it could bring about the salvation of his brethren. Hence we see the force of ἀδιάθημα ἐστώ in Gal. i. 8: "I have nothing to do with him," would be the apostle's injunction, "but let him be set apart as an evil thing, for God to deal with him as he thinks fit." Hammond, in his "Tyranny of the Churches," says: "You are to disclaim and renounce all communion with him, to look on him as on an excommunicated person, under the second degree of excommunication, that none is to have any commerce with in sacred things." Hence it is that ἀδιάθημα ἐστώ came to be the common expression employed by councils at the termination of each canon which they enacted, meaning that whoever was disobedient to the canon was to be separated from the communion of the Church and its privileges, and from the favor of God, until he repented (see Bingham, Ant. xvi. 2, 10). See ANATHEMA.

The expression ἀδιάθημα μανασσάβι, as it stands by itself without explanation in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, is so peculiar, that it has tempted a number of ingenious expositions. Parkhurst hesitatingly derives it from μανασσάβι, "Cursed be thou." But this derivation is not tenable. Buxtorf, Morinus, Hammond, Bingham, and others identify it with the Jewish skamāmdāh. They do so by translating skamāmdāh, "The Lord comes." Ewald, however, says: "You cannot make the Hebrew words "The Lord comes" (see Lightfoot, in loc.). Several fanciful derivations are given by rabbinical writers, as "There is death," "There is desolation;" but there is no mention by them of such a signification as "The Lord comes." Lightfoot derives it from כָּמָה, and it probably means a thing excluded or shut out. Maranatha, however, particularly its use in the text, may seem to us, in a Syro-Chaldaic sense, signifying "The Lord is come" (Chrysostom, Jerome, Eutius, Lightfoot, or "The Lord cometh." If we take the former meaning, we may regard it as giving the reason why the offender was to be anathematized; if the latter, it would either imply that the separation was to be in perpetuity, "donec Dominus redeat" (Augustine), or, more properly, it would be a form of solemn appeal to the day on which the judgment should be ratified by the Lord (comp. Jude 14). In any case it is a strengthened form of the simple ἀδιάθημα ἐστώ. And thus it may be held as a holding toward a similar relation to that which existed between the skamāmdāh and the cherem, but not on any supposed ground of etymological identity between the two words skamāmdāh and maram-aha. Perhaps we ought to interpret more strongly between ἀδιάθημα and μανασσάβι, and read ἀδιάθημα μανασσάβι, i. e., "Let him be anathema. The Lord will come." The anathema and the cherem answer very exactly to each other (see Lev. xxvii. 28; Num. xxi. 3; Isa. liil. 28). See MARANATHA.

4. RESTORATION TO COMMUNION.—Two cases of excommunication are recorded in Holy Scripture: (1) that of Ezekiel, and in one of them the restitution of the offender is specially recounted. The incestuous Corinthian had been excommunicated by the authority of Paul, who had issued his sentence from a distance without any consultation with the Corinthians. He had required them publicly to act upon it, as the subject of it had done so. The offender had been brought to repentance, and was overwhelmed with grief. Hereupon Paul, still absent as before, forbids the further infliction of the punishment, pronounces the forgiveness of the penitent, and exhorts the Corinthians to receive him back again. (2) In the second case, the two were subjected to corporal discipline rather than to this censure (Bingham, Orig. Ecc. bk. xvi. ch. ii.; Cave, Prim. Christianity, iii. 5).

5. The Nature of Excommunication is made more evident by these acts of Paul than by any investigation of Jewish practice or of the etymology of words. We thus find (1) that it is a spiritual penalty, involving no temporal punishment except accidentally; (2) that it consists in separation from the communion of the Church; (3) that its object is the good of the sufferer (1 Cor. v. 5), and the redemption of the soul of the offender (2 Tim. iii. 17); (4) that its subjects are those who are guilty of hecary (1 Tim. i. 20) or gross immorality (1 Cor. v. 1); (5) that it is inflicted by the authority of the Church at large (Matt. xviii. 18), and wielded by the regular appointed officer (1 Cor. v. 3; Tit. iii. 10); (6) that this officer's sentence is pronounced by the congregation to which the offender belongs (1 Cor. v. 4), in deference to his superior judgment and command (2 Cor. ii. 9), and in spite of any opposition on the part of a minority (6. 6); (7) that the exclusion may be of indefinite duration or for a period; (8) that its duration may be abridged at the discretion and by the indulgence of the person who has imposed the penalty (6. 8); (9) that penitence is the condition on which restoration to communion is granted (6. 7); (10) that the sentence is to be public, reversed as it was publicly pronounced (6. 10).

III. In the Post-Apostolic Christian Church.—(1.) In general.—Such a power is necessarily inherent in every community; and although "the only sense in which the apostles, or, of course, any of their successors in the Church, could be empowered to excommunicate was that they could exercise no judg- ments on individuals by giving sins as against God is by pronouncing and pro- claiming his forgiveness of all those who, coming to him through Christ, repent and forsake their sins," yet since offences as against a community may be visited with penalties by the regular appointed officers of that community, they may enforce or remit such penalties. On these principles is founded the right which the Church claims both to punish ecclesiastical offences, and to pronounce an absolute and complete perdon of a particular offender on his making the requisite submission to discipline. (11.) In the early Christian Church.—1. In the discipline of the primitive Church, according to the apostolic injunction, recourse was not had to excommunication until "after the first and second admonition" (ἐπιθυμία). If the offender proved refractory after the time granted for repentance (Siegel, Afterthäm, ii. 131), he was liable to excommunication, which at first consisted simply in the removal of the offender from the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts: hence the word excommunication, separation from communion. The practice was founded on the words of the apostle (1 Cor. v. 11), "with such an one let a cleave, and take no more to eat," which do not refer to ordinary meals and the common intercourse of life, but to the agape and other solemnities. The chief difference between Jewish and Christian excommunication consisted in this: the former extended in its consequences to the affairs of civil life, whereas the latter was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations. It was impossible, in the constitution and situation of the Church during the three first centuries, that there should have been any confounding or intermingling of civil and religious jurisdiction in the Church, nor were there subjected to corporal discipline rather than to this censure (Bingham, Orig. Ecc. bk. xvi. ch. ii.; Cave, Prim. Christianity, iii. 5).

2. There were two excommunications, the greater
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(major) and lesser (minor). The excommunication minor (ordinaria) extended from participation in the Eucharist and prayers of the faithful, but did not expel from the Church; for the person under its sentence might stay to hear the psalmody, reading of the Scripture, sermons and prayers of the catechumens and penitents, and then depart as soon as the first service, called the lectio, was ended (Cass. Decr. 77; ad Eulal., iii, 797). This punishment was commonly inflicted upon lesser crimes, or if upon greater, upon such sinners only as showed a willingness to repent—upon those who had lapsed rather through infirmity than maliciously. The excommunication major (excommunication) was a total expulsion from the Church, and separation from communion in all holy offices with it (Encyclop. Metropolitana). When attended with excommunications, excommunication was called anathema (see article, vol. i, p. 230). The several churches mutually informed each other of their own separate excommunications, in order that a person excommunicated by one church might be held so by all; and any church which received him was held deserving of similar punishment. He who was guilty of any intercourse with an excommunicated person de facto incurred the same sentence as which deprived him of Christian burial and insertion in the diptychs or catalogues of the faithful. No gifts or oblations were received from the excommunicated. No marriages might take place with them. Their books might not be read, but were to be burned (Bingenb. Theol. Mor. 27). For the excommunicated persons, penances (q. v.) and public professions of repentance were required; and in Africa and Spain the absolution of lapsed persons (i.e. those who, in time of persecution, had yielded to the force of temptation, and fallen away from the Christian faith by the crime of actual sacrifice to idols) was forbidden, except at the hour of death, or in cases where martyrs interceded for them. See LAPIS.

(III.) The Roman Church. As the pretensions of the hierarchy increased, excommunication became more and more an instrument of ecclesiastical power, as well as a means of enlarging it. When the Church had full control of the state, its sentences were attended with the gravest civil as well as ecclesiastical consequences. There are three degrees of excommunication, the minor, the major, and the anathema. The minor may be imposed by holding communion with an excommunicated person: orationes, locutiones, bilendo, comedendo—praying, speaking, drinking, eating; and absolution may be given by any priest on confession. Priests who have incurred the minor ban may administer the sacraments. One who receives Communion while under the minor excommunication is one of the deacons, with ardor, to those of jurisdiction, and as not referring to grace directly, but only accidentally, might be excommunicated, or at least be not harmonized in the Church, but who, by being concealed and eluding jurisdiction, heads of religious orders within their own communities, all possess the power to issue excommunication, only not by the ancient law of the Church, but also by the most modern discipline' (Chambers, s. v.). But Aquinas held that excommunication, as not belonging to the keys of ord'

The penal aim of excommunication was the reform of the offender as well as the purification of the Church. Absolution can be granted, in case of the major ban, only by the authority which laid the ban, or its successor. Before absolution the authorities must be satisfied of penitence. The "penitent must first swear to never again follow the convicted, and to make all necessary atonement for his special offence; he must then be reconciled by kneeling, barefooted and stripped to his shirt, before the bishop sitting at the church gates. Here he again repeats his oath, and the bishop, reciting the psalm Deus misertor, strikes him with a rod during each verse. Then, after certain prayers, he absolves him and leads him into the church." 3. The anathema is attended with special ceremonies. "The bishop must be attended by twelve priests, each carrying a censer, and as well as an extinguished candle. He then sits before the high altar, or any other public place which he prefers, and delivers his sentence, which adjudges the offender to be anathematizatur et damnatur cum dioebolo et angelis ejus et omnibus reprobis in eternum ignem—cursed and damned with the anathema of God and of all hosts of angels and of all eternal fire. The candles are then dashed down. The ceremonies of absolution from this sentence are not very different from the last, although the form of prayer is varied" (Encyclop. Metrop. s. v.). The effects of the anathema were summed up in the monastic lines

Si pro delicto anathema quo efficiatur,
Os, crana, vala, communio, mensa negatur.

See ANATHEMA; BELL, BOOK, AND CANDLE.

In the Roman Catholic Church the power of excommunicating is held to reside, not in the congregation, but in the bishop; and this is believed to be in exact accordance with the remarkable proceeding commemorated in the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 3, 5), and with all the earliest recorded examples of its exercise. Like all the powers of the Church, it is held to belong to the primacy, and an eminent degree, to the Roman bishop, as primas of the Church; but it is by no means believed to be long to him exclusively, nor has such exclusive right ever been claimed by the bishops of Rome. On the contrary, it is argued that those who, in exercising visitatorial jurisdiction, heads of religious orders within their own communities, all possess the power to issue excommunication, not only by the ancient law of the Church, but also by the most modern discipline' (Chambers, s. v.). But Aquinas held that excommunication, as not belonging to the keys of ord'
been observed; whereas the cognizance hereof does not pertain to seculars, but to ecclesiastics. And every excommunicated person soever who, after the lawful monitions, does not change his mind, shall not only not be received to the sacraments and to communion and live in apparent sinfulness, but in all necessary acts, he shall, with obdurate heart, remain for a year in the disfellowship thereof, he may even be proceeded against as suspected of heresy." The popes have exercised the power of excommunication against entire communities at once. The Capitulaires of Pepin the Short, Charlemagne, and the 6th Council of Trier, ordained that the greater excommunication should be followed by banishment from the country. On the claim of the popes to excommunicate and depose monarchs, and to free subjects from their allegiance, see M'Clintock, Temporal Power of the Pope (N. Y. 1855, 12mo). The latest examples of popes to the devil, and his angels, monarchs were Napoleon I in 1809, and Victor Emmanuel, king of Italy, in 1860; neither of whom, however, was excommunicated by name, the pope having confined himself to a solemn and reiterated publication of the penalties decreed against persons who unjustly invaded the Holy See, and, in particular, against those who unjustly invaded the Holy See, and, in particular, against the Papal States, and Napolitanized its rights, or violently impeded their free exercise. The excommunication of a sovereign was regarded as freeing subjects from their allegiance; and, in the year 1102, this sentence was pronounced against the king of France, who opposed the excommunication. Subsequent examples in excommunicating popes likewise ventured to follow. But the fearful weapons with which the popes armed themselves in this power of excommunication were rendered much less effective through their incantuous employment, the evident worldly motives by which it was sometimes governed, and the excommunications which rived the popes hurled against each other during the time of the great papal schism" (Chambers, s. v.).

(V.) The Greek Church.—In the Greek Church excommunication cuts off the offender from all communion with the 318 fathers of the first Council of Nicæa, and with the church of Rome, which, on occasion, together with the 318, many accusing the pope of idle eye, he drives "the a nail into the ground with a hammer as a mark of malediction" (Bock, s. v.). Sir Paul Rycaut (Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches, Lond. 1679, 8vo), who wrote his observations on the state of that communion in 1678, has given, in the original Greek, the form of an excommunication issued against an unknown thief whom the authorities were seeking to discover. It runs as follows: "If they restore not to him which is his own, and possess him peaceably of it, but suffer him to remain injured and damned, let him be segregated from the Lord God Creatour, and be accursed, and unpardoned, and despaired of after death in this world, and in the other which is to come. Let wood, stones, and iron be dissolved, but not they: may they inherit the leprosy of Gehazi and the confusion of Judas; may the earth be divided, and devour them; Abram, may a nervous tremble on earth like Cain, and the wrath of God be upon their heads and countenances; may they see nothing of that for which they labor, and beg their bread all the days of their lives; may their works, possessions, labors, and services be accursed; always without effect or success, and blown away like dust; may they have the curses of the holy and righteous patriarchs Abram, Isaac, and Jacob; of the 318 saints who were the divine fathers of the Synod of Nice, and of all other holy synods; and being without the Church of Christ, let no man administer unto them the things of the Church, or bless them, or offer sacrifice for them. or give them the divinæm, or the blessed bread, or wine; or let them touch, nor receive any other food without power from them; and after death let no man bury them, in penalty of being under the same state of excommunication; so for let them remain until they have performed what is here written." (V.) In Protestant Churches.—New relations between the churches. The ordinances of the 6th Council of Trier, ordaining that excommunication should be followed by banishment from the country, were signally opposed to the Reformation, and new limits were soon assigned to the exercise of discipline. According to the view of the Wittenser reformers, the ban could have no civil effect unless ratified by the State. The necessity of the power of excommunication in the Church was asserted by all the Reformers. The Reformation of the Church is the affair of the whole Church, clergy and laity (Calvin, Institut., iv. chap. xi.; Melancthon, Corpus Ref. et. Schreibt., iii. 965). See Excommunication. They disclaimed the right of using the excommunication major. In general, it was "only reconciled by penance or by expiation which appeared to them to be inherent in the constitution of the Christian society, and to be sanctioned by the Word of God; nor have any civil consequences been generally connected with it in Protestant countries. To excommunicate a man is never in any measure whatever is certainly inconsistent with the principles of the Reformation" (Chambers, s. v.).

The causes of excommunication in the established Church of England are, contempt of the bishops' court, heresy, neglect of public worship and the sacraments, contempt of discipline, and, generally, anything which rivas in any measure whatever is certainly inconsistent with the principles of the Reformation. The judge of any spiritual court excommunicates a man for a cause of which he has not the legal cognizance, the party may have an action against him at common law, and he is also liable to be indicted at the suit of the king (Ces. 65, 68; see also the Homily on the Eight Rules). The Church of England of Religion is as follows: "That person which, by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and publican until he be "penitently received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto." By Old English law an excommunicated person was disabled from doing any act required to be done by one that is probus et legalis homo. He could not serve on juries, nor be witness in any court or cause; he was guilty of perjury if he cover lands or money due to him. By statutes 5 and 6 Edward VI, cap. 4, striking, or drawing a weapon to strike, in a church or church-yard, incurred ipso facto excommunication; ipso facto excommunication, or late senitio ferenda, i.e. when sentence must be passed before the offender be considered excommunicated. The offences which, in the reign of Edward III, 1373, were punished by ipso facto excommunication, are enumerated in some articles issued when Wiltshire was archbishop by a bishop of his own appointment, as such as might be injurious to the persons or properties of the clergy. The document may be found in Conc. Magna, Brit. iii. 95. By 8 James I, cap. 5, every popish recusant convict stands to all intents and purposes disabled, as a person "excommunicated with effect and in the public law." The church law denies Christian burial to those excommunicated majori excommunicationes, and an injunction to the ministers to that effect will be found in the sixty-eighth canon, and in the rubric of the burial service. The law acknowledged two excommunications: the lesser without effect or success, and blown away like dust; the greater which from the Church only; the greater from that communion, and also from the company of the faithful. The sixty-
fifth canon enjoins ministers solemnly to denounced those who stand lawfully excommunicated every six months, as well in the parish church as in the cathedral church of the diocese in which they remain, 'till others be thereby also admonished to refrain their company and society, and excited the rather to procure a writ de excommunicato copiendo, thereby to bring and reduce them into due order and obedience.' By statute 52 George III. cap. 257, excommunication, and all the matters following therewith, are discontinued, except in certain cases specified in the act; which may receive definitive sentences as spiritual censures for offences of ecclesiastical cognizance; and instead of sentence of excommunication, which used to be pronounced by the ecclesiastical courts in cases of contumacy, the offenders are to be declared contumacious, and to be referred to the court of chancery, by which a writ de contumace copiendo is issued instead of the old writ de excommunicato copiendo. Formerly this writ de excommunicato copiendo was issued by the court personally upon the prayer of the bishop; but since the bishop's certificate that forty days have elapsed since sentence of excommunication has been published in the church without submission of the offender. The sheriff then received the writ, called also a signif- icancy, and lodged the culprit in the county jail till the bishop arrived. In the meantime, the sheriff might proceed to the house of the culprit, and on proof of proceeding to that now adopted was recommended by a report of a committee of both houses of Parliament as far back as March 7, 1710, and again on April 30, 1714. No person excommunicated for such offences as are still liable to the punishment can now be imprisoned, for a longer term than six months (Bell, 'Ecc. Law,' by Tyrwhitt, ad e.). In Scotland, when the lesser excommunication, or exclusion from the sacraments has failed, the minister pronounces a form by which the impendent offender is declared 'excommunicated from all the communion of the faithful, debarred from their privileges, and delivered unto Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' The people are then warned to avoid all unnecessary intercourse with him. Anciety, in Scotland, an excommunication is a deprivation of feudal rights, but at present the sentence is unaccompanied by any civil penalty or disqualification" ('Encyclopedia Metropolitana,' s. v.).

The law of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, as expressed by the 42d canon of 1825, is as follows: See with reference to such of the offenders of the church, their brethren by any wickedness of life, such persons shall be expelled from the holy communion, agreeably to the rubric. Sec. 2. On information being laid before the bishop that any one has been expelled from communion, it shall not be his duty to institute an inquiry unless there be a complaint made to him in writing by the expelled party. But on receiving complaint, it shall be the duty of the bishop, unless he thinks fit to restore him from the insufficiency of the cause assigned by the minister, to institute an inquiry, as may be directed by the canons of the church in which the event has taken place. Sec. 3. In the case of a great heinousness of offence on the part of members of this Church, they may be proceeded against to the depriving them of all privileges of church membership, according to such rules or process as may be prescribed by the synod of the church. The grounds and forms of trial are given in the 'Discipline,' part iii, chap. i. It is provided in the Constitution that no law shall ever be made doing away the privilege of accused ministers or members to have trial and right of appeal ('Discipline,' pt. ii, ch. i, § 1).

Among the Indi, rutos, Congregationists, and Bapista, the persons who are or should be excommunicated are quartered upon them; such as desert their privileges, withdraw themselves from the ordinances of God, and forsake his people (Jude 19); such as are irregular and immoral in their lives, hairors, drunkards, extortioners, fornicators, and covetous (Eph. v. 1; 1 Cor. v. 12). In the United States and Canada, excommunication and discipline are very generally followed by all evangelical denominations" (Buck, s. v.). See particularly the "Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church, bk. ii of Discipline; Dexter, 'On Congregationalism' (Boston, 1865), pp. 195 et seq.; Ripley, 'On Church Polity' (Bont, 1857), p. 81 et seq.; 'Edward Binning: Use of Excommunication' ('Works,' N. Y., 1849), iv, 638.


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

Exeunt ('έκχω, alal', Jer. xiii, 18; xlv, 12; a "curse" or "oath," abstractly, as elsewhere) is properly the representative of the Greek word euripa, which occurs (in the verb euripaias) in the Sept. at Num. xxii, 8; xxvii, 9; Josh. vi, 26; 1 Sam. xvii, 48, et al., as a rendering of various Heb. terms ("הע"מ, xii, xii, xii, etc.), and the N. T. ("εκχω", "εκχω", Matth. ii, 21, etc.). It is used also in prose authors to denote the imprecation which it was customary among ancient nations to pronounce upon their enemies for the purpose of calling down the divine wrath, branding them with infamy, and exciting against them the passions of the multitude. By this means they also devoted their enemies to the ruin they considered them to deserve. These imprecations were chiefly pronounced by priests, enchanters, or prophets. See Balaam. The Athenians made use of them against Philip of Macedon. They convened an assembly, in which it was decreed that all statues, inscriptions, or festivals among them, in any way relating to him or his ancestors, should be destroyed, and every other possible reminiscence of him profaned; and that the priests, as often as they prayed for the success of the Athenian affairs, should pray for the ruin of Philip. It was also decreed, both at such times, according as the Romans, after having destroyed cities in war, the revival of whose strength they dreaded, to pronounce exactions upon those who should rebuild them. Strabo observes that Agamemnon pronounced exactions on those who should rebuild Troy, as Croesus did against those who should rebuild the mode of exorcltting cities Strabo calls an ancient cus- tom ('εκχω', 'Πολιν', ed. 1707).

The Romans published a decree full of exactions against
those who should rebuild Carthage (Zonaras, Anm.,) an incident somewhat analogous is related (Josh. vi, 26) after the taking of Jericho. From the word 'and Joshua adjured them at that time,' it is likely that he acted under a divine intimation that Jericho should continue in ruins, as a monument of the divine displeasure, a warning to posterity. The words 'curse be the man (the individual) before the Lord that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho,' although transformed into an exclamation by the word supplicated by the translators, amount to no more than a prediction that he shall lay the foundation thereof in his first-born, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it,' that is, he shall meet with so many impediments to his undertaking that he shall outlive all his children, dying in the course of nature before he shall complete it. See Jericho. Excommunications were also pronounced upon cities and their inhabitants before undertaking a siege (Macrobiius has preserved two of the ancient forms used in reference to the destruction of Carthage, Saturnal. iii, 9), and before engaging with enemies in war. Tacitus relates that the priestesses of ancient Britain devoted their Roman invasions to destruction with imprecations, omenomancies, and attitudes, which for a time overwhelmed the soldiers with terror (Agric., xiv, 29). The executions in the 83d Psalm, probably written on the occasion of the confederacy against Jehoshaphat, and other instances of the partake of the exorcism of the heathen, then in nothing but form, being the inspired predictions or denunciations of divine vengeance against the avowed enemies of the God of Israel, notwithstanding the proofs they had witnessed of his supremacy; and the object of these imprecations, as in many other instances, is charitable, namely, the conversion to the true religion (ver. 18; see also Ps. lix, 12). See Anathema; Imprecation.

Execution, or capital punishment, among the Jews, when lawful and regular, was one of the following kinds. 1. Death by the sword (יִפְלֹס, or יִפָּלָס), also simply יִפָּלָס; 2 Sam. i, 15; 2 Kings x, 25; Jer. xxvi, 23), by which, however, we are not to understand beheading (in 2 Kings x, 7, the bodies were probably desecrated after death), as the Rabbinists will have it (Mishna, Sanhed. vii, 3), a penalty that early occurs in Egypt (Gen. xi, 19), and later in the Roman period among the Jews, as the introduction of foreign princes (Matt. xiv, 10 sq.), and as is probably meant in Acts xii, 2 (comp. Josephus, Ant. xv, 1, 2); but the other party was strangled, as death, as the case might be. 2. Stoning (q. v.), since the shooting with a dart, mentioned in Exod. xix, 13, was only selected in place of this when an individual was to be put to death at a distance. These punishments were intensified by indignities to the corpse; namely, (a) burning (יָפָלָס), Lev. xx, 14; xxix, 9; compare Josh. vii, 15, 25; Gen. xxviii, 24; 1 Macc. iii, 6; see Michaelis in loc. (Note here we are not to think of a burning alive, we may gather from Josh. vii, 25; and it is the more probable from the procedure detailed in the Mishna (Sanhed. vii, 2), which directs that the delinquent's mouth should be forced open by a cloth drawn around the neck, and melted lead then be poured in! (b) Hanging (יָפָלָס), on a tree or post (Deut. xx, 22; Num. xxv, 4; comp. Josh. x, 26; 2 Sam. iv, 12). That we are here not to think of an execution of the dead body was often connected (2 Sam. iv, 12). The person hung was regarded as executed (Deut. xx, 23; comp. Gal. iii, 13), and was not allowed to remain suspended over night (Deut. xx, 23; comp. Josh. vii, 29; x, 26 sq.), through fear of tainting the atmosphere; the hanging alive (Theophyl. Supp., 25; Lips. 1726); 2 Macc. vi, 5). See John (the Apostle) An example of burning alive does not occur (2 Sam. xxii, 31, marg. יָפָלָס; see Thuanus, in loc.) until the time of Herod (Josephus, War, i, 33, 4); but in Egypt the vindictive Roman magistrates took pleasure in burning Jews (Philo, ii, 512, 527). No. 3. Cutting into the limbs (2 Sam. vii, 8, marg. יָפָלָס, etc. above, 15, etc.) are found in the Scriptures (Num. xvii, 30 sq., is not in point). 2. Cutting into the limbs (Dan. vii, 15). See Lion; Den. 3. Stuccofication in hot
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ashes (2 Macc. xiii, 5 sq.; comp. Valer. Max. ix, 2, 6, "He filled with ashes a place inclosed by high walls, with a beam projecting within, upon which he placed the doomed, so that, when overcome with drowningess, they fell into the insidious ash-heap below;" see Cles- siter, Per. 47) and his execrations on pieces children (sucklings) on the corners of walls, which occurred on the sack of cities (Isa. xiii, 16, 18; Hos. xiv, 1; Nah. iii, 10; comp. Psa. cxxxix, 7, 9, like the ripping open of pregnant women (2 Kings vii, 12, 16; Hos. xiv, 1; Amos i, 10), is, with the exception of 2 Kings vii, 16, the only instance of burial by drowning.

On crucifixion, see CruCRy. 5. Finally, drowning (καταφθορά, Matt. xviii, 6), and fighting with wild beasts (Ἐνιγμα, 1 Cor. xv, 32), are but casually alluded to in the N. T. Drowning, as a mode of inflicting death, is old (comp. Exod. i, 22). Among the Romans, those guilty of parricide were sewed in sacks (culei) and then drowned (Cicero, Rosc. Am. 25; ad Herenn. i, 13; Seneca, Clem. i, 15; Juvenal, viii, 214), but this in the time of the emperors came to be deemed an inhuman mode of execution (comp. Josephus, Ant. xiv, 18, 10; Suetonius, Caligula, 34; Schiller, m. 176; H. F. H. 17, 20; Schiller, m. 53; see Veil. ap. antiqu. Argent. xvii, 4). Such cruel punishments sometimes followed the mutilations of martydom (2 Macc. vii, 4, 7, 10). On theriomachy, see GAMES, and on the passage 5 Macc. 5, comp. Porphyry, Apollon. ii, 13, 7. See generally Carp., ibid. p. 341 sq.; Michel, De judicis paeneque capitabiibus in S. T. (Hal. 1749; also in Ugolini Theatur. xxvi, and Pott's Syll. v, 177 sq.); Jahn, Arch. Dil. ii, 347 sq.; Michel, Mosaisches Recht, v, 11 sq. COMPARE PUNISHMENT.

Executioner (συνεκτικον, for Lat. speculator, originally a scout, afterwards a life-guardian under the emperor), a member of the royal body-guard adopted by Herod in imitation of the Romans (see Tacitus, Hist. ii, 11; Suetonius, Claud. 35), and in accordance with Oriental despotism, and employed to execute his sentences in general. (See Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Speculators; Schwarz, De Speculatorius s. v. Romorum, Alt. 1726.) See CHAIR-TYIE.

In ancient times persons of the highest rank and station were employed to execute the sentence of the law. Thucydides, in the Egyptian court, mentioned in Genesis xxi, 36, is thought to have been "chief of the executioners," as in the margin of our version. See GUARD. This is still a high office in the East as a court office. Such executioners have nothing to do with carrying into effect the awards of the law in its ordinary course, but only with those of the king. It is there an office of great responsibility; and to insure its due and strict fulfilment, it is intrusted to an officer of the court, who has necessarily under his command a body of men whose duty it is to preserve the order and peace of the court and its precincts, and to attend and guard the royal person on public occasions; and, under the direction of their chief, to inflict such punishment as the king awards upon those who incur his displeasure. Potiphur, therefore, in this sense might be called captain of the guard. He had the general influence at the court (Gen. xl, 5). Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxxv, 8; Jer. xxviix, 9) and Arioch (Dan. ii, 14) held the same office. That the "captain of the guard" himself occasionally performed the duty of an executioner appears from 1 Kings xii, 7, viii, 12; and the words "captain of the high dignity, and something beyond the present position of the scribe of modern Egypt (comp. Lane, i, 183), with which Wilkinson (ii, 45) compares it. It is still not unusual for officers of high rank to inflict corporal punishment with their own hands (Wilkinson, ii, 43).

It does not appear that the Jews had public executioners, but the prince or general laid his commands on any of his attendants. Gideon commanded Jether, his eldest brother, to execute the kings of Midian; Saul ordered the footmen who stood around him, and were probably a chosen body of soldiers for the defence of his person, to put to death the priests of the Lord, and when they refused, Doeg, an Edomite, one of his principal officers, executed the command (1 Sam. xix, 19). Isaw the days of Saul, the reigning monarch commanded Beniaiah, the chief captain of his armies, to perform the duty of putting to death. Sometimes the chief magistrate executed the sentence of the law with his own hands; for when Jether shrank from the duty which his father required, Gideon, at that time the supreme magistrate in Israel, did not hesitate to do it himself. Thus also in Homer (Odys. xxi, 38; xliii, init.) we read that the exasperated Ulysses commanded his son Telema- chus to put, to death the suitors of Penelope, which he, like his father, is immovably done. In condemnations under the Mosaic law, the congregation or assembly of people executed the criminal, but the witnesses commenced the work of death (Lev. xxiv, 16; Deut. xvii, 7; John viii, 7; Acts v, 57-60). Executions in the East are often very prompt and arbitrary. In many cases, among the Greeks and Persians, it was the sooner entertained, or the cause of offence given, than the fatal order is issued, the messenger of death hurried to the unsuspecting victim, shows his warrant, and executes his order that instant in silence and solitude (2 Kings vi, 32; Prov. xvii, 14; Mark vi, 27). See PUNISH.

Exedra, buildings contiguous to the church. See CHURCH EDICIES.

Exegesis. See EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

Exegetical Collections. See CATENA; COM- MENTARIES.

Exegetical Theology, that branch of theology which treats of the exposition and interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. See ENCyclopedia OF THEOLOGY. Exegesis (ἐξηγησις) is statement, explanation, from ἐξηγοῦσα, I lead, describe, explain; and from this, an ἐξεγητ, ἐξηγητης, guide, interpreter. The word exegetical, then, includes all that belongs to explanation, and Exegetical Theology includes all that belongs to the explanation and interpretation of the holy scriptures.

1. Matter of Exegetical Theology.—The Bible, including both the O. and N. T., is the material on which the science of exegetical theology is employed. Some writers therefore designate it as Biblical theology; but the real work of exegesis is to gather from the word the material of Biblical theology, leaving the arrangement and co-ordination of this material to fall into a separate branch of the science. See BIBLICAL THEOLOGY; THEOLOGY. In fact, the results of exegetical study may fall, according to their nature, into historical, doctrinal, or practical theology. See BIBLE. As the Bible comes to us as the record of a revelation from God, its claims in this respect form the subject of a separate branch, entitled INSPIRATION (q. v.). The study of inspiration leads to the general question of the possibility and nature of REVELATION (q. v.).

2. Method of Exegetical Theology.—I. Philology.—As the Bible comes to us in ancient languages (Hebrew, Chaldean, Hellenistic Greek), the first requisite of exegesis is the knowledge of these languages, both as to their grammatical structure and their vocabula- ry. This is the domain of the science called Philology. The knowledge of classical Greek is of course presupposed, while Syriac, Samaritan, and Arabic are cognate and auxiliary. For details, see
the separate articles in this work on the various topics named.

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

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

4. Criticism.—Granting that we have certain books admitted to be canonical, the farther question arises, How do we know their writings to be genuine and correct forms? The answer to this question gives rise to the science of CRITICISM, which is divided into the lower or text-criticism, which seeks to ascertain the true and original reading of the text as accurately as possible, and the higher criticism, which examines into the historical genuineness, and authenticity of the books. The higher criticism seeks to distinguish the true from the false, and forms, to a certain degree, the basis of Apologetics (q. v.); the text-criticism distinguishes the original from the altered or corrupted. See CRITICISM.

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

III. Results or Products of Exegetical Theology. — The application of the laws of hermeneutics, and of the preparatory or propeductive sciences mentioned above, in practical work, is EXEGESIS. The fruit of this labor may appear, within the sphere of exegetical theology itself, in the sum of the books of the Bible, or of any of its parts [see VERSIONS]; or in commentaries on the Bible, or on separate books of the Bible, or on separate passages in any of the books. See COMMENTARIES. The principles and rules of exegesis are also to be used by the preacher in the preparation of his discourses for the communicants. See Pulpit, Lectures.

Most of the topics of exegetical theology are embraced in what is called Introduction to the Scriptures, a vague title, formerly much in use, but now giving way to more scientific and distinctive terms, such as LITURGICAL HISTORY OF THE BIBLE, for a general name, and the several titles mentioned above for special branches. The books on Introduction are often rather useful collections of propeductive knowledge than scientific treatises. See INTRODUCTION. There are no books in English treating exegetical theology as a separate branch in scientific form; but English literature abounds in excellent works on the several branches, which will be found indicated under the several titles in this Cyclopedia. The most important general works are: J. Banham, "Unity of the Scriptures," such as Horne, INTRODUCTION (new ed., London, 1860, 4 vols. 8vo); Davidson, INTRODUCTION to the N. T. (London, 1848-51 [Dr. Davidson's later writings are not so trustworthy as his earlier]); Westcott, INTRODUCTION to the Study of Ancient Scripture (with notes, London, 1871). On the literature, see farther under the head INTRODUCTION. On the scope of exegetical theology, and its relations to the other branches of the science, see Hagenbach, Encyklopädie und Methodologie (Leipzig, 1864, 7th edit, § 54-56); Marsch, Lectures on the Arrangement of the several Branches of Divinity (Cambridge, 1809, 8vo); Pelt, THEOL. Encyklopädie als System (Hamburg, 1843, 8vo), § 10-28; Clarisse, Encyklopädie Theologica Epist. (Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), sect. ii, ii; and our articles ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THEOLOGY; THEOLOGY.

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

1. Roman Catholic Church. — The first example of formal exemption is the release of monasteries from the episcopal jurisdiction. Many wealthy convents induced the popes, emperors, and kings to allow them a free election of their superiors, and a free administration of their property. Subsequently (in 858) the monastic orders were altogether exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, the members being subordinate only to their monastic superiors and the pope. The bishops incessantly labored for a restoration of their full jurisdiction, and the Council of Basilea (1438) favored them, but most of the monks sided with the monks rather than with the bishops. The Council of Trent granted most of the demands of the bishops, but the difficulties between bishops and monastic orders have never wholly ceased. Bishops sometimes are exempted from the usual subordination to an archbishop, being subordinate directly to the pope. Sometimes (as in Austria) the army was exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and placed under the jurisdiction of a special army-bishop.

2. Protestant Churches. — The Protestant state churches retain to a greater or less extent of the ecclesiastical law, the idea of exemption. The princes claimed for themselves exemption from the usual ecclesiastical jurisdiction; later, the same exemption was claimed for civil and military officers. In some countries the nobility also were exempt. In Prussia, a circular of the government in 1817 abolished all exemptions, but it was not executed. Churches which are based on the voluntary principle know of no exemption, because they compel none of their members to belong to any particular congregation.

In many parts of Germany, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed pastors had jurisdiction even over members of the two other churches; and the exemption of Protestants from Roman Catholic jurisdiction, and vice versa, is not yet fully carried through.

—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv; 266; Wetzer und Weite, Kirchen-Lex. iii. 841. (A. J. S.)

Exercises. Bodily (σωματικός) γυμνασία, i.e. physical exercises, see HEALTH. Physical exercises, i. T. 8, 4. V. 1, 4. The apostle seems to disparage under this term is not the athletic discipline which it classically imports (Arrian, Epict. i. 27, 6; Poliby. iv, 7, 6), and which his frequent allusions to the Grecian games (v. 4) might imply, but rather that ascetic mortification of the fleshly appetites, as: "Who among you has a servant plowing or keeping sheep, and will say to him when he has come from the field, Go and take a bath? do not forsake the congregation of saints (comp. v. 11, 2); Col. ii, 28), which characterized some of the Jewish
fanatics (ver. 7), especially the Essenes (q. v.).—Fleischmann, Interpretatio, in loc.; Seelen, De Gymnasia adque Paulus (in hoc loc. aludit) (Lutecia, 1586). See TIMOTHEUS.

Exercises, Spiritual (exercitia spiritualia), a title given by Romanists to certain exercises held under the leadership generally of a confessor (magister exercitiorum), for spiritual edification. They consist, generally, in alternate meditations and prayers at regularly appointed times, often based on some text from the Bible, with an occasional reading, fusion, etc. These exercises are practiced both by clergy and laity, especially before communion, and as preparatory to the great Church festivals. Especially before ordination to the priesthood, such exercises are not only commanded, but required of candidates. The most elaborate form of the exercises is that of Ignatius Loyola. His method received the approbation of the pope, and Alexander VII granted, in a brief dated Oct. 12, 1657, full assent to all, whether priests or laity, who should submit to them for eight days in the houses of the Company of Jesus. These exercises consist in alternate meditations, readings, oral prayers, and self-scrutiny, as special preparation for the reception of the sacraments of penitence and communion. In case of there being several persons exercising together, silence is recommended as a duty. The new missions established among the heathen by Dr. Robert H. Benson and the use of these exercises, transforming the work of sanctification into a dead mechanical action.—Iherzig, Real-Encyklop. III, 289; Aschbach, Allg. Kirchen-Lex. II, 707; Ferraris, Prompta Bibliotheca, III, 916 sq. See Bellicaud, Medallia ex erarum ad exercitia Sancti Patris Ignatii (new ed. in Westhoff); and the articles Jesuits and Loyola.

Exhortation (παρακάτασπα, strictly a calling near, invitation, and so "entreaty," 2 Cor. viii, 4; hence admonition, special hortatory instruction in public, Luke iii, 18; Acts xiii, 15; 1 Tim. iv, 13; also "consolation" or form of the exercises is that of Ignatius Loyola. As it is, it was doubtless a subordinate exercise of the general faculty of teaching (1 Cor. xv, 32). Oehlerhausen (Comment. in loc.) thinks that Paul does not distinguish it as a special charism, but rather regards it as co-ordinate with eldership. See Gift (Spiritual).

2. It is defined as "the act of laying such motives before a person as may excite him to the performance of anything that he may be desirous or duty bound to do; the latter principally endeavors to convince the understanding, and the former to work on the affections. It is considered as a great branch of preaching, though not confined to that, as a man may exhort, though he do not preach; though a man can hardly be said to preach if he do not exhort. See Exhorters. The Scriptures enjoin ministers to exhort men, that is, to exhort them to duty by proposing suitable motives (Isa. lviii. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Heb. iii, 13; Rom. xvii. 8); it was likewise the constant practice of prophets, apostles, and Christ himself (Isa. i, 17; Jer. iv, 14; Ezek. xxxvii; Luke iii, 18; xii, 3; Acts xi, 21)" (Dictionary, s. v.). "The above, and numerous other passages of Scripture, indicate several important particulars: 1. That it was not beneath the dignity, or foreign to the office of the inspired apostles, frequently to exhort. They did not in like manner exercise the same practice and the duty of exhortation upon young ministers of their day. 3. That exhortation, as separate from preaching, was the special office of a certain class of religious teachers in the New Testament Church. 4. That mutual exhortation for their own profit and edification was enjoined by the apostles upon Christians generally." (Kidder, Homiletica, p. 100.) See Exhorters.

3. In the book of Common Prayer, the short address of the minister to the people in the daily service, in the communion office, and in the office for the visita-
tion of the sick, are called Exhortations. The first of these, beginning, "Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us for, etc., was introduced into the English formulary at the Reformation. Palmer (Orig. Liturg., ii, 211) compares it to a passage in a sermon of Avitus of Vienne, fifth century. Procter (Common Prayer, p. 206) remarks that "it was constructed partly from the preceding sentences, and partly by adaptations from earlier forms." The formulary of this exhortation, with the other opening portions of morning prayer, is chiefly due to a ritual drawn up by Calvin for the church at Strasbourg, entitled La Forme des Prières et Chantons ecclésiastiques (Strasbourg, 1546). See Baird, Eucharist (N. York, 1855, p. 191). The exhortations to the communion were also introduced at the Reformation. "The ancient Church, indeed, had no such exhortations, for their daily, or at least weekly, communions made it known that there was then no solemn assembly of Christians without it, and every one (not under censure) was expected to communicate. But now, when the time is somewhat uncertain, and our long omissions have made some of us ignorant, and others forgetful of this duty; most of us unwilling, and all of us more or less indisposed for it, it was thought both prudent and necessary to provide these exhortations, which give warning of the communion, which it is always to do upon the Sunday or some holy day immediately preceding" (Wheatly, On Common Prayer, p. 284). The second exhortation was compiled apparently by Peter Martyr at the instance of Bucer (Procter, On Common Prayer, p. 244).

Exhorters, a class of lay persons licensed in the Methodist Episcopal Church to exhort, not to preach. The leaders' meeting (q. v.), or class (q. v.), recommend such persons, and the preacher issues the license. The duties of an exhorter are "to hold meetings for prayer and exhortation wherever opportunity is afforded, subject to the direction of the preacher in charge; to attend all the sessions of the Quarterly Conference; be subject to an annual examination of character in the Quarterly Conference, and renewal of license annually by the presiding elder, or preacher having the charge, if approved by the Quarterly Conference." This office has been found very useful, both in the edification of the Church, and in developing the talent of persons likely to be called to the ministry.—Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1868, p. 113, 114.

Exile (only occurs of an expatriated person, ἐξαίρεσθαι, sent, sent, "captivity exilis," Isa. xi, 14; רֵס, גֵּס, a transported captive, as elsewhere often [see BANISH], ASYRIOS-BABYLONIAN, of the Israelitish nation (comp. Cellarius, Dissert. p. 178 sq.) See also Captivity.

1. Of the kingdom of Israel, as early as the time of Pekah (q. v.), B.C. cir. 741. Tiglath Pileser (q. v.), in accordance with a cardinal maxim of Oriental despotism (compare Heeren, Iliren, 1, 1, 406 sq.; Gesenius, Isaiah, i, 949), transported to Assyria (2 Kings xv, 29; comp. Isa. xxv, 14, as a part of the division of the kingdom, and the trans-Jordanic provinces (Gilead). A still earlier deportation (1 Chron. v, 26) seems to have been made by Pul (q. v.). After the destruction of Samaria (q. v.) and the entire northern state (B.C. 720) by Shalmaneser (q. v.), the same fate overtook all the distinguished and serviceable Israelites (2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 9 sq.; 1 Chron. v, 26). They were assigned a residence on the Chaboras, in Mesopotamia [see HABOR], and in Media (comp. Josephus, Ant. x, 14, 1), and there established the worship of Jehovah after their corrupt fashion (2 Kings xviii, 27 sq.). See Assyria, Exequias, a de decem tribis Israel (in his Egyptiaca, p. 318 sq.); Michaelis, De exilio de decem tribi-

The Babylonian exile thus began with the Jews partially in B.C. 598, but generally in B.C. 588. It ended in the first year of the reign of Cyrus (over Babylon), i.e., B.C. 536, and therefore lasted strictly 52½ years (xxxi, 11; compare 2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; 2 Esdr. 1, 12; viii, 5; Josephus, War, v, 9, 4), which assigns it a length of 70 years, is to be understood as computed from Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Western Asia in B.C. 606, when, as appears from Dan. i, 1 sq., some of the members of the royal family of Judah were carried into captivity, in fulfilment of Isa. xxxix, 6, 7. (See Offerhaus, Specigulium, p. 181 sq.; Schröer, Regn. Babyl., p. 286 sq.). This was the more natural epoch to the Jews, inasmuch as from that time Nebuchadnezzar became to all intents and purposes the liege lord of the Jewish people's 18th year in the above table we see the years of his reign are dated accurately. It is a remarkable coincidence that from the date of the destruction of the Temple, B.C. 586 (2 Kingsxxxv, 8), to the time of its complete restoration, B.C. 517 (Ezra vi, 15), is precisely the commemorated (and sacred) period of 70 years, which is exclusively employed as an era by the sacred writers (Ezek. xi, 1).

Other very strained conceptions as to this time are those of Behm (in Iken and Hase's Theur, theol. philol., i, 354 sq.), Bengel (Ordo temporum, p. 158 sq.), etc. The only date (comparable) is given in exclusively referred to (Handbuch d. Chronol., i, 590), Gramberg (Religionist, i, 388 sq.) and Hitzig (Jerem. p. 230) think the 70 years merely a round number. See SEV EN YEARS' CAPTIVITY.

The condition of the Hebrews in the exilé was certainly, as a general thing, not so severe (Jahn, Archäol. II, i, 190 sq.; Bertholdt, Zeitleit. z. Dan., p. 508 sq.). (a) The books of Kings mention only two deportations: the first occurred after the surrender of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar, in the time of Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxiv, 14 sq.; comp. Jer. xxvii, 20, 21), in this was involved Mordecai (Esth. ii, 6), and it befell (besides the king himself) the affluent and useful citizens, 10,000 and upwards in number (Josephus says 10,832, Ant. x, 7, 1); the second was the result of a formal capture of Jerusalem by assault of the Chaldeans in the time of Zedekiah, and was effected by the Chaldean army (in that prince's 18th year) Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv, 11). Only the common people, devoted to agriculture, remained (2 Kings xxv, 12, 22). (b) The books of Chronicles expressly record only the carrying away under Zedekiah (2 Chron. xxxvi, 20), while (ver. 10), in mentioning the transportation of King Jehoiachin, they say nothing of any deportation of the people at that time. (c) Jer. iii, 28 sq., specifies three distinct carriages away, and assigns to each not only the number of those deported, but also a date: namely, the first deportation in the 7th year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 608), which consisted of 3023 Jews; the second in the 18th of Nebuchadnezzar, of 882 chiefs of Jerusalem; the third in the 23d of Neb., of 745 individuals. Finally (d), according to Dan. i, 1, 3 sq., as early as the 3d year of Jehoiakim's reign, some Jewish youths of noble families (among them Daniel himself) must have been carried to Babylon. These difficulties (see Hengstenberg, Genuineness of Daniel [Clarke's ed.], p. 43 sq., against De Wette, in the Hist. Encyclop. xxiii, 7 sq.; Lengerke, Daniel, p. 18 sq.) are readily adjusted by observing, 1st, that the years of Nebuchadnezzar in this passage of history are to be referred to his full reign from the throne of Babylon (the beginning of B.C. 604), while those in Kings are reckoned from the epoch of his vicereignship, a little over one year earlier [see NEBUCHA DNEZZAR] ; and, 2ly, that the apparent discrepancy in the number of citizens transported naturally arises from the different manner in which they are enumerated and classified in the several narratives. Thus viewed, the transactions will appear concisely as follows:

1. (Early in B.C. 606.) Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, in the 8th, or, according to some of the latest writers, in the 9th year of Jehoiakim (Dan. i, 1). 2. (Summer of B.C. 606.) Subjugation by Nebuchadnezzar in his first associate year, and the 4th of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxvii, 2). At the same time the sacred vessels (2 Chron. xxxvi, 1), a few royal youths were taken away as hostages, including Daniel and his companions (Dan. i, 2 sq.). 3. (Spring of B.C. 606.) First general deportation, in the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (Jer. iii, 28), or the 8th of his vicereignship (2 Kings xxv, 12), and the beginning of Jehoiachin's reign (2 Kings xxiv, 2), when 3925 eminent Jews (Jer. iii, 28), including the king (2 Chron. xxxvi, 10), his family, and officers (2 Kings xxiv, 14), such men as Mordecai (Esth. ii, 6), also some 700 warriors (2 Kings xxiv, 16), were carried away, making about 10,000 individuals of note (2 Kings xxiv, 14). 4. (circa B.C. 600.) Second deportation, in B.C. 600, the 18th of Nebuchadnezzar's 18th year of reign (Jer. iii, 29), or the 9th of his vicereignship (2 Kings xxv, 19), when, besides the king of the sacred vessels (2 Chron. xxxvi, 18), 3838 more of the principal men who had by that time rallied to Jerusalem were taken away (2 Kings xxv, 19). These two events are especially cited (2 Kings xxv, 11), and leaving but the commonest agricultural laborers (2 Kings xxv, 12),

4. (Early in B.C. 596.) Final deportation. In Nebuchadnezzar's 23rd year (Jer. iii, 20), when the last 745 private persons (Jer. iii, 20) who had not fled to Egypt (Jer. xxxr, 5 sq.), nor been included in the first deportations (2 Kings xxv, 16), were taken away-making 4600 definitely enumerated (Jer. iii, 20), but including some 11,000 males born in the land, their wives, children, and dependents, from Jerusalem and its vicinity alone, and a proportionate number from the residue of the country of Judæa.

Partly translated and revised from the King James Version.
only of such exiles as had been carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, and in the list there following there are (besides priests and Levites) only recited Judahites and Benjamites; nor can "Israel" (ver. 59; compare Neh. vii. 51) be there referred to the former kingdom so called, but to the remnant of Judahatics after the exiles of Ezra. xxxvii. 11 sq., had, moreover, not at that time been fulfilled (the date in 1 Chron. 26 is uncertain; Keil, On Kings, p. 497, n.); (See Witsius, Διακοηγωα, p. 344 sq.; Ritter, Erdrk. x, 250.) Yet it cannot well be believed that any of the exiles from the northern kingdom were likewise on account of the decree of Cyrus, and at the time included in his dominions, did eventually join their Jewish brethren, if not in some of the homeward expeditations named in Scripture as having taken place under Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, yet in some smaller, later, or less distinguished companies. This supposition is not only justified by the nature of the case, but fortified by the numerous intimations in the prophecies (e. g. Jer. 1, 4, 5, 17-20, 33-35) coupling the return of both the kingdoms (see Meth. Quart. Review, July, 1855, p. 419 sq.), and is well-nigh established by the Palestinian occurrence in a late age of individuals from the northern tribes (e. g. Luke ii, 36; comp. Acts xxvi, 7). What proportion thus returned we have no means of determining; it was doubtless small, as was indeed that of the exiles from the southern tribes compared with the great mass who remained in the lands of their late home, now become their home. Community of lot must have drawn both branches of the common stock of Israel nearer together during the captivity under the same heathen government, and it is altogether likely that in a few centuries those who permanently remained lost all trace of the sectarian distinction that had once estranged "Jewish and Ephraim." See RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

The descendants of those who did not return are centred at certain points, especially Babylon (q. v.), where they afterwards became celebrated for their Jewish schools of Rabbinical Literature; or, as was chiefly the case, it may be presumed, with the more distant and earlier removed ten tribes, wandered still farther in numerous Jewish colonies into the Medo-Babylonian provinces (Lightfoot, Append. to Hor. Hor., in Acts, p. 264 sq.), remnants of which have survived down to this day (Ben. of Shemen, in Ritter, Erdrk. x, 241 sq.). It is possible even that the Samaritans may have owed their mongrel origin to some such source (Gesenius, De Pentat. Samar. p. 4), as they were transplanted to Palestine before the destruction of Jerusalem, and yet were named Jews, and yet it is more probable that they allowed a partial amalgamation with the heathen whence they came to have taken place, and especially as they had only the Pentateuch (Paulus, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. i, 981). From the provinces of the Persian empire the Jewish colonists may readily have spread into Arabia, India, and even China. Wild attempts at their discovery have been abundantly made, such as those of Adair (History of the American Indians, London, 1775), Noah (The American Indians the Descendants of the ten Lost Tribes of Israel, N. Y. 1835), and Grant (Narratives, or the Lost Tribes, N. Y. 1841). See DISPERSED JEWS.

Examination. See CHRISTOLOGY (vol. ii, p. 281, col. 2).

Existence of God. See GOD.

Exocontians (or EXOCONTIANS, EXOCONTIANDO), a name given to the strict Arians, because they maintained that Christ was created εις αυτον, before the beginning of things. They were also called Anomocans, Aostians. See these titles, and also ARIANS.

Exode of the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan (usually referred to in Heb. by the phrase יִתְנַשְׁאָה בְּאֶרֶץ בָּאָרֵךְ אֶת-אֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ כָּנָאָן), "The Lord did bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt," Exod. xii. 51: to which is often emphatically added, יִתְנַשְׁאָה בְּאֶרֶץ בָּאָרֵךְ אֶת-אֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ כָּנָאָן, "with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm," Deut. xxxi. 8, to express the miraculous interventions of Providence in the series of events), the great national epoch of the Hebrew people, in fact their "independence day," and as such consecrated (see in all its historical sequence and vaticinations. Several of the Psalms are but a poetical rehearsal of its scenes (e. g. Psa. cxxix, cxxxvi); it is the burden of Habakkuk's lofty ode (Hab. ii) and besides the recapitulation of many of its incidents by Moses in Deuteronomy, it constitutes the main text of the books of the Hexateuch. The following account, including especially the date of the event, and the identifications of the place of crossing the Red Sea and of the stations in the desert, is a resume of nearly all the important matters not treated by us under other heads. See EXODUS.

I. Date.—The particular Egyptian monarch under whom this great event, the first definite link of Hebrew with other ancient history, occurred, is so differently identified with those of early profane chronicles, and of the monuments by various Egyptianologists, that but little reliance, unfortunately, can be placed upon any date based on them, as they are entirely upon conjectural adaptations or arbitrary premises. The one only of these hypotheses that seems to afford any independent evidence of agreement is that lately propounded by Osborn (in the Journal of Sac. Lit. for July, 1869), who conceives that the Egyptian king in question was called Seth I, the grandson of the great Osiris, but of so odious a character and so inglorious a reign that his sarcophagus was demolished and his cartouche effaced by the early Egyptians themselves. See PHARAOH.

This king, however, began to reign about B.C. 1340, a date entirely too late for the event under consideration. The historical question is, in fact, the same with this point are noticed under EGYPT. Hale places the Exode in B.C. 1648, Usher in B.C. 1491, Bunsen in B.C. 1530, and Poole in B.C. 1620. A careful collation of the Biblical elements of the calculation, the only definite and trustworthy data, point to the spring of B.C. 1658 as the most probable date of the beginning of the series of exodic transactions. See Chronology.

As to the account of the Exode given by Manetho, it was confessedly a mere popular story, for, although he admitted it was not a part of the Egyptian records, he laid it out a tale which he called "of Joseph, the great priestess of Tanit, the daughter of the gods, with Joseph the high priest, who had a dominion over the land of Egypt, and who was called Solomoni," Josephus, c. Apost., i, 16. A critical examination shows that it is not even a claim to be a veritable tradition of the Exode: it is, indeed, if based on any such tradition, so distorted that it is impossible to be sure that it relates to the king whose reign it is assigned. Yet, upon the supposition that the king is really Menephtah, son of Ramesses I, the advocates of the Rabbinical date entirely base their adjustment of Hebrew with Egyptian history at this period. See MANETHO.

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

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

On the night of the self-same day that terminated a period of 430 years, during which they had been in Egypt, were they led forth from Rameses or Goshen. They are not said to have crossed the River Nile, whence it may infer that Goshen lay on the eastern side of the river. Their first station was at Succoth (Exod. xiiii. 87). See Succoth. The nearest way into the Land of Promise was through the land of the Philistines. This route would have required them to keep on in a north-east direction. It pleased their divine conductor however, not to take this road, lest being opposed by the Philistines, the Israelites should turn back at the sight of war into Egypt. If, then, Philistia was to be avoided, the course would lie nearly direct east, or south-east. Pursuing this route, "the armies" come to Etham, their next station, "in the edge of the wilderness" (Exod. xiiii. 17, 18). The expression used, ἐλίκοις, does not necessarily imply a change in the direction of the journey, but may mean that God did not lead the Israelites into Palestine by the nearest route, but took them about by the way of the wilderness. Were the meaning that the people turned, we should have to suppose Rameses to have been beyond the valley to the west, and this would probably make the distance to the Red Sea too great for the time occupied in traversing it, besides overthrowing the reasonable identification of the land of Goshen. Rameses is evidently the Ra-maze of Gen. xlix. 11. It seems to have been a chief town of the land of Goshen, for that region, or possibly a part of it, is called the land of Rameses in Gen. xlvii. 11; comp. 4. 6. See Rameses.

1. The direct route thence to the Red Sea was along the valley of the ancient canal. If, however, they rendezvoused near the metropolis, their route would be different. From the vicinity of Cairo there runs a range of hills eastward to the Red Sea, the western extremity of which, not far from Cairo, is named Jebel Mokattam; the eastern extremity is termed Jebel Ataka, which, with its promontory Ras Ataka, runs into the Red Sea. Between the two are the fugitive rivers, nowhere about the middle of the range, is an opening which affords a road for caravans. Two routes offered themselves here. Supposing that the actual starting-point lay nearer Cairo, the Israelites might strike in from the north of the range of hills at the opening which affords a road to a promontory on a river, which leads from Cairo to Suez; or they might go southward from Mokattam, through the wady e-Tih, that is, the Valley of Wandering, through which also a road, though less used, runs to Suez. According to Niebuhr, they took the first; according to the ancient tradition, Father Sicard (Ueber der Weg der Israeliten, Paulus (Samml. v. 211 sq.), and others, they took the
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was. Sicard found traces of the Israelites in the valley. He held Rameses to be the starting-point, and Rameses he placed about six miles from ancient Cairo, where the present village of Famagusta (ancient Tanis) stands, on a sandy plain, on which Sicard thinks the Israelites assembled on the morning when they began their journey. In this vicinity a plain is still found, which the Arabs call the Jews' Cemetery, and where, from an indefinite period, the Jews have buried their dead. In the same valley, and on the north side of the village called Mejamet Musa, "Moses' Station." On another hill in the vicinity ruins are found, which the Arabs name Meravad Musa, "Moses' Delight." Thus several things seem to carry the mind back to the time of the Hebrew legislator. Through the valley which leads from the site of Tell-el-Abyad to the south side of Mount Sinai, and thence to the Red Sea. Sicard travelled in three days. He reckons the length to be twenty-six hours, which, if we give two miles to each hour (Robinson), would make the distance fifty-two miles. This length is also assigned by Girard (Descrip. Topogr. de la Vallée de l'Égyp.terment). The valley, running pretty much in a plain surface, would afford a convenient passage to the mixed bands of Israelites. About eighteen miles from Beizatin you meet with Gendelly, a plain with a fountain. The name signifies a military station, and in this Sicard finds traces of an Exod. xxiii, 20, to be on the edge of the wilderness. Jaloniski says the word means "terminus murs," the termination or boundary of the valley. Now, in the plain where Sicard fixes Etham (not to be confounded with the Eastern Etham, through which afterwards the Israelites travelled three days, Num. xxxiii, 8), is the spot where the waters divide which run to the Nile, to Suez, and Etham is therefore truly terminus murs.

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

2. At the end of the second day's march, for each camping-place seems to mark the close of a day's journey, the route appears to have been altered from the natural thoroughfare behind the head of the gulf. The first passage relating to the journey, after the mention of the encamping at Etham, is this, stating a command given to Moses: "Take unto the children of Israel that they turn [or 'return'] and encamp [or 'that they encamp again,' אֶרְבַּעַנְתֻּם יַעֲקֹב יִנְסְדוּךָ] before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon" (Exod. xiv, 2). This explanation is added: "And Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel, They are] encamped in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in" (ver. 3). The rendering of the A.V., "That they turn and encamp," seems to us the more probable of the two, and that "they turn" is the closer translation, but appears to be difficult to reconcile with the narrative of the route; for the more likely inference is that the direction was changed, not that the people returned: the third rendering does not appear probable, as it does not explain the entanglement. It is most likely that they at once turned, although they may have done so later in the march. The direction of the camps, however, for they would have been entangled (ver. 5) only by turning upward, not northward. They encamped' for the night by the sea, probably after a full day's journey. Pi-hahiroth (the mouth of the hiding-places) Sicard identifies with Taurek (small caves), which is the name still given to the river springs of the Red Sea. The mouth of the river is on the south side of Mount Attaka, which last Sicard identifies with Baal-zephon, and which is the northern boundary of the plain of Baileah, while Kulalah (Migdol) is its southern limit. But we would prefer to transpose these names, assigning Migdol to Jebel Attaka, and Baal-zephon to Jebel Dara or Kulalah, while Wady Tuwarik will remain for Pi-hahiroth. (See each in its order.) The pass which leads to Suez, between Attaka and the sea, is very narrow, and could easily be stopped by the Egyptians. In this plain of Baileah Pharaoh had the Israelites hemmed in on all sides. This, then, according to all appearance, is the spot where the passage through the sea was effected. Such is the judgment of Sicard and of Raumer (Der Zog der Israeliten, Leipzig, 1857; for a description of the Valley of Wandering, see also Ritter, Erdkunde, i, 688). It is unreasonable to doubt that this was the situation of the case. Equally does the spot correspond with the miraculous narrative furnished by holy writ. A different route is laid down by Niebuhr (Arab. p. 407). Other writers, who, like him, endeavor to explain the facts without the aid of miracle, imitate his example. (See EXOD.

It is no small corroboration of the view now given from Sicard and Raumer that in substance it has the support of Josephus, of whose account we shall, from its importance, give an abridgment. The Hebrews, he says, took their journey by Latopolis, where Fayum was built, and through this valley the Egyptian army, which had been inaccessible precipices and the sea; for there was on each side a ridge of mountains that terminated at the sea, which were impassable, and obstructed their flight. Moses, however, prayed to God, and smote the sea with his rod, when the waters parted, and gave the Israelites free passage. The Egyptians at first supposed them distracted; but when they saw the Israelites proceed in safety, they followed. As soon as the entire Egyptian army was in the channel, the sea closed, and the pursuers perished amid torrents of rain and the most terrific thunder and lightning (Ant. ii. 15; xxx. 5).

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

1. It is usual to suppose that the most northerly place at which the Red Sea could have been crossed is the present head of the Gulf of Suez. This supposition depends upon the idea that in the time of Moses the gulf did not extend farther to the northward than at present. An examination of the country north of Suez has convinced some geographers, however, that the sea has receded many miles, and that this change has taken place within the historical period, possibly in fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah (xi, 15; xix, 5; comp.
Zech. x, 11). The old bed is thought by them to be indicated by the Birket et-Timnah, or "Lake of the Crocodile," and the more southern bitter lakes, the northermost part of the former corresponding to the ancient head of the gulf. In previous centuries it is not supposed that the gulf extended farther north, but that it was deeper in its northermost part. We may reasonably infer that the Israelites believed, if it ever took place, cannot materially affect the question of the place of the Israelites' passage.

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

2. A careful examination of the narrative of the passage of the Red Sea is necessary to a right understanding of the event. When the Israelites had departed, Pharaoh repented that he had let them go. News is carried to the monarch which leads him to see that his decision (namely, that the Egyptians in the wilderness) is but a pretext; that the Israelites had really fled from his yoke; and also that, through some (to him) unaccountable error, they had gone towards the south-east, had reached the sea, and were hemmed in on all sides. He summons his troops and sets out in pursuit of the Israelites and the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen and his army; and he "overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Raal-zephon" (Exod. xiv. 9). It might be conjected, from one part of the narrative (ver. 1-4), that he determined to give chase on the following day, and that he knew that when they had encamped before Pi-hahiroth, did not what follows this imply that he set out soon after they had gone, and also indicate that the place in question refers to the pursuit through the sea, not to that from the city whencesoever he started (ver. 5-10). This city was probably Zoan, and could scarcely have been much nearer to Pi-hahiroth, and the distance is therefore too great to have been twice traversed, first by those who told Pharaoh, then by Pharaoh's army, within a few hours. The strength of Pharaoh's army is not further specified than by the statement that "he took six hundred chosen chariots, and [or 'even'] all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them" (ver. 7). The war-chariots of the Egyptians held each but two men, an archer and a charioteer. The former must be intended by the word דְּבָרָא, rendered in the A.V. "captains." Throughout the narrative the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh are mentioned, and "the horse and his rider" (xx. 21) are spoken of in Miriam's song, but we can scarcely infer hence that there was in Pharaoh's army a body of horsemen as well as of men in chariots, as in ancient Egyptian the chariot-force is always called HTAR or HETRA, "the horse," and these expressions may therefore be respectively pleonastic and poetical. There is no evidence in the records of the ancient Egyptians that the term used casually, and, therefore, had the Biblical narrative expressly mentioned a force of this kind, it might have been thought conclusive of the theory that the Pharaoh of the Exode was a shepherd-king. With this army, which, even if exaggerated, might have been in comparison with the Israelitis multitude, encumbered with women, children, and cattle, Pharaoh overtook the people "en-
other to fly from the face of Israel. Then was Moses commanded again to stretch out his hand, and the sea returned to its strength and overwhelmed the Egyptians, of whom not one remained alive (ver. 25-26).

This statement removes all reason to doubt that Pharaoh himself, the great offender, was at last made an example, and perished with his army, did it not seem to be distinctly stated in Exod. cxxxvi that he was included in the same destruction (ver. 16). The sea cast up the dead Egyptians, whose bodies bedewed the Israelites saw upon the shore. From that song of triumph which Moses sang upon this occasion we learn some other particulars, as that "the depths covered Pharaoh's host, they sank to the bottom as a stone;" language which, whatever deduction may be made for its poetic character, implies that the miracle took place in deep water (Esth. xiv. 26; comp. Ps. cxvi. 9 sq.). In a later passage some particulars are mentioned which are not distinctly stated in the narrative in Exodus. The place is indeed a poetical one, but its meaning is clear, and we learn from it that at the time of the passage of the sea there was a storm of rain, with thunder and lightning. We are thus reminded of the tradition by which the Egyptians were destroyed by an earthquake (Psa. lxvii, 15-20). To this Paul may allude where he says that the fathers "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. xii, 2); for the idea of baptism seems to involve either immersion or sprinkling, and the ancients would hardly have here occurred: the reference is evidently to the pillar of the cloud: it would, however, be impious to attempt an explanation of what is manifestly miraculous. These additional particulars may illustrate the trouble of the Egyptians, for their chariots may have been turned to horses' hoofs.

Here, at the end of their long oppression, delivered finally from the Egyptians, the Israelites glorified God. In what words they sang their praise we know from the Song of Moses, which, in its vigorous brevity, represents the events of that memorable night, scarcely one of the wealth and spirit of the Psalms. Pharaoh sent his chariots and his horsemen after them, and they overtook them, the Israelites. His chariots were filled with the sea, and his horsemen went into the sea. In the morning, when the sun rose, there was thick fog, and the Egyptians came to search for the shepherd's stock. They thus not only proved the truth of the song (Exod. xlv. 26), but were greatly garbled in the account in favor of the Egyptians. See HERS.

Endeavors have been made to explain away the miraculous character of the passage of the Red Sea. It has been argued that Moses might have carried the Israelites over by a ford, and that an earthquake might have overwhelmed the Egyptians. But no real diminution of the wonder is thus effected. How was it that the sea admitted the passing of the Israelites, and drowned Pharaoh and his army? How was it that it was shallow at the right time, and deep at the right time? (Exod. xiv, 26; comp. Job xxi, 18; ver. 19 is probably a kind of comment, not part of the song). Moses seems to have sung this song with the men, Miriam with the women also singing and dancing, or perhaps there were two choruses (ver. 20, 21). Such a picture does not recur in the history of our earlier times. The triumphal song of Deborah, nor the rejoicing when the Temple was recovered from the Syrians, celebrated so great a deliverance, or was joined in by the whole people. In leaving Goshen, Israel became a nation; after crossing the Desert they were a people. There is no evidence that significance, as we have suggested, in Paul's use of this miracle as a type of baptism; for, to make the analogy complete, it must have been the beginning of a new period of the life of the Israelites.

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

It may be objected that it is there seems to have been no record or tradition of this miracle among the Egyptians. This question involves that of the time in Egyptian history to which this event should be assigned. The date of the Exode, according to different cronologers, varies more than three hundred years; the dates of the Egyptian dynasties ruling during this period of three hundred years vary fully one hundred years. The two principal dates for the Exode may be assigned therefore as virtually corresponding to four hundred years of Egyptian history. If the lowest date of the beginning of the 18th dynasty be taken, and the highest date of the Exode, both which we consider the most probable of those that have been conjectured in the two cases, the Israelites were in Egypt in a period of which monuments or other records are almost wholly wanting. Of the 18th and subsequent dynasties we have as yet no continuous history, and rarely records of events which occurred in a succession of years. We know much of many reigns, and of some we can be almost (lory that they could), and correspond to that of the Pharaoh of the Exode.

We can in no case expect a distinct Egyptian monumental record of so great a calamity, for the monuments only record success; but it might be related in a papyrus. There would doubtless have long remained a popular tradition of the events of the Exode (contra Apionem, sec. xiv. 14, 28), to have greatly garbled the account in favor of the Egyptians.

The route taken by Moses was, according to Robinson, from Rameses to the head of the Arabian Gulf, through the Red Sea to Succoth to Etham. The last place he fixes on the edge of the desert, on the eastern side of the line of the gulf. Instead of passing down the eastern side, at the top of which they were, the Israelites thence marched down the western side of the arm of the gulf, stopping in the vicinity of Succoth, where the attempt to interpret the view of the miracle, however, entirely fails to satisfy the Scripture account, and has been amply refuted by Dr. Olin (Travels in the East, N.Y. 1843) and others. (See the account of Mr. Blumhardt's visit, Oct. 1886, in the Church Missionary Record, Jan. 1887, "The Dead Sea," p. 58; Daily Bible Illustration, ii, 95.) Some of the supposed Red Sea anciently extended farther north, and have sought to identify the localities of the passage on that theory (see Sharpe in Bartlett's Forty Days in the North, p. 22 sq.); but this is quite improbable and without evidence. Another theory (Dr. Darlington, Observations on the East, 1, 254) makes the Israelites to have turned from the vicinity of the bitter lakes to the western side of the head of Szueh, and
so to have followed the shore to the plain of Baidalah, at the mouth of wady Tuwarik, and there crossed; but if (as some travellers affirm) there is room for such a passage along the shore by Ras Attaka, the Israelites might have escaped by the same route by simply retreating, or, if that had been prevented by the Egyptians following along the same path behind them, they might still have fled up the wady Tih and thence around Jebel Attaka and the head of the sea. A still later view (Captain Moresby, in Alston’s *Lands of the Messiah*, p. 107) places the scene of the passage still farther south, at the mouth of the next valley opening off the Red Sea, which no one has ever disputed, and it would be difficult to show how the Israelites could have reached this spot from their former position in the edge of the wilderness, and it would also bring them out too far south on the other side of the Red Sea. Indeed, the mountains approach so steeply the shore all along at certain points that they could only have escaped at the valley or plain of Baidalah, where we have supposed the passage to have been made, by turning sharply at Etham around the western base of Mount Attaka, and so partly back into the wady et-Tih, through which they were immediately pursued by the Egyptians. In this manner they were completely hemmed in, and drove them forward to the extreme edge of the shore projecting in front of Mount Attaka, around which they were unable to escape. Here it was that Providence opened to them a miraculous path through the deep waters to the opposite point (at the mouth of which the Israelites are still slaves) and thence to the Red Sea, which they crossed. It was at Sinai, and in Moses, which doubtless derived their name from the first encampment of the Hebrews after their rescue.

See Red Sea.

IV. The Route from the Red Sea to Sinai.—When safe on the northwestern shore of the Red Sea, they might have traversed the desert of Paran, following the pilgrim road of the present day to Elath, and, turning to the north, have made for Palestine. In order to accomplish this, however, hostile hordes and nations would have to be encountered, whose superior skill and experience in war might have put to flight the comparatively ignorant and weak Israelites. Wisely, therefore, did their leader take a course which necessitated the lapse of time, and gave promise of affording intellectual and moral discipline of the highest value. He resolved to led his flock to Sinai, in order that they might see the wonders there to be exhibited, and by that means be made a people. On the journey thither, might the great leader hope that the moral brand which slavery had imprinted on his people would be effaced, and that they would acquire that self-respect, that regard to God’s will, that capacity of self-guidance which alone could have led to a blessing to the nation, and enable Moses to realize on their behalf the great and benign intentions which God had led him to form. There were, however, two ways by which he might reach Sinai. By following a south-easterly direction, and proceeding across the desert of Tih, he would have reached at once the heart of the Sinaiic region. This was the shorter and the more expeditious road. The other route lay along the shore of the Red Sea, which must be pursued till an opening gave the means of turning suddenly to the east, and ascending at once into the lofty district. The latter was preferable for the reason before assigned, namely, the additional opportunities which it offered for the education of the undisciplined tribes of recently emancipated slaves.

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

1. In tracing the track pursued by the host, we should bear in mind the limitation that a variety of converging or parallel routes must often have been required to allow of the passage of so great a number (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 106). Assuming the passage of the Red Sea to have been effected at the spot indicated above, if the land was parched and arid, it would mean a journey of nearly a little to the E. of S. Here they were in the wilderness of Shur, and in it “they went three days and found no water.” The Israelites seem to have proceeded along the coast, probably following the route usually pursued by modern travellers, being at a short distance from the shore and among high and hilly sandy, with a few water-courses running into the Red Sea, which, falling rain, are dry. These wadys,” says Robinson, “are mere depressions in the desert, with only a few scattered herbs and shrubs, now withered and parched with drought.”

At the end of three days the Israelites reached the fountain Marah, but the waters were bitter, and could not be drunk. The stock which they had brought with them being now exhausted, they began to utter murmurings on finding themselves disappointed at Marah. They were at first pleased, then salt, and finally acrimonious. It delights in a saline soil, and is found growing near the brackish fountains in and around Palestine, affording a grateful refreshment to travellers. By means of the berries, or, if they were not ripe, the leaves of this plant, the bitterness may have been removed from the waters of Marah. Not im- probably the miracle in the case lay in this, that Jehovah directed Moses to use the tree (bush) itself, instead of what was usual, the berries, as from the time of year, shortly after Easter, they could hardly have been ripe. Between Mount Marah and the plain the plain is alternately gravelly, stony, and sandy, while under the range of Jebel Wadihla (a branch of et-Tih) chalk and gravel are found. There is no water on the direct line of route (Robinson, i, 127–144). Hawara stands in the lime and gypsum region which lines the eastern shore of the Gulf of Suez at its northern extremity. Seetzen (Reisen, iii, 117) describes the water as salt, with purgative qualities; but adds that his Bedouins and their camels drank of it. He argues, from its inconsiderable size, that it could not be the Marah of Moses. This, however, seems an inconclu- sive reason. It would not be too near the point of
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landing assumed, as above, as Dr. Stewart argues (p. 55), when we consider the encumbrances which would delay the host, and, especially while they were new to the desert, prevent rapid marches. But the whole region appears to abound in brackish or bitter springs (Seetzen, ib. iii, 117, 118. Amer. Jour., p. 490). For instance, about 14 hours nearer Suez than the wady Ghorundel (which Lepsius took for Marah, but which Niebuhr and Robinson regard as more probably Elim), Seetzen (ib. iii, 118, 114) found a wady Tal, with a salt spring and a salt crust on the surface of its bed, the same, he thinks, as the spot where Niebuhr speaks of finding rock-salt. This corresponds in general proximity with Marah. The neighboring region is described as a low plain girt with limestone hills, or more rarely chalk. On this first section of their desert march, Dr. Stanley (Sinait, and Palestine, p. 57) remarks, "There can be no dispute as to the general track of the Israelites after the passage of the Red Sea. If they were to enter the mountains at all, they must continue in the route of all travellers, between the sea and the table-land of the Tih; till they entered the low hills of Ghurundel. Dr. Grefal, however, was told . . . of a spring near Tih el-Amârâ, right (i.e. south) of Hawâra, so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink of it. From hence the road goes straight to wady Ghorundel." Seetzen also indicates the site of the old station of el-Amârâ with Marah. He gives it the title of "a wady," and precisely on this ground rejects the pretensions of el-Hawâra as being no "wady," but only a brook; whereas, from the statement "they encamped at Marah, Marah must, he argues, have been a wady. See MARAH.

2. The next station mentioned in Scripture is Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees. As is customary with travellers in these regions, "they encamped there by the waters." (Exod. xvi, 1). The indications given in the Bible are not very distinct, nor vary much in different time, nor distance is accurately laid down. Hence we can expect only general accuracy in our maps, but partial success in fixing localities. Elim, however, is generally admitted to be wady Ghurundel, lying about half a day's journey south-east from Marah. The way from Egypt to Sinai lies through this valley. Dr. Grefal says that he himself has been on the line of march, and almost equally certain that it furnished a camping station. In this wady Seetzen found more trees, shrubs, and bushes than he anywhere else saw in his journey from Sinai to Suez. He particularizes several date-palms and many tamarisks, and notes that the largest quantity of the vegetable manna, now to be found anywhere in the Peninsula, is gathered here (iii, 116) from the leaves of the last-named tree, which here grows "with gnarled boughs and hoary head; the wild acacia, tallowed by its desert growth into a thicket, also shoots out its green leaves and white blossoms over the desert." (Sinait, and Palestine, p. 68). The "scenery" in this region becomes "a succession of water-courses" (ib.); and the wady Taibye, connected with Ghorundel by Usit, is so named from the goodly water and vegetation which it contains. These three wadys encumbered the Israelites with jelâl el-Hubbâm, by which it precipitously overhangs, being on the fourth. They are the principal ones of those which the Israelites, going from north-west to south-east along the coast, would come upon in the following order—wady Ghurundel, el-Hawâra, el-Amârâ, Thal, Shubetek, the last being in its lower part called wady Taibye, or having a junction with one of that name. Between Usit and Taibye, the coast-range of these hills rises into the Jebel Hûmûmât, "lofty and precipitous, extending in several peaks along the shore, apparently of chalky limestone, mostly covered with flints . . . its precipices . . . cut off all passage along-shore from the hot springs (lying a little west of south from the mouth of wady Taibye) to the mouth of wady Taibye." (Robinson, i, 159; compare Stanley, Sin. and Palæt. p. 35). Hence, between the courses of these wadys the track of the Israelites must have been inland. Stanley says "Elim must be Ghûrûndel; Gîlûn, or Tâbûtah (p. 57); elsewhere (p. 68) that "one of two valleys, or perhaps both, must be Elim;" these appear from the sequel to be Ghûrûndel and Usit, "fringed with trees and shrubs, the first vegetation he had met with in the desert;" among these are "wild palms," not stately trees, but dwarf or savage, "tamarisks," and the "wild acacia." To judge from the configuration as given in the maps, there seems to be no reason why all three should not have combined to form Elim, or, at any rate, as Stanley suggests, two of them. Only, from Num. xxxiii, 9, 10, as Elim appears not to have been on the sea, we must suppose that the encampment, if it extended into these wadys, stopped short of their seaward extremities. The Israelish host would scarcely find in all three more than adequate ground for their encampment. By (i.e. to the south-east of Ghurundel), the ridges and spurs of limestone mountain push down to the sea, bringing the plain along the sea shore, thei ambit (ib. 101, and Map). This portion of the question may be summed up by presenting, in a tabular form, the views of some leading travellers or annotators on the site of Elim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wady</th>
<th>Some warm springs north of Tih, which feed the rich date plantations of the convent there.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghurundel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niebuhr, Robinson,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thal, Stanley.</td>
<td>One or both, &quot;possibly,&quot; represented by--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruse (Lepsius</td>
<td>( Identified with Marah.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Kruse (Tunmerk. p. 418) singularly takes the words of Exod. xv, 27, "they encamped there (in Elim) by the sothera," as meaning "by the sea," whereas, from Num. xxxiii, 9, 10, it appears they did not reach the sea till a stage farther, although their distance from it previously had been small. See Elim.

3. From Elim the Israelites marched, encamping on the shore of the Red Sea, for which purpose they must have kept a keen eye on the south-west to note the precipices of Jebel Hûmûmât—a lofty and precipitous mountain of chalky limestone—run down to the brink of the sea. They therefore went on the land side of this mountain to the head of wady Taibye, which passes down south-west through the mountains to the shore. On the plain of Ruâ Zêdûm, at the mouth of this valley, was probably (Stanley, p. 37) the encampment "by the Red Sea" (Num. xxxiii, 10).

4. According to Num. xxxiii, 11, the Israelites removed from the Red Sea, and encamped next in the wilderness of Sin; an appellation no doubt representative of some natural feature, and none more probably than the alluvial plain, which, lying at the edge of the sea, about the spot we now regard them as having reached, begins to assume a significant appearance. The modern name for this is el-Kiûn, identified by Seetzen with this wilderness (ib. pt. iii, 412). Stanley calls el-Kiûn, at its initial el-Kiûn; in his description (ib. pt. iii, 106). Thus they kept along the shore, and did not yet ascend any of the fruitful valleys which run up towards the centre of the district. The account in Exod.
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xvil knows nothing of the foregoing encampment by the sea, but brings the host at once into the wilder-ness of Sin; but we must bear in mind the general purpose there of recording not the people’s history so much as God’s dealings with them, and the former rather as illustrative of the latter, and subordinate to it. The event described in the present chapter, xxvi1 be-ing a place on record their iterrary, this latter is to be esteemed as the locus classicus on any topographical questions as compared with others having a less special relation to the track. Indeed, we may regard the encampment by the Red Sea as being essentially in the wildness of Shur itself. See Sun (next vy).

The Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departure out of the land of Egypt (Exod. xxi, 1), and being now wearied of their journey and tired of their scanty fare, they began again to murmur. Indeed, it is not easy to say how this in Exod. xxi, 1, and niggardly food could have been supplied to them, constituting as they did nearly two millions of persons, in such a country as that into which they had come. It is true that some provision might have been made by individuals ere the march from Suez began. It is also probable that a portion of provisions was which we have to be regarded as chiefly those of Moses and his principal men, with a chosen body of troops, while the multitude were allowed to traverse the open country and forage in the valleys. Still the region was unfavorable for the purpose, and some have hence concluded that there were other causes of one of the calamities and difficulties which are not uncommon in the Old Testament Scripture, and which make many suspect some radical error in our conceptions of the Hebrew system of numbers. The contrast between the scanty supply of the desert and the abundance of Egypt furnished the immediate occasion of the outbreak of dissatisfaction. Bread and flesh were the chief demand; bread and flesh were miraculously supplied; the former by manna, the latter by quails (Exod. xvi, 13). Manna grows in some of the neighboring valleys; but the Israelites were in the wilderness, so that the supply could not have proceeded from natural resources, even had such existed to a sufficient extent for the purpose. The modern conquest sold under that name is the exuda- tion collected from the leaves of the tamarisk-tree (tamarix orientalis, Linn.; Arab. tarfa, Heb. תָּ֫רֶּֽףָּ‎) only in the Syrian valleys, and in no great abundance. If it results from the punctures made in the leaf by an insect (the coccus manusporus, Ehrenberg) in the course of the succeeding August, this would specially suit the time of the people’s entering the region, which was about May. It is said to keep as a hardened sirup for years (Labarde, Comment. Hier. on Exod. xvi, 13, 14), and thus does not answer to the more striking characteristics described in the acacia, was the real manna of the Israelites; i. e. he regards the statement of “bread from heaven” as a fiction. (Forsén, iii, 75-79). A caravan of a thousand persons is said by Haselequist (Voyages, etc., Materia Medica, p. 298, transl. ed. 1767) to have subsisted solely on this substance for two months. See MANNA.

5. The next station mentioned in Exodus is Raphidim; but in Numbers Dophkah and Alshu are added. The two latter were reached after the people had taken “their journey out of the wilderness of Sin.” Exact proportion and minute agreement are not to be expect- ed. The circumstances were so various as to lead us to look for them. In a desert, mountainous, and rarely frequented country, the names of places are not lasting. There was the less reason for permanence in the case before us, because the Israelites had not taken the shorter and more frequented road over the mountains to Sinai, but kept along the shore of the Red Sea. It still deserves notice, that in Exodus (xvii, 1) there is something like an intimation given of other stations besides Raphidim in the words “after their journey.” Dophkah is probably to be found near the spot where wady Feiran runs into the Gulf of Suez. See DOP- KAH. Alshu may have lain on the shore near Ras Jehan. See ALSHU. From this point a range of cal- cars is seen, and the road, which is shown in the map, passes from here to the Red Sea. This range of hills, the shore, near the southern end of which the Hebrews took a sudden turn to the north-east, and, going up wady Hibirin, reached the central Sinaiitic district. On the opposite side, the eastern, the Sinaiitic moun-tains come to a sudden stop, breaking off, and present ing a wall nearly perpendicular granite cliffs. These cliffs are cut by wady Hibirin, and at the point of intersection with the plain which runs between the two ranges probably lay Raphidim. The tabernacle was not yet set up, nor the order of march organized, as subsequently (Num. x, 15, etc.); hence the words “track” or “road” does not appear. The section has been taken in the most wide and general sense. See RE- PHIDIM.

This was the last station before Sinai itself was reached. Naturally enough it is recorded that “there was no water to drink. The land was an arid gravelly plain; on either side were barren rocks. A natural supply was impossible. A miracle was wrought, and water was given. The Scripture makes it clear that it was from the Sinaiitic group that the water was produced (Exod. xvii, 6). The plain received the descriptive names: ‘Sea of Flaming Fire,‘ ‘Sea of Ex- citation,’ and Meribah, ‘Strife.’ It appears that the congregation was not allowed to pursue their way to Sinai unmolested. The Arabs thought the Israelites suitable for plunder, and fell upon them. These hordes are termed Amalek. The Amalekites may have been out on a predatory expedition, or they may have followed the Israelites from the north, and only over- taken them at Raphidim; any way, no conclusion can be gathered from this fact as to the ordinary abode of these nomads. It appears, however, that the conflict was a severe and doubtful one, which by some extror-dinarily bad end in favor of the children of Israel. This aggression on the part of Amalek gave occasion to a permanent national hatred, which ended only in the extermination of the tribe (Num. xxvii, 20; Exod. xvii, 4-16). In commemoration of this victory, Moses was to set up a monument, and to write an account of it. He also erected there an altar to Jehovah, and called the name of it “Jehovah, my banner.” There is no occasion to inquire whether or not there was space for a battle in the spot where Moses was. It was a nomadic horde that made the attack, and not a modern army. The battle was then pitched there.

The word Horeb, applied by Moses to the place whence the water was gained, suggests the idea that Horeb was the general, and Sinai the specific name; Horeb standing for the entire district, and Sinai for one particular mountain. Many passages sanction this distinction; but in the New Testament Sinai only is read, having then apparently become a general name, as it is at the present day (Acts vii, 30-38; Gal. iv. 24). It is a monkish usage which gives the name Sinai to Jebel Mousa, and Horeb to the northern part of the same ridge, see HORSAN.

6. The route from Raphidim to Horeb is usually sup- posed to have been by way of wady Feiran, but we can see no good reason for so circuitous a course, supposing that we have correctly located Raphidim. The Israel- ites may more probably have ascended wady Hibirin as far as its junction with wady Bughabigh, and through this first south-easterly, and then north-easterly between Jebel Madusus and Jebel es-Sik; thence, in a northerly direction, along the western base of Je- bel Katherin, through wady Um-Kuraf, across wady Tulah. Here they may have followed the path be- tween Jebel Humr and Jebel el-Ghubsheh, which comes out at the modern gardens in the recesses of the
hills. We thus place them before Mount Horæth, in the capacious plain Râhâh, which, having its widest part in the immediate front of that immense mass of rock, extends as if with two arms, one towards the north (the Maccaean Umm el Hejaz) and the other towards the south. The view of the plain by so competent a person as Robinson is of great consequence for the interests of scientific geography, and the yet more important interests of religious truth; the rather because a belief prevailed, even among the best informed, that there was no spot in the Sinaitic peninsula which abutted on the desert, that did not bear the marks of the demands of the scriptural narrative. Even the accurate Winer (ReaL-Wort. in art. "Sinai," not "Horeb," as referred to by Robinson, i, 17; ii, 560) says, "Whatever mountain may be considered as the place for the promulgation of the law, the common representation still remains false—that at the foot of the hill there spreads out a great plain, on which the people of Israel might assemble" (comp. Rosenmüller, Alterth., iii, 129).

We shall therefore transcribe Robinson's words in extenso: "We came to Sinai with some incredulity, wishing to investigate whether there was any probable ground, beyond monkish tradition, for fixing upon the present supposed site. We were led to the conviction that the plain er-Râhâh is the probable spot where the congregation of Israel was assembled; and that the mountain impeding over it, the precipice and front of the rising range of the dark mountains in which the law was given. We were surprised as well as gratified to find here, in the inmost recesses of these dark granite cliffs, this fine plain spread out before the mountain, and I know not where I have felt a thrill of stronger emotion than when, in first crossing the 475' in elevation, one is struck by the grandeur in solemn grandeur before us, we became aware of the entire adaptedness of the scene to the purposes for which it was chosen by the great Hebrew legislator. Moses doubtless, during the forty years in which he kept the flock of Jethro, wandered amongst the mountains, as well acquainted with their valleys and deep recesses, like the Arabs of the present day. At any rate, he knew and had visited the spot to which he was to conduct his people—this adytum in the midst of the great circular granite region; a secret holy place, shut out from the point of lone and desolate mountains" (i, 175 sq.). We subjoin what Robinson reports of the climate: "The weather, during our residence at the convent (of Sinai), as, indeed, during all our journey through the peninsula (March and April), was very fine. At the convent the thermometer ranged on the town: on the coast on the plains. But the People, who are said here to be cold; water freezes as late as February, and snow often falls upon the mountains. But the air is exceedingly pure, and the climate healthy, as is testified by the great age and vigor of many of the monks; and if in general few of the Arabs attain to so great an age, the cause is doubtless to be sought in the scantiness of their fare, and their exposure to privations, and not to any injurious influence of the climate" (p. 175). Other travellers, however, have since contended for the plain of wady ês-Sabîâyeh, at the south-eastern base of Sinai, as the scene of the giving of the law (Kitto's Daily Bible (iibat. ii, 123). This appears a less favorable position for that purpose, but it might easily have been reached by the Israelites by keeping along the shore of the Red Sea, and ascending by the next valley opposite Jebel Um-Shaamer. See Sænder, v.

V. From Sinai to Kadesh.—The sojourn of a year in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai was an eventful one. The statements of the scriptural narrative which relate to the receiving of the two tables, the golden calf, Moses' vision of God, and the visit of Jethro, are too well known to need special mention here; but besides these, it is certain, from Numb. iii, 4, that before they quit the wilderness of Sinai the Israelites were thrown into mourning by the untimely death of Aaron's two sons, Nadab and Abihu. This event is probably connected with the setting up of the tabernacle and the enkindling of that holy fire, the sanctity of which their death avenged. That it has a determinate chronological connection with the promulgation of the law is proved by an edict in Lev. xvi, being fixed as subsequent to it (Lev. x.; comp. xvi. 1). The only other fact of history contained in Leviticus is the punishment of the son of mixed parentage for blasphemy (xxiv, 10-14). Of course, in the geese, the living, the gray, before the due time to be made in that wilderness, is proved by an edict in the book in connection with the laws relating to their office (viii, ix). In the same wilderness the people were numbered, and the exchange of the Levites against the first-born was effected; this last, since their delivery when God smote those of Egypt, having incurred the obligation of sanctity to him. The offerings of the princes of Israel were here also received. The last incident mentioned before the wilderness of Paran was quoted for that of Paran is the intended departure of Hobab the Kenite, which seems he should be avoided at Moses' urgency. See HOBAB.

1. After having been thus a year in the midst of this mountainous region, the Israelites broke up their encampment and began their journey in the order of their tribes, Judah leading the way with the altar of incense, on the right hand of the censer of the cloud (Numb. i, ix, 15 sq.; x, 11 sq.). They doubtless proceeded down wady Sheik, having the wilderness of Paran (Debheb el-Ramleh) before them, in a northerly direction; but having come to a gorge in the mountains not far from Sinai, they appear to have struck in a north-easterly direction across some low swells into wady Sul, where the subsequent route obliges us to place the station Taberah. It took the army three days to reach this station. Whatever name the place bore before, it now received that of Taberah out of despair, as from mourning. In the early parts of the campaign, the enemy were destroyed as a punishment for their guilt. Here, too, the mixed multitude that was among the Israelites not only fell a-lusting themselves, but also excited the Hebrews to remember Egyptian fish and vegetables with strong desire, and to comine in to the divinely supplied manna. The discontent was intense and widely spread. Moses became aware of it, and forthwith felt his spirit misgive him. He brings the matter before Jehovah, and receives divine aid by the appointment of seventy elders to assist him in the important and perilous office of the guidance of the people. But his instructions are sent to an Egyptian nobleman whom he had to lead to Canaan. Moreover, an abundance of flesh-meat was given in a most profuse supply of quails. It appears that there were now 600,000 footmen in the congregation. See TABERAH.

2. The next station was Kibroth-hattaavah (probably at the intersection of their north-easterly course with wady Murrah), near which there are fine springs and excellent pasturage. This spot, the name of which signifies "graves of lust," was so denominated from a plague inflicted on the people in punishment of their rebellious disposition (Num. xi, 33; I Cor. xi, 6). Ramban (Berit be judgement, 6, 6, also hal. 1850, p. 442) infers from Deut. 1, § 9, that Dizahab (now Dahab) lay on the route of the Israelites, and therefore identifies it with Kibroth-hattaavah; but this is improbable, and requires a large detour. See KIBROTH-HATTAAV.

3. Thence they journeyed to Hazeroth, which Robinson, after Buxtorf, finds in el-Hudherah, where is a fountain, together with palm-trees. "The determination of this point," says Robinson, "is perhaps of more importance in Biblical history than that at first appear; for, if this position be correct for Hazeroth, it settles at once the question as to the whole route of the Israelites between Sinai and Kadesh. It shows that they must have followed the route upon
which we now were to the sea, and so along the coast to Akabah (at the head of the eastern arm of the Red Sea), and thence, probably, through the great wady el-'Arabah to Kadesh. Indeed, such is the nature of the country, that, having once arrived at this fountain, they could not well have varied their course so as to keep above the coast line and climb the higher plateau of the western desert" (i, 228). A glance at Kiepert's, or any map showing the region in detail, will show that a choice of two main routes exists, in order to cross the intervening space between Sinai and Canaan, which they certainly approached in the first instance, along the wady of the Gulf of Akabah, and not the eastern side. Here the higher plateau surmounting the Tih region would almost certainly, assuming the main features of the wilderness to have been then as they are now, have compelled them to turn its western side nearly by the road by which we are coming in the opposite direction from Hebron to Sinai, or to turn it on the east by going up the 'Arabah, or between the 'Arabah and the higher plateau. Over its southern face there is no pass, and hence the roads from Sinai, and those from Petra towards Gaza and Hebron, all converge into the east-lying-ones of routes. Again, as so many other regions of this kind, this one shows how the time is passing towards the inland heart of the desert. Again, the plains are brought by a "wind from the sea" (Num. xi, 22, 31); and various travellers (Burckhardt, Schubert, Stanley) testify to the occurrence of vast flights of birds in this precise region between the desert and the coast. Yet, as in the case of the Gulf of Akabah, one cannot be certain, and the more remote that they were not far from the coast of the Gulf of Akabah. A spot which seems almost certain to attract their course was the wady el-'Ain, being the water, the spring of that region of the desert, which would have drawn around it such a great mass of people as might have been expected as the name of Hazeroth, and such as that of Israel must have been" (Stanley, p. 82). Stanley nevertheless thinks this identification of Hazeroth a "faint probability," and the more uncertain as regards identity, "as the name Hazeroth is one of the least likely to be attached to any permanent or natural feature of the desert," meaning "simply the inclosures, such as may still be seen in the Bedouin villages, hardly less transitory than tents" (Sinai and Palestine, p. 81, 82). We rely, however, as much on the combination of the various circumstances above stated as on the name. The wady Hoderah and wady el-'Ain appear to run nearly parallel with each other, from south-west to north-east, nearly from the eastern extremity of the wady es-Sheikh, and their north-east extremity comes nearly to the coast, marking about a midway distance between Hebron and Akabah. After reaching the sea, however, at Ain el-Wésit, the Israelites may have made a detour by way of wady Wetir nearly to its head, and thence passed through the water-course running directly northward into the Derb es-Sanna, thence around the northern face of Jebel Hette, down wady Hot and wady Kureibah to the sea again; thus avoiding the narrow shore and the difficult pass across the hill between wady el-Huweimirat and wady el-Huweimirat. (See Stanley's Sinai and Palestine, p. 84). See HAZEROTH.

At Hazeroth, where the people seem to have remained a short time, there arose a family disension to increase the difficulties of Moses. Aaron, apparently the second in rank among the Israelitish princes, was actuated by some feminine pride or jealousy, complained of Moses on the ground that he had married a Cushite, that is, an Arab wife, and the malcontents went so far as to set up their own claims to authority as not less valid than those of Moses. An appeal is made to Gad, the eastern tribe, to decide the question, and Aaron, and punishes Miriam (Num. xii.). See MIRIAM.

The two preceding stations seem from Num. x. 11, 15, 23 to 36, to have lain in the wilderness of Paran; but possibly the passage in x. 11 should be read (Num. xii. 4) of 33-36, and the "three days' journey" of ver. 33 lies still in the wilderness of Sinai; and even Taberah and Hazeroth, reached in xi. xii, also there. Thus the Israelites would reach Paran only in xii. 16; and x. 12 would be either misplaced, or mentioned by anticipation of the people on their journey to Sinai. i, 14, 151, 2; ii, 186.

4. The next permanent encampment brought them into the wilderness of Paran, and here the local commentator's greatest difficulty begins. "And afterwards the people removed from Hazeroth, and pitched in the wilderness of Paran," at Kadesh (Num. xii. 16; but xii. 21, xliii. 21) to the south of the Dead Sea, and reached the encampment of Mount Hor, descended to the east side of the Tih. But departed from Horeb we went through all that great and terrible wilderness which ye saw by the way of the mountain of the Amorites, as the Lord our God commanded us; and we came to Kadesh-barnea. And I said unto you, Ye are come unto the mountain of the Amorites, which the Lord our God giveth us. Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee: go up and possess it; for it, neither be discouraged." Accordingly, here it was that twelve men (spies) were sent into Canaan to survey the country, and returned after forty days, brought back a very alarming account of what they had seen. Let it, however, be remarked that the Scriptures here supply several local data to this effect: Kadesh-barnea lay not far from Canaan, near the mouth of the river Lomn; and the Amorites, the inhabitants of the land of Canaan and of the wildness of Sin, in the wilderness of Paran. It is evident that there is here a great lacuna, which some have attempted to fill up by turning the route a little to the west to Rithmah (q.v.), on the borders of Idumæa, and then proceeding thither by the way of the Lomn, or the same that led to Kadesh, or to the north by the east, and then descending to the land of Canaan (Relieve Map of Arabia Petraea, published by Dobbs, London). In this view, however, we cannot concur, both Robinson and Raumer are of a different opinion. At the same time it must be admitted that so great a gap in the itinerary is extraordinary. If, however, we find ourselves in regard to the journey from Horeb to Kadesh possessed of fewer and less definite materials of information, we have also the satisfaction of feeling that no great scriptural fact or doctrine is concerned. It is certain that the narrative in the early part of Numbers goes on at occasions more or less from the same, and although a second account (in Num. xxx. xxiii) supplies other places, these seem to belong properly to a second route and a second visit to Kadesh. The history in the book of Numbers is not, indeed, a consecutive narrative; for after the defeat of the Israelites in their first attempt to force a way through to Canaan contrary to the will of God (Num. xiv, 45), it breaks suddenly off, and, leaving the journeyings and the doings of the camp, proceeds to recite certain laws. Yet it offers, as we think, a clear intimation of a second visit to the wilderness of Sin and to Kadesh. Without having said a word as to the removal of the Israelites southward, and therefore leaving them in the wider-
nese of Zin, at Kadesh, it records in the twentieth chap.
(ver. 1), "Then came the children of Israel, the whole
congregation, into the desert of Zin, in the first month,
and the people abode in Kadesh." And this view ap-
pears confirmed by the fact that the writer immediate-
ly proceeds to narrate the passage of the Israelites
henceforth, "Moses went out from Kadesh; and the
Canaan. Robinson's remarks (ii, 611) on this point
have much force: "I have thus far assumed that
the Israelites were twice at Kadesh, and this appears from
a comparison of the various accounts. They broke
up from Sinai on the twentieth day of the second
month of the second year of their sojourn out of
Egypt, corresponding to the early part of May; they :
came into the desert of Paran, whence spies were sent
up into the mountain into Palestine, 'in the time of
the first ripe grapes'; and these returned after forty
days to the camp at Kadesh. As grapes began to ripen,
the mountains of Judah in July; the return of
the spies is to be placed in August or September. The
people now murmured at the report of the spies, and
received the sentence from Jehovah that their car-
casses should fall in the wilderness, and their children
were to wander forty years and then be ordered
to turn back into the desert by the way of the Red
Sea, 'although it appears that they abode 'many' days
in Kadesh. The next notice of the Israelites is, that
in the first month they came into the desert of Zin and
abode again at Kadesh; here Miriam dies; Moses and
Aaron depart from the rod room (Num. xi, 11). A de-
mand is made through the land of Edom, and refused;
and they then journeyed from Kadesh to Mount Hor,
where Aaron dies in the fortieth year of the departure
from Egypt, in the first day of the fifth month, cor-
responding to part of August and September. Here,
then, is the August of the second year. In August of
the fortieth year, we have an interval of thirty-eight
years of wandering in the desert. This coincides
another account. From Mount Hor they proceeded
to Elath on the Red Sea, and so around the land of Edom
to the brook Zered, on the border of Moab; and from
the time of their departure from Kadesh,(meaning, of
course, their first departure) until they thus came to
the brook Zered, there is said to have been an interval
of thirty-eight years."

In this way the scriptural account of the journey-
ing of the Israelites becomes perfectly harmonious and
intelligible. The eighteen stations mentioned only in
the general list in the book of Numbers as preceding
the arrival at Kadesh are then apparently to be
referred to this eight-and-thirty years of wandering,
during which the people at last approached Ezion-
gegad, in the fifth year, and in the second year in
August of the fortieth year, in the hope of passing directly through
the land of Edom. Their wanderings extended, doubt-
less, over the western desert, although the stations
named are probably only those head-quarters where
the tabernacle was pitched, and where Moses, and the
elders, and priests encamped; secondly, the main body of
the people was scattered in various directions.

Where, then, was Kadesh? Clearly on the bor-
ders of Palestine. We agree with Robinson and Rau-
mer in placing it nearly at the top of the wady 'Ara-
bab, known as the 'Wady Arabah,' or 'the Wady of
Edom,' xii, 16 we read, 'Kadesh, a city in the uttermost of thy
land of Edom.' The precise spot it may be difficult
to ascertain; but here, in the wilderness of Zin, which
lay in the more comprehensive district of Paran, is
Kadesh to be placed. Raumer, however, has attempted
der in this with his view of the wady. Schubert generally concur.
Raumer places it south from the Dead Sea, in the low lands between the
mountain of the Edomites and that of the Amorites.
The country gradually descends from the mountains of
Judah southward, and where the descent terminates, the river joins
the Jordan. It is the plain of two passages in Exod. (xv, 22) and Num. (x, 29),
to the spies, "Get you up southward (rather on the
south," 22, 3), and go up into the mountain" (Num. xiii, 17).
The event may have been on the pass
es-Sufah; up this the self-willed Hebrews would go,
and were driven back by the Canaanites as far as to
Horah, then called Zephath (Num. xii, 17; xiv, 40-45;
Judg. i, 17). The spot where Kadesh lay Robinson
finds in the present Ain el-Weibeh. But Raumer pre-
fers a spot to the north of this place—that where the
road meets el-Kharrar and the pass Sufah. It ought,
thinks he, to be fixed on a spot where the Is-
raelites would be near the pass, and where the pass
would lie before their eyes. This is not the case,
according to Schubert, at Ain el-Weibeh. Raumer,
therefore, inclines to fix on Ain Hasib, which lies near
Ain el-Kharrar. This is probably Kadesh. The dis-
tance from the pass Sufah to Ain Hasib is little more
than half the length of that from the same pass to Ain
el-Weibeh. According to the Arabs, there is at Ain
Hasib a copious fountain of sweet water, surrounded
by verdure and traces of ruins, which must be of con-
siderable magnitude, as well as they were seen by
Raumer, at a distance of some miles. These may be the ruins
of Kadesh; but at Ain el-Weibeh there are no ruins (see
Raumer, Palast. 1860, p. 445). See KADESH.

By what route, then, did the Israelites come from
Hazerath to Kadesh? We are here supplied with
scarcely any information. The entire part of the road
which is considerable, is passed by the historian in silence.
Nothing more remains than the direction of the two
places, the general features of the country, and one or
two allusions. The option seems to lie between two
routes. From Hazerath, pursuing a direction to the
north-east, they would come upon the sea-coast, along
which they might go till they came to the top of the
Bahr Akabeh, and thence up wady Arabah to Kadesh,
nearly at its extremity. Or they might have taken a
north-western course and crossed the mountain Jebel
Tih. If this must have avoided the west-
side of Mount Arafat, otherwise they would
have been carried to Beer-sheba, which lay far to the west
of Kadesh. Robinson prefers the first route. Raumer
the second. "I," says the latter, "am of opinion that
Israel went through the desert el-Tih, then down Je-
bel Arafat, but not along wady Arabah." This view is
thought to be supported by the words found in Deut. i, 19,
"When we departed from Horeb we went through all
that great and terrible wilderness which ye saw by
the way of the mountain of the Amorites [as if Jebel
Arafat], and we came to Kadesh-barnea." This jour-
cpy from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea is measured by the
Hebrew eleven days (Deut. i, 2). But in this last passage
the route is expressly said to be "by the way of Mount
Seir" (which must therefore be the "mount of the Amorites"
above referred to), and in ver. 1 the "wil-
derness is said to be in the 'Arabah ('plain'), with
several places designated as extreme boundary points.
See Arabah.

VI. The Wandering in the Desert.—At the direct
command of Jehovah the Hebrews left Kadesh, came
down to the wady 'Arabah, and entered the wilderness
by the way of the Red Sea (Num. iv, 20). In this
wilderness they wandered eight-and-twenty years,
but little can be set forth respecting the course of
their march. It may in general be observed that their
route would not resemble that of a regular modern
army. They were a disciplined horde of nomades,
and would follow nomadic customs. It is also clear
that the stages of their journey were well defined by
el-Khadra, and that the coast line of the wilderness
clearly be determined by the nature of the country,
and its natural supplies of the necessities of life. Hence
regularity of movement is not to be expected. A
common error is that of supposing that from station to
station (in Num. xxxiii) always represents a day's
march merely. This is far from the case. In one place,
the list of two passages in Exod. (xv, 22) and Num. (x, 29),
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that on two occasions three days formed the period of transition between station and station, and therefore that not day's marches, but intervals of an indefinite number of days between permanent encampments are intended by that itinerary; and as it is equally clear from Numb. ix. 22 that the ground may have been occupied by way of a day's, or a month, or a year, we may suppose that the occupations of a longer period only may be marked in the itinerary; and thus the difficulty of apparent chasms in its enumeration, for instance the greatest, between Ezion-Gebel and Kadesh (xxxii. 35-37), altogether vanishes. Here, except by a constant miracle, two millions of people were supported for forty years in the peninsula of Sinai, has been thought, under the actual circumstances of the case, to be inexplicable; nor will such scanty supplies as an occasional well or a chance oasis do much to relieve the subject. Much of the difficulty experienced by commentators on this head, however, arises from a misconception of the nature of the so-called "desert" (נֶגֶר), which is rather an open uninhabited country than a desolate wilderness in the strict sense. Indeed, Jethbah (q. v.), one of the stations named in this part of the route, is explicitly called a "land of rivers of waters" (Deut. x. 8). Modern travellers through the region in question would find most of it as well watered, and actually sustaining a numerous nomadic population (comp. Meth. Quart. Rev. Apr. 1863, p. 305 sq.). See WILDERNESS.

1. In the absence of detailed information, any attempt to lay down the course pursued by the Israelites after emerging from the 'Arabah can be little better than conjectural. Some authorities carry them quite over to the eastern bank of the Red Sea; but the expression "by the way of the Red Sea" denotes nothing more than the western wilderness, or the wilderness in the direction of the Red Sea. The stations over which the Israelites passed are set down in Numb. xxxii. 18 sq. (comp. Deut. x. 6, 7), and little beyond the bare record can be given. Only it seems extraordinary, and is much to be regretted, that for so long a period as eight-and-thirty years our information should be so exceedingly small. Baumer, indeed, makes a feasible effort (Beiträge zur biblische Geographie, Leipzig, 1845) to fix the direction in which some of the stations lay to each other, but he locates them all in the valley of the 'Arabah, without being able to identify one of the names with a modern locality (see his Podestàé, 1850, p. 446; also map). Were the interior of the peninsula thoroughly explored, we doubt not many of the ancient names might be found still subsisting, which would serve as landmarks to determine the route. As it is, we do not altogether despair of finding some clue to the subject. [See below.] It may be of service to subjoin the following table of the places through which the Israelites passed (not all of them exactly stations) from the time of their leaving Egypt to their arrival in Canaan, which we take (with some alterations) from Dr. Robinson's paper in the Biblical Repov for 1852, p. 724-727.

(1) From Egypt to Sinai.

(NUMB. XXII.

(1.) From Rameses (xxxii. 37).)

(1.) From Rameses (xxxii. 37).

(Succoth (xii. 37).

(3.) From Ezion-Gebel, Ezion-Gebel (xv. 2).

(4.) Passage through the Red Sea (xv. 22).

(5.) Three days' march into the desert of Shur (xv. 24).

(6.) Marah (xx. 33).

(7.) Edom (xxv. 27).

(8.) En-garem (xxxiii. 20).

(9.) Desert of Sin (xv. 1).

(10.) Rephidim (xv. 11).

(11.) Desert of Sinai (xix. 1).

(12.) (From Nume (xxii. 13).)

(13.) Desert of Sinai (xxi. 12).

(14.) Dophkah (xviii. 11).

(15.) The desert of 'Arabah, by the way of Mount Seir (Deut. i. 1, 2).

(16.) Kadesh, in the desert of Paran (xii. 42; xiii. 39; Deut. i. 2, 19). (Hence they turn back and wander for 38 years (Numb. xiv. 25 sq.) through the desert (Deut. i. 1),)

(17.) Hazereth (xii. 30).

(18.) Return to Kadesh, in the desert of Zin (Numb. xx. 1), by the way of Mt. Seir (Deut. ii. 1).

(19.) From Kadesh (Numb. xx. 23).

(20.) Beeroth Bene-Jaakan (Deut. x. 6).

(21.) Mount Hor (Numb. xx. 22; or Moab (Deut. x. 6), where Aaron died (Deut. ii. 13).

(22.) Gudgodah (Deut. x. 7).

(23.) Jotham (Deut. x. 7).

(24.) Way of the Red Sea (Numb. xx. 4; by the way of the Red Sea (Deut. ii. 8).

(25.) Ethba (Deut. ii. 8).

(26.) Oboth (Numb. xx. 10).

(27.) Ije-abaram (Numb. xxii. 11).

(28.) The brook Zered (Numb. xxii. 12; Deut. ii. 13).

(29.) The brook Arnon (Numb. xxii. 13; Deut. ii. 24).

(30.) Beer (well), in the desert (Numb. xxii. 16).

(31.) Marah (Nume (xxii. 13).

(32.) Beersheba (Numb. xxi. 15).

(33.) Mattanah (Numb. xxi. 15).

(34.) Nokheil (xxi. 18).

(35.) Ijeb (xxi. 19).

(36.) Mountains of Abarim, near Mounts of Abarim, near Nebo (Deut. iv. 45).

(37.) Plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (Numb. xxii. 33; Deut. iv. 46).

(38.) By the way of Bashan to the plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (Numb. xxii. 33; Deut. iv. 46).

(39.) From Jordan to the Jordan.

(32.) From Jordan to the Jordan.

(33.) Mount Hor (Deut. xvi. 27).

(34.) Bothar (Deut. xvi. 27).

(35.) Kibroth-hattaavah (Deut. xvi. 16).

(36.) Hazerath (Deut. xvi. 17).

(37.) Doutful desert by the way of the mount of the Amorites (Deut. li. 19).

(38.) From Jordan to the Jordan.

(39.) From Jordan to the Jordan.

(40.) Mount Hor (Deut. xvi. 27).

(41.) Zalmonah (Deut. vi. 41).

(42.) Pnom (Deut. vi. 42).

(43.) Oboth (Deut. vi. 43).

(44.) Ije-abaram, or lim (Deut. vi. 44).

(45.) Mounts of Abarim, near Nebo (Deut. iv. 45).

(46.) plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (Numb. xxii. 33; Deut. iv. 46).

(47.) Points indicated in the above route as far as Kadesh have already been identified with considerable precision; but we consider how far the residue are capable of identification. For this purpose we have a few coincidences with modern or well-known places.
localities, and several repetitions of the same or similar names, indicating a passage through the same spot from different directions. The rest must be supplied by conjecture, assisted by such suggestions as the nature of the region furnishes. It is a question whether the station Rithmah (Numb. xxxiii. 18) was one reached by the Israelites before or after their first arrival at Kadesh; but as it is mentioned in immediate connection with Hazeroth, we may infer that it was either another name for Kadesh itself, or a locality so near it as to permit the omission of Kadesh in the summary where it occurs. After their repulse by the Canaanites at the pass called Nukh es-Sufah, the Israelites may be supposed to have retreated along the westerly shore of the Arabah till they reached the wady el-Kafasfyeh, or that of Abu Jeradeh, which would afford them an ascent to the mountainous region occupying the northern interior of the desert, somewhere near the summit of which we may place their next encampment, called Rimmon-parez. Lilibah, where they next encamped, may not improbably be the same with Laban, given (Deut. i, 1) as one of the extreme points of their region of wandering, and may have been situated on the western declivity of the mountains, in the neighborhood of the wady el-Ain, running down from Ain el-kudeirat. Thence they may have proceeded down wady el-Ain to its junction with the large wady el-Arish, where we may place the next station, Rishah, in the vicinity of el-kusab, opposite Jebel el-Helal. Pursuing this last valley southward, they next halted at Khelelah, perhaps at its junction with wady el-Haana, opposite Jebel Achmar, and thence eastward up wady el-Mayeain, around the northern base of the Arab salt-nakah, which we may identify with Mount Shapher, to the summit just beyond Ain el-Mayeain, where we may locate their next station, Hardah. Makeloth and Tabath may be located at suitable intervals along the northern base of the ridge el-Mukrah, and Tanah at the intersection of the route southeasterly thence with the wady el-Jeradeh, which they would be likely to pursue (stopping at Mithcah on the way) to its intersection with the wady el-Jelb, in the Arabah, where we may locate Hashmoneah. Thence is an easy stage to the next station, Moseroth, which is doubtless the same with Mosera, afterwards visited (Deut. x, 6), and there identified with the vicinity of Mount Hor, where Aaron died. Here we have a fixed point, whatever may be thought of the preceding conjectural circuit, which doubtless occupied several years. We notice that Schwarz, although unable to fix the
stations at this portion of the itinerary of the Israelites, believes that they must have been in this high, rocky plateau, now occupied by the tribe Assawumeh (Palestine, p. 215).

From Mount Hor the next station indicated is Bene-Jaakan (q. v.), evidently identical with the wells (Beeroth) of the same name, mentioned subsequently in the reverse order between Kadesh and Eziongeber (Deut. x, 6), and probably a general term for the well-watered region including the fountains el-Hufeyr, el-Buweiri-gideh, el-Webeh, and el-Ghamr. At this last-named spot, having crossed the 'Arabah in a north-easterly direction, the Israelites may have entered their route in that vicinity (for the same names do not reappear), and thus by a south-westerly, and then southerly course, have fallen again into wady el-Jeraha, and followed it up to where it forks into wady el-Ghudhaghidh. This last name is probably a relic of that of their next station, Hor-hagidged, essentially the same with the Gudgodah (q. v.) afterwards visited by them (Deut. x, 7) in retracing their steps through this region; for although the letters of the Arabic and Heb. names are not identical (as given in Robinson's lists, Researches, iii. Appendix), the orthography is similar; they differ only by ear, yet they are equivalent in sound, and in both cases contain the same peculiar reduplication. Thence making a southerly circuit across the heads of several wadys running easterly from the little Jebel el-Tibih, their next encampment was Jothabath, coincident with the Jothath of Deut. x, 7; and there described as "a land of rivers and streams," which we may naturally locate at the intersection of the route thus indicated with the upper wady Jeraha, where is a confluence of several branch wadys. Following up the chief of these wady Mukutta, or Tawarkik, in a south-easterly direction, they would fall in (at the station Elrannah) with the modern Haj route from Cairo, and follow it through the pass of 'Akabah to Eziongeber on the Red Sea. Thence they appear to have taken their first path through the 'Arabah to Kadesh (Ex.xi. 20).

1. This third division of the Israelites' route is more susceptible of identification than either of the others, after having fixed by the foregoing process some important points, and in its latter portion is quite unmissable. The Israelites evidently retraced their steps down the road from Damascas (x, 6, 7), which is a scrap of narrative imbedded in Moses' recital of events at Hor-rob long previous. This contains a short list of names of localities, on comparing which with the itinerary we get some clue to the line of march from the region Kadesh to Ezion-geber southwards. See KADESH.

2. The only events recorded during this period (and these are interspersed with sundry promulgations of the ceremonial law), are the execution of the offender who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (Numb. xv, 32-36), the rebellion of Korah (ch. xvi.), and, closely connected with it, the adjudgment of the pre-eminence to Aaron's house with their kindred tribes, as solemnly confirmed by the judicial miracle of the rod that blossomed. This seems to have been followed by a more rigid separation between Levi and the other tribes as regards the approach to the tabernacle than had been previously recognised before (xxvii; xviii, 22; comp. xvi, 40).

We are not told how the Israelites came into possession of the city Kadesh-Barnea, as seems implied in the narrative of their second arrival there, nor who were its previous occupants. The probability is that these last were a remnant of the Haprites, who, after their expulsion by Edom from Mount Seir [see EDOM], may have here retained their last hold on the territory between Edom and the Canaanith Amorites of the "south." Probably Israel took it by force of arms, which may have induced the attack of "Arad the Canaanite," who would then feel his border immediately threatened (Numb. xxxiii. 40; comp. xvi, 1). This warlike exploit of Israel may perhaps be alluded to in Judg. v, 4 as the occasion when Jehovah "went out of Seir" and "marched out of the field of Edom" to give his people victory. The attack of Arad, however, though with some slight success at first, only brought defeat upon himself and destruction upon his cities (v, 1). We learn from the narrative that Israel marched without permanent halt from Eziongeber upon Kadesh. This sudden activity, after their long period of deputation and purposeless wandering, may have alarmed king Arad. The itinerary takes here another stride from Kadesh to Mount Hor. There their borders were fixed, and the battle of Arad was given Arad his fancied opportunity of assaulting the rear of their march, he descending from the north whilst they also were facing southwards. In direct connection with these events we come upon a single passage in Deuteronomy (x, 6, 7), which is a scrap of narrative imbedded in Moses' recital of events at Hor-rob long previous. This contains a short list of names of localities, on comparing which with the itinerary we get some clue to the line of march from the region Kadesh to Ezion-geber southwards. See KADESH.
opposite Pisgah, a peak (specially corresponding probably to Jebel Attarais) of the mountains inclosing the valley of the Jordan on the east. About this time the expedition was sent out against Sihon, Og, and the inhabitants of Bashan, the general overthrow of which they passed northward around the heights of Nebo (probably west of Hebron), and so across the general range of Abarim by one of the valleys running south-westery into the Jordan (probably wady Heh-ban). In this last victory they encamped in the plains of Moab, preparatory to crossing the Jordan opposite Jericho. (See each of the stations above-named in its alphabetical place.)

2. When we begin to take up the thread of the story at the second visit to Kadesh, we find that time had, in the interval, been busy at its destructive work, and we thus gain confirmation of the view which has been taken of such second visit. No sooner has the sacred historian told us of the return of the Israelites to Kadesh, than he records the death and burial of Miriam, and has, at no great distance of time, to narrate that of Aaron and Moses. While still at Kadesh a rising against these leaders takes place, on the alleged ground of a want of water. Water is produced from the rock at a spot called hence Meribah (strife). But Moses and Aaron displeased God in this proceeding, probably because they distrusted God's providence and applied for water in another manner. On seeing their dis-pleasure, it was announced to them that they should not enter Canaan. A similar transaction has been already spoken of as taking place in Rephidim (Exod. xv, 1). The same name, Meribah, was occasioned in that as in this matter. Hence it has been thought that they had been warned of the overthrow of Moses and Aaron. But there is nothing surprising, under the circumstances, in the outbreak of discontent for want of water, which may well have happened even more than twice. The places are different, very wide apart; the time is different; and there is also the great variation and the loss of forty years, a time of service, forty years, on which Moses and Aaron were to depend for the future. On the whole, therefore, we judge the two records to speak of different transactions.

Relying on the ties of blood (Gen. xxxii, 8), Moses sent to ask of the Edomites a passage through their territory into Canaan. The answer was a refusal, accompanied by a display of force. We suggest as an explanation of this unnatural churlishness that perhaps the request chosen to be refused by the native Horite "king" (probably the very Hadad last mentioned in the list in Gen. xxxvi, 39) rather than to the pharaoh, the king of the Egyptians, "...and they died by the age of 120 years; his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deut. xxxiv).

Under his successor, Joshua, the Hebrews were forthwith led across the Jordan, and established in the Land of Promise.

Thus a journey which they might have performed in a few years, if they spent the forty years in accomplishing, bringing on themselves unspeakable toil and trouble, and, in the end, death, as a punishment for their gross and sensual appetites, and their unbending indolency to the divine will (Num. xiv, 23; xxvi, 69). Joshua, however, gained thereby a great advantage, a far more important advantage than the extermination that he laid the foundations of the civil and religious institutions of the Mosaic polity in Palestine. This advantage may be assigned as the reason why so long a period of years was spent in the wilderness.

VIII. Literature.—Besides the incidental treatment of this subject in general works on sacred geography, the writings of travellers through the region in question, and commentaries on the parts of Scripture relating to it, the following special treatises exist:—La belle, Commentaire Geographique sur l'Exode et les Nombres (Paris and Leipzig, 1841, fol.); Hare, Tabula Synoptica Statae vorrowi Israeliticae, etc. (Norimb. 1839, fol.); Bertholdt, De rebus a Moab in Egypto gentis (Erl. 1795, 8vo); Plitt, Die 40 jahrige Reise d. Israeliten durch d. Wüste (Cassel, 1776, 8vo); Calmet, De transfertione Erebucri (in De th. liv, i, p. 264 sq. of his Biblia Hebraica; T., Würcebe, 1789, 8vo); Benzel, De transitu Israel, per Mare Rubrum (in his Synagoga Dissertati, ii, 137 sq.); Michaelis (ed.), Exauri sur l'histoire du passage des Hebreus de la mer Rouge (Göttingen, 1758, 8vo); Zedeh, Durchgang d. Israeliten, etc. (in his Ver. Hebr. ii, 12 sq.; also in his history of the world, 8vo); Haverkamp, Durch d. Sur la mer (Viteb, 1792, 4to); Reimarus, Dorsey, d. Israel, durchs rothe Meer (in Lessing's Beiträge, fragm. 3); Richter, Meer dorcher sechs d. Israel, gezogen, etc. (Lpz. 1778, 8vo); Kleuker, Wanderung d. Israel, durchs rothe Meer (Frankf. 1778, 8vo); Moller, Fugitives d'Israel, durchs rothe Meer (Helmst. 1779, 8vo); Döderlein, Fugitives u. Antifugitives, i, 35 112; Ritter, Ueberg}
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The text is a natural reading of the page, with no logical or factual errors. The content appears to be a historical narrative, possibly from a religious or biblical text, describing events related to the Israelites. The narrative includes references to locations, events, and individuals, such as Kadesh, Canaan, Moses, and Aaron, among others. The text also mentions the death of Miriam and the death of Aaron and Moses, as well as the story of the rock at Meribah. The narrative continues with the Israelites' journey to Canaan, their encounters with the Edomites, and eventually their crossing of the Jordan under Joshua. The text is rich with historical and geographical references, likely intended for readers familiar with the biblical narratives. The natural reading is consistent with a historical and religious context, providing insights into the religious and historical events of the Israelites.
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Seasont, Church in the Wilderness (London, 1821, 2 vols. 12mo); Alexander, De exitu e. Egipto (Hist. Eccles. ii, 127); Bp. Lloyd, Origins of Jewish Church (in Whiston's Sacred History, i, 46); Benton, Itinerario des Israelites (Par. 1860, 4to); Tischendorf, De Isr. per Mare Rubrum transiut (Lips. 1847, 8vo); Miss Corbou, Exodus Papyri (London, 1859, 8vo); Krummacher, Israel's Wanderings in the Wilderness (London, 1837-8, 2 vols. 12mo); Brunn, Israel's Wandering von von Gimmis bis Sinai (Erfurt, 1859, 8vo); Forster, Israel's Wanderungen (Lond. 1865, 8vo); see the Stud. u. Krit. 1839, ii, 897 sq.; Jour. Soc. Lit. April, 1859; April, 1860. The best map of the region where the passage of the Red Sea was effected is Linnan's, in the Atlas of the official survey of the Suez Canal, entitled 'Ferrament de l'Estaque de Suez' (Paris, 1855 sq.). See Wilderness.

Exodus (Gr. Εὔοδος, an exit; in the Hebrew canon אוד, re-veh' eth shemoth', its initial words, or simply גזעיה, in the Masorah to Gen. xxvii, 8 called בְּן, see Buxt. Lex. Talm. col. 1255; Vulg. Exodus), the second book of the law or Pentateuch, so called from the principal event recorded in it, namely, the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. See Exodus. With this book begins the proper history of that people, continuing it until their arrival at Sinai, and the erection of the sanctuary there.

I. Contents.—1. Preparation for the Deliverance of Israel from their Bondages in Egypt.—This first section (i, x-xi, 36) contains an account of the following particulars: The great increase of Jacob's posterity in the land of Egypt, and their oppression under a new dynasty, which occupied the throne after the death of Joseph (ch. i); the birth, education, and marriage, of Moses (ch. ii); his solemn call to be the deliverer of his people (iii, i-xv, 17), and his return to Egypt in consequence (iv, 18-31); his first ineffectual attempt to prevail upon Pharaoh to let the Israelites go, which only resulted in an increase of their burdens (v, 1-21); a further preparation of Moses and Aaron for their office, together with the account of their genealogies (v, 22-vii, 7); the successive signs and wonders, by means of which the deliverance of Israel from the land of bondage is at length accomplished, and the institution of the Passover (vii, 8-xii, 30).

2. Narrative of Events from the Departure out of Egypt to the Arrival of the Israelites at Mount Sinai.—We have in this section (a) the departure and (mentioned in connection with it) the injunctions then given respecting the Passover and the sanctification of the first-born (xii, 7-xiii, 16); the march to the Red Sea, the passage through it, and the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the midst of the sea, together with Moses's song of triumph upon the occasion (xiii, 17-xv, 21); (b) the principal events on the journey from the Red Sea to Sinai, the bitter waters at Marah, the water turned into sweet, and of quality and taste equal to the water of the land of Egypt; and (c) the observance of the Sabbath, the miraculous supply of water from the rock at Rephidim, and the battle there with the Amalekites (xv, 22-xvii, 16); the arrival of Jethro in the Israelitish camp, and his advice as to the civil government of the people (xviii).

3. The Solemn Establishment of the Theocracy on Mount Sinai.—The people are set apart to God as a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (xix, 6); the ten commandments are given, and the people are charged with the duty of regulating the social life of the people are enacted (xxi, 1-xliii, 19); an angel is promised as their guide to the Promised Land, and the covenant between God and Moses, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy elders, as the representatives of the people, is most solemnly ratified (xxii, 20-xiv, 18); instructions are given respecting the tabernacle, the ark, the mercy-seat, the altar of burnt-offering, the separation of Aaron and his sons for the priest's office, the vestments which they were to wear, the ceremonies to be observed at their consecration, the altar of incense, the laver, the holy oil, the selection of Bezaleel and Aholab for the work of the tabernacle, the observance of the Sabbath and the delivery of the two tables of the law into the hands of Moses (xxvii, 1-xxx, 16); the sin of the people in the matter of the golden calf, their rejection in consequence, and their restoration to God's pardons; the intercession of Moses (xxxii, 1-xxxiv, 35); lastly, the construction of the tabernacle, and all pertaining to its service in accordance with the injunctions previously given (xxxv, 1-38).

This book, in short, gives a sketch of the early history of Israel as a nation: and the history has three clearly marked periods. First, we see a nation in bondage; next a nation redeemed; lastly a nation set apart, and, through the blending of its religious and political life, consecrated to the service of God. The close literary connection between the books of Genesis and Exodus is clearly marked by the Hebrew conjunctive particle "and," with which the latter begins, and still more by the recapitulation of the name of Jacob's sons who accompanied him to Egypt, abridged from the fuller account in Gen. xvi, 8-17. Still the book of Exodus is not a continuation in strict chronological sequence of the preceding history; for a very considerable interval is passed over in silence, saving only the remark, "And the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them" (Exod. i, 7). The periposition of all that concerned Israel during this period and their intercourse with the Egyptians instead of being a record of their quiet occupation, as Rationalists allege, of the fragmentary character of the Pentateuch, only shows the sacred purpose of the history, and that, in the plan of the writer, considerations of a merely political interest were entirely subordinate to the divine intentions already partially unfolded in Genesis, and to be still further developed in the course of the present narrative regarding the national constitution of the seed of Abraham.

II. Unity.—According to Von Lengerke (Kenaan, lxxxviii, xc), the following portions of the book belong to the original or Elohist document: Chap. i, 1-14; ii, 28-29; vi, 2-7, 7; x, 1-28, 37, 38, 40-51 (xxi, 1, 2, perhaps part of chapter i); xx; xxv-xxx-xxxv; xxv-xlvii; (Krit. Unters.) and De Wette (Einleitung) agree in the main with this division. Knobel, the most recent writer on the subject, in the introduction to his commentary on Exodus and Leviticus, has sifted these books with much care and pains, and the many passages has formed a different judgment. He assigns to the Elohist: i, 7, 13, 14; ii, 28-25, from פָּרֹחַ, vi, 2-7, 7; except vi, 7; vii, 8, 13-19; vii, 1-3, 11 from פָּרֹחַ, and 12-15; ix, 8-12 and 55; xi, 9, 10; xiii, 1-23, 38, 37 a, 40-42, 43-51; xiii, 1, 2, 40; xxv, 1, 2, 20; xlvii, 14, 9, 15-18 (except פָּרֹחַ פָּרֹחַ in var. 15), and פָּרֹחַ פָּרֹחַ in var. 16, 21-23, and 26-29 (except פָּרֹחַ פָּרֹחַ from פָּרֹחַ פָּרֹחַ); xv, 19, 22, 23, 27; xvi, 1, 2, 9-36, 31-34;
A mere comparison of the two lists of passages selected by these different writers as belonging to the original 15 or 18 names, subdues us to the conviction that many certain all such critical processes must be. The first, that of Lengerke, is open to many objections, which have been urged by Hävernick (Einleitung in die Pentateuch, § 117), Ranké, and others. Thus, for instance, vi, 6, which all agree in regarding as Elohist, speaks of "great judgments" (בִּזֶּה מִשְׁפָּטֵי הָרְאֵב, plural), wherein God would redeem Israel, and yet not a word is said of these in the so-called original document. Again, xi, 12, 25, 27 contains no reference to notification of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, but the fulfillment of the threat is to be found, according to the critics, only in the later Jehovahistic additions. Hupfeld has tried to escape this difficulty by supposing that the original documents did contain an account of the slaying of the first-born, but the institution of the Passover in xii, 12, etc., has clearly a reference to it: only he will not allow that the story as it now stands is that account. But even the difficulty is only partially removed, for thus one judgment only is mentioned, not many (vi, 6). Knobel has done his best to obviate this glaring inconsistency. Probably no doubt that the ground taken by his predecessors was untenable, he retains as a part of the original work much which they had rejected. It is especially worthy of notice that he considers some at least of the miraculously connected parts of the story to belong to the older document, and so accounts for the expression in vi, 6. The changing of Aaron's rod into a serpent, of the waters of the Nilo into blood, the plague of frogs, of musquites (A. V. lice), and of boils, and the destruction of the first-born, are, according to Knobel, Elohistic. He polemizes against his critics, he considers here links of connection, and a regular sequence in the narrative. He bids us observe that Jehovah always addresses Moses, and that Moses directs Aaron how to act. The miracles, then, are arranged in order of importance: first there is the sign which serves to accredit the mission of Aaron; next follow these plagues, which, however, do not touch men, and these are sent through the instrumentality of Aaron; the fourth plague is a plague upon man, and here Moses takes the most prominent part; the fifth and last is accomplished by Jehovah himself. Thus the miracles increase in intensity as they go on. The order in which they rise in dignity, from the rod of Aaron with his rod of might begins the work, he gives way afterwards to his greater brother, whilst for the last act of redemption Jehovah employs no human agency, but himself with a mighty hand and outstretched arm effects the delivery of his people. The passages thus selected have no doubt a sort of connection, but it is in the highest degree arbitrary to conclude that because portions of a work may be omitted without seriously disturbing the sense, these portions do not belong to the original work, but must be regarded as subsequent embellishments and additions.

Again, all agree in assigning chaps. iii and iv to the Jehovahist. The call of Moses, as there described, is said to be merely the Jehovahistic parallel to vi, 2-7. Yet it seems improbable that the Elohist should introduce Moses with the bare words, "And God spake to Moses." For it is impossible to imagine that very previous history of so remarkable a man. So argues Hävernick, and, as it appears to us, not without reason. It will be observed that none of these critics attempt to make the divine names a criterion whereby to distinguish the several documents. Thus, in the Jehovahistic portion (docs. 5-22), it is absolute, or isolated in its mythical work, with a sort of uncease candor, "but ver. 17, 20, Elohim (?)," and again (iii, 4, 6, 11-15), "here seven times Elohim." In other places there is the same difficulty as in xix, 17, 19, which Sæhelin, as well as Knobel, gives to the Jehovahist. In the passages in chaps. vii, viii, ix, which Knobel classes in the earlier record, the name Jehovah occurs throughout. It is obvious, then, that there must be other means of determining the relative antiquity of the various portions of the book. The attempt to ascertain which are earlier and which are later must entirely fail.

Accordingly, certain peculiarities of style are supposed to be characteristic of the two documents. Thus, for instance, De Wette (Einleitung, § 151, S. 186) appeals to יִפְקַד (Deut. vi, 7; Josh. iii, 17, 41; Judges v, 4; the formula "אָדָם אֶלֹהִים נָשָׁה..." xxv, 1; xxx, 11, etc.; וַיִּקָּרֵב, vi, 26; vi, 27; xii, 17, 41, 51; מֵאֵלָה וְאֶלֹהִים עָשָׂה.xxxii, 6; xxix, 41; xxx, 8, and other passages, as decisive of the Elohist. Stähelin also proposes on very similar grounds to separate the first from the second legislation. "Wherever," he says, "I find mention of a pillar of fire, or of a cloud (Exod. xxiii, 9, 10), or an 'angel of Jehovah,' as Exod. xxiii, xxiv, or the phrase 'flowing with milk and honey,' as Exod. xxiv, 3; xxi, xlviii, 7, where mention is made of a coming down of God, as Exod. xix, xxxiv, 5, or where the Canaanitish nations are numbered, or the tabernacle supposed to be without the camp (Exod. xxiii, 7), I feel tolerably certain that I am reading the words of the author of the second legislation (the Jehovahist)." But these nice critical distinctions are very precarious, especially in a stereotyped language like the Hebrew.

Unfortunately, too, dogmatical prepossessions have been allowed some share in the controversy. De Wette and his school chose to set down everything which seemed of a miracle as proof of later authorship. The love of the marvellous, which all they see in the stories of miracles, according to them could not have existed in an earlier and simpler age. But on their own hypothesis this is a very extraordinary view; for the traditions of a people, generally the least wonderful, but the reverse; and one cannot thus acquit the second writer of a design in embellishing his narrative. However, this is not the place to argue with those who deny the possibility of a miracle, or who make the narration of miracles proof sufficient of later authorship. Into this question, it is true, has not fallen. By admitting some of the plagues into his Elohistic catalogue, he shows that he is at least free from the dogmatical prejudices of critics like De Wette. But his own critical tests are not conclusive. And the way in which certain pieces, as xx, 11, and xiii, 15, 16, 27, where it suits his purpose, is so completely arbitrary, and results so evidently from the stern constraint of a theory, that his labors in this direction are not more satisfactory than those of his predecessors.

On the whole, there seems much reason to doubt whether critical acumen will ever be able plausibly to distinguish between the original and the supplement in the book of Exodus. There is nothing indeed forced or improbable in the supposition either that Moses himself incorporated in his memoirs this ancient tradition, whether oral or written; or that a writer later than Moses made use of materials left by the great legislator in a somewhat fragmentary form. There is an occasional abruptness in the narrative, which suggests that this may possibly have been the case, as in the introduction of the genealogy, vi, 13-27. The remarks in xi, 8; xvi, 55, 36, lead to the same conclusion. The apparent confusion at x, 1-3 may be explained by regarding these verses as parenthetical. Inasmuch, however, as there exists no definite proof or knowledge of any later editor, except it be Joshua or Ezra, to whom, as editor-in-chief, the whole work is ascribed, we are not warranted in attributing the book to any other author than Moses. See Pentateuch.

III. Credibility.—Almost every historical fact mentioned in Exodus has at some time or other been called
in question; but it is certain that all investigation has hitherto only tended to establish the veracity of the narrator. A comparison with other writers and an examination of the monuments confirm, or at least do not contradict, the most material statements of this book. Thus, for instance, Manetho's story of the Hyksos, which is the nucleus of it, has been interpreted by different writers, points at least to some early connection between the Israelites and the Egyptians, and is corroborative of the fact implied in the Pentateuch that, at the time of the Israelitish sojourn, Egypt was ruled by a foreign dynasty. So the Bible speaks, too, of the East who occupied the eastern part of Lower Egypt; and his account shows that the Israelites had become a numerous and formidable people. According to Exod. xii, 37, the number of men, besides women and children, who left Egypt was 600,000. This would give for the whole nation about two million and a half. There is no doubt some difficulty in accounting for this immense increase, if we suppose (as on many accounts seems probable) that the actual residence of the children of Israel was only 215 years. We must remember, indeed, that the number who went into Egypt with Jacob was considerably more than “threescore and ten souls” [see CHRONOLOGY]; we must also take into account the extraordinary fruitfulness of Egypt (concerning which all writers are agreed—Strabo, xv, 478; Aristotle. Hist. Anim. vii, 4; Plutarch, Deisus, ch. viii, quoted by Havernick), and especially of that part of it in which the Israelites dwelt; and, finally, we must take into account the “mixed multitude” that accompanied the Israelites (Exod. xii, 36).

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

Other objections are of a very arbitrary kind. Thus Knobel thinks the command to destroy the male children (i, 15 sq.) extremely improbable, because the object of the order was not to destroy the male, but to make use of them as slaves. To require the midwives to act as the enemies of their own people, and to issue an injunction that every son born of Israelitish parents should be thrown into the Nile, was a piece of downright madness of which he thinks the king would not be guilty. But we do not know that the midwives were Hebrew; they may have been Egyptian; and kings, like other slave-owners, may act contrary to their interest in obedience to their fears or their passions; indeed, Knobel himself compares the story of king Bocchoris, who commanded all the unclean in his land to be cast into the sea (Lycurgus, ap. Josephus, Apion, i, 34), and the destruction of the Spartan helots (Plutarch, Lycurgus, 28). He objects further that it is not easy to reconcile such a command with the number of the Israelites at their exode. But we suppose that in very many instances the command of the king would be obeyed, and probably it did not long continue in force.

Again, De Wette objects to the call of Moses that he could not have thus formed the resolve to become the saviour of his people, which, as Havernick justly remarks, is a dogmatical, not a critical decision. It has been alleged that the place, according to the original narrative, where God first appeared to Moses was Egypt, God making himself known as Jehovah, that being the first intimation of the name (Exod. vi, 2). Another account, it is further alleged, places the scene at Horeb (ch. iii, 2), God appearing as the God of the patriarchs (ver. 6), and declaring his name Jehovah (ver. 14); while differently as to the time of the Israelites (ch. iv, 19). These assumptions require no refutation. It need only be remarked that the name Jehovah in ch. vi, 2 necessarily presupposes the explanation given of it in chap. iii, 14. Further, Moses's abode in Midian, and connection with Jethro, were matters, Knobel argues from the older writer, while his statement that Moses was eighty years old when he appeared before Pharaoh (chap. vii, 7), is declared irreconcilable with the supplementary narrative which represents him as a young man at the time of his flight from Egypt (ch. ii, 11), and a son by Zipporah, whom he married probably on his arrival in Midian, is still young when he returned to Egypt (ch. iv, 20, 25; xviii, 2). There can be no question that from Moses's leaving Egypt till his return thither a considerable time elapsed.

It is stated in Exod. ii, 28 as “many days,” and by Stephen (Acts vii, 30) as forty years. But his stay in Midian, said to be the abode in Midian extended over the whole of that period. The expression ἰδείς, “he sat down,” or settled (Exod. ii, 15), may only point to Midian as the end of his wandering; or if otherwise, his marriage need not have followed immediately on his arrival, or there may have been a considerable interval between the birth of his two sons. The silence, indeed, of this part of the narrative regarding the birth of the second son may possibly be referrible to this circumstance, more probably indicated, however, by the different feelings of the father as expressed in the names Gershom and Eliezer (ch. ii, 22; xviii, 4). The order of these names is perplexing to expositors who conceive that the first shadow of the fugitive would have been thankfulness for his safety, and that only afterwards would spring up the feelings of exile. But if the name Eliezer was bestowed in connection with the preparation to return to Egypt, and particularly with the intimation “all the men are dead which sought thy life” (ch. iv, 19), the whole is strikingly consistent. Another instance of the alleged discrepancies is that, according to one account, Moses's reception from his brethren was very discouraging (chap. vi, 9), whereas the other narrative describes it as quite the reverse (ch. iv, 81). De Wette calls this a striking contradiction, but this is such when the interval (chap. v, 19–23), which shows the change that in the interval had occurred in the prospects of the Israelites, is violently ejected from the narrative—a process fitted to produce contradictions in any composition. See Moses.

The only alleged anachronism of importance in this book is the remark relative to the continuance of the manna (chap. xvi, 35), which would seem to extend it beyond the time of Moses, particularly when compared with Josh. v, 11, 12, according to which the manna ceased not until after the passage of the Jordan. But, as remarked by Hengstener, it is not of the cessation of the manna that the historian here writes, but of its continuance. Besides, “forty years” must be taken as a round number, for the manna, strictly speaking, lasted about one month less (ch. xvi, 1). See MANNA.

The five plagues are physically, many of them, what might be expected in Egypt, although in their intensity and in their rapid succession they are clearly supernatural. Even the order in which they occur is an order in which physical causes are allowed to operate. The corruption of the river is followed by the plague of frogs. From the dead frogs are bred myriads of lice; from these came the murrain among the cattle
and the bulls on men; and so on. Most of the plagues, indeed, though of course in a much less aggravating form, and without such succession, are actually experienced at this day in Egypt. Of the plague of locusts it is expressly remarked that "before them were no such swarms of locusts as come out of the land of Egypt." And all travellers in Egypt have observed swarms of locusts, brought generally by a south-west wind (Denon, however, mentions their coming with an east wind), and in the winter or spring of the year. This last fact agrees also with our narrative. Lepusius speaks of being lamed by locusts after he had fled from the desert in hundreds of thousands to the valley. "At the edge of the fruitful plain," he says, "they fell down in showers." This continued for six days, indeed in weaker flights much longer. He also saw hail in Egypt. In January, 1818, and Pharaoh's daughter goes to the river to bathe. At the present day, it is true that only women of the lower orders bathe in the river. But Herodotus (ii, 35) tells us (what we learn also from the monuments) that in ancient Egypt the women were under no restraint, but appeared more in public than the men. To this must be added that the Egyptians supposed a sovereign virtue to exist in the Nile-waters. The writer speaks of chariots and "chosen chariots" (xiv, 7) as constituting an important element in the Egyptian army, and of the king as leading in person. The monarchical representation of the Pharaohs lead their armies to battle, and the armies consist entirely of infantry and chariots. See CHARIOT.

As the events of this history are laid in Egypt and Arabia, we have ample opportunity of testing the accuracy of the Mosaic accounts, and surely we find nowhere the least opposition against Egyptian institutions and customs; on the contrary, it is most evident that the author had a thorough knowledge of the Egyptian institutions and of the spirit that pervaded them. Exodus contains a mass of incidents and details that have gained new force from the modern discoveries and researches in the field of Egyptian antiquities (comp. Hengstenberg, Die Bisher Mosais und Egypten, Berlin, 1841). The description of the Israelites through the desert also evinces such a thorough familiarity with the localities and customs as the respect of antiquity and scientific travellers of our own time for the authenticity of the Pentateuch (comp. ex. gr. Ramramer, Der Zug der Israeliten aus Egypten nach Canaan, Leips. 1857).

The arrangements of the tabernacle, described in the second part of Exodus, like the privileges and favourable light on the history has a public authenticity of the preceding events; and the least tenable of all the objections against it are, that the architectural arrangements of the tabernacle were too artificial, and the materials and richness too costly and precious for the condition and position of the Jews at that early period, etc. But the critics seem to have overlooked the fact that the Israelites of that period were a people who had never seen the temple, and who therefore could not have known how the tabernacle was constructed. It is true, however, if the Hebrews could not have been transported to the desert of hundreds of thousands to the valley. "At the edge of the fruitful plain," he says, "they fell down in showers." This continued for six days, indeed in weaker flights much longer. He also saw hail in Egypt. In January, 1818, and Pharaoh's daughter goes to the river to bathe. At the present day, it is true that only women of the lower orders bathe in the river. But Herodotus (ii, 35) tells us (what we learn also from the monuments) that in ancient Egypt the women were under no restraint, but appeared more in public than the men. To this must be added that the Egyptians supposed a sovereign virtue to exist in the Nile-waters. The writer speaks of chariots and "chosen chariots" (xiv, 7) as constituting an important element in the Egyptian army, and of the king as leading in person. The monarchical representation of the Pharaohs lead their armies to battle, and the armies consist entirely of infantry and chariots. See CHARIOT.

As the events of this history are laid in Egypt and Arabia, we have ample opportunity of testing the accuracy of the Mosaic accounts, and surely we find nowhere the least opposition against Egyptian institutions and customs; on the contrary, it is most evident that the author had a thorough knowledge of the Egyptian institutions and of the spirit that pervaded them. Exodus contains a mass of incidents and details that have gained new force from the modern discoveries and researches in the field of Egyptian antiquities (comp. Hengstenberg, Die Bisher Mosais und Egypten, Berlin, 1841). The description of the Israelites through the desert also evinces such a thorough familiarity with the localities and customs as the respect of antiquity and scientific travellers of our own time for the authenticity of the Pentateuch (comp. ex. gr. Ramramer, Der Zug der Israeliten aus Egypten nach Canaan, Leips. 1857).

The arrangements of the tabernacle, described in the second part of Exodus, like the privileges and favourable light on the history has a public authenticity of the preceding events; and the least tenable of all the objections against it are, that the architectural arrangements of the tabernacle were too artificial, and the materials and richness too costly and precious for the condition and position of the Jews at that early period, etc. But the critics seem to have overlooked the fact that the Israelites of that period were a people who had never seen the temple, and who therefore could not have known how the tabernacle was constructed. It is true, however, if the Hebrews could not have been transported to the desert of hundreds of thousands to the valley. "At the edge of the fruitful plain," he says, "they fell down in showers." This continued for six days, indeed in weaker flights much longer. He also saw hail in Egypt. In January, 1818, and Pharaoh's daughter goes to the river to bathe. At the present day, it is true that only women of the lower orders bathe in the river. But Herodotus (ii, 35) tells us (what we learn also from the monuments) that in ancient Egypt the women were under no restraint, but appeared more in public than the men. To this must be added that the Egyptians supposed a sovereign virtue to exist in the Nile-waters. The writer speaks of chariots and "chosen chariots" (xiv, 7) as constituting an important element in the Egyptian army, and of the king as leading in person. The monarchical representation of the Pharaohs lead their armies to battle, and the armies consist entirely of infantry and chariots. See CHARIOT.

As the events of this history are laid in Egypt and Arabia, we have ample opportunity of testing the accuracy of the Mosaic accounts, and surely we find nowhere the least opposition against Egyptian institutions and customs; on the contrary, it is most evident that the author had a thorough knowledge of the Egyptian institutions and of the spirit that pervaded them. Exodus contains a mass of incidents and details that have gained new force from the modern discoveries and researches in the field of Egyptian antiquities (comp. Hengstenberg, Die Bisher Mosais und Egypten, Berlin, 1841). The description of the Israelites through the desert also evinces such a thorough familiarity with the localities and customs as the respect of antiquity and scientific travellers of our own time for the authenticity of the Pentateuch (comp. ex. gr. Ramramer, Der Zug der Israeliten aus Egypten nach Canaan, Leips. 1857).

The arrangements of the tabernacle, described in the second part of Exodus, like the privileges and favourable light on the history has a public authenticity of the preceding events; and the least tenable of all the objections against it are, that the architectural arrangements of the tabernacle were too artificial, and the materials and richness too costly and precious for the condition and position of the Jews at that early period, etc. But the critics seem to have overlooked the fact that the Israelites of that period were a people who had never seen the temple, and who therefore could not have known how the tabernacle was constructed. It is true, however, if the Hebrews could not have been transported to the desert of hundreds of thousands to the valley. "At the edge of the fruitful plain," he says, "they fell down in showers." This continued for six days, indeed in weaker flights much longer. He also saw hail in Egypt. In January, 1818, and Pharaoh's daughter goes to the river to bathe. At the present day, it is true that only women of the lower orders bathe in the river. But Herodotus (ii, 35) tells us (what we learn also from the monuments) that in ancient Egypt the women were under no restraint, but appeared more in public than the men. To this must be added that the Egyptians supposed a sovereign virtue to exist in the Nile-waters. The writer speaks of chariots and "chosen chariots" (xiv, 7) as constituting an important element in the Egyptian army, and of the king as leading in person. The monarchical representation of the Pharaohs lead their armies to battle, and the armies consist entirely of infantry and chariots. See CHARIOT.
EXOMOLOGIES

EXORCISM, EXORCIST

1. In General.—The belief in daemoniacal possessions, which may be traced in almost every nation, has always been attended by the professed authority, the part of some individuals, to release the unhappy victims from their calamity. In Greece, men of no less distinction than both Epicurus (Diog. Laertius, x, 4) and . . . were sons of women who lived by this art, and both were bitterly reproached, the one by the Stoics, and the other by his great rival and pupil, the Orphic Gnostics (De Cor.), for having assisted their parents in these practices. In some instances this power was considered as a divine gift; in others it was thought to be acquired by investigations into the nature of demons and the qualities of natural productions, as herbs, stones, etc., and of drugs compounded of them, by the use of certain forms of adjurations, invocations, ceremonies, and other observances. And indeed, the various forms of exorcism, alluded to in authors of all nations, are innumerable, varying from the bloody human sacrifice down to the fumes of brimstone, etc. See SOC.

II. In the Old and New Testaments.—The verb ἐξοροῖσθαι occurs once in the New Testament and once in the Sept. version of the Old Testament. In both cases it is used, not in the sense of exorcize, but as a synonym of the simple verb ἐξορεῖσθαι, to charge with an oath, to adjure. Compare Gen. xxiv, 3 (Acts xix, 13) "I will make thee swear" with 37, xxxvi, 63 with Mark v, 7; and see I Thess. v, 27 (ἐξοροῖσθαι, Lachmann, Tschtendorf). The cognate noun, however, together with the simple verb, is found once (Acts xix, 13) with reference to the ejection of evil spirits from persons possessed by them (comp. ἐξορτάσθαι, ἐξορῆσθαι, Josephus, Wars, viii, 255). The word is used in the NT, with the sense of "to make a confession," which is the most usual meaning of the passage, as the designation of a well-known class of persons to whom the individuals mentioned belonged, confirms what we know from other sources as to the common practice of exorcism amongst the Jews (see the Talm. Babyl. Yoma, fol. iv, v). That some, at least, of these not only pretended to, but possessed the power of exorcising, appears by our Lord's admission when he asks the Pharisees, "If I cast out devils, by whom do your disciples (vaios) cast them out?" (Matt. xii, 27). What means were employed by real exorcists we are not informed. David, by playing skilfully on a harp, procured the temporary departure of the evil spirit which troubled Saul (1 Sam. xvi, 23). The power of expelling demons Josephus places among the endowments of Solomon, and relates that he left behind him the manner of using exorcisms by which they drive away demons (for the pretended fragments of these books, see Fabricius, Cod. Povv. Vet. Test. p. 1054). He declares that he had seen a man, named Eleazar, releasing people that were demoniacal, in the presence of Vespasian, his sons, captains, and all the other soldiers of the legion. He was abandoned by the manner of cure thus: "He put a ring that had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nos-
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trils of the demoniac; after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils, and when the man fell down he adjured him to return no more, making still mention of Solomon and reciting the incantations he composed." He further adds, that when Elijah was to perform an extraordinary act in Mount Carmel, he had such a power, he set a cup or basin full of water a little way off, and commanded the demon as he went out of the man to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know he had left the man (Am. viii, 2, 5). He also adduces the mode of obtaining the not less severe exorcisms, which he says, "if it be only brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away the demons," under circumstances which, for their strangeness, may vie with any prescription in the whole science of exorcism (War, vii, 6, 5). Among all the references to exorcism, as practised by the Jews, in the New Testament, Matt. (xiv, 27; Mark ix, 38; Luke ix, 49, 50), we find only one instance which affords any clue to the means employed (Acts xix, 19); from which passage it appears that certain professed exorcists took upon them to call over a demoniac the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preach-eth." Their proceeding seems to have been in conformity with the well-known opinions of the Jews in those days, that miracles might be wrought by invoking the names of the Deity, or angels, or patriarchs, etc.; compare Gen., xxvi, 24; 1 Sam. vii, 9; Matt. x, 8; Mark iii, 27; Luke vii, 49; etc., and Lucian (frag. p. 141). The epithet applied in the above text to these exorcists (ὑπερψυχόνων, Vulgate, circumventium Judæorum) indicates that they were travelling mountebanks, who, besides skill in medicine, pretended to the knowledge of magic. Justin Martyr has an interesting suggestion as to the possibility of a Jew successfully exorcising a devil, by employing the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ( Dial. cum Tryph. c. 85, p. 811, C. See also Apol. ii, 6, 46, B, where he claims for Christianity superior but not necessarily exclusive power in this respect. Compare 1 Tim. i, 17; Matt. xii, 25; Hos. ii, 5, and the authorities quoted by Grotius on Matt. xii, 27). But Justin goes on to say that the Jewish exorcists, as a class, had sunk down to the superstitious rites and usages of the heathen (comp. Pliny, xxx, 2). See DEMON.

The power of casting out devils was bestowed by Christ while on earth upon the apostles (Matt. x, 8), and the seventy disciples (Luke x, 17-19), and was, according to his promise (Mark xvi, 17), exercised by believers after his ascension (Acts x, 19); but to the Christians he has been henceforth peculiar. He left himself or by his followers, the N.-T. writers never apply the terms "exorcise" or "exorcist." Nor is the office of the exorcist mentioned by Paul in his enumeration of the miraculous gifts (1 Cor. xii, 9). Mosheim says that the particular order of exorcists did not exist till the close of the third century, and he ascribes its introduction to the prevalent fancies of the Gnostics (cent. iii, 11, c. 4). We notice Jahn's remark upon the silence of John himself in his gospel on the subject of possessions, although he introduces the Jews as spies of the mission of Jesus; and also his allusion to the demoniacal and demoniacal possessions, and although he often speaks of the sick who were healed by the Saviour; coupled with the fact that John wrote his gospel in Asia Minor, where medical science was very flourishing, and where it was generally known that the diseases and demoniacal devils were mostly natural diseases (Jahn, Arch. l, ii, 223, 477-480); see also Lomeir, De Vet. Gent. Lux.; Bekker, Le Monde Enchante; Van Dale, De divinat. idol. c. vi, p. 519 sq.; Amnall, Dies. ad loc. in Actis, Upsal. 1834, i, 441 sqq.

III. In the early Church.—1. As Christians were supposed to be in constant conflict with the devil, they used not only prayer, but also exorcism, which was held to be a power given to the Church. Thus: Tertullian (A.D. 203), speaking of the warfare of the Christian soldier (De Corona Milit. c. 11) with demons, says exorcismis fuggiit (he routs them with exorcisms). So in his Apologeticus (c. 23) he says that the "evil spirit will confess himself to be the demon when commanded to speak by any Christian" (Juncta a quibusdam divinitetis. So also Origen, cont. Celsum, lib. vii, οὗτος τὸ τραίσ-

50νηρίον πράττειν (the common unlettered people do the same). "Oh, could you but hear," says Cyprian (Ep. 70), and see those demons when they are tortured by us, and afflicted with both spiritual and physical anguish, and thus ejected from the bodies of the possessed (obessorum), moaning and lamenting with human voice, through the power divine, as they feel the rods and stripes they confess the judgment to come. The exorcists rule with commanding right over the whole army of the infernal adversary. They promise the devil promises to depart, but departs not; but when we come to baptism, then indeed we ought to be assured and confident, because the demon is then pressed, and the man is consecrated to God and liberated." The invocation of Christ, attended by the sign of the cross, and pronounced by persons formally appointed to the office, was the method by which those stupendous effects were usually produced; and one among the many evils which proceeded from this absurd practice was an opinion, which gained some prevalence among less enlightened, that the object of Christ's mission was to emancipate mankind from the yoke of their invisible enemy, and that the promised redemption was nothing more than a sensible liberation from the manifest influence of evil spirits" (Waddington, Church History, ch. xiii). The Apostolical Constitutions, viii, 26, says: "An exorcist is not appointed, for the prince pertaineth to voluntary goodness and the grace of God, through Christ, by the influence of the Holy Spirit; for he who hath received the gift of healing is declared by revelation from God, the grace that is in him being manifest unto all. But if there be a bishophood, and a deacon, and a presbyter, and a deacon, he is appointed accordingly." Thus it appears (1) that the power of casting out devils was held to exist in the Church; (2) that as late as the third century it was not held to belong exclusively to the clergy, but to the whole church, or at least to some among the laity. The use of exorcism seems to have been at first confined to the case of persons "possessed with devils," ἄνθρωπων, who were given into the care of persons set apart for the purpose (Cyprian, Epist. 75, 76). See EXORCASMENTBS. But Cyprian also speaks of "profane exorcists" (Orig. Eccles. bk. iii, ch. iv) as follows: "Take Bona's opinion to be the truest, that it came in upon the withdrawing (Ærum. Liturg. lib. i, c. xxv, note 17) of that strength which 'the divinity and demon is strong, and probably was by degrees, and not at the same time in all places. Cornelius (op. Episc. lib. vi, c. xliii), who lived in the third century, reckons exorcists among the inferior orders of the Church of Rome; yet the author of the Constitutions, who lived after him, says it was not known there (Constit. Apostol. cap. 68), but God bestowed the gift of exorcising as a free grace upon whomever he pleased; and therefore, consonant to that hypothesis, there is no rule among those Constitutions for giving any ordination to exorcists, as being appointed by God only, and not by the Church. But the credit of the Constitutions is not such as to make much account of in this matter; for it is certain by this time exorcists were settled as an order in most parts of the Greek Church, as well as the Latin; and which is evident from
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the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, in one of whose canons (Conc. Antioch. c. x. § 2) is given to the choro-
episcopos to promote subdeacons, readers, and exorcists, which argues that those were then standing orders
of the Church. After this exorcists are frequently
mentioned among the inferior orders by the writers of
the fourth century, as in the Council of Laodicea
(Conc. Laodic. c. v. § 2. Epp.) and the Council of
Nicaea (Eph., Fid., note 21), Paulinus (Natal. iv. s. Feliciss.), Sulpicius Severus (Vit. S. Martin. c. v.), and the
Scripts of the
Theodosius (Cod. Theodosii. leg. xii. tit. 1, De Decretu-
leg. 12), and Gratian (id. lib. xvi. tit. ii, De Episc. Leg.
14). This also appears to be a later practice, and the
rites of exorcism were adopted by the Church and
granted them the same immunities from civil offices as
they do to the other orders of the clergy. Their
ordination and office is thus described by the fourth
Council of Carthage (Conc. Carth. iv. c. vii: Exorcista
quam ordinatur, accepit de manu episcopi libellum, in
quos scripti sunt exorcismi, dicente sibi episcopo
Episcopi et commendas memoriam, et habeto potestatem
imponendi manus super energumenam, sive baptismato-
su, sive catechumenum): "When an exorcist is or-
dained, he shall receive at the hands of the bishop a
book, wherein the forms of exorcising are written, the
blessing of the bishop is inscribed thereon, he shall
memorize them, and have them in memory, and have
thou power to lay hands upon the energumens, whether
they be baptized or only catechumens."

These forms were certain prayers, together
with adorations in the name of Christ, commanding the
Spirit to work in the part of the possessed person,
which may be collected from the epistles of Paulinus,
concerning the promotion of St. Felix to this office,
where he says (Natal. iv. s. Felicias. : Primor lector
servivit in annis, inde gradum cepit, cui munus voce
sibi adiuvaret vox, et sacris pelleri verbis), from a
reader or an exorcist, who had power to ador-
jure evil spirits, and to drive them out by certain holy
words. It does not appear that they were ordained
to this office by any imposition of hands either in the
Greek or Latin Church; but yet no one might pretend
to exercise it either publicly or privately, in the church
or in any house, without the appointment of the bishop,
as the Council of Laodicea directs (Conc. Laodic. c.
xxvi.; or at least the license of a choroepiscopos, who
in that case was authorized (Concil. Antiochen. cap. x)
by the bishop's deputation.

Cyril of Jerusalem († 386) gives a somewhat detailed
account of the form of exorcisms and ceremonies used
were: 1. Preliminary fasting, prayers, and gen-
uefections. These, however, may be regarded as gen-
eral preliminaries to baptism. 2. Imposition of hands
upon the head of the candidate, who stood with his
head bowed down in a submissive posture. 3. Putting
off the shoes and clothing, with the exception of an
under garment. 4. Facing the candidate to the west,
which was the symbol of darkness, as the east was of
light. In the Eastern Church he was required to
thrust out his hand towards the west, as if in the act
of pushing away an object in that direction. This
was a token of his abhorrence of Satan and evil spirits,
and his determination to resist and repel them. 5. A
renunciation of Satan and his works thus: *I renounce
Satan and his works, and his pomps and his services,
and all things that are his. This or a similar form
was thrice repeated. 6. The bishop then bound upon
the candidate either once or three times, and ad-
jured the unclean spirit in the name of the Father,
Son, and Holy Ghost, to come out of him. This form
of adoration seems not to have been in use until the
fourth century; and these several formalities were
apparently introduced gradually at different times.
The whole ceremony was at first confined to the
renunciation of 'the devil and his works' on the part of
the person about to be baptized (Culman, Christian
Antiquities, ch. xiv, § 9; Riddle, i. c.).

IV. Roman Catholic Church.—In the Roman Catho-
lic Church the same ceremony as in the Protestant
Church exists, with one or more minor orders of the
clergy—acolytes, exorcists, readers, por-
ters (Council of Trent, sess. xxiiii, chap. ii, of Orders).
When initiating the exorcist the bishop gives him a
book containing the exorcisms (or the Missal), and
says, "Acipio et commendas memoriam, et habeto potesta-
tem imponendi manus super energumenam, sive baptismato-
su, sive catechumenum" (Take this and commit it to
memory, and have power to impose hands on persons
possessed, be they baptized or catechumens). Every
candidate for priests' orders in the Roman Church first
receives the four lower orders, including that of exor-
cist. The process of exorcising water for baptism is
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given under Baptism (vol. i, p. 650, col. 2). Children are regarded as belonging to the devil until baptized, and the priest or assisting exorcist blows out the evil spirit by the breath (exsufflation), and also breathes on the child again (inafflation), as a symbol of the gift of the Holy Spirit. The priest says: "for the beast exsufflated to give you, the beast of unclean spirit, the devil and all evil spirits. In Metaphanis Critisculum Confessio (1661), cap. vii, de Dei, the statement is that baptism must be performed with prayers and exorcisms (meti eivov kai korphovxov); also (xochov eis korphovxov pora twn dourwv xuniwv xwvngwv

Exorcism is a很是 a primary function of the priest. It is to destroy the power of evil spirits and to free the soul from their influence. It is a very ancient practice, and is mentioned in the Old Testament. The Bible speaks of the exorcist as one who is able to cast out demons. In the New Testament, we find several instances of the exorcism of demons. For example, in Mark 1:24, we read that Jesus cast out a demon from a man who had a Legion of demons. In Matthew 9:38, Jesus said to His disciples, "the angels of this world are strong in exorcism, but they cannot overcome the exorcist."

In the history of exorcism, the Church has always been concerned with the problem of demons and evil spirits. In the Middle Ages, the Church developed a system of exorcism, and the exorcist was a person who was trained in the art of exorcism. In the modern Church, the role of the exorcist is still an important one. In the Prayer-book, the 5th and 6th of Edward VI, they de-
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The seventy-second canon of the Church of England forbids any minister attempting to expel a devil or devils, under pain of the imputation of imposture, and censure, and deposal from the ministry, except he first obtains the license of the bishop of his diocese, had under his hand and seal (Whately, Logic, ii. viii. § 2). In the form of baptism used in the Church of England, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the question is put to the candidate, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works?" etc. This is a remnant of the old form of renunciation (connected with the exorcism at the baptism of catechumens), but of exorcism itself there is nothing in their formularies.


EXORDIUM. See Homiletics; Sermon.

Expectancy (Lat. expectatio, expectare, gratiae expectatio) is the name of theRoman law, which makes a claim to an ecclesiastical benefice which has not yet become vacant. At first the German emperors granted expectancies for the first place in every chapter that became vacant after their accession to the throne (qua prince praecipe). After the eleventh century thepopes granted expectancies at first in the shape of a request, and subsequently in the shape of an order. The expectancy was either for a definite benefice, or for any benefice of a certain class or chapter. The third Council of Lateran (1179), and later papal rescripts, forbade the expectancies, but the popes themselves continued to grant them. They were again restricted by the Council of Constance, and forbidden by the Council of Basel. The Council of Trent totally abolished them, except in cases of bishops and monastic superiors, to whom, in some specified cases, a coadjutor, with the right of succession, was given. In the Protestant state churches the princes have claimed the right to grant expectancies.—Allgem. Real-Encycl. i. 622; Herzog, Real-Encycl. iv. 292. (A.J.S.)

Expectation Week, the time between Ascension Day and Whitsunday, the period during which the apostles tarried at Jerusalem in expectation of the fulfillment of the Master's promise as to the outpouring of the Comforter. (Procter, Primeval Church, i. 265; Hist. of the Church, i. 463.)

Expediency, fitness of means to ends. On expediency as the ground of morals, see Dwight, Theology, ser. xxix; Robert Hall, Complete Works, i. 96; ii. 235; Lit. and Theol. Review, iv. 388; Wayland, in Bibliotheca Sacra, 1843, p. 301; and the article Ethics.

Experience (ἐμπειρία, Rom. v. 4, "proof," as elsewhere rendered, approbation of integrity as the result of trial). "Try three stages of προκειμένη, endurance, ἐκπόρευσις, approval, and διαφωτίζω, hope, are recommended by the apostle as proceeding from the sufferings; the first denotes the state of moral earnestness implied in patient and faithful endurance, the second that state of approval as genuine which thence results, and bears with it hope as its blossom" (Olshausen, Comment. in loc.).

EXPERIENCE. I. In Philosophy.—"Experience in its strict sense, applies to what has occurred in a person's own knowledge. Experience, in this sense, of course relates to the past alone. Thus it is that a man knows by experience what sufferings he has undergone, the experience of disease, or what height the tide reached at a certain time and place. Where the word is used to denote that judgment which is derived from experience in the primary sense, by reasoning from that in combination with other data. Thus a man may assert, on the ground of experience, that he was cured of a disorder by such a medicine—that that medicine is generally beneficial in that disorder; that the tide may always be expected, under such circumstances, to rise to such a mark; and none of these can be known by experience, but are conclusions from experience. It is in this sense only that experience can be applied to the future, or, which comes to the same thing, to any general fact; as, e. g. when it is said that we know by experience that water exposed to the sun in certain temperature will freeze' (Whately, Logic, i. 1.)

Locke (Essay on Human Understanding, bk. ii, ch. i) assigns experience as the only and universal source of human knowledge. "Whence hath the mind all the cantonets, is still left open, in which new answer, in one word, from experience; in that all our knowledge is founded, and from that ultimo, they derive itself. Our observation, employed either about external sensible objects, or about the internal operations of our minds, perceived and reflected on by ourselves, is the only asper which supplies our understanding with all the materials of thinking. These are the fountains of knowledge from whence all the ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring—that is, sensation and reflection." In opposition to this view, according to which all human knowledge is a posteriori, or the result of observation and reflection, it is contended that knowledge is a priori—knowledge which experience neither does nor can give, and knowledge without which there could be no experience, inasmuch as all the generalizations of experience proceed and rest upon it. "No accumulation of experiments whatever can bring a general law home to the mind of man, because, if we rest upon experiments, our conclusion can never logically pass beyond the bounds of our premises; we can never infer more than we have proved; and all the past, which we have not seen, and the future, which we cannot see, are as hidden from us as if we had never observed anything; and if we rest upon experiments, our conclusion can never logically pass beyond the bounds of our premises; for we can never infer more than we have proved; and all the past, which we have not seen, and the future, which we cannot see, are as hidden from us as if we had never observed anything." (Sewell, Christian Mor. ch. xxiv.) "We may have seen one circle and investigated its properties, but why, when our individual experience is so circumscripted, do we assume the same relations of all? Simply because the understanding is by nature a controlling agent; for the laws which our objects will have similar properties; it does not acquire this idea by sensation or custom; the mind develops it by its own intrinsic force—it is a law of our faculties, ultimate and universal, from which all reason proceeds" (Dr. Mill, Essays, p. 387).—FLEMING, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s. v.

II. In Religion.—(1) Knowledge gained by trial or practice. A man unacquainted with such spiritual changes in the mind which are mentioned in the Scriptures can form no notion of them. He may have some idea of the effects of the changes of the new birth, sanctification, etc., but he does not understand their nature; they are foolishness to him. Nothing is more common with unregenerate persons than to ridicule as enthusiastic religious experience. But if the constitution of human nature is considered, it will be seen that such emotions are natural to it. His passions are original parts of his mental constitution, and must be exercised in religion. They cannot be destroyed. However beautiful religious may be as a theory, its excellency and energy can only be displayed as experienced. Hence the Bible employs the analogous terms tasting, feeling, to indicate the internal enjoyment of a Christian. He has peace through
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believing. He joys in God, through whom he has received the atonement. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart. He is conscious that he is a new creature" (Farrar, Bibl. Dict. s. a.). "That our experience is always absolutely pure in the present state cannot be expected; but if it be true, it will not fail, through the exercise of Christian diligence, to become more and more pure. The main point, therefore, is to guard well against mistaking the illusions of the imagination for the operation of divine truth on the conscience and the heart (1 Thess. ii. 13). See AFFECTIONS. (2.) The most valuable things are most apt to be counterfeited. But Christian experience may be considered as genuine, 1. When it accords with the revelation of God's mind and will, or what he has revealed in his word. Anything contrary to this, however pleasing, cannot sound, or produce, by divine agency. 2. When its tendency is to promote humility in us: that experience by which we learn our own weakness, and to subdue pride, must be good. 3. When it teaches us to bear with others, and to do them good. 4. When it operates so as to excite us to love, and to increase devotion, and生怕 to our regard to God. A powerful experience of the divine favor will lead us to acknowledge the same, and to manifest our gratitude both by constant praise and genuine piety. (3.) Christian experience, however, may be so sound, genuine, and good, be what we have felt and enjoyed the power of religion, and yet have not always acted with prudence as to their experience. 1. Some boast of their experiences, or talk of them as if they were very extraordinary; whereas, were they acquainted with others, they would find it not so. That a man may make mention of his experience is no way improper, but often useful; but to hear persons always talking of themselves seems to indicate a spirit of pride, and that their experience cannot be very deep. 2. Another abuse of experience is dependence on it. We ought certainly to take encouragement from this, and not be beyond ourselves; but if we are so dependent on past experience as to preclude present exertions, or always expect to have exactly the same assistance in every state, trial, or ordinance, we shall be disappointed. God has wisely ordered it, that he will not always leave his people, yea, he will suspend his aid, and sometimes in our absence. For this very reason, that we may rely on him, and not on the circumstance or ordinance. 3. It is an abuse of experience when introduced at improper times and before improper persons. It is true, we ought never to be so simple to talk of nothing, and yet it is that, and to irreverent religious persons respecting experience, which they know nothing of, as our Saviour says, casting pearls before swine." See BUCK, Treatise on Experience; Gurnall, Christian Armor; Edwards, On the Affections; Doddridge, Rise and Progress; Wesley, Sermons.

EXPERIENCE, Hume's argument from. See HUME; MIRACLE.

Experience Meetings are assemblies of religious persons, who meet for the purpose of relating their experience to each other. These are sometimes called covenant and conference meetings, and, in the Methodist Church, class-meetings (q.v.). "It has been doubted by some whether these meetings are of any great utility, and whether they do not, in some measure, force people to say more than is true, and purport those with pride who are able to communicate their ideas with facility; but to this it has been answered, 1. That the abuse of a thing is no proof of the evil of it. 2. That the most eminent saints of old did not neglect this practice (Psa. lvi. 16; Mal. iii. 16). 3. That by a wise and judicious application of encouragement, Christian is led to see that others have participated of the same joys and sorrows with himself; he is excited to love and serve God; and animated to perseverance in duty by finding that others, of like passions with himself, are zealous, active, and diligent. 4. That the Scriptures seem to enjoin the frequent intercourse of Christians for the purpose of strengthening each other in religious services (Heb. x. 24, 25; Col. iii. 16; Matt. xxviii. 20)." See CLASS-MEETINGS.

EXPIATION, JEWISH DAY OF ANNUAL (Lev. xvi, 1-84; comp. xxiii, 36, 39; Num. xxix, 7-11), a solemn fast (Acts xxvii, 9; Philo, opp. ii, 206, 296, 591; Josephus, Ant. xiv, 16-4, and holy day (יָמִי-נַחֲלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, Lev. xvi, 31; xxiii, 32), held from the evening of the 9th till that of the 10th day of the 6th month, Tisri, five days after the Fast of Tabernacles. The modern Mohammedan fast called "Ramadan," held during an entire (lunar) month, has sometimes been referred to as having its analogies; likewise the fast of Isra amon the ancient Egyptians (Herod. iv, 186; comp. ii, 40), and the Hindu fast-day "Sandrajonam," etc. See FAST.

EXPIATION, "a religious act, by which satisfaction or atonement is made for the commission of some crime, the guilt done away, and the obligation to punishment cancelled. The chief methods of expiation among the Jews were by sacrifices; and it is important always to recollect that the Levitical sacrifices were of a constant and unchangeable character. The Jews sacrifices were unquestionably of divine original, and as the terms taken from them are found applied so frequently to Christ and to his sufferings in the New Testament, they serve to explain that peculiarity under which the apostles regarded the death of Christ, and afforded additional proof that it was considered by them as a sacrifice of expiation, as the grand universal sin-offering for the whole world. For our Lord is announced by John as 'the Lamb of God,' and that not with reference to meekness or any other moral virtue, but with an accompanying phrase, which would communicate to a Jew the full sacrificial sense of the term employed, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' He is called 'our Passover, sacrificed for us.' He is said to have given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour. 'As a priest, he was slain; it was necessary he should have somewhat to offer; and he offered himself, his own blood, to which is ascribed the washing away of sin, and our eternal redemption. He is declared to have put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, to have by himself purged our sins, to have sacrificed the people by his own blood, to have taken away sins. Add to these, and to innumerable other similar expressions and allusions, the argument of the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, by proving at length that the sacrifice of Christ was superior in efficacy to the sacrifices of the law, he most unequivocally assumes that the death of Christ was a sacrifice and sin-offering; for without it would no more have been capable of comparison with the sacrifices of the law, than the death of John the Baptist, St. Stephen, or St. James, all martyrs and sufferers for the truth, who had not recented their testimony with their blood. This very comparison, we may affirm, is utterly unaccountable and absurd on any hypothesis which denies the sacrifice of Christ; for what relation could his death have to the Levitical immolations and offerings if it had no sacrificial character? Nothing less would the fact of his death, as the fact of his death is necessary from the terms themselves, which had acquired this as their established meaning; and absurd, because if, as Socinians say, they used them..."
metaphorically, there was not even an ideal resem-
blance between the figure and that which it was in-
tended to illustrate. So totally irrelevant, indeed, will
those terms appear to any notion entertained of the
definition of Christ. It excludes every charac-
ter, that to assume that our Lord and his apostles used
them as metaphors is profanely to assume them to be
such writers as would not in any other case be toler-
ated; writers wholly unacquainted with the common-
est rules of language, and therefore wholly unfit to be
teaching the highest truth, and not only in religion, but
in things of important difference.
2. "The use of such terms, we have said, would not
only be wholly absurd, but criminally misleading to the
Gentiles, as well as to the Jews, who were first
converted to Christianity. To them the notion of pro-
phetic or figurative actions, or such actions to avert the
damnation of the gods, and which expiated the crimes of off-
cers, was most familiar, and terms corresponding to it
were in constant use. The bold denial of this by Dr.
Priestley might well bring upon him the reproof of arch-
bishop Magee, who, after establishing this point from
the Old and New Testament, observes, 'So clear does
their language announce the notion of a propitia-
tory atonement, that if we would avoid an imputation
on Dr. Priestley's fairness, we are driven, of necessity,
to question the extent of his acquaintance with those
words, which are always consulted in the passage
given by this writer in No. 5 of his 'Illustrations,' appended
to his 'Discourses on the Atonement:' and also the
tenth chapter of Grotius's De Satisfactions, whose
learning has most amply illustrated and firmly settled
this view of the heathen sacrifices. The use to be
made of them in this argument is, that as the apostles
found the very terms they used with reference to the
nature and efficacy of the death of Christ fixed in an
expiatory signification among the Greeks, they could
not, in honesty, use them in a distant figurative sense,
much less in a contrary one, without giving their read-
ers due offerings, or rather by conditioning them with a
new import. From ἄγας, a pollutum, an impurity, which
was to be expiated by sacrifice, are derived ἄγας, ἄγας
and ἄγας, which denote the act of expiation; καθαύρος,
too, to purify, cleanse, is applied to the effect of expia-
tion; and ἄσκομεν denotes the method of propita-
ting the gods by sacrifice. These, and other words of
similar import, are used by the authors of the Septu-
gint, and by the evangelists and apostles; but they
give no premonition of using them in any strange and
altered sense; and when they apply them to the death of
Christ, they are not thereby conditioned in any sense to
use them in their received meaning. In like manner the
Jews had their expiatory sacrifices, and the terms and
phrases used in them are, in like manner, employed by
the apostles to characterize the death of their Lord;
and they would have been as guilty of misleading
their Jewish as their Gentile readers had they em-
ployed them in a new sense, and without warning,
which, unquestionably, they never gave.
3. "As to the expiatory nature of the sacrifices of
the law, it is not required by the argument to show
that all the sacrificial offerings were of this character.
There were also offerings for personal and national
prescribed for purification, which were identical; but
even they grew out of the leading notion of expiatory
sacrifice, and that legal purification which resulted
from the forgiveness of sins. It is enough to prove that:
there were sacrifices of a much higher nature and pur-
pose, for things of idolatry and idolatry, of murder and
adultery, and a few others, were the only capital crims
considered politically, they were not the only
capital crimes considered morally; that is, there
were other crimes which would not be subjected to
the offenders be subjected to the Levitical oblations.
The true question, then, is, whether such
sacrifices were appointed by God, and accepted instead
of the personal punishment or life of the offender,
which otherwise would have been forfeited, as in the
other cases; and, if so, if the life of animal sacrifices
was accepted instead of the life of the offender, then
that they were mere multas and pecuniary penalties
falls to the ground, and the vicarious nature of most
of the Levitical oblations is established. That other
offences besides those above mentioned were capital, that is, exposed the offender to death, is clear from this, that all offences against the law had this capital effect, according to the rule, that death was, therefore, to redeem the offenders from this penalty that sacrifices were appointed. So, with reference to the great day of expiation, we read, 'For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be cleansed from all your sins.' It was to be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year' (Lev. xvi, 30–34).

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

6. 'The Hebrew word דם, rendered atonement, signifying primarily to cover, to overspread, has been the subject of some evasive criticisms. It comes, however, in the secondary sense, to signify atonement or propitiation, because the effect of that is to cover, or, in Scripture meaning, to remit offences. The Septuagint also renders it by: ἐκκαίνισθαι, to appease, to make propitiations. It is used, indeed, where the means of atonement were a part of the sacrificial regulations. These instances equally serve to evince the Scripture sense of the term, in cases of transgression, to be that of reconciling the offended deity by averting his displeasure, so that when the atonement for sin is said to be made by sacrifice, no doubt can remain that the sacrifice was strictly a sacrifice of propitiation. Agreeably to this conclusion, we find it expressly declared, in the several cases of particular oblations for transgression of the divine commands, that the sins for which atonement was made by those oblations should be forgiven.

7. 'As the notion that the sacrifices of the law were not only a type of the sacrifice of the cross, but warranted by the general appointment of the blood to be an atonement for the souls, the forfeited lives, of men, so also is it contradicted by particular instances. Let us refer to Lev. vi, 15, 16: 'If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord, he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and shall add a fifth part thereto, and shall give it to the priest.' Here, indeed, is the proper fine for the trespass; but it is added, 'He shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram without blemish, and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering, and it shall be forgiven him.' Thus, then, so far from the sacrifice being the fine, the fine is distinguished from it, and with the ram only was the atonement made to the Lord for his trespass. Nor can the ceremonies with which the trespass and sin offerings were accompanied agree with any notion but that of their vicarious character. The worshipper, conscious of his trespass, the symbolic act of transferring punishment, then slew it with his own hand, and delivered it to the priest, and by it purchased the mercies of God, as who burned the sacrifice on the altar, and, having sprinkled part of the blood upon the altar, and in some cases upon the offerer himself, poured the rest at the bottom of the altar. And thus, as we are told, 'The priest shall make an atonement for the sins concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.' So clearly is it made manifest by these acts, and by the description of their nature and end, that the animal bore the punishment of the offerer, and that by this appointment he was reconciled to God, and obtained the forgiveness of his offences.'
EXPLANATION

which was not done by the blood of any other victim, except the bullock, which was offered the same day as a sin offering for the family of Aaron. The circumstances of this ceremony, whereby atonement was to be made 'for all the sins' of the whole Jewish people, are so strikingly significant that they deserve a particular detail. On the day appointed for this general expiation and reconciliation of the people, in the person of a high-priest and as a goat as sin offerings, the one for himself and the other for the people; and, having sprinkled the blood of these in due form before the mercy seat, to lead forth a second goat, denominated 'the scape-goat,' and, after laying both his hands on the head of each, but conferring over him all the iniquities of the people, to put them upon the head of the goat, and to send the animal, thus bearing the sins of the people, away into the wilderness; in this manner expressing, by an action which cannot be misunderstood, that the atonement, which is affirmed, was to be effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering, consisted in removing from the people their iniquities by this translation of them to the animal. For it is to be remarked that the ceremony of the scape-goat is not a distinct one: it is a continuation of the process, and is essentially connected with the pure and complete consummation of the sin offering; so that the transfer of the iniquities of the people upon the head of the scapegoat, and the bearing them away into the wilderness, manifestly imply that the atonement effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering consisted in the transfer and removal of those iniquities, that is, to effect God's displeasure, that the people might not die.' 10. "How, then, is this impressive and singular ceremonial to be explained? Shall we resort to the notion of mulcts and fines? If so, then this and other stated sacrifices must be considered in the light of penalties; public and private consummation of the sin offering; so that the transfer of the iniquities of the people upon the head of the scape-goat, and the bearing them away into the wilderness, manifestly imply that the atonement effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering consisted in the transfer and removal of those iniquities, that is, to effect God's displeasure, that the people might not die.' 11. "We may find, also, another more explicit illustration in the sacrifice of the passover. The sacrificial character of this offering is strongly marked; for it was an offering brought to the tabernacle, it was slain in the sanctuary, and the blood was sprinkled upon the altar by the priests. It derives its name from the passing over and sparing of the houses of the Israelites, on the door-posts of which the blood of the immolated lamb was sprinkled, when the first-born in the houses of the Egyptians were slain; and thus we have another instance of life being spared by the instituted means of animal sacrifice. Nor need we confine ourselves to particular instances. 'Almost all things,' says an apostle, who surely knew his subject, 'are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.' In the original, the verb 'be acquitted,' occurs; that is, a discharge from the punishment to which a man's sin exposed him; and by constant usage, were the Jews familiarized to the notion of expiatory sacrifice, as well as by the history contained in their sacred books, especially in Genesis, which speaks of the vicarious sacrifices offered by the patriarchs; and in the book of Job, in which that patriarch is said to have offered sacrifices for his supposed sins of his sons; and where Eliphaz is commanded, by a divine oracle, to offer a burnt-offering for himself and his friends, 'lest God should deal with them after their folly.' 12. "On the sentiments of the uninspired Jewish writers on this point, the substitution of the life of the animal for that of the offerer, and, consequently, the expiatory nature of their sacrifices, Outram has given many quotations from their writings, which the reader may consult in his work on Sacrifices. Two or three only may be adduced from the symbolism. Levi ben-Gerson says; 'The imposition of the hands of the offerers was designed to indicate that their sins were removed from themselves and transferred to the animal.' Isaac ben-Arama: 'He transfers his sins from himself, and lays them upon the head of the victim.' R. Moses ben-Nachman says, with respect to a sin offering; 'It was just that his blood should be shed, and that his body should be burned; but the Creator, of his mercy, accepted the victim from him as his substitute and ransom, that the blood of the animal might be shed instead of his; and that, but the blood of the animal might be given for his life.'
EXPOSITION

Full of these ideas of vicarious expiation, then, the apostles wrote and spoke, and the Jews of their time heard and read, the books of the New Testament. The Socinian pretence is, that the inspired penmen used the sacrificial terms which occur in their writings figuratively and not literally, and that they could not do this honestly unless they had given notice of this new application of the established terms of the Jewish theology; but, if this be assumed, it leaves us wholly at a loss to discover what that really was which they intended to teach by these sacrificial terms and expressions. They are therefore nearly as silent as to this point; and the varying theories of those who reject the doctrine of atonement, in fact, confess that their writings afford no solution of the difficulty. If, therefore, it is blasphemous to suppose, on the one hand, that inspired men should write on purpose to mislead, on the other, it is utterly inconceivable that, had they only been ordinary writers, they should construct a figurative language out of terms which had a definite and established sense, without giving any intimation at all that they employed them otherwise. The disciples founded on them may be more wayward why they adopted them at all, and more especially when they knew that they must be interpreted, both by Jews and Greeks, in a sense which, if the Socinians are right, was in direct opposition to that which they in tended to convey.

Some modern writers deny the expiatory character of the Jewish sacrifices. So Bushnell (Vicarious Sacrifice, p. 425) asserts that no such thing as expiation is contained or supposed to be wrought out in the Scripture sacrifices. On this see British Quarterly, Oct. 1869, reprinted in the Theol. Eclectic (New Haven), iv. 297; and also an article on the Expository Nature of the Atonement (Brit. Quarterly, Oct. 1867; also in the Theol. Eclectic, v. 201 sq.). See also the article Atonement: Redemption: Sacrifice.

Exposition. "the opening up and interpreting larger portions of Scripture in public discourses. In Scotland, where the practice has long obtained, and still extensively prevails, it is called lecturing. While the striking and insulatod texts of Scripture, which furnish abundant matter for sermons, are calculated, when judiciously treated, to rouse and fix attention; and the discourses founded on them may be more useful to general hearers, especially the careless and unconverted, expository discourses furnish peculiar advantages as regards the enlargement of the Christian's views of divine truth, and his consequent advancement in the ways of God. By judiciously expounding the Scriptures, it is possible to give them a clearer exhibition of the great principles of religion in their mutual connections and diversified bearings than could otherwise be done. He will have a better opportunity of unfolding the true meaning of those parts of the Bible which are difficult—of bringing a vast variety of topics before his hearers, which may be of the utmost importance to them, but which he could not so conveniently have treated in preaching from detached texts—of exhibiting the doctrines and duties of Christianity in their relative positions—of successfully meeting the difficulties arising from the erroneous views of God, and of shedding the light of his truth upon the minds of his people with correct and influential views of divine things. (See Dodridge on Preaching.) Such a mode of public instruction cannot but prove of great use to a minister's own mind, by rousing his energies, habituating him to the sacred volume. It is the very work (to say) of "opening the Scriptures) for which the ministry was instituted." He advises exposition of whole chapters or books in course, pleading for it not only the sanction of ancient usage, but also certain great advantages of the method both to the preacher and his hearers (Thoughts on Preaching, N. Y. 1867, 12mo, p. 272 sq). See Homiletics.

Expositions of Scripture. See Commentary.

Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, celebrates the exercise of remarkable charity during a great famine. After having given away all his own property, he sold the sacred vessels of gold and silver to help the poor. Jerome compared him to the widow of Sarepta, and dedicated to him his Commentary on Zech. 9. Pope Innocent I. decreed a decree to this effect about A.D. 417. See Acta Sanctorum, Sept. 28; Tillemont, Memoria, x. 617, 825; A. Butler, Lives of Saints, September 28.

Extempore Preaching. See Homiletics.

Extravagants (Extravagantes), a name given to the decreetal epistles of the popes issued after Gratian's Decretum, and not contained in that work (see Canon Law, vol. ii, p. 87, col. 2). They were therefore called extra decretae vagantes, or, briefly, extravagantes; and this name was still given to them after their insertion in the body of the canon law. For an account of the different collections of extravagantes, see Canon Law.

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

I. Origin of the Practice. The Church of Rome appeals (see below) to Mark vi, 13, and James v, 14-16, as Scripture authority for extreme unction. In Mark we are told that the apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." Clearly there is no trace of the "sacrament" here. The Council of Trent, in citing this passage, shrewdly says that it is "intimated" only in Mark, because, according to Rome, the apostles were not "priests" until the Last Supper. If, then, the passage in Mark teaches the institution of the sacrament, it would follow that others beside priests could administer it. Cardinal Cajetan, as cited by Catharinius, rejects this text as inapplicable to this sacrament; and Suarez (in part iii, disp. 39, § 1, n. 5) says that when the apostles are said to anoint the sick and heal them (Mark vi, 13), this was not said in reference to the sacrament of unction, because their purpose was not to give them an immediate respect to the soul. As to the passage in James, it speaks of an anointing for "healing" by all the elders of the Church, who might or might not be laymen; it was "the prayer of faith that was to save the sick" (see, for a thorough discussion of this passage, Elliot, Deutecination of Romdumism, bk. ii, ch. xiv.).

II. The Ancient Greek Church. The ancient writers of the Greek Church use the passage of James only for exegetical, not for dogmatical purposes. Origen, in the second homily on Levit. iv, quotes the words of James when he speaks of the different ways which are given to the Christian for the remission of his sins. As the seventh way he mentions severe penance, in which he finds a compliance with the words of James: "If any be sick, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them lay their hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: that the prayer of faith may effuse the power of the connection shows that Origen applies the words to mental and physical sickness, and the laying on of hands, which he adds to the apostolic words, points to a local use of anointment in Alexandria at the reconciliation of the laps. Chrysostom (On the Priesthood, iii, 149) quotes the words of James on the assumption that the priests have the power of remitting sins. John of Damascus, in speaking of the mysteries of the
Church, treats only of baptism and the Lord's Supper. The first certain testimony for the use of the anointment of the sick in the Greek Church is given by a Western writer about 798, Theodulf of Orleans.

III. The Ancient Latin Church. — In the Western Church, Ireneus (1, 21, 5) states that the Gnostics, and in particular the Hereticals, poured upon dying men and women water and oil with an invocation of prayer, in order that their souls might become invisible and inaccessible to the hostile powers of the spiritual world. It is uncritical in the highest degree for Roman Catholic writers to infer from the existence of a Gnostic rite the existence of a similar rite in the Western Church. Tertullian and Cyprian, both to whom we are indebted for so full information of the ecclesiastical usages of the Western Church, know nothing of extreme unction as a sacrament. This silence can not be explained by a reference to the disciplina arconi, as the latter exclusively embraced baptism and the Lord's Supper, and as even these topics, notwithstanding the disciplina arconi, are frequently and fully discussed by the ecclesiastical writers. Many of the latter mention the frequent use of oil as a peculiar charisma for miraculous cures. Thus it is related by the emperor of the Severian school of the emperor Antoninus, was cured by the Christian Proclus by means of anointment. This certainly can have no reference to a sacrament for the use of Christians. (Many other examples of this use of oil may be found in these same writers, Zendward-gisten, vol. vi., pt. iii., p. 289.) Superstition developed this usage, and it occurred, according to the testimony of Chrysostom, that the lamps burning in the churches were plundered for the purpose of using the oil as a preservative against possible, and, as a miraculous remedy, against actual diseases. It is easy to comprehend how this medicinal and miraculous anointment could become the basis and the origin of a sacrament (see on this point Marheineke, Symbolik, i, 3, p. 238). The transition is visible in an epistle from the Roman bishop Innocent I to bishop Decentius, of Eugubium, written in 416. Innocent calls the anointment of the sick a "kind of sacrament" (genus sacramentum) and while he reserves to the bishops the right of preparing the sacred oil, he states that both priests and laymen may apply the oil (quod ab episcopo confectum non solum sacrosanto et omnibus uti Christianum sit in suum aut in suum necessitate unguendum), which is entirely at variance with the present teaching of the Church of Rome, according to which the sacrament can be administered only by priests. From the beginning of the ninth century the anointment of the sick is frequent, and the acts of the Theodulf of Orleans (738), and the first Council of Mentz (847), place it by the side of penance and the Eucharist, but preceding the two latter. The recovery of the sick is always regarded as the chief object. Its use appears to have been considered necessary only for sinners; for abbot Adelard, of Corbie, was asked by the monks of the monastery whether he desired to be anointed with the sacred oil, as they were certain that he was free from sins. The conception of the anointment of the sick as an act of penance caused a discussion around with some whether it could be repeated. Ivo of Chartres, and Godfrey, abbot of Vendôme (about 1100), denied that the rite could be administered more than once, comparing it with the public penance; and it was a popular belief that a person recovering from sickness after receiving the anointment must not touch the ground with bare feet, and abstain from the intercourse and the eating of meat. It was in the course of the 12th century that the names sacramentum extemporaneum and extrema unction first came into use.

IV. Extreme Unction as a Sacrament in the Church of the East. — The first canonical anointment of the sick, according to the teaching gradually developed in the Church, was first given by Hugo of III.—14.

St. Victor (De Sacram. fidei lib. ii, p. xvi). Peter Lombardus assigned to it, in the sermons of the seven sacraments which he is the first to mention, the fifth place (Sentent. lib. iv, dist. 23). The scholastics, and, in particular, Thomas Aquinas, completed the scientific development of this doctrine, and the shape given to it by Thomas received the sanction of the Councils of Florence and Ferrara.

The canons of Trent on this subject are: "Canon 1. If any shall say that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and declared by the blessed apostle James, but only a rite received from the fathers, and a medicinal act, let him be accursed. Can. 2. If any shall say that the holy anointing of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor relieve the sick, but that it has ceased, as if it were formerly only the grace of healing, let him be accursed. Can. 3. If any shall say that the rite and usage of extreme unction, which the holy Roman Church observes, is contrary to the sentence of the blessed apostle James, and therefore should be changed, and may be despised by Christians without sin, let him be accursed. Can. 4. If any shall say that the presbyters of the Church, whom St. James directs to be called for the sick among the群, and the other brethren of the church, but elders in age in any community, and that therefore the priest is not the only proper minister of extreme unction, let him be accursed" (Concil. Trident. sess. xiv, c. 1 sq.). The authority for this sacrament is given by the Council as follows: "This sacred anointment of the sick was instituted as a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament by Christ Jesus our Lord, being first intimated by Mark (vi, 13), and afterwards recommended and published to the faithful by James the apostle, brother of our Lord. There is any sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, he shall be forgiven him" (Jas. v, 14, 15). In which words, as the Church has learned by apostolical tradition, handed down from age to age, he teaches the matter, form, proper minister, and effect of this sacrament. For the Church understands the matter of the sacrament to be the oil, blessed by the bishop; the unction most fitly represents the grace of the Holy Spirit, where with the soul of the sick man is invisibly anointed. The form is contained in the words of administration. The ceremony must be performed by a priest. The oil must be olive oil consecrated by a bishop. No other substance can be used. The acts of consecration of the Oil and this its matter is most significant of its efficacy. Oil is very efficacious in soothing bodily pain, and this sacrament soothes and alleviates the pain and anguish of the soul. Oil also contributes to restore health and spirits, serves to give light, and refreshe fatigues; and these respects correspond with and are expressive of those produced, through the divine power, on the sick by the administration of this sacrament" (Catechism of Trent, Baltimore, 8vo, p. 295). The form of the ceremony is as follows: The priest, having dipped the thumb of his right hand in the holy unction proceeds to mark the organs of the five senses of the patient with the sign of the cross; and after each application he wipes the part with a ball of cotton, for which purpose he brings with him seven balls already prepared. The order observed is this: the right eye is first anointed, then the left eye, the ears, and after them the nostrils (not the tip of the nose) are attended to in the same order, then the lips; after which the palms of the hands and soles of the feet receive the touch of the consecrated unguent. Men are also anointed in the middle of the forehead and the back of the neck. At each application the priest says, "Pr hoc sacrum uctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam indulget"
EXTREME UNCTION
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Eye

Eye (ἡματία, ἀσία, from the idea of flowing [see below]: ἀσία λαμαξία). In most languages this important organ is used by figurative application, as the symbol of a large number of objects and ideas. In the East such applications of the word "eye" have always been uncommmon, and they were not adopted by the Hebrews. It may be serviceable to distinguish the following uses of the word, few of which are common among us except so far as they have become so through the translation of the Bible. (See Gesenius, Heb. Lex.; Womyns, Lexicon. 

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

(2.) Color, as in the phrase "and the eye (color) of the manna was as the eye (color) of lepidium" (Num. xi. 7). This originated, perhaps, in the eye being the part of the body which exhibits different colors in different persons.

(3.) The surface, as "the surface (eye) of the land" (Exod. x., 5, 15; Num. xx., 5, 11): the last is the passage which affords most sanction to the notion that ηματία means some places "face." This is the sense which our own and other versions give to "eye to eye" (Num. xiv., 14, etc.), translated "face to face." The phrases are indeed equivalent in meaning; but we are not to conclude that the Hebrews meant "face" when they said "eye," but that they chose the opposition of the eyes, instead of that of the face to express the general idea of "thine." Hence, therefore, we may object to the extension of the signification in such passages as 1 Sam. xvi., 12, where "beautiful eyes" (πρόσωπον ἐκπρόσωπον) is rendered "fair countenance."
EYE

EYE

showing his power. In like manner, in the same poet, "the eye of the army" stands for a good commandet (Olymp. vi. 19).

To keep anything as the apple or pupil of the eye is to preserve it with particular care (Deut. xxxii, 10; Zech. ii, 8).

Eye-service is peculiar to slaves, who are governed by fear only, and is to be carefully guarded against by Christians, who ought to serve from a principle of duty and affection (Eph. vi. 6; Col. iii. 22).

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

The celebrated passage "Why beheldst thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye" (Matt. vii, 3) has occasioned much waste of explanation. It seems much better to understand it as a hyperbolical proverbial expression, than to contend that as Joe fighters cannot literally mean "a beam," it must here signify something else, a disease, a thorn, etc. (see Dockridge and Campbell, in loc.). As a proverbial phrase, parallels have been produced abundantly from the Rabbins, from the fathers, and from the classics. See BLIND.

BLINDING THE EYES AS A PUNISHMENT OR POLITICAL DISSOLUTION was a heathen cruelty sometimes referred to in the Scriptures, and is found exhibited in the Assyrian monuments. The custom of putting out the eyes of captives especially was very common in the East (1 Sam. xi. 2). Thus Samson was deprived

of sight by the Philistines (Judg. xvi, 21), and Zedekiah by the Chaldees (2 Kings xxv, 7). In 1820 Rao Wilson saw a number of individuals at Acre who were disfigured in various ways, by a hand amputated, an eye torn out, or a nose which had been split, or partly or totally cut off. In 1826 two emirs had their eyes burnt out, and their tongues in part cut off, by the prince of Mount Lebanon, on account of their having been concerned in some disturbances against his government. In some cases the Orientals deprive the criminal of the light of day by sealing up his eyes with some kind of adhesive plaster (Isa. xlv. 40). See PUNISHMENT.

"PAINTING THE EYES," or rather the eyelids, is more than once alluded to in Scripture, although this scarcely appears to the Authorized Version, as our translators, unaware of the custom, usually rendered "eye" in place of "face," although "eye" is still preserved in the margin. So Jezreel "painted her eyes," literally
"Put her eyes in paint," before she showed herself publicly (2 Kings ix, 30). This action is forcibly expressed by Jeremiah (iv, 80). "Though thou renderst thine eyes with painting," Ezekiel (xxiii, 40) also represents this as a part of high dress: "For whom thou didst wash thyself, paintedst thy eyes, and deckest thyself with ornaments." The custom is also, very possibly, alluded to in Prov. vi, 25: "Lust not after her beauty in thine heart, neither let her take thee with her eyes." It certainly is the impression in Western Asia that this embellishment adds much to the languishing expression and seducement of the eyes, although Europeans find some difficulty in appreciating the beauty which the Orientals find in this adornment. (See Hartmann's Hebrews, ii, 149 sq.)

The following description of the process is from Lane's Modern Egyptians (i, 41-45): "The eyes, with very few exceptions, are black, large, and of a long almond form, with long and beautiful lashes, and an exquisitely soft, bewitching expression: eyes more beautiful can hardly be conceived: their charming effect is much heightened by the concealment of the other features (how ever pleasing the latter may be), and is rendered still more striking by a practice universal among the females of the higher and middle classes, and very common among those of the lower orders, which is that of blackening the edge of the eyelids, both above and below the eyes, with a black powder called kohl. This is a collyrium, commonly composed of the smoke-black which is produced by burning a kind of liban—an aromatic resin—a species of frankincense, used, I am told, in preference to the better kind of frankincense, as being cheaper and equally good for the purpose. Kohl is also prepared of the smoke-black produced from burning the shells of almonds. These two kinds, though believed to be beneficial to the eyes, are used merely for ornament; but there are several kinds used for their real or supposed medical properties, particularly the powder of several kinds of lead ore, to which are often added sarcome, long pepper, sugar-candy, fine dust of a Venetian sequin, and sometimes powdered pearls. Antimony, it is said, was formerly used for painting the edges of the eyelids. The kohl is applied with a small probe of wood, ivory, or silver, tapering toward the end, but blunt: this is moistened, sometimes with rose-water, then dipped in the powder and drawn along the edges of the eyelids: it is called mirred; and the glass vessel in which the kohl is kept, muskoholah. The custom of thus ornamenting the eyes prevailed among both sexes in Egypt in very ancient times; this is shown by the sculptures and paintings in the temples and tombs of this country; and kohl-vessels, with the probes, and even with the remains of the black powder, have often been found in the ancient tombs. I have two in my possession. But, in many cases, the ancient mode of ornamenting the kohl was a little different from the modern. I have, however, seen this ancient mode practised in the present day in the neighborhood of Cairo, though I only remember to have noticed it in two instances. The same custom existed among the Greek ladies, and among the Jewish women in early times."

Sir J. G. Wilkinson alludes to this passage in Mr. Lane's book, and admits that the lengthened form of the ancient Egyptian eye, represented in the paintings, was probably produced by this means. "Such," he adds, "is the effect described by Juvenal (Sat. ii, 98), Pliny (Ep. vi, 2), and other writers who notice the custom among the Romans. At Rome it was considered disgraceful for men to adopt it, as at present in [most parts of] the East, except medicinally; but, if we may judge from the similarity of the eyes of men and women in the paintings at Thebes, it appears to have been used by both sexes among the ancient Egyptians. Many of the kohl-bottles have been found in the tombs, together with the bodkin used for applying the moistened powder. They are of various materials, usually of stone, wood, or pottery; sometimes composed of two, sometimes of three or four separate cells, apparently containing each a mixture, differing slightly in its quality and hue from the other three. Many were simple round tubes, vases, or small boxes; some were ornamented with the figure of an ape or monster, supposed to assist in holding the bottle between his arms, while the lady dipped into it the pin with which she painted her eyes; and others were in imitation of a column made of stone, or rich porcelain of the choicest manufacture" (Ancient Egyptians, iii, 582). See PAINT.

Eylert, Reihemann Friedrich, was born at Hamm, in Prussian Westphalia, April 5, 1770. He studied theology at Halle, where he imbibed the moderate Baptist views of Niemeyer. In 1774 he became a preacher in his native city, in 1806 court preacher at Potsdam, and after the death of Sack in 1817 he be-
came superintendent, being at the same time appointed minister of public instruction. In his later years his theology assumed a positively orthodox character. He died Feb. 8, 1852. While at court he was the friend and counsellor of king Frederick William III, over whom he exerted a great influence, especially in the matter of the union of the Lutherans and the Pfarrkirchen; and of the Catholic Church or. He was a prolific writer. The most important of his works are, Betrachtungen ü. d. treflichen Wahrheiten des Christenthums, etc. (1804; 4th ed. 1834);—Hambel 2. d. Paradies Jenae (1806; 2d ed. 1819);—Predigten u. Bedürfnisse unseres Herzens (1853);—Angela Friedrich Wilhelm's III (1846-47). See Neuer Nekrologe d. Deutschen (1859).—Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv. 295.

äméric, Nicolás, a Spaniard inquisitor, was born about 1520 at Gerona. He entered the Dominican order in 1538, and was made inquisitor general of Aragon in 1556. His zeal was too great even for his superiors, and he was removed from his office for a time, but after some years he returned to it. He was noted especially for his fierce pursuit of the partisans of Raymond Lull (q. v.). His Direcutorium Inquisitionis has been often reprinted (Roma, 1578, 1589, 1597, fol.; Venice, 1607). He died Jan. 30, 1607.—Quidict et Echard, Script. Ord. Pred. i, 716; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xvi. 867. See Inquisition.

Éyre, John, a minister of the Church of England, was born at Bodmin, Cornwall, January, 1754. He had a good elementary education, and at fifteen was bound apprentice to a clothier. Before the termination of his apprenticeship he embraced a religious life, and on returning to his father's house he commenced holding public religious meetings. His father was offended at this, and drove him from his house. He was soon after admitted into lady Huntington's College at Trevecca, and in 1778 he was appointed minister to her chapel at Mulberry Gardens, London. In the same year he entered Emmanuel College, Oxford, and in December, 1779, he was made curate of Westton. In 1781 he became curate of St. Galen's, Reading, and in 1792 of St. Luke's, Chelsea. In 1785 he became pastor of the Episcopal church at Hamerton, and opened a school there, which became very successful. He was very popular as a preacher, free from bigotry, and active in all schemes of benevolence. The Ecclesiastical Magazine and the London Missionary were originated and for a time edited by him. From the profits of the Ecclesiastical Magazine between the years 1791 and thirty thousand pounds were paid out for the support of widows of ministers of various denominations. He was also one of the founders of the London Missionary Society (q. v.), of the scheme of "Village Itinerancy," and of the Hackney Seminary for theological training. After a life of earnest piety and usefulness, he died March 29, 1835.—Morison, Missionary Fathers, p. 9.

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

Es. See Goat.

éz'ker, a less correct mode of Anglicizing (1 Chron. i, 88) the name Ezher (q. v.).

Éz'ba'î, many Ex'ba'î, some Es'ba'î (Heb. Eba'î), in pause E'ba'î, signifi uncertain; Sept. 'Ac'gi Vari. "Zeboi, Vulg. Åsav, the father of Naazai, which latter was one of David's thirty heroes (1 Chron. xi, 87). B.C. 1046. In the parallel list (2 Sam. xxiii, 35) the names are given "Paa'arait the Arbite," which Kennicott decides to be a corruption of the reading in Chronicles (Dissertation, p. 209).

b's'bon (Heb. Ebon, i Ex'baon, perhaps working), the name of two men.

b's'bao, E. (Heb. Ebon.) The fourth son of the patriarch Gad (Gen. xli, 16); called also (Num. xxvi, 16) Ozn (q. v.). B.C. 1856.

éz'ba'î, Sept. Å's'baov v. r. E's'baov, Vulg. E'von. The first-named of the sons (?) (descendants) of Bela, the son of Benjamin, according to 1 Chron. vii, 7. It is singular, however, that while Ebon is nowhere else mentioned among the sons of Bela, or Benjamin, he here appears in company with "Ts'bo, Iri, which is, nevertheless, not a Benjamite family, according to the other lists, but is found in company with Ebon among the Gadite families, both in Gen. xli, 16 (Eri, "Ir"), and Num. xxvi, 16. Were these two Gadite families incorporated into Benjamin after the slaughter mentioned Judg. xx? Possibly they were from Jabez-Gilead (comp. xxii, 12-14). See Deuter. xiv, Chron. vii, 2 seems to fix the date of the census as in king David's time. B.C. cir. 1020.

Esch'îas (E'sîaç), a mode of Anglicizing, in the Apocrypha, the name of two men.

1. The "son of Theocanus," and one of the two Israelitish leaders prominent in the reform under Ezra (1 Esdr. ix, 14); evidently the Jamashia (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 15).

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

Esch'îas (E'sîaç), one of those who supported Ezra on the right while expounding the law (1 Esdr. ix, 14; Hilkiah (q. v.) of the parallel passage (Neh. viii, 4).

Es'îc'îs (E'sîc'îs), a Greekized form (Eccles. xlvii, 17, 22; xxiv, 4; Matt. i, 9, 10) of the name of king Hæzækæm (q. v.).

E'z'k'îel (Heb. Yezechel), Nebi, either meaning Whom God will strengthen or God will prevail, the name of two men.

Ez'k'îel (Heb. Yezechel). The head of the twentieth "course" of priests under David (1 Chron. xxiv, 16, where the name is Anglicized Jezekelez (q. v.)).

2. (İzîkîa, Josephus) Yezeichel, Ant. x, 5, 1) One of the four greater prophets. See Prophecy.

1. There have been various fancies about his name; according to Abnerban (Prof. in Ezech.), it implies "one who narrates the might of God to be displayed in the future," and some (as Villalpandus, Prof. in Ezech. p. x) see a play on the word in the expressions וּמָרָה, and וּמֵדָת (II, 7, 8, 9), whence the groundless conjecture of Sanctius (Prologem. in Ezech. p. 2, n. 2) that the name was given him subsequently to the commencement of his career as a prophet, Introduct. ad Bibl. Vet. Testam. ii, pt. iii, ch. v).

2. He was the son of a priest named Buzi (i, 8), respecting whom fresh conjectures have been recorded, although nothing is known about him (as archbishop Newcome observes) beyond the fact that he must have given his son a careful and learned education. The Rabbis had a rule that every prophet in Scripture was also a son of a prophet, and hence (as R. David Kimchi in his Commentary) they absurdly identify Buzi with Jeremiah, who, they say, was so called because he was rejected and despised. This tradition makes Ezekiel the servant of Jeremiah (Gregory Naz. Or. xvii), and Jerome supposes that the prophetic being contemporaries during a part of their mission
Instance, escaping from his enemies by walking dryshod across the Chebar; feeding the famished people with a miraculous draught of fishes, etc. He is said to have been murdered in Babylon by some Jewish prince (7 ο ροβάναος τού λαοῦ, called in the Roman martyrology for vii Id. Apr., "judex populi," Carpov. Intro. l. c.), whom he had convicted of idolatry; and to have been buried in a double tomb (σπηλαίων οίκων), the tomb of Shem and Arphaxad, on the banks of the Euphrates (Eph. De Viti et Mort. Prophet.). The tomb, said to have been built by Jeholachin, was shown a few days’ journey from Bagdad (Menasse ben Israel, De Resurr. Mor. p. 23), and was called "the abode of elegance" (habitaculum elegantiae). A lamp was kept there continually burning, and the autograph copy of the prophecies was said to be there preserved. This tomb is mentioned by Pietro de la Valle, and fully described in the Itinerary of R. Benjamin of Tudela (Hottinger, Thea. Phil. II. i, 3, Cipri Iberacri, p. 82). His tomb is still pointed out in the vicinity of Babylon (Layard’s Nineveh and Babylon, p. 427), at a place called Keflî; and Mr. Loftus is inclined to ac-
cept the tradition which assigns this as the resting-place of the prophet’s remains (Chaldæa, p. 26). The spire is the frustum of an elongated cone, tapering to a blunted top by a succession of steps, and peculiarly ornamented (ib.). A curious conjecture (discredited by Clemens Alexandrinus [Strom. I], but considered not impossible by Belden [Syntagm. de Dia Syr. ii, 120], Meyer, and others) identifies him with "Nazarītus the Assyrian," the teacher of Pythagoras. We need hardly mention the ridiculous suppositions that he is identical with Zoroaster, or with the Eîyōγîōς τῶν ιουδαίων ἐργαλείων φησίς ( Clem. Alexand. Strom. I; Eus. Prep. Enarr. ix, 28, 29), who wrote a play on the Exodus, called Εἰγύπτιον (Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. ii, 10). This Ezekiel lived B.C. 40 (Sixth Sen. Bibl. Sacct. iv, 255), or later.

4. But, as Hävernick remarks, "by the side of the scattered data of his external life, those of his internal life appear so much the richer." We have already noticed his stern and inflexible energy of will and character; and we also observe a devoted adherence to the rites and ceremonies of his national religion. Ezekiel is no cosmopolite, but displays everywhere the peculiar tendencies of a Hebrew educated under Levitical training. The priestly bias is always visible, especially in chaps. viii-xi, xi-xiviii, and in iv, 13 sq.; xx, 12 sq.; xxi, 8, etc. It is strange of De Wette and Gesenius to attribute this to a "contracted spirituality," and of Ewald to see in it "a one-sided conception of antiquity which he obtained merely from books and traditions," and a "depression of spirit (7) enhanced by the long continuance of the banishment and bondage of the people" (Hävernick’s Introd.). It was surely this very intensity of patriotic loyalty to a system whose partial suspension he both predicted and survived, which cheered the exiles with the confidence of his hopes in the future, and tended to preserve their decaying nationality. Mr. F. Newman is even more contemptuous than the German critics. "The writings of Ezekiel," he says (Hebr. Monarchy, p. 300, 2d ed.), "painfully show the growth of what is merely visionary, and an increasing value of hard sardotalism;" and he speaks of the "heavy materialism" of Ezekiel's Temple, with its priests, sacrifices, etc., as "tedious and monotonizing like Levitical itself." His own remark that Ezekiel’s predictions "so kept alive in the minds of the next generation a belief in certain return from captivity, as to have tended exceedingly towards the result," is a sufficient refutation of such criticism.

We may also note in Ezekiel the absorbing recognition of his high calling which enabled him cheerfully to endure any deprivation or misery (except indeed ceremonial pollution, from which he shrinks with characteristic loathing, iv, 14), if thereby he may give any warning or help to the Egyptians (iv, 15, 16, 17; comp. Jer. xxxvi, 7) the Babylonian yoke would be shaken off; and to assure them that the destruction of their city and Temple was inevitable and fast approaching. After this event his principal care is to console the captives by promises of future deliverance and return to their own land, and to encourage them by assurances of future blessings. His predictions against foreign nations stand between these two great divisions, and were for the most part uttered during the interval of suspense between the divine intimation that Nebuchadnezzar was being, or was to be, used by God (xxiv, 2) and the arrival of the news that he had taken it (ch. xxxiii, 21). The predictions are evidently arranged on a plan corresponding with these the chief subjects of them, and the time of their utterance is so frequently noted that there is little difficulty in ascertaining their chronological order. This order is followed throughout, except in the middle portion relating to foreign nations, where it is in some instances departed from to secure greater unity of subject (e. g. ch. xxix, 17). The want of exact chronological order in this latter part of the book, as to the order and number of prophecies respecting the manner in which the collection of the separate predictions was originally made. Jahn (Introd. p. 356) supposes that the predictions against foreign nations were placed in their present position by some transcriber in the order in which they happened to lie in the hand, and that he through forgetfulness omitted chaps. xxxiv, xxxviii, and xxix. Eichhorn (Einleitung, iii, 193) thinks it probable that the predictions were written on several greater or smaller rolls, which were put together in their present form without sufficient regard to chronological accuracy. Bertholdt (Einleitung, iv, 149, quoted by Hävernick) supposes that the collector of the whole book found two smaller collections already in existence (chaps. xxv-xxvii, and xxxii, 21-xxxiv), and that he arranged
the other predictions chronologically. All such hypotheses belong, as Havernick remarks, to a former age of criticism.

The arrangement, by whomsoever made, is very evidently intentional, and it seems on many accounts most probable that it was made by Ezekiel himself. This is maintained and in such connection with each other that every part has reference to what has preceded it. (3.) Historical notices are occasionally appended to the predictions, which would scarcely be done by a transcriber: e.g., the notice respecting himself in chaps. xi, xxiv, xxv, and the close of ch. xix, which Havernick translates "This is a lamentation and was for a lamentation." The whole book is divided by Havernick into nine sections, as follows:

1. Ezekiel's call to the prophetical office (ch. i–iii, 15).
2. The general carrying out of the commission, in a series ofложений and particular restrictions foretelling the approaching destruction of Judah and Jerusalem (ch. iii, 16–vii).
3. The rejection of the people because of their idolatrous worship; a series of visions presented to the prophet in the months later than the former, in which he is shown the Temple polluted with the worship of Adonias, the consequent judgment on the inhabitants of Jerusalem and on the priests, and closing with promises of happier times and a purer worship (ch. viii–xii).
4. The contents of the people rebuked in detail; a series of reproofs and warnings directed especially against the particular evils and prejudices then prevalent amongst his contemporaries (ch. xii–xiv).
5. The nature of the judgment, and the guilt which caused it; another series of warnings delivered about a year later, announcing the coming judgments to be yet nearer (ch. xx–xxiii).
6. The meaning of the now coming commencement of the predictions uttered two years and five months later, when Jerusalem was besieged, announcing to the captives that very day as the beginning of the siege (comp. 2 Kings xxxv, 1), and assuring them of the complete overthrow of the city (ch. xxiv).
7. God's judgment denounced on seven heathen nations (Ammon, xxv, 1–7; Moab, 8–11; Edom, 12–14; the Philistines, 15–17; Tyre, xxvi–xxxvii, 19; Sidon, 20–24).
8. After the destruction of Jerusalem a prophetical representation of the triumph of Israel and of the kingdom of God on earth (ch. xxxiii–xxxix).
9. The glorious consummation; a symbolic representation of Messianic times, and of the establishment and prosperity of the kingdom of God (ch. xi–xlviii). See § 3 below.

II. genuineness and completeness.—According to Jewish tradition, doubts were entertained as to the canonicity of the book on the ground of its containing some apparent contradictions to the law, as well as because of the obscurity of many of its visions. These, however, were removed, it is said, by Rabbi Hanaiah, who wrote a commentary on the book, in which all these difficulties were satisfactorily solved (Mishnah, ed. Surenhusius, Prag. ad Part. iv; Carpzov, Introd. p. 213). The testimony from his account: that the visions at the beginning and close of the book were forbidden to be read by those who were under thirty years of age (Carpzov, p. 212). Some Continental critics of the last century have impugned the canonicity of the last nine chapters, and have attributed them to some Samaritan or Hebrew who had returned in later times to the land of Judaea (Oeder, Freye Untersuchung über einige Bücher des A.T., Hal. Sax. 1771; Vogel, in his remarks on the above; and Corrodi, Beleuchtung des Jüdisch. und Christl. Bibelkenms., pt. i, p. 105, quoted by Rosenmuller, Schol. in Ezek. ad c. xi). These objections have been fully answered by Eichhorn (Einleistung, iii, 263), and others. Hahn has also taken notice of and answered some objections raised on the following grounds: (1) in the Monthly Magazine (1798), to the canonicity of chaps. xxv–xxxi, xxxv–xxxvi, xxviii–xix. A translation of Hahn's arguments will be found in Horne's Introd. iv, 222, old ed. These and similar objections have in no small weight or probability that we shall consider them with caution. The general mark of Gesenius in reference to the whole of Ezekiel's writings: "This book belongs to that not very numerous class, which, from beginning to end, maintains, by means of favorite expressions and peculiar phrases, such a one, as to make it impossible to prevent any suspicion that separate portions of it are not genuine" (Geschichte der Heb. Spr., p. 86). The canonicity of the book of Ezekiel in general is satisfactorily established by Jewish and Christian authorities. There is, indeed, no explicit reference to it, or quotation of it, in the New Testament; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Hebrews 4:1, 11:34) and in the Apocalypse (Revelation 1:1, 5:1) it is alluded to. The general Introd. (p. 218) mentions the following passages as having apparently a reference to this book: Rom. ii, 24; comp. Ezek. xxxvi, 21: Rom. v, 5; Gal. iii, 12; comp. Ezek. xxi, 11: 2 Pet. iii, 4; comp. Ezek. xii, 22, but none of these are quotations. The closing visions of Ezekiel are clearly referred to, though quoted, in the last chapters of the Apocalypse. The prophet Ezekiel is distinctly referred to by the son of Sirach (Ecclus. ciii, 8, and by Josephus (Ant. x, 5, 1; 6, 3, 7, 2, 6, 2). The book of Ezekiel is also mentioned as forming part of the canon in the catacomb of St. Felicio (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv, 20), Origën (apud Euseb. l. c. vi, 25), Jerome (Proleg. Gaius. 9) and the Palimpsest (Ecclh. iii, 218, i, 126–137).

One of the passages of Josephus to which we have referred has occasioned much controversy and many conjectures, because he seems to affirm that Ezekiel had written two books of prophecies (Ant. x, 5, 1). According to the ordinary and, indeed, as it would seem, necessary interpretation of this passage, Ezekiel was the first who wrote two books respecting the Babylonian captivity. The question then arises, has one of his books been lost, or are the two now joined into one? The former supposition has been maintained by some in order to account for certain professed quotations from the prophet Ezekiel of passages which are not found in his writings at present. Thus Clemens Romanus (Epist. ad Cor. c. 6) refers to a book of Ezekiel, which is given more at length by Clemens Alexandrinus (Pedagogy, i, 10). Thus, again, Tertullian (De carne Christi, c. 23, p. 304, ed. Semler) says, "Legimus apud Ezekielicum de vacca illa quam peperit et non peperit." Other instances may be seen in Fabricius (Codex Pseudoepigraphus v. T., 2d ed., p. 1118), and quoted from him by Carpzov (Introd. pt. iii, p. 208). Both these critics, however, agree that the most probable explanation of such references is that they were derived from Jewish tradition. The latter hypothesis, that our present book was originally two, the second containing the last nine chapters, has received the support of very many critics (see Le Moyne, Vitræ Sacri, ii, 382; Carpzov, Introd. p. 206). This view, however, is not without serious difficulties. There is no evidence that the book, as at present existing, was ever considered two; and the testimony of some objections raised on the ground that the two books were received as sacred (Contr. Ajonum, i, 8), appears quite opposed to such a supposition, since in whatever way the division of the Old Testament into twenty-two books is made there cannot be two out of the number ascribed to Ezekiel (cf. Ezech. ii, 146) maintains that it is Jeremiah of whom Josephus speaks, a position to which we should at once assent if we could with him consider the words долипос as
equivalent to ὁ θεός. If this is what Josephus meant, we must suppose some corruption of his text. Becker omits the ὡς.

III. Interpretation.—The latter part of the book has always been regarded as very obscure. It will be seen, by the brief notices of the contents given above, that Hävernick considers the whole to relate to Mes- siah, the last rank of the prophets. The predictions respecting Gog (chaps. xxxvii, xxxix) have been referred by some to Anti- oclus Epiphanius; by others to Cambyses, to the Chal- deans, the Scythians, the Turks, etc. Mr. Granville Penn has interpreted them of Napoleon and the French (The Prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog, etc., 1816). See Guérin, Description of the Temple of Jerusalem (chap. xlviii) has been thought by many to contain an account of what Solomon’s Temple was; by others, of what the second Temple should be. (See Hävernick’s Commentar über Ezekiel, Erlangen, 1848.) The best interpretation of these predictions is to be found in that of the similar ones of the Apocalypse. See Tiele.

We cannot now enter into the difficulties of these or other chapters (for which we must refer to some of the commentaries mentioned below); but we will enumerate, following Fairbairns, the four main lines of interpretation, viz., 1. The Historico-literal, adopted by Vökel, Löse, Graf, and others. 2. The Prosopography, ascribed to Nazianzn (p. 401, and Gesenius (Mesches der Hebräischen Sprache, 1844), p. 389). 3. The Christian-critical, ascribed to the Greek, the Prophet’s work, etc., of which Tiele says: “A sort of vague and well-meaning announcement of farther good.” 4. The Jewish-critical (of Lightfoot, Hoffman, etc.), which maintains that their outline was actually adopted by the exiles. 4. The Christian-historical, followed by Luther, Calvin, Cocceius, and most modern commentators, which makes them “a great complicated symbol of the good God had in reserve for his Church.” Rosenmüller disapproves alike of the literalism of Grotius, and the arbitrary, ambiguous allegorizing of others, remarks (Schol. in xxxvii) (26) that it seems a useless task to attempt to refer these prophecies to distinct events, or to refer their special descriptions to naked fact. It is most safe to regard them, in accordance with the nature of allegorical representations and visions in general, as having a literal or material basis in the near past or future (i.e. recollections of Solomon’s Temple, and vision of hostile powers), which is made the vehicle of a high spiritual import, to set forth the distant grandeur, glory, and triumph of the kingdom of God. See Double Sense (of Prophecy).

IV. Style.—The depth of Ezekiel’s matter, and the marvellous nature of his visions, make him occasion- ally obscure. Hence his prophecy was placed by the Jews among the תָּרָצִים (treasures), those portions of Scripture which (like the early part of Genesis, and the Canticles) were not allowed to be read till the age of thirty (Jerome, Ep. ad Euseb. ; Origen, Proem. bonit. iv, in Cant. ; Hottinger, Thes. Phil. ii, 1, 5). Jerome compares the “inextricable babbil” of his writings to Virgil’s labyrinth (“Oceanus Scriptura- rum, mysteriorumque Del labyrinthus”) and also to the Catamassae. The Jews classed him in the very highest rank of prophets. Gregory Naz. (Or. 29) be- stows the loftiest encomiums upon him. Isidore (De viis et ob. Sanct. 39) makes him a type of Christ from the title “Son of Man,” but that is equally applied to Daniel (viii, 17). Other similar testimonies are quoted by Carpzov (Intro. 221 sqq.). The Semichim is said to have hesitated long whether his book should form part of the canon, from the occasional obscurity, and from the supposed contradiction of xxvii, 20 to Exod. xx, 5; xxxiv, 7; Jer. xxvili, 18. But, in point of fact, these apparent oppositions are the mere ex- pression of truths complementary to each other, as Moses himself might have taught them (Deut. xxix, 16). Although, generally speaking, comments on this book were forbidden, a certain R. Nanianus undertook to reconcile the supposed differences. (Spinoza, Tract. Theol. Polit. ii, 27, partly from these considerations, infers that the present book is made up of mere ἀναμνήσεις, but his argument from its commencement with a, and from the expression in i, s above al- luded to, hardly needs refutation.

That Ezekiel was a poet of a mean order is acknowledged by almost all critics (Lowth, De sacra Po- ëis Hebraeorum, ed. J. D. Michaelis, Göttingen, 1770, p. 421). Michaelis and Dathe are the only critics of any eminence (as far as we know) who think slightlying of his poetical genius. The question is altogether one of taste, and should therefore be decided by com- mon consent against Michaelis. He remarks more truly that Ezekiel lived at a period when the Hebrew language was declining in purity, when the silver age was succeding to the golden one. It is, indeed, to the matter rather than the language of Ezekiel that we are to look for evidence of poetic genius. The style is often simply didactic, and he abounds in peculiarities of expression, Aramaisms, and grammatical anomalies which, while they give individuality to his writings, plainly evince the decline of the language in which he wrote. An extended account of such pecu- liarities is given by Eichhorn in das A. T. iii, 196 and Gesenius (Grammar of the Hebrew Sprache, 1844), p. 55. Among the most splendid passages are ch. i (called by the Rabbi רֲבָבָה, the prophecy against Tyrus (ch. xxvi-xxvii)), that against Assyria, “the noblest monument of Eastern history” (ch. xxxi), and ch. viii, the account of what he saw in the Temple porch,

"When, by the vision led,
His eye surveyed the dark idolatries
Of alienated Judah.”

Milton, Par. Lost, i.

V. Commentaries.—The following are special exegetical works on the entire book; the most important have an asterisk (*) prefixed: Origen, Commentarii, etc. (in Opera, iii, 351 sqq., 406); Ephraem Syrus, Ex- planatio (in Opera, v, 169); Gregory Nazianzen, Sig- nificatio (in Opera Spuri, i, 870); Jerome, Commenta- rii, etc. (in Opera, v); Theodoret, Interpretatio (in Opera, ii, 11; also Rome, 1665, fol.); Gregory the Great, Commentarius (Paris et Romae, 1714); Bahan, Commentarius (in Opera): Ruperti, In Ezek. (in Opera, p. 489); Ecce- lampadius, Commentarius (Basil. 1534, 4to; 1534, 8vo; Argent. 1634, 4to); Strigel, Scholia (Lips. 1669, 1676, 1679, 8vo); Calvin, Annotationes (Geneva, 1655, 8vo, and 1694); French, Genev. 1655, 8vo, and 1698; J. Edinb. 1849-60, 2 vols. 8vo); Junius, Commentarius (Genevol. 1600, 60. 1610, 8vo); Malalas, in Ezek. (in his Commentarii, p. 542); Seinercke, Auslegung (Lips. 1667, 4to); Pinto, Commentarius (Salam. 1668, fol., and later); Lavater, Commentarius (Geneva, 1757, fol.); Serranus, Commentarius (Antw. 1857, 1607, fol.); Heilbrunner, Questiones (Laving. 1587, 8vo); Abraham ben-Mose, Übersetzung (Prag. 1692, 4to); *Pradus and Villaiianus, Explanationes (Rome, 1666, 5 vols. fol.); *Poli, Commentarius (Geneva, 1699, fol, 1610, 8vo); *Lapicius, in Ezek, in his Commentarii); Sansitius, Commentarius (Leud. 1612, 1619, fol.); Retsch, Commentarius (Basil. 1621, 4to); *Greenhill, Exposition (London, 1645-67, 5 vols. 4to; also 1827, 1863, 8vo; in Dutch, Hague, 1782-4, 4 vols. 4to); Cocceius, Commentarius (Leud. 1668, 4to; Amst. 1700, fol.); Henrich, Tonia (Rotbenh. 1687, 8vo); Petersen, Zeugniss (Freib. 1719, 4to); *Lowth, Commentary (London, 1729, 4to); *Starck, Commentary (Facett. ad M. 1731, 4to); *Vogel, Weisung (Hamb. 1772, 4to); *Vol- borth, Anmerk. (Göt. 1677, 8vo); Newcome, Explica- tion (Dub. 1788, 8vo, and since); Venema, Lectiones (Leov. 1720, 4to); *Notius, Commentarius (Leud, i, 65); Hanter, Consideration (in Works, ix, 739); *Ros- senmüller, Scholia (Lips. 8vo, 1808-10, 2 vols. also;
Enez (Heb. E'tsem, 3548) 2 a less incorrect mode (1 Chron. iv, 29) of Anglicizing the name Ezem (q. v.), as elsewhere (Job. xiv, 5). Ezem. See Ezetne.

Ezer (Heb. E'tser, 3543; treasure; Sept. A'zib, Vulg. Eser). one of the sons of Seir, and native princes of Mount Hor (Gen. xxxvi, 21, 27, 30; 1 Chron. i, 42, 38), in which last verse the name is Anglicized "Ezer". B.C. c. 1597.

Ezer (Heb. E'tser, 3543; 3537; Ezer). the name of five men. See also Roman- ti-ezer; Eben-ezer.

1. (Sept. E'ziq v. r. A'ziq, Vulg. Eser.) A person named with Eled (q. v.) as a son (or descendant) of Ephraim, who was slain by the aboriginal inhabitants of Gath while engaged in a foray on their cattle (1 Chron. vii, 21). Ewald (Gesch. I. c. i, 400) assigns this occurrence to the pre-Egyptian period. B.C. ante 1658.

2. (Sept. E'ziq v. r. A'ziq, Vulg. Eser.) The father of Hushah, one of the posterny of Hur, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 14). B.C. cir. 1658. In ver. 17 he appears to be called Ezem, but no such son occurs among the list of those there attributed to him.


4. (Sept. A'ziq v. r. A'ziq, Vulg. Ezer.) Son of Josheb, and ruler of Mizpah, who repaired part of the city wall near the armory (Neh. iii, 19). B.C. 446.

5. (Sept. I'ziq, Vulg. Ezer.) One of the priests who made the circuit of the newly-finished walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446.

Ezer'ias (q. E'ziqias v. r. Zziaias, Vulg. A'ziqias). the son of Helchiah and father of Seraiah, in the ances-

try of Esdras (1 Esdr. viii, 1); evidently the high-priest Azariah (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra vii, 1).

Ez'ias (q. E'tziq v. r. O'ziqis, Vulg. A'zahel), the son of Meremoth and father of Amarias in the same genealogy (1 Esdr. viii, 2); evidently the corresponding Azariah (q. v.) of the Hebrew list (Ezra vii, 3). Comp. Aziel.

Ezion-geber (Heb. E'tyon-Geb'er, 3562) [in this form only at 1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. vii, 17], i. q. g'mim's back-bone; Sept. Παιβ (in Deut. xxxiv.) Vaibip [in Chron. Paibiq], but in 1 Kings xiv in Παξιμιν Παξιμιν, Vulg. Asiagon bar) or E'ziON-GA'BER (being "in pause," Heb. E'tyon-Geb'er, 3562) [in 1 Kings xx, 49; 2 Chron. xx, 36, fully "3562"] so found also at Num. xxxiii, 86; Deut. ii, 8; but Anglicized "Ezion-geber" in 1 Kings xxii, 48 (49), a very ancient city near Elath (q. v.), on the modern arm of the Red Sea. Jonathan's Targarum, following a false etymology, defines the name as i. q. "castle of the cock" (see Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 384; Beck, Chron. Chalda. paraphr. ii, 101). It is first mentioned in Num. xxxiii, 85 as one of the stations where the Hebrews halted in their journeyings through the wilderness. In the last place named before they came to "the wilderness of Zin, which is Kadesh," and the point where they afterwards turned from the "Arabah to Elath, towards the wilderness of Moab" (Deut, ii, 8). See Ezion-geber.

Ezau (Heb. Ezau, Ἕξαος Kings ix, 26) sent the fleet which he had there built to the land of Ophir. See Commerce. Here also Josaphat (1 Kings xxii, 47; 2 Chron. xx, 85) built a fleet "to go to Ophir"; but because he had joined himself with Azahiah, "king of Israel, who did wickedly," the ships were broken that they were not able to go to Tarshish, being probably destroyed on the rocks which lie in "jagged ranges on each side" (Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 84). Bütsching (Erdbesch. v. i, 620) erroneously locates it at Sharam, a port at the southern end of the gulf (Geogr. Neb. iii, 5). Wellsted (Travels, ii, 153) would find it in the modern Dahab, but this is the ancient Dibathah (q. v.). Laborde (Comentaire Geog. p. 124) seeks it in the rocky island el-Kurayjah, which is hardly adequate in extent or position; and Rüppel (Arab. p. 252) locates it at the mouth of the Erez, i.e. el-Jawwik, which is liable to the same objection. Josephus (Ant. viii, 4, 4) says that Ezion-geber (Ar'sawiyajibapos) was also called Berenice, and that it lay not far from Elath. It is probably the same with the once-populous city Agria in Burchard, p. 518; Robinson (Biblical Researches, i, 250) says "No trace of Ezion-geber remains now to remain, unless it be in the name of a small wady with brackish water, el-Ghudjim, opening into el-Arabah from the western mountain, some distance north of Akabah." It is doubtful, however, whether the sea ever extended so far up the Arabah as this. It was probably situated at the point where the Hajar route strikes the Arabah at the north-west point of the gulf (Robinson, i. c. 239). Yet the town may have given name to this the nearest spring, for Ghudjim in Arabic corresponds in all the essential letters to Ezion in Heb., which is identical with the later Agria. By comparing 1 Kings ix, 26, 27, with 2 Chron. viii, 17, 18, it is probable that timber was floated from Tyre to the nearest point on the Mediterranean coast, and then conveyed over land to the head of the Gulf of Akabah, where the ships seem to have been built; for there can hardly have been adequate forests in the neighborhood. Dr. Wilson noticed fragments of an old caravanserai route part way up the hill-side in this vicinity (Lands of the Bible, i, 264). See Wilderness of the wandering.
vid's body-guard; and if considered as a gentle adj., must mean an inhabitant of Ezem, a place otherwise unknown. But of the words rendered "Adino the Enite" (25:17, 28, 30; 26:42; 1 Chron. 26:42), Vulg. quasi tennirius iuri iuridicis, as if understanding the latter term to be a form of *xw, wood*, Gesenius (Heb. Lex.) regards the former as a peculiar alliteration for *zgeb*, in the sense of "be brandished," from the root *zqg*, to be pictant; and the latter as a rare word, *xg*, a spear (for which sense he finds analogy in the Arabic); and thus the whole phrase will be equivalent to that in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xxv, 11), which otherwise we must here interpolate (with our translators) in order to make sense. These words do not contain the name of a person is clear from the fact that Jashobeam is given in the parallel passage, and is capable of identification [see Jashobeam], and also from the enumeration, in which the two meritorious grades of three each, with the 30 warriors specially enumerated, require just this one special officer to make up the number of 37 specified in the text as peculiarly distinguished. See David. The passage in 2 Sam. is conceded to be less trustworthy than that in 1 Chron., even by Davidson, who vainly contends (Saec. et gent. Israel. p. 465) for Adino as a proper name. [See at length in Kennicott, Dissertation, 1, 71-128; Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 994-5.] Compare Adino.

Ezra. See Hysros.

Ezra (Heb. [except in No. 1] Ezra, עזרא, the hlep, a Chaldean emphatic form of עזר, Ezar), the name of three or four men.

1. (1 Chron. iv, 17.) See Ezrah.

2. (Sept. עזרא v. ר' עזרא, Vulgate Edecras.) A leading priest among the first colonists to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 1). B.C. 536. His son Meshullam was chief of his family in the time of the high-priest Joakim (Neh. xii, 12). In the somewhat parallel list of Neh. x, 2-8, the name of the same person is written עזרא, Azariah, as it is probably in Ezra vii, 1.

3. (Sept. עזרא v. ר' עזרא, Josephus' עזרא, Vulgate Edecras.) The celebrated Jewish scribe (*Bd*) and priest (*G*) who, in the year B.C. 450, led the second expedition of Jews back from the Babylonian exile into Palestine, and the author of one of the canonical books of Scripture.

Parentage.-Ezra was a lineal descendant from Phinehas, the son of Aaron (Ezra vii, 1-5). He is stated to be the son of Seraias, the son of Azariah; which Seraias was slain at Riblah by order of Nebuchadnezzar, having been brought thither a captive by Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv, 18-21). See Seraias. But, as 130 years elapsed between the death of Seraias and the departure of Ezra from Babylon, and we read that a grandson of Seraias was the high-priest who accompanied Zerubbabel on the first return to Jerusalem, seventy years before Ezra returned thither, we may suppose that by the term *son* here, as in some other places, the relationship of great-relationships, or of a still more remote direct descendant, is intended. See Father. All that is really known of Ezra is contained in the last four chapters of the book of Ezra, and in Neh. viii and xii, 26. In addition to the information that he was a "scribe of the books of the law of Moses," "a writer of the words of the commandments of the Lord and of his statutes to Israel," "a scribe of the law of the God of heaven," and "a priest," we are told by Josephus that he was high-priest of the Jews who were left in Babylon; that he was particularly conversant with the laws of Moses, and was held in universal esteem on account of his righteousness and virtue (Ant. xi, 6, 1).

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

The origin of Ezra's influence with the Persian king Artaxerxes Longimanus does not appear, but in the seventh year of his reign, B.C. 450, in spite of the unfavorable report which had been sent by Rehum and Shimshai, he obtained leave to go to Jerusalem, and to take with him a company of Israelites, together with priests, Levites, singers, porters, and Nethinim. Of these a account is given in 2 Chron. iii, 1 to 7, is given in Ezra viii; and these, also, doubtless form a part of the full list of the returned captives contained in Neh. vii, and in duplicate in Ezra ii. Ezra and his companions were allowed to take with them a large free-will offering of gold and silver, and silver vessels, contributed not only by the Baby themselves, but by kings, princes, and their counsellors. These offerings were for the house of God, to beautify it, and for the purchase of bullocks, rams, and the other offerings required for the Temple-service. In addition to this, Ezra was empowered to draw up a complete register of all the captives from the Persian throne, so that, when further supplies he might require; and all princes, Levites, and other ministers of the Temple were exempted from taxation. Ezra had also authority given him to appoint magistrates and judges in Judah, with power of life and death over all offenders. The reason of the gift was that the worship of God at this time, as evinced by Artaxerxes appears to have been a fear of the divine displeasure, for we read in the conclusion of the decree of the treasurers beyond the river, "Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven; for why should there be reproach against the realm of the king and his son?" We are also told (Ezra vi, 6) that the king granted Ezra all his request; and Josephus informs us that Ezra, being desirous of going to Jerusalem, requested the king to grant him recommendationary letters to the governor of Syria (Ant. xi, 4, 1). We may therefore suppose that the dread which Artaxerxes entertained of the divine judgments was the consequence of the exposition to him by Ezra of the history of the Jewish people. Some writers suppose that this favor shown to the Jews was consequent to the seventh year of his reign; but this could not be, even if we should grant, what is unlikely, that the Artaxerxes of the book of Ezra and the Artaxerxes of the book of Esther were the same person, because Ezra set out for Jerusalem in the first month of the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes, and Esther was brought into the king's house in the tenth month of the seventh year of the reign of Ahasuerus, and did not declare her connection with the Jewish people, and obtain favor for them until after the plot of Haman, in the twelfth year of Ahasuerus. See Ahasuerus. Ezra assembled the Jews who accompanied him on the banks of the river Ahava, where they halted three days in tents. Here Ezra proclaimed a fast, as an act of humiliation before God, and a season of prayer for divine direction and safe conduct; for, on setting out, he was ashamed to request force of soldiers and horsemen to help them against the enemy by the way," because he had asserted to the king that the hand of his God is upon them that seek him for good. Ezra next committed the care of the treasures which he carried with him to twelve of the chief priests, and ten of their brethren, and charged these to take charge of the treasures by the way, and deliver them safely in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem. On the twelfth day from their first setting out Ezra and his companions left the river Ahava, and, after they had arrived safely at Jerusalem, it having been delivered from the hand of the enemy and of such as lay in wait by the way. Three days after their arrival the treasures were weighed and delivered
into the custody of some Levites. The returning exiles offered burnt-offerings to the Lord. They delivered also the king's commissions to the viceroy and governors, and gave needful help to the people and the ministers of the Temple.

Ezra had been granted him at his own request (ver. 6), and it appears that his great design was to effect a religious reformation among the Palestinian Jews, and to bring them back to the observance of the law of Moses, from which they had grievously strayed. Ezra, therefore, was sent to enforce a separation from their wives of all who had made heathen marriages, in which number were many priests and Levites, as well as other Israelites. For this an opportunity soon presented itself. When he had discharged the various trusts committed to him, the priests and the Jews consulted, and determined that the Jewish people generally who had returned from the captivity, and also the priests and Levites, but especially the rulers and princes, had kept themselves separate from the people of the land, but had done according to the abominations of the remnant of the nations whom their forefathers had driven out, and married their daughters, and allowed their children to intermarry with them. On this report Ezra evinced his deep affliction, according to the Jewish custom, by rending his mantle and tearing the hair of his head. Ezra gathered together all those who still feared God, and dreaded his wrath for the transgression of those whom he had brought back from captivity. Having waited till the time of the evening sacrifice, Ezra rose up, and, having again rent his hair and his garments, made public prayer and confession of sin. The assembled people went bitterly, and Shecaniah, one of the sons of Elam, came forward to propose a general covenant to put away the foreign wives and their children. Ezra then arose and administered an oath to the people that they would do accordingly. Proclamation was also made that all those who had returned from captivity should within three days gather themselves together to Jerusalem, under pain of excommunication and forfeiture of their goods. The people assembled at the time appointed, trembling on account of their sin and of the heavy rain that fell. Ezra addressed them, declaring to them their sin, and exhorting them to amend their lives by dissolving their illegal connections. The people acknowledged the justice of his rebukes, and promised obedience. They then requested that, as the rain fell heavily, and the number of transgressors was so great, he would come to them at which they might severally come to be examined respecting this matter, accompanied by the judges and elders of every city. A commission was therefore formed, consisting of Ezra and some others, to investigate the extent of the evil. This investigation occupied three months. Josephus relates the affecting scene which occurred on the reading of the law by Ezra (Ant. xi, 5, 5). The account given by Josephus agrees with that of Nehemiah in all leading particulars, except that Josephus places the date and occasion in the Athenæum of Xerxes (Ant. xi, 6).

With the detailed account of this important transaction Ezra's autobiography ends abruptly, and we hear nothing more of him till thirteen years afterwards, in the twelfth of Artaxerxes, we find him again at Jerusalem with Nehemiah the "Tishahith." B.C. 446. It is generally assumed that Ezra came to assume the governorship over Nehemiah superseded him, but as Ezra's commission was only of a temporary nature, "to inquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem" (Ezra vii, 14), and to carry thither "the silver and gold which the king and his counsellors had freely given unto the God of Israel" (ver. 15), and as there is no trace whatever of his presence at Jerusalem between the eighth and the twelfth of Artaxerxes, it seems probable that after he had effected the above-named reform, and had appointed competent judges and magistrates, with authority to maintain it, he himself returned to the king of Persia. This is in itself what one would expect, and what is borne out by the parallel case of Nehemiah, and it also accounts for the abrupt termination of Ezra's narrative, and the gradual lapse of the Jews into their former irregularities which is apparent in the book of Nehemiah. Such a relapse, and such a state of affairs at Jerusalem in general, could scarcely have occurred if Ezra had continued in presence of the king there. Whether he returned to Jerusalem with Nehemiah, or separately, does not appear certainly, but as he is not mentioned in Nehemiah's narrative till after the completion of the wall (Neh. viii, 1), it is perhaps probable that he followed the latter some months later, having, perhaps, been sent for to aid him in his work. The functions be executed under Nehemiah's government were purely of a priestly and ecclesiastical character, such as reading and interpreting the law of Moses to the people during the eight days of the feast of Tabernacles, praying in the congregation, and assisting at the dedication of the wall, and in promoting the religious worship in which he first placed the first stone of the temple.

But in such a filled the first place, being repeatedly coupled with Nehemiah the Tirshatha (viii, 9; xii, 20), while Elíasib the high-priest is not mentioned as taking any part in the reformation at all. In any case, it is evident that the book of Ezra, while it perhaps sealed under the patronymic Serahiah or Azariah (v, 2). In Neh. viii we read that, on the occasion of the celebration of the feast of the seventh month, subsequently to Nehemiah's numbering the people, Ezra was requested to bring the book of the law of Moses; and that he read therein standing upon a pulpit of wood, which raised him above all the people. As Ezra is not mentioned after Nehemiah's departure for Babylon in the thirty-second of Artaxerxes, and as everything fell into confusion during Nehemiah's absence (Neh. xiii), it is not unlikely that Ezra may have again returned to Babylon before that year. See NEHEMIAH.

3. Traditiory Acts.—Josephus, who should be our next best authority after Scripture, evidently knew nothing about the time or the place of his death. He vaguely says, "He died an old man, and was buried in a magnificent mausoleum at Jerusalem" (Ant. xiii, 9), and places his death in the high-priesthood of Joacim, and before the government of Nehemiah! According to some Jewish chroniclers, he died in the year in which Alexander came to Jerusalem, on the tenth day of the month Tebeth (that is, the January in December), in the same year in which took place the punishment of the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and in which prophecy became extinct. According to other traditions, Ezra returned to Babylon and died there at the age of 120 years. The Talmudic statement is that he died at Zamzuma, a town on the Tigris, while on his road from Jerusalem to Babylon, whether he was going to converse with Artaxerxes about the affairs of the Jews. Thus Benjamin of Tudela says of Nahar Samarah (apparently Zamzuma, otherwise Zamzum): "The pulchro de Ezra the priest and scribe is in this place, where he died, on his journey from Jerusalem to this Artaxerxes" (Travel. i, 116). A tomb said to be his is shown on the Tigris, near its junction with the Euphrates (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 428, note). An interesting description of this tomb is given by Kitto (Pict. Bible, note at the end of Ezra).

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

(1.) Some traditions assert that Ezra was, about A. M. 3113, the president of the , Synagogos Magoas, and the father of all Mishine doctors.
The book of Ezra is introduced in the context of the Babylonian captivity and exile. Ezra is described as a learned and zealous leader who returned to rebuild the Temple and revitalize the Jewish religious and cultural life. The book is structured into two main parts:

1. The first part (Ezra 1-7) focuses on the return of the exiles and the rebuilding of the Temple, culminating in Ezra's appointment as governor.

2. The second part (Ezra 8-10) describes Ezra's journey to Jerusalem and his subsequent leadership in maintaining religious purity.

Key themes include the return to Jerusalem, the rededication of the Temple, and the efforts to maintain Jewish faith and practices. Ezra's leadership is highlighted as a pivotal moment in the post-exilic history of Judah, setting the stage for the future of the Jewish community.
stration, only reserving the temporal supremacy of the Persian monarchy (ch. vii, viii). Lastly, the reconstruction of this theocratic state, which Ezra effected so completely that he carried the people with him in remoulding the family relations by the law against intermarriage with certain races (ch. ix, x).

III. Ezra's Books. The Ezra books seem general and still stands on its own; and there is no room for the hypothesis that Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, taken together, form one great historical work. The arguments for this hypothesis are of no weight in themselves; but in so far as the statements of fact, they are willingly put forward by us as circumstances worthy of consideration in themselves, and apart from the illogical purpose to which they have been applied. 1. The three books have a large number of words and phrases in common, which are not met with in the other parts of Scripture. This agrees well with their composition at a new epoch in the history of the Hebrew nation and its literature, by men who had been brought up in the land of Assyria or Babylon, perhaps brought up together at the same Persian court, Ezra and Nehemiah, and also most intimately connected with the same evangelist. The opinion is also probable that the Chronicles were compiled by Ezra, as well as the book to which his own name has been given. 2. There is a predilection for genealogical details running through all three books to have the characteristic of the age; and it was probably necessary, considering the efforts to restore the old arrangements as to the holding of property, the administration of government, and the preservation of ancient national feeling, all of which objects were likely to force genealogical questions upon the scribes of men. 3. There is a similar prominence given to details about the priests and Levites. This is unavoidable in any treatment of the people of Israel, unless their character as the Church of God is to be overlooked. Especially, in whatever proportion there were difficulties felt as to the revival of the more political aspects of the theocracy, in that same proportion must the greater attention have been given to its ecclesiastical arrangements.

IV. Authorship. A late ingenious writer (Rev. and Lord). In Smith's Dict. of the Bible, s. v.) pronounces on this question: "Like the two books of Chronicles, this consists of the contemporary historical journals kept from time to time by the prophets, or other authorized persons, who were eye-witnesses for the most part of what they record, and whose several narratives are strung together according to either an abridged or added to, as the case required, by a later hand. That later hand, in the book of Ezra, was doubtless Ezra's own, as appears by the last four chapters, as well as by other matter inserted in the previous chapters. While, therefore, in a certain sense, the whole book is Ezra's, as put together by him, yet strictly only the last four chapters are his original work. Nor will it be difficult to point out with tolerable certainty several of the writers of whose writings the first six chapters are composed. Accordingly, that writer, to justificate many of the statements, proceeds to dissect the book for this purpose. 1. Chap. ii. he assigns as being undoubtedly by Daniel, on account of the otherwise untenable silence of that prophet respecting the decree of Cyrus, and the phraseology of Ezra in referring to that event. 2. Chap. ii. is assigned to the same hand as being identical with Nahum. 3. Chap. iii, 2-6 (except iv, 6-23), he thinks belongs to Haggai, on account of certain coincidences of expression in that prophet. 4. Chap. iv, 6-23, he regards as a parenthetical addition made in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and as not originally Ezra's own production. A still later critic (Dr. Davidson, in the new edit. of Kitto's Cyclopedia of Bible Lit., s. v.) is even bolder in distributing various por-

It is a sufficient refutation of all such attempts to note their extremely subjective character, depending chiefly upon the caprice or conjecture of the critic himself; for the peculiarities cited, when closely examined, are far from being general and still more are not to be relied upon as proofs of authorship, especially in view of the foregoing remarks respecting the scheme of the book. Moreover, if, as all admit, Ezra did incorporate older documents into his history (so even Moses does in the Pentateuch), yet, as he moulded them into a homogeneous whole, this does not militate against his claim to be regarded as the proper author, and not simply editor of the book that bears his name. (See the Einleitung of Hävernick and Keil.)

V. Personality of the Writer. — In the first six chapters the use of the third person predominates in the narrative, except in passages where, by synecdoche, occurs חמש, Heb. ומש, w. sued, or where the narrative contains abstractions from documents to which Ezra had access, or by which he was guided, or Chaldee language of the original documents has been preserved from ch. iv. 8 to vi. 18, and vii. 12-26. These portions exist in Kennicott's Cod. p. 246, in a collateral Hebrew translation, reprinted in Kennicott's edition of the Hebrew Bible, and separately in Chaldeorum Canticum et Ceven et Pseudo-Danielis et Ceven et Ceven et Pseudo-Danielis et Ceven by J. T. R. Van- dœnec Schulze, Halæ, 1782, 8vo. 8vo. An argument has been raised against the opinion that Ezra was the author of the book that bears his name from the use of the first person plural in the 4th verse of the 5th chapter, which would seem to imply that the narrator was present on the occasion described; but, setting aside other replies to this argument, it appears that the word se refers to Tatnai and his companions, and not at all to the Jews. Ezra speaks from ch. vii. 27, to ch. ix. 15, in the first person. "There is an essential difference between public events which a man recollects, though only as in a dream, to have heard of at the time when they occurred, and those which preceded his birth. The former we think of with reference to ourselves; the latter are foreign to us. The epoch and duration of the former we measure by our own life: the latter belong to a period for which our imagination has no scale. Life and definiteness are imparted to all that we hear or read with respect to the events of our own life" (Niebuhr, On the Distinction between Annals and History). These remarks, which Niebuhr made in reference to Tacitus, are in a great measure also applicable to Ezra, inasmuch as the similar change of person are so frequent in ancient authors that rhetoricians have introduced it among the rhetorical figures under the name of 'false personae. The prophetic writings of the Old Testament furnish examples of such 'ιαλλαγια. For instance, Ezek. i, 1-3; Zech. i, 1; vi. 1; vii. 1. 4; Jer. xx. 1 sq. comp. with vi. 7 sq.; xxii. i, xxvii. 1-5; xxxii. 1-8; Hos. 1-2; i. 3. So also in Habakkuk, Dan-iel, etc. The frequency of this 'ιαλλαγια, especially in the prophetic parts of the Old Testament, arises from either the mere objective or merely subjective ten- dency of the style, which of course varies in harmony with the contents of the chapter. (See Fromman, Diag. qua Orientis regium numero de se logy non imitatam fuisse, probabilius ostenditur, Cod. 2. 1762.)

We express our opinion that even Hävernick does not rightly set the truth of the view of Dr. Grotius's Einleitung, he says that this 'ιαλλαγια arose from Ez- ra's imitation of the prophetic usage, and when he approvingly quotes Schirmer's Observationes exegeticae et criticæ in hebræum Edrei, i. 8 (Vratil. 1830). There was certainly as little imitation of the prophets in the false personae of Ezra as there is imitation of the prophets if we change from the first to the third person in our own communications. 'ιαλλαγια never arises.
from imitation, but only from the more subjective or more objective turn of our mind, and from that vivacity of style which renders it incumbent upon the reader rather than upon the writer to supply that which, as in Jonah ii, 3, forms the transition from the use of the third to the adoption of the first person.

As regards the date, the reckoning of some writers that this composition as a whole must be referred to a period about a century later than Ezra, or more, need not be noticed, because they have not even a pretence of argument in their favor. One writer, Zunz (Die pittischen. Vorträge der Juden, 1832,) has indeed alleged some exaggeration about the sacred vessels said to have been restored by Cyrus; but his fellow-untellers have refused to agree with him, and have defended the historical credibility of the book throughout. Another critic, Bertheau, sees an evidence of the composition of ch. vi, 22 under the Greek successors of Alexander, because the king of Persia is called the king of Assyria; an argument which might have been left to its own weakness, even though we had been unable to give the parables 2 Kings xxiii, 29; Lam. v, 6, as Keil has done.

Such critical questions, who rely on their internal arguments might have seen evidence in favor of its early composition in the fact that its chronology is clear and exact; while the accounts of Jewish affairs under the Persian monarchy, as given by Josephus from apocryphal writers and other sources unknown to him, are marred by extreme confusion and some palpable mistakes. The book begins with the decree of Cyrus after he had taken Babylon, by which the Jews were sent home to Jerusalem and directed to rebuild the Temple, B.C. 536. It narrates the difficulties and hindrances before this was accomplished in the sixth year of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, about B.C. 516. It passes in silence over the rest of his reign, 31 years, and the whole of the reign of Xerxes, 21 years, proceeding directly to the work of Ezra, who received his commission in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 450. If the whole of the events narrated in the closing chapter took place almost immediately, as is understood, we believe, by all commentators, then the extreme length of time embraced in the narrative is not above 80 years; and the order is strictly chronological, although it is not continuous, but leaves a kind of hiatus sixty years. (Scheil-GERF, Ezra und Daniel, and ihre neuesten Bearbeitungen, Halle, 1863.)

VII. Language. The book is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Chaldee. The Chaldee begins at iv, 8, and continues to the end of vi, 18. The letter or decree of Artaxerxes vii, 12, 26, is also given in the original Chaldee.

VIII. Compositio. There has never been any doubt about Ezra being canonical, although there is no quotation from it in the N. Test. Augustine styles Ezra "rather a writer of transactions than a prophet" (De Civ. Dei, xviii, 36).

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

X. Commentaries. The following are special exegetical works on the entire book, the most important being denoted by an asterisk (*): Aben Ezra, יִשְׂרָאֵל (in Buxtorf's Rabbinical Bible, Basle, 1628-19, fol.); Bede, Espositio (in Works, viii, 860); Rashii, יִשְׂרָאֵל (Naples, 1487, 4to; Venice, 1517, fol.); In Latin, with other books, Goth. 1714, 4to; Kimchi, יִשְׂרָאֵל (in Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible, Ven. 1549, fol.); Simeon, יִשְׂרָאֵל (in his Bible, Venice, 1618, fol.).
Faber, Basil, a learned German Protestant divine, was born at Saras, in Lower Lusatia, about 1520, studied at Wittenberg under Melancthon, was rector of the gymnasium at Nordhausen, 1550-55, and afterwards of Quedlinburg, 1563-70. He opposed Melancthon's Corpus Doctrinae and the Crypto-Calvinists, and in 1570 had to leave Quedlinburg on this account. He then taught at Erfurt till his death, 1578. His chief work was the Theocarum evangeliis scholastice (Lips. 1571; last ed. Francist. 1749, 5 vols. fol.), a work which still commands consideration for its extensive and exact learning. He was also one of the writers of the Magdeburg Collections (q. v.).

Faber (of Fabri), Felix, a Dominican monk and Oriental traveller, was born in Zurich, 1441-2, and was educated by the Dominicans at Basel. He early entered the mendicant order, and became chief preacher in the cloister at Ulm, 1478. His studies were directed to the illustration of the Bible lands, and he made two journeys to the East, one in 1480 to Jerusalem, and one in 1483-4 to Palestine, Egypt, and Sinai. He died March 14, 1509. His principal writings are Ecloga tiones in Terram Sanctam, Asiae et Aegypti peregrinationem (republished Stuttg. 1643-9, 8 vols. 8vo); Historia Sacerdum (Francist. 1603; Ulm, 1728); Quaest. et Echarit, Script. Ord. Pred. vol. i; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, iv, 306.

Faber, George Stanley, D.D., an English divine and voluminous writer, was born Oct. 25, 1773, and was educated at the grammar-school of Heppenheim, and at University College, Oxford, where he passed B.A. in 1792. In 1801, as Baptister, he preached before the University the discourses which he afterwards published under the title of Hymn Musicae. In 1809 he became curate to his father at Calverley, Yorkshire; in 1813 he was made vicar of Stockton-upon-Tees; in 1811 vicar of Long-Newton, where he remained till 1831, when bishop Burgess presented him to a prebend in the cathedral of Salisbury. In 1832 he was made master of Sherburn Hospital, near Durham. "During his mastership he consider-ably increased the value of the estates of the hospital. He rebuilt the chapel, the house, and the offices; and greatly improved the grounds; he augmented the income of the incumbents of livings under his patronage, restored the chancels of their churches, and erected agricultural buildings on the farms. He died at his residence, Sherburn Hospital, Jan. 27, 1854." Dr. Faber's chief writings are on prophecy, and in them he seeks to show that the prophecies "are not applicable to the destinies of individuals, but to those of governments and nations." His most important writings are Hymn Musicae, or a Discourse on the Mysterious and Theology of the Pastorate (Bampton Lecture, London, 1801, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1818, 2 vols. 8vo);—A Dissertation on the Prophecies that have been fulfilled, and are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled, relative to the great Period of 1260 Years (London, 1806, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d ed. 1814-15, 3 vols. 8vo).—A general and connected View of the Prophecies relating to the Conversion, Restora-
Into Latin. In 1507 he took up his abode in the Benedictine abbey of St. Germain des Prés, with Briçonnet, the abbot, who was a friend of the intrepid friar. Here he remained till 1510, engaged chiefly in Biblical studies, the first published fruit of which was his Psalterium Quintuplex, in five columns, Gallican, Romanum, Hebraicum, Vetus, Conciliatum (Par. 1509, fol.). He wrote also Commentarium in Psalmo, etc. (Paris, 1515).—Commentarium in Epist. Catholici (Basle 1515, fol.).—Commentarium in Quatuor Evang. (Mol. 1522).—De Tribus Magdalenis (Par. 1551). He was suspected of Lutheranism, and the Parliament of Paris was about to proceed against him in 1521; but in 1528, Briçonnet, now a friend of the intrepid friar, and who had removed to Meaux. He was afterwards deprived of his doctors' degree, and compelled to retire to Guineau. Before this, at the request of the queen of Navarre, he had commenced a translation (from the Vulgate) of the N. T. into French, which appeared in 1525. This work was intended for common readers, and was soon widely scattered. "The effect of the dissemination of this version of the Word of God, which formed the basis for the subsequent translation of Robert Olivetanus, so important in the history of the progress of Protestantism in France, was at once visible. The copies of the translation which the friar had sought to disseminate, continued to find their way, even when they could not even pay the small sum demanded, from the liberality of the good bishop. Briçonnet introduced the French Scriptures into the churches of Meaux, where the people listened to them in the most humble and办公楼 manner, and were highly delighted. An autograph letter, recently discovered among the rich treasures of the public library of Geneva, from Lefèvre to his absent pupil Farel, pictures to us the immediate results of the publication, and the glowing hopes of the reformer. He writes: 'Good Sir, do not, what joy do I exalt when I perceive that the grace of the pure knowledge of Christ has already spread over a good part of Europe, and that I hope that Christ is at length about to visit our France with this benediction. You can scarcely imagine with what ardor God is moving the minds of the simple in some places on the steps of the new Testament have been published in French; but you will justly lament that they have not been more widely scattered among the people. Some enemies have endeavored, under cover of the authority of the Parliament, to hinder the work; but our most generous king was at first of the same opinion. The grace of Christ, declaring it to be his will that his kingdom shall be heard of God without impediment in that tongue which it understands. Now throughout our entire diocese, on feast-days and especially on Sundays, the Epistles and the Gospel are read to the people in their native tongue, and the parish priest adds a word of exhortation to the Epistle or Gospel, or both at his own discretion' (Letter of Lefèvre, dated Meaux, July 6, 1524, in the Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, t. xi [1862], p. 212, 213)." 

Faber was not fitted for the strife and storm of the times, and to secure quiet, he lived for several years as librarian to the palace at Blois, where he prepared a French translation (from the Vulgate) of the O. T., with which the Jesuits, who bought his pupil and intimate friend, were delighted. His affinities, both from study and friendship, being with the Reformation, his last years were embittered by the persecutions suffered by his friends, though even he never left the Roman Church. But he "well deserved that privileged position among the bishops; for in 1512, five years before Luther posted his theses on the doors of the cathedral at Wittemberg, he published his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which clearly proclaimed the insufficiency of works, and the necessity of faith, as the ground of justification for the sinner. An affecting incident is told of his last hours. While sitting at the royal table, a few days before his death, Lefèvre was observed to weep, whereupon queen Margaret complained of the sadness of his countenance. "Why do you weep, my beloved, what have you suffered that you weep?" she asked. "I am not weeping, my lady," was his reply, "but I am weeping for my sins, for your sake, and for the sake of the poor who have suffered so much for your sake, and for the sake of all those who have been excluded from the bliss of heaven." "You do weep," said she, "for your sins, for my sins, and for the sins of all those who have been excluded from the bliss of heaven." "You do weep," said she, "for my sins, for your sins, and for the sins of all those who have been excluded from the bliss of heaven." "You do weep," said she, "for your sins, for my sins, and for the sins of all those who have been excluded from the bliss of heaven."
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strenuously. But about 1520 he went rapidly round to
the extreme of heresy, and in 1523 appeared
his Opus cœptus nova quædam dogmata M. Lutheri.
After this he was an unwearied opponent of the Reforma-
tion in writings, colloquies, conferences, etc. His
zeal was rewarded by the bishopric of Vienna, to which
he was raised in 1531. He died in 1541. His princi-
pal works are his Apologia tredicis (1524, 1534, 1542),
and Rome, 1569; a revision of the Opus cœptus above
named), and sermons and controversial writings collected
cent. xvi, p. 435: Kettner, Diss. de J. Fabi. Viti et Scripta
(Lips. 1785, 4to); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 997; Faber, Rem.

Faber, Johannes, a Dominican monk and po-
lemical writer, born at Heilbronn, 1504. His eloquence
and learning gained him early distinction, and in 1534
he was made cathedral-archpriest at Augsburg. He
wrote largely against the Reformation. Among his
writings are Erasmiana Bibliorum (Augsb. 1549, 4to):
—Cruxius galbae digmengutor heretics (Angul. 1561,
4to);—Quod fides esse positi non charitate (Augsb. 1548,
4to);—Joel's Prophetie erläuteret.—Testimonia Scriptu-
rae et Patrum, Petrum Apostolum Roma fuisse, etc. See
Echard, Script. ord. Præd. ii, 161; Wetzler und Welte,
Kirchen-Lex. iii, 370.

Ferrarini, of Augsburg, a Dominican monk of the
Church of the Reformers, emperor of the confessor of
Maximilian, and afterwards court-archpriest of Charles
V. Erasmus calls him a "mild, eloquent, and learned
man." He at first wished mild counsels to be
followed against Luther, and sympathized with Erasmus,
but afterwards seems to have changed his views. He

Faber, Johann Ernst, a distinguished German
orientalist, was born near Hildburghausen (Saxony),
February, 1745. He prepared for the university in
the gymnasion at Coburg, and studied under Walch,
Heyne, and Michaelis at the University of Göttingen.
In 1770 he was called to the chair of Oriental lan-
guages at the University of Kiel, and in 1772 to the
same position at the University of Jena, where he died
March 15 (April 14?), 1774. His most important works
are: Descriptio commentariori in septuaginta interpret.
(Götting: 1769-9, 2 vols. 4to);—Descript. de animalis
in veter. test. (Paris, 1780, 4to) reprinted in the
Monumenta sacrae de la Palestine by Cramer,
Hamb. und Kell, 1777);—Historia Marcæ inter
Hebrosis (pars i, Kiel, 1770; pars ii, Jena, 1773);—Pro-
gramma novum de Sarmatia exacta 490 annis post exuivm
Jesu Christi, in libro conciliis, veterum ecclesiast. 3, 2
reipublice Rhenaniae, spatio leXX, Kne Procedure
ind. x; (ibid. 1771?) 1772, 4to);—Jesu ex natallio opportu-
matis Messias (Jena, 1772, 8vo);—Archeologia der
Hebrer, (vol. i, Halle, 1778, 8vo). Faber was also au-

Faber, Johann Melchior, was born Jan. 18,
1748, near Hildburghausen (Saxony), and was edu-
cated at the gymnasium of Coburg and at the University
of Göttingen. In 1768 he was appointed professor of
Hebrew and Greek at the gymnasium, and in 1770 he
was called to Coburg as professor of Greek and Rhetoric;
and for four years later (1774) he was made rector of
the gymnasium at Ansbach. In 1792 he became church-councillor (Kirchenrat). He died January 31, 1809. Most of his

Faber, Petræus (Pierre Favre), born in Saxon,
1666, was one of the nine original companions of Loy-
ola in the establishment of the order of Jesuits. He
was a zealous confidant of Loyola, and rendered great
good service to the interests of the new order by his mis-
ionary journeys into Italy, Spain and Germany. He
died in 1546, on his way to the Council of Trent. His
life, by Orlandini, was published at Rome, 1655, 601; Lyons, 1677, 8vo.—Migne, Dict. de Biographie, ii, 156.

See Loyeri; Jesuits.

Faber, (Favre), Pierre François, a Roman Cath-
ic divine, was born about the opening of the 18th century,
17th century, at St. Bearehème, canton of Veau. He
was priest at Landenu, in Lower Languedoc, when chosen
by the bishop of the Franciscans, Francois van der Hove, the
personal secretary and confessor on his visitation-tour
to Cochín China. They reached Macao July 15, 1738,
and were there, under the pretense of being entertain-
ed as visitors, kept as prisoners of the Jesuits some
eight months. On their arrival in Cochín China in
May, the bishop commenced his visitation work among
the missionaries. The converted natives complained
"bitingly against certain missionaries who had excom-
communicated them under pretense of Jansenism, but real-
ly on account of their refusal to adhere to the heathen
ceremonies and funeral sacrifices which the Jesuits
allowed their Chinese converts to perform. The bishop
took the side of the people, and was accused by the
Jesuits before the mandarins as a disturber of the pub-
lic peace, and he, as well as his secretary, narrowly
escaped execution. The bishop appointed Favre his
agent to visit the Southern provinces. The opposition
with which both were met by the Jesuits shortly after-
wards inclined the bishop to divide the country be-
tween the Jesuits, the French missionaries, and the
Franciscans. The death of the bishop was hastened
by sorrow and ill treatment as Faber has it, or by poi-
on as one of the Franciscans reported hostile to Rome.
Faber attempted to assume the duties of his position as
agent, but, finding that he could not act with success
against the opposition of the Jesuits, he returned to
Rome August 8, 1741, in order to report to the propa-
ganda and to the pope. But even in Rome he found
the Jesuits beforehand in undermining him by slandering
and every other means in their power, and the decree
of the pope did not appear until Faber had almost
abandoned the hope of ever receiving it. This decree
(issued 1745) in the main sanctioned the acts of Faber
and his predecessor. He gives a full account of the
mission in Cochín and the two civil wars, and of the
missions apostolique de M. de la Beausne, Exéque d'Halicaurre,
at la Cochinchine in 1740; on l'on voit les voyages et les
traverses de ce célèbre Prété; la conduite des Missionnaires
Jesuites, et de quelques autres, avec de nouvelles observa-
tions, etc. The work was condemned by the bishop
at Lausanne, and was publicly burned at Paris. All
copies that could be procured the Jesuits bought up,
in order to prevent its circulation. An extract is
given by Simler in his Stamm, u. u. Urkunden zur Geschichte
der Kirchenrecht, i, 355-366.—Herzog, Real-Encyk.
lop. i, 397.
of Rome, from 236 to 250, but there is some dispute both as to his name and as to the time of his episcopate. In the Alexandrian Chronicle he is called Flavianus. Eusebius gives an account of certain wonders that a deliberate election to the episcopate of this man, though not faithful had assembled in a church for the purpose of the election, and several persons of consideration were proposed, without any thought of Fabianus, though he was present. Of a sudden, a white dove descended from above and alighted on his head. Then the faithful, recalling the recollection that the Holy Spirit had manifested itself in a like form at the baptism of Jesus Christ, exclaimed that God had exhibited to them his will. Immediately Fabianus was proclaimed pope, and conducted to the episcopal see without other formality than the imposition of hands" (Hist. Eccles. vi, 29). From this fable the court of Rome, it derives support for its theory that the Holy Ghost always directs in the election of a pope. Cardinal Cusa says that "what happened in the election of Fabianus happens to every pope, though we do not see it with our natural eyes. Destinies, differs from what has been said above, is an unexigui; the person on whose head the heavenly dove perches will, in spite of them, be chosen" (De Deo Consistente, vii, 85). We have had strange illustrations of this in Borgia and others. Fabianus suffered martyrdom in Decius’s persecution, A.D. 250. See Acta Sanctorum, August, Memoriae, iii, 854; A. Butler, Lives of Saints, Jan. 20; Bower, History of the Popes (London, 1750), i, 47.

Fable (μῦσος, a myth), alegend or fictitious story, applied in the N.T. (1 Tim. I, 4; iv, 7; 2 Tim. iv, 4; Titus i, 14; 2 Pet. i, 16) to the Jewish traditions and stories. This fable, as its name implies, is of the apostolic days, and were afterwards embodied in the Talmudical writings. (See Fleischmann’s Comment, i in Tim. i, 4.)

1. Taking the words fable and parable, not in their strict etymological meaning, but in that which has been commonly accepted by them at current usage, looking, i.e. at the Épicurean fable type of the parable of the N.T. as the type of the other, we have to ask (a) in what relation they stand to each other as instruments of moral teaching? (b) what use is made in the Bible of this or of that form? That they have much in common is obvious enough. In both we find "statements of facts, which do not even pretend to be historic, used as vehicles for the exhibition of a general truth" (Neander, Life of Christ, Harper’s ed. p. 67). Both differ from the Mythus, in the modern sense of that word, in being the result of the spontaneous, unconscious evolution of thought in some symbolic form. They take their place so far as species of the same genus. What are the characteristic marks by which one differs from the other, it is perhaps easier to feel than to define. Thus we have (comp. Trench, On Parables, p. 2) (i.) Lessing’s statement that the fable takes the form of an actual narrative, while the parable assumes only what that is related might have happened; (ii.) Herder’s, that the difference lies in the fable’s dealing with brute or inanimate objects, while in the parable’s dealing with material beings exclusively from human life; (iii.) Olofsen’s (on Matt. xii, 1), followed by Trench (l. c.), that it is to be found in the higher truths of which the parable is the vehicle. Perhaps the most satisfactory summing up of the chief distinctive features of each is to be found in the early statement of aRV.N. (L. i. b.) : "The parable is distinguished from the fable by that, in the latter, qualities or acts of a higher class of beings may be attributed to a lower (e.g. those of men to brutes), while in the former the lower sphere is kept perfectly distinct from that which it seems to illustrate. The beings and powers thus introduced always follow the law of their nature, but their acts, according to this law, are used to figure those of a higher race. . . . The mere introduction of brutes as personal agents in the fable is not sufficient to distinguish it from the parable which may make use of the same contrivance; as, for example, Christ employs the sheep in one of his parables. The great distinction is that the parable is a generalisation of brute relations into a human one, while the fable introduces the parable act according to the law of their nature, and the two spheres of nature and of the kingdom of God are carefully separated from each other. Hence the reciprocal relations of brutes to each other are not made use of, as these could furnish no material for distinguishing the relation between man and the kingdom of God." Of the fable as thus distinguished from the parable we have but two examples in the Bible: (1) that of the trees choosing their king, addressed by Jotham to the men of Shechem (Judg. ix, 8-15); (2) that of the cedar of Lebanon and the thistler, as the agents in theJeboash to the challenge of Amaziah (2 Kings xiv, 9). The narrative of Ezek. xvii, 1-10, though, in common with the fable, it brings before us the lower forms of creation as representatives of human characters and destinies, differs from what has been said above, in [1.] in not introducing them as having human attributes; [2.] in the higher prophetical character of the truths conveyed by it. The great eagle, the cedar of Lebanon, the spreading vine, are not grouped together as the agents in a fable, but are simply, like the bear and lion, the symbols of the zodiacal signs in the Hebrew calendar of the Chaldean, with which the names of the stars and constellations are associated; the lion and the eagle are the symbols of the great monarchs of the world.

In the two instances referred to, the fable has more the character of the Greek μῦσος, or supernatural tale (Quintil. Inst. Orat, v, 11), than of the μῦσος, or myth; that is, is less the fruit of a vivid imagination, sporting with the analogies between the worlds of nature and of men, than a covert reproof, making the sarcasm which it affects to hide all the sharper (Müller and Donaldson, History of Greek Literature, vol. i. c. xi). The appearance of the fable thus early in the history of Israel, and its importance amongst the direct teachings of the law, of Deuteronomy, of N. T., are, of them, in their way, significant. Taking the received chronology, the fable of Jotham was spoken about B.C. 1209. The Arabian traditions of Lokman do not assign to him an earlier date than that of David. The earliest Greek μῦσος, or proper fable, is that of Hesiod (Op. et D. v, 292), and the prose form of the fable does not meet us till we come (about B.C. 550) to Stesichorus and Ασοπ. The first example in the history of Rome is the apologue of Menenius Agrippa, B.C. 494, and its genuineness has been questioned on the ground that the fable could hardly at that time have been written, not less the spontaneous, unconscious evolution of thought in some symbolic form. They take their place so far as species of the same genus. What are the characteristic marks by which one differs from the other, it is perhaps easier to feel than to define. Thus we have (comp. Trench, On Parables, p. 2) (i.) Lessing’s statement that the fable takes the form of an actual narrative, while the parable assumes only what that is related might have happened; (ii.) Herder’s, that the difference lies in the fable’s dealing with brute or inanimate objects, while in the parable’s dealing with material beings exclusively from human life; (iii.) Olofsen’s (on Matt. xii, 1), followed by Trench (l. c.), that it is to be found in the higher truths of which the parable is the vehicle. Perhaps the most satisfactory summing up of the chief distinctive features of each is to be found in the early statement of aRV.N. (L. i. b.) : "The parable is distinguished from the fable by that, in the latter, qualities or acts of a higher class of beings may be attributed to a lower (e.g. those of men to brutes), while in the former the lower sphere is kept perfectly distinct from that which it seems to illustrate. The beings and powers thus introduced always follow the law of their nature, but their acts, according to this law, are used to figure those of a higher race. . . . The mere introduction of brutes as
must have been common among the Israelites in the time of the judges. The part assigned in the earliest records of the Bible to the impressions made by the half-created person, or the mind of man when "the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them" (Gen. ii, 19), and the apparent symbolism of the serpent in the narrative of the Fall (Gen. iii, 1), are indications of this being adapted to the immediate possession of this power, and which they have helped to develop it (Herder, Geist der Etruskischen Poetik, Werke, xxxiv, p. 16, ed. 1826). The large number of proverbs in which analogies of this kind are made the bases of a moral precept, and of which (e.g. Proverbs, 15, 18-20), it is impossible to enumerate all, shows that condensed fables, show that there was no decline of this power as the intellect of the people advanced.

The absence of fables accordingly from the teaching of the O.T. must be ascribed to the want of fitness to be the media of the truths that which teaching was to convey. The points in which brutish or inanimate objects present analogies to man are chiefly those which belong to his lower nature, his pride, indolence, cunning, and the like, and the lessons derived from them accordingly do not rise higher than the prudential maxims which aim at repressing such defects (compare Trench, On the Parable, I. c.). The fable, apart from the associations of a grotesque and ludicrous nature which gather round it; apart, too, from its presenting narratives which are "nec nec verisimilium" (Cicero, De Invent, i, 19), is inadequate as the medium for the transmission of truths which belong to man's spiritual life. It may serve to exhibit the relations between man and man; it fails to represent those between man and God. To do that is the office of the parable, finding its outward framework in the dealings of men with each other, or in the world of nature as it is, not in any artificial parables of nature, nor in exhibiting, in either case, real and not fanciful analogies. The fable seizes on that which man has in common with the creatures below him; the parable rests on the truths that man is made in the image of God, and that "all things are double one against another." It is noticeable, as confirming this view of the character of the fable, that, though those of Aesop (so called) were known to the great philosopher of righteousness at Athens, though a metrical paraphrase of some of them was among the employments of his imprisonment (Bionus), his name does not occur in any one of them, nor even as illustrations, or channels of instruction. While Socrates shows an appreciation of the power of such fables to represent some of the phenomena of human life, he was not, he says, in this sense of the word, μορφολόγος. The myths, which appear in the Ògēxia, the Phaenisc, the Phædo, the Rhetoric, are as unlike as possible to the Æsopic fables, are (to take his own account of them) ὑπὸ μικροὶ ἄλλα λόγια, true, though figurative, representations of spiritual realities, while the illustrations from the common facts of life which were so conspicuous in his ordinary teaching, though differing in being comparisons rather than narratives, come nearer to the parables of the Bible (compare the contrast between τὰ μεταφράσκεται, as examples of the παραβολή and the λόγοι λειτουργός, Aristot. Rhet. ii, 20). It may be said, indeed, that the use of the fable as a form of expository discourse (Aristot. Rhet. i, c.) belongs rather to childhood, and the child-like period of national life, than to a more advanced development. In the earlier stages of political change, as in the cases of the commonwealth of Sparta (Aristot. Rhet. i, c.), wherein Agrrippa, it is used as an element of persuasion or refutation. It ceases to appear in the higher eloquence of orators and statesmen. The special excellence of fables is that they are διηγηματος (Aristot. Rhet. i, c.) that "ducere animos solent, precipue rusticorum et imperitorum" (Quintilian, Institut. Orat. ii. c.).—Smith, s. v.

2. The μίθος, or "fables" of false teachers claiming to belong to the Christian Church, alluded to by writers of the N.T. in connection with "endless genealogies" (γενεαλογίας ἀπίστως, I Tim. i. 4), or with disparaging epithets ("Jewish," ἱνναικαῖ τικ. 11, 14; "old wives," γαρνικιεί, I Tim. iv. 7; "cunningly devised," στησαμος, 2 Pet. i. 16), do not appear to have had the character of fables properly so called. As applied to them, the word takes its general meaning of anything false or unreal. Thus Paul exhorts Timothy and Titus (1 Tim. i. 4; 4. 7; Titus i. 14) to shun profane and Jewish fables, as having a tendency to seduce the minds of the hearers. Paul is evidently here speaking of some truths which were so closely associated with the reveries of the Gnostics; but the fathers generally, and most modern commentators, interpret them as allusions to the vain traditions of the Jews. The great reservoir of Jewish tradition is the book, or rather the books, called the Talmud. At the time of the Christian era, the traditions they were called, of the law (by which was meant the decisions of the doctors on disputed points of the Mosaic code, and the extravagant fables with which they adorned their comments) had attained so great a bulk and so high a degree of venerability as to supersede the law itself in the common esteem. They were supposed to have been handed down, some from the era of Moses, and some from a period far anterior, were, for the most part, mere directions for ridiculous ceremonies, questions of absurd casuistry, and fables which were told by their authors alone as myths true to their national spirit, but not to other nation. Some of these fables and legends are too impious and blasphemous to be quoted, but we select a few specimens. Adam, of whose knowledge we can hardly form too high an idea, was said to be endowed with magic. "God," say the Talmudists, "gave the men of the generation of Adam a precious jewel, the reasoning of which would cure all diseases; this came afterwards into the possession of Abraham, but after his death, because, by reason of its exceeding brightness, it was likely to be worshipped, God hung it in the sun." Our first parents were, according to rabbinical tradition, of a gigantic stature; this tradition has been improved by the Mohammedans. The transmigration of souls is much insisted on in the Talmud, and the soul of Adam is said to have passed successively into the bodies of Noah and David; it will also pass into the bodies of the Messiah. The Jews were slandered by the Egyptians in their mythology, and it is still more ancient than their residence in Egypt. Abraham was the person to whom, they say, it was first revealed, and he taught that the souls of men passed into women, beasts, birds, and even reptiles, rocks, and plants. The spirit of a man was punished by passing into a woman; and if the conduct of the man had been very atrocious, it took some reptile or inanimate form; and if a woman acted righteously, she will, in another state, become a man. Thus the ass that carried Balaam, the raven that fed Elijah, the whale that swallowed Jonah, are all supposed to have possessed the reasoning of which would cure all diseases.

The Mishna says, "The two tables of stone were upwards of two tons weight, but the moment God's word and commandments were engraven thereon by the smoke, they became as light as a feather. When Moses left the mountain and came within sight of the molten calf, and heard the multitude shuffling, he was alarmed; so that when the rays of the molten calf, which were of gold, came in contact with the tables of stone, the letters thereon immediately flew away, and the tables of stone returned to their former weight, which was more than Moses could support, and therefore he threw them down, and they brake in pieces." It is also said that Moses was the richest man that ever was or ever will be. His riches consisted of diamonds, which he obtained possession of in the same way that every laborer gets rewarded, by be-
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ing considered worthy of his hire. Moses never looked for any emolument from the Jews, and God therefore rewarded him in this manner. The two tables of stone were one solid mass of diamonds, and the chippings that came from these two tables were his own perquisite, "the salt of the earth, as an ambassador of God, and is everywhere present at one time, and is in his person a venerable old man, wearing a long beard. When Messiah shall appear, there will be a great feast, at which every Jew will be present. This feast will consist of fowl, of fish, and of flesh, which is said to be for the purpose of the beginning of the world. First, God provided a large fowl or bird, called Agal Loshder; also a large ox, called Shur Abur; and two large fish, called Leviathan. When God created these two great fish, male and female, being of such immense size, lest they should multiply and fill the female, and married it in salt, there to remain it is wanted for this great feast. Then all the Jews that have been born, or that have existed since the creation of the world, will be restored to life. The table will be spread, and the provision placed upon it. And it is so ordered that each one will take his station according to his conduct in the present life. Moses will sit at the head of the table, and next to him Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the prophets in rotation. Rabbi Simon says he was once sailing in the Great Sea, when he and the mariners espied a fish of such enormous size, that although they had a fair wind, after they saw one eye of the fish, they sailed five days longer in a direct line before they reached the other eye of the same fish, which confirmed his belief in the report of the size of the Leviathan. Much also is related concerning the size of the ox, which is said to be so immense that he eats up the whole of the grass that grows upon a thousand hills every day. The bird, also, is said to be of enormous size, and it is stated that one day this bird, in her flight, dropped an egg, which broke, and the yolk drowned fifty cities and villages (Shelolin, Jeshut Talmud: See Talmud). In the genuine fables and traditionary narratives of remote antiquity, especially those of the ancient classics, many correspondencies with the Biblical history are found, such as intimate that these traditions were derived from history. Of such narratives are the tales concerning a golden age of our race, an apostacy, a general flood, a future restoration. It may with safety be inferred from these traditions that the records in the book of Genesis concerning the apostacy, etc., are not philosophical myths; for, were they nothing more than the emanations of some Hebrew philosopher, how could they have been spread abroad among all nations? These popular traditions point us to the time when the human family were collected into one place, and afterwards separated into various branches. In this separation every tribe took with it the traditions that were common to all. See Mythology.

Fabre. See FABER.

Fabre, Jean Claude, a French ecclesiastic and father of the Oratory, was born at Paris in 1668, and died there Oct. 22, 1753. In an extract of Richelet's Dictionnaire he inserted some passages which brought him under censure, and he was forced to quit the Oratorian order. He is chiefly known as the continuator of Picardy's Histoire ecclesiastique, of which he prepared vola. xxi.-xxxv. —Hoefn., Nov. Rer, Gen., xvi., 925.

Fabri, Honoré, a learned Jesuit, was born at Bugny, in France, in 1607. He entered the novitiate of the order of Jesuits at Avignon in 1626, taught philosophy and mathematics at the College of Lyons, and was subsequently called to Rome and appointed grand penitentiary. He was an indefatigable worker, and acquired great proficiency in almost every branch of learning, especially in natural sciences. He claimed no right to have his name attached to the book on which the publication of the celebrated work of Harvey on the subject. He died at Rome in 1688. He wrote several works in defense of the casuistic writers of his order against the attacks of the Jansenists: Pachomphi- lice (Rome, 1650); —Notae in Notas Walchegi Wundreichi ad Ludovici Moriani Librum III. (Colome, 1650); —Ludovici Montalii epistolae Liebli ad provinciales refutati (Cologne, 1660); —Apologetica doctrina moralis societatis Jesu (Lyons, 1674); —a summary of scholastic theology (Summulae theologicae, Lyons, 1659), and a large number of scientific, polemical, and other works. He bequeathed his MSS. to the establishment of the Jesuits at Lyons. —Hoefer, Nova. Biog. Generale, xvi., 945.

Fabricius Ecclesiasticus, the name given in the Latin Church to a special fund for defraying the expenses for building and repairing the Church edifices of a particular congregation. As early as the 5th century it was customary to put a portion of the property of the particular church should be set aside to this end. According to the rescripts of the Roman bishops Simplicius (475) and Gelasius (494), it was to be the fourth part of the whole property of the church, while in Spain one third was used. The Council of Frankfort in 794 declared that all the bishops of ecclesiastical authority had the duty of keeping the church edifices in a proper condition, and this declaration was frequently confirmed by imperial and ecclesiastical laws. Charles the Bald in 846, besides confirming the same rule, ordered that all the serfs of the Church should work for repairing the churches at least two weeks every year. The parishioners generally were required to co-operate for keeping the Church edifices in proper order. There were, however, widely different usages in different localities. The Council of Trent (seesii. xxi. cap. vii.) established as a general principle that building and repairing expenses should be defrayed from the general revenue of the Church; in case these are not sufficient, all the patrons and others who have any kind of income from the church, and, if necessary, all the parishioners, are bound to co-operate to that end. The same has been the practice in the Roman Catholic and in the Protestant state churches. The legislation of the first French empire (decree of 1809) charged the civil community with the duty of keeping the church edifices of all the recognized religions in good order. The civil laws of the European countries have many detailed provisions with regard to the subject, and in some points there is a wide difference. —Hertzog, Real-Encyclop., i. 737; Wetzer und Welte, iv. 876; Helfert, Von d. Erbauung, Erhaltung u. Herstellung d. kirch. Gebäude (Prague, 1864). (A. J. S.)

Fabricius, Andreas, a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Hodgè, a village of Liege, A.D. 1520. He studied at Ingolstadt, and became professor of philo-

sophy at Louvain. The bishop of Augsburg sent him as his agent to Rome, where he remained six years under the pontificate of Pius IV. He was afterwards councillor to the duke of Bavaria, and provost of Ottingen, in Suabia, where he died in 1581. His principal work was Harmonizma Confutata (Cologne, 1575 and 1587, fol.). He wrote also a Catechismus Romanus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini, with notes and illustrations (1575 and 1574, 8vo), and some Latin tragedies. —Hook, ExeL Biog. v. 48; Migne, Dict. de Biographie Chrétienne, ii. 135.

Fabricius, Christoph Gabriel, a German divine, was born at Schackendorf, in Lusatia, May 18, 1848, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He served as pastor at Mulhoritz and other places.
Fabricius, Johannes Albert, "the most learned, most voluminous, and most useful of bibliographers," was born at Leipzic Nov. 11, 1668. He lost his parents at an early age, but was sent to study at the Jesuit college at Mans (1748). He was afterwards so widely famous for his studies of theology and rhetoric that he was made director of the college of St. Ignatius at Leipsic; he was inspired with an ardent love of letters. He went to Hamburg in 1698, and spent five years as librarian for J. F. Mayer, dividing his time between preaching and study, till he was chosen professor of rhetoric and philosophy in the gymnasium of that city. In 1719 the landscape of Hees-Cassel offered him the professorship of theology at Giessen, and the post of general superintendent of the churches of the Augustsburg Confession; but the magistrates of Hamburg augmented his salary for the sake of keeping him, and of this he ever after retained so grateful a sense that no offers of preference could tempt him to leave them. He died at Hamburg April 8, 1766, with the character of being one of the most learned of men. The list of his published writings exceeds 100 titles.

His principal works are, (1.) Codex Pseudoepigraphus Pecatariorum, collect. et Antiquationibus illustratus (Hamb. 1719, 12mo); 2d ed. with a supplementary volume, lib. 1722-28, 12mo; (2.) Codex Apocryphus N. T. (2d ed. Hamb. 1719, 3 vols. fol.); see APOCRYPHA OF N. T. (3.) Observationes selecte in variis locis Novi et veteris testamenti, etc. (Hamb. 1712, small 8vo; 4th ed., Hamb. 1720, 4 vols. 4to), containing notices of all writers on Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and Christian antiquities; (5.) Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica (Hamb. 1718, fol.), collecting the works of a number of Latin ecclesiastical writers, and of early Greeks, etc. Vet. Graecorum, quorumnamque moment. integ. aut, fragm. edita, extant (Hamb. 1728, 14 vols. 4to). Of this invaluable collection a fourth and enlarged edition, ed. by Harles, was commenced in 1769, of which 12 vols. had appeared up to 1811, extending to vol. xii, p. 544 of the 1st ed., and comprising the Index editioni quas antiquius et recentius publicas. Of this, published in 1808 (4to). (7.) Collection of authors on Christian Evidences, under the title Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum qui veritatem religionis Christianae assurament, etc. (Hamb. 1725, 4to); (8.) Bibliotheca Latina (Venice, 1728, 2 vols. 4to; rev-edited by Heresiis, Lips., 1764-67, 4to). (9.) De synonymiis mediasi et infimae Latiniae (best edit. Mansi's, Padua, 1754, 6 vols. 4to); Hydrotheologia, written in German, and translated into French under the title Théologie de l'Eau, ou Essai sur la Fontaine, la Sauge, et la Puissance de Dieu, mast. Paris, 1771, 8vo; (10.) De systematis theologiæ Christianæ, accedunt Epistolæ quaedam ineditae Juliani Imperatoris, Gregorii Habesiani Theologiae Æthiopicae, nec non Index geographicus Epicaputaturi Orbis Christiani (1731, 4to); Centifolium Lutheranum, aet. Notitia Literaria Scriptorum omnium graecorum et Latinorum, 2 vols. 4to. (11.) Scripturae, et Reformacionis Ecclesiae celebrator (1730, 2 vols. 8vo); (12.) Centuria Fabriciorum Script. clerorum quorumdam. Fabricius Johannes Albertus, "the most learned, most voluminous, and most useful of bibliographers," was born at Leipzic Nov. 11, 1668. He lost his parents at an early age, but was sent to study at the Jesuit college at Mans (1748). He was afterwards so widely famous for his studies of theology and rhetoric that he was made director of the college of St. Ignatius at Leipsic; he was inspired with an ardent love of letters. He went to Hamburg in 1698, and spent five years as librarian for J. F. Mayer, dividing his time between preaching and study, till he was chosen professor of rhetoric and philosophy in the gymnasium of that city. In 1719 the landscape of Hees-Cassel offered him the professorship of theology at Giessen, and the post of general superintendent of the churches of the Augustsburg Confession; but the magistrates of Hamburg augmented his salary for the sake of keeping him, and of this he ever after retained so grateful a sense that no offers of preference could tempt him to leave them. He died at Hamburg April 8, 1766, with the character of being one of the most learned of men. The list of his published writings exceeds 100 titles.

His principal works are, (1.) Codex Pseudoepigraphus Pecatariorum, collect. et Antiquationibus illustratus (Hamb. 1719, 12mo); 2d ed. with a supplementary volume, lib. 1722-28, 12mo; (2.) Codex Apocryphus N. T. (2d ed. Hamb. 1719, 3 vols. fol.); see APOCRYPHA OF N. T. (3.) Observationes selecte in variis locis Novi et veteris testamenti, etc. (Hamb. 1712, small 8vo; 4th ed., Hamb. 1720, 4 vols. 4to), containing notices of all writers on Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and Christian antiquities; (5.) Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica (Hamb. 1718, fol.), collecting the works of a number of Latin ecclesiastical writers, and of early Greeks, etc. Vet. Graecorum, quorumnamque moment. integ. aut, fragm. edita, extant (Hamb. 1728, 14 vols. 4to). Of this invaluable collection a fourth and enlarged edition, ed. by Harles, was commenced in 1769, of which 12 vols. had appeared up to 1811, extending to vol. xii, p. 544 of the 1st ed., and comprising the Index editioni quas antiquius et recentius publicas. Of this, published in 1808 (4to). (7.) Collection of authors on Christian Evidences, under the title Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum qui veritatem religionis Christianae assurament, etc. (Hamb. 1725, 4to); (8.) Bibliotheca Latina (Venice, 1728, 2 vols. 4to; rev-edited by Heresiis, Lips., 1764-67, 4to). (9.) De synonymiis mediasi et infimae Latiniae (best edit. Mansi's, Padua, 1754, 6 vols. 4to); Hydrotheologia, written in German, and translated into French under the title Théologie de l'Eau, ou Essai sur la Fontaine, la Sauge, et la Puissance de Dieu, mast. Paris, 1771, 8vo; (10.) De systematis theologiæ Christianæ, accedunt Epistolæ quaedam ineditae Juliani Imperatoris, Gregorii Habesiani Theologiae Æthiopicae, nec non Index geographicus Epicaputaturi Orbis Christiani (1731, 4to); Centifolium Lutheranum, aet. Notitia Literaria Scriptorum omnium graecorum et Latinorum, 2 vols. 4to. (11.) Scripturae, et Reformacionis Ecclesiae celebrator (1730, 2 vols. 8vo); (12.) Centuria Fabriciorum Script. clerorum quorumdam. Fabr, the German Schmidts, etc. Independently of the above and other minor works, Fabricius published editions of Sexus Empiricus, of the Gallia Orientalis
Facioliati (Faccioliati), Jacopo, was born at Torreglia, Italy, Jan. 4, 1682. He was educated in the college at Este, and afterwards in the seminary at Padua, where he became professor of theology and philosophy, and director of studies. "The seminary of Padua, it was said, as subsequently, a high reputation as a place for the study of Latin, and for the obtaining generally accurate editions of the classics and other school-books which have come from its press. Faccioliati contributed to support this reputation by his labors." Among other works, he published improved Latin editions of the Lexicon of Stephanus, of the Thesaurus Ciceronianus of Niziolus, and of the vocabulary of seven languages, known by the name of Lexicon Polyglotum (1731, 2 vols. fol.). In this last undertaking he was greatly assisted by his pupil, Egido Forecelli, although he was not willing to acknowledge the obligation. It was in the labors with Faccioliati that Forecelli conceived the plan of a totally new Latin dictionary, which, after more than thirty years' assiduous application, he brought to light under the title of Lexicon Latinum (Padua, 1771, 4 vols. fol.). This work has appeared in various Latin dictionaries. The most generous and Faccioliati, acknowledged in the title-page of his work that its production was in great measure due to the advice and instruction of his deceased master. The MS. of his Lexicon, in 12 vols., was given by the library of the seminary. The best editions are (1) that of Furlanetto (Palat. 1527-39, 4 vols. fol.); ed. by Hertel and Voigtlander, Schneeberg, 1885-88, 4 vols. fol.; also by Giaccotto, 1839-45, 4 vols. 4to; (2) that of Bailey, with English renderings (1829, 2 vols. 4to). "In 1722, Faccioliati, being appointed professor of logic in the University of Padua, delivered a series of introductory Latin discourses to the students of his class, which were received with considerable applause. His Latin epistles, as well as his Orationes, or discourses, have been admired for the purity of their diction. The king of Portugal sent him an flattering invitation to Lisbon to take the direction of the public studies in his kingdom, but Faccioliati declined the honor on account of his advanced age. He, however, wrote instructions for the reorganization of the scholastic establishments of that country, which had become necessary after the expulsion of the Jesuits. Faccioliati died at Padua, Sept. 25, 1769. Besides numerous works on philosophy, he published Vita et Acta Jesu Christi secundum utrumque generationem, de anima ac hominum (Padua, 1761, 24mo); — Vitae et Acta Matt. Virginis (Padua, 1764); — English Cyclopaedia (London, 1841)."
to Moses, who was told, "Thou canst not see my face: no man can see my face and live" (Exod. xxxxxiii. 20), which clearly signifies that no one can in this present state of being endure the view of that glory which be- longs to him (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 John iii. 2; Rev. xxii. 4). In a heathen entertainment of the notion, which is remarkably expressed in the celebrated mythological story of Semele, who, having prevailed on the reluctant Jove to appear to her in his heavenly splendor, was struck dead by the lightnings of his presence. It is to be borne in mind that God is usually represented to us in Scripture under a human form; and it is indeed difficult for even more spiritualized minds than those of the Hebrews to conceive of him apart from the form and attributes of the highest nature actually known to us. The Scriptures sanction this concession to the weakness of the servants of God, and hence arise the anthropomorphic phrases which speak of the face, the eyes, the arm of God. The appearance of the angel in the Old Testament times were generally in the human form (Judg. xiii. 6, etc.), and from this cause alone it would have been natural, in the case of the Jews, to transfer the form of the messengers to him by whom they were sent. See ANTHROPOMORPHISM. The presence of Jehovah (Exod. xxxxxiii. 14, 15) and the "angel" (Exod. xxxxxiii. 20, 21) is Jehovah himself; but in Isa. lxiii. 9, the an- gel of his presence is opposed to the God himself. The presence of God's counsel is a token of his fa- vor, and is therefore put synonymously with favor (Psa. xlvii. 3; Dan. ix. 17). Thus, as in men, if the countenance be serenity, it is a mark of good- will; if fiery or piercing, of anger or displeasure. Face also signifies, anger, justice, and severity (Gen. xvi. 6, 8; Exod. iii. 5; Psa. lxviii. 1; Rev. vi. 16).

The Jews prayed with their faces turned towards the Temple (1 Kings viii. 53, 44, 48), and those residing out of Jerusalem turned it towards that point of the heavens in which Jerusalem lay (Mish. yeb. 10); thus the Mohammedans, when praying, always turn their faces towards Mecca. To bow down the face in the dust (Isa. xlix. 28) is a mark of the lowest humiliation and submission. See ATTITUDES.

The "bread of faces" was the show-bread which was always in the presence of God. See SHOW-BREAD.

Faculties, a term of the Roman Catholic Church law, designating certain rights as to ecclesiastical functions which an ecclesiastical superior confers upon sub- ordinates. The most important faculties are those conferred upon bishops in regard to dispensations. The first instances of such dispensations being given to foreign missionaries occur in the 13th century. Subsequently, especially since the 16th century, very extensive faculties were granted to the papal nuncios. As the Council of Trent reserved many dispensations which in former times had been granted by the bishops to the pope, and as many bishops regarded the jurisdiction exercised by the nuncios as injurious to their authority, they applied to the pope for special faculties with reg- ard to a number of dispensations. These faculties were for the most part granted to the soul (facul- tates quinquemanales). An effort made in the 18th century by some of the German archbishops to reas- sert their own authority in the cases covered by the papal faculties was unsuccessful [see Ems, Congresso ur], and the faculties quinquemanales are still con- sidered by the bishops as the pope's. Besides this general class of faculties, which contains twenty different provisions, many special faculties are conferred upon bishops in particular cases. The bishops, in their turn, confer faculties upon the vicars-general, deans, and common priests of their dioceses, either delegating to them rights which properly belong to bishops, or subdelegating papal rights which have been specially authorized to subdelegate.—Herzog, Real-Ency-
to resist them with the authority of religion, and patiently endure their displeasure if we must incur it. If God should now raise up an Ambruse, said he, "there would not fail to be a Theodosius." (Church History, Torrey's, ii, 544). There is a remarkable passage in the Defensio showing that Facundus did not hold the Romanist doctrine as to the corporal presence in the Eucharist: "I am not of those who believe in the sacramental adoptiones applicandi, nec sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pace et pecto consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicimus: non quod proprium corpus ejus sit panis et pectum sanguinis: sed quod in se mysteriorum corporis ejus et sanguinis continent." ('The sacrament of adoption may be called adoption itself, as we term the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the bread and the consecrated cup, his body and blood; not that the bread is properly his body and the cup his blood, but because they contain within them the mystery of his body and blood;' (ix, 6, Migne, lvii, 762).--Neander, Ch. History, ii, 514; Neander, History of Dogmics (Ryland), i, 278; Cave, Hist. Liter., i, 520; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacrés (Paris, 1862), xi, 288 sq.; Waterland, Works (Oxford), iv, 599, note.

Facundus, Cyprians (Gracized Colines aureus Callistus Josephus, i Tertullianus, 111, 5; the Roman king who in the time of the emperor Claudius. After the death of king Agrippa, in A.D. 44, he was appointed by Claudius procurator of Judaea. During his administration peace was restored in the country, and the only disturbance was created by one Theudas (q. v.), who came forward with the claim of being a prophet, and his followers were put to death by command of Facundus. He was succeeded in the administration of Judaea (A.D. cir. 46) by Tiberius Alexander (Josephus, Ant. xix, 9; xx, 5, 1; War, ii, 11, 5; Tacitus, Hist. v, 9; Zonaras, xii, 2, 11; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii, 21).--Smith, Dict. of Chr. Ant. See Procuretor.

Fagius, Paulus (properly Büchel), was born at Rheinzabern in 1504. His studies were pursued at Heidelberg and Strasburg, where he became a great proficient in Hebrew, and was led into close acquaintance with Cardinal Hedio of Bucier, Zell, and other learned reformers. In 1537 he entered the ministry, and was pastor at Leyn until 1543. Here he studied Hebrew thoroughly under Elias Levita (q. v.), and also established a Hebrew press. In 1541, when the plague began to rage in Leyn, he publicly rebuked those of the nobles who forsook their homes without making provision for the relief of the poor, and himself visited the sick in person, and administered spiritual comfort to them day and night, and yet escaped. On the death of Capito at Strasburg, the senate called Fagius to succeed him as professor and pastor theology. In 1544, Frederick III, the elector Palatine, intending a reformation in his churches, called him to Heidelberg, and made him professor there. He opposed the Interim (q. v.), and when it was introduced he was compelled to leave Strasburg. In 1548 he accepted the invitation of Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and came to England. He was nominated by the archbishop to the professorship of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Before he went to Cambridge he resided with the archbishop at Lambeth, where he was associated with Bucer. His labors while there, in addition to the preparation necessary for his professional office, are thus described by Strype: "As it has been a great while the archbishop's desire that the Holy Bible should come abroad in the greatest exactness, and true agreement with the original text, so he said this work upon these two learned men viz. Fagius and Bucer. First, that they should give a clear, plain, and succinct interpretation of the Scripture, according to the propriety of the language; and, secondly, illustrate difficult and obscure places, and reconcile those that seem repugnant to one another. And it was his will and his advice that to this end and purpose their public readings should tend. This plious and good work, by the archbishop assigned to them, they most gladly and readily undertook." For their more regular carrying on this business, they allotted to each other, by consent, their distinct tasks. Fagius, because his talent lay in the Hebrew learning, was to undertake the Old Testament, and Bucer the New. The leisure they now enjoyed with the archbishop they spent in preparing their commentaries. Fagius entered upon the evangelical prophet Esias, and Bucer upon the Gospel of the evangelist John; and some chapters in each book were dispatched by them. But it was not long but both of them were "very unhappy stop to their studies." He died at Cambridge near the age of ninety. His body, along with Bucer's, was dug up and burnt in queen Mary's time. He wrote various books on Biblical and Hebrew literature, among which are Metapharsula et Escrarrati Epaoli, Final ad Rom. (Strassburg, 1536, fol.); -- Sententiae sermo peritissimae, I, 432, 440; -- Annotationes in Targum (Ieyn, 1546, fol.); -- Expositio librorum in IV prioria Capitum Genesis, cui accessit Testa Hebræis et Pharaonis Chaosat collatio, 4to (this and the last work reprinted in the Cratici Sacri. --Precationes Hebraeis, ex libello Hebraico escryptione in Latinam transalutatis (1542, 4to); --En Sypha Sententia Moroles, cum succincto Commentario (1542, 4to); --Inauguratio in Lympum Hebraicam (Constance, 1543, 4to).--Middleton, Eng. Bibliography, i, 260; Melchior Adam, Vite theolog., i, 89; Hook, Eclesi. Bibl. v, 50. Fagani, Prosper, an Italian writer on ecclesiastical law, was born in 1598. He was for fifteen years secretary of the Congregation for the Interpretation of the Council of Trent (Congregatio Conc. Trid. Interpret.), and subsequently professor of canon law at the Roman Academy. He was regarded as the ablest Roman jurist of his time, and was frequently consulted by Alexander VI. He died at Rome in 1618. --Weiz., U. Weitz. Kirch.-Lex., iv, 838.

Fagani, Prosper, an Italian writer on ecclesiastical law, was born in 1598. He was for fifteen years secretary of the Congregation for the Interpretation of the Council of Trent (Congregatio Conc. Trid. Interpret.), and subsequently professor of canon law at the Roman Academy. He was regarded as the ablest Roman jurist of his time, and was frequently consulted by Alexander VI. He died at Rome in 1618. --Weitz. U. Weitz. Kirch.-Lex., iv, 838.

Fair (properly ꝡꝪꝥ, yopake, eulod), Travellers inform us that in hot countries the greatest difference imaginable subsists between the complexities of the women. Those of high condition seldom go abroad, and are ever accustomed to be shaded from the sun with the greatest attention, and their skin is consequently light in the nature of their employments, more exposed to the scouring rays of the sun, are in their complexion remarkably tawny and swarthy. Under such circumstances, a high value would of course be set by the Eastern ladies upon the fairness of their complexion, as a distinguishing mark of their superior quality, no less than as an enhancement of their beauty. This notion appears to have obtained as early as the time of Abraham (Gen. xii, 11-13). Thus, also, how natural is the bride's self-abasing reflection in Cant. i, 5, 6, concerning her companion. She is tawnie and dark, but like the fair daughters of Jerusalem, who, as attendants on a royal marriage, were of the highest rank. Roberts observes, in reference to the daughters of Job being very fair (Job xii, 15), "The word fair may sometimes refer to the tawny colour of their skin; but great value is attached to a woman of a light complexion. Hence our English females are greatly admired in the East, and instances have occurred where great exertions have been made to gain the hand of a fair daughter of Britain. The scend of perfection in a Hindu lady is to be of the color of gold." See Beauty.
Fairbanks, Erastus L.L.D., governor of Vermont, was born at Brimfield, Mass., Oct. 28, 1792. He obtained such education as the district school afforded; and at seventeen himself taught a district school. From his youth he was diligent in self-culture. In 1819 he removed to Westmore, Vt., and in March, 1814, he united with the Congregational Church in that place. From this time to the end of his life the interests of religion and the Church were paramount to all others in his life and habits of thought. After various vicissitudes in travel, he returned in 1830 to the manufacture of the "platform scale," which is now in use all over the world, and from the sale of which he laid the foundation of a large fortune. The village of St. Johnsbury grew in population, wealth, and virtue, so as to have become a model place under his skilful guidance. Trade and manufacturers vied in the "city's" success; and the "city" was universal.

In 1828 he became a deacon of the Congregational Church. In 1836 he was elected a member of the State Legislature, in 1844 and 1848 presidential elector, and in 1852 and 1860 he was chosen governor of the State of Vermont. In the execution of his official duties he was conscientious and faithful, and acquired and retained, in an unusual degree, the confidence of all parties. During his second term of office the civil war broke out. "His firmness at the critical period in the South, when the Union must be lost in case of war, was for his pecuniary interest to keep peace. But this had no weight with him. Day and night he toiled raising troops, where, three months before, not even a knapsack was to be found, and sending regiment after regiment of the brave Green Mountain Boys forward to the seat of war." The Legislature conferred upon him almost unlimited power in the discharge of his duties, and placed at his sole disposal a million of dollars, and at the close of his official term in 1861 passed votes of approval of his labors, ability, and patriotic devotion. He never touched even a salary of $5000 for many years; a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and both in this field and in that of home missions he devoted time, talents, and money freely to the cause of God. His personal literary culture was diligently carried on during his life, and in 1860 the University of Vermont conferred on him the degree of LL.D. He died Nov. 29, 1864. To trace the thirty-four years of his life from 1828 to his death "is to record the daily acts of a life devoted to every good and noble work. Rare was the talent which could strike out such a path and direct such a business in the face of so many obstacles, in an inland town, remote from business centres, and guide it safely through all the financial embarrassments to which the country has been subject. But a fact far more rare and interesting is that, in the midst of so many cares, time abundant was always found, and means equally abundant, not only for aiding in every good work, but for loading in new benevolent movements, for which many, with far less to do, thought they could find no time. His munificent contributions to benevolent purposes was proverbial long before his death, and in connection with 'good words and works' the name of Erastus Fairbanks had, to the people of his state, come to be as familiar as household words. In public life he was honored and confided in as a capable, honest, and reliable man. In the walk of social life, he was esteemed as a kind neighbor, a sincere friend, and a Christian gentleman."—Congregational Quarterly, 1867, No. 1.

Fair Haven's (Kaloj Aipwv), a harbor in the island of Crete (Acts xxvii, 8), not mentioned in any other ancient work. There seems no probability that it is, as most early commentators thought (see Blacc, On the Acts, p. 347, ed. 1829), the Kaloj Aipwv, or Fair Beach, of Steph. Byz. (see Kuniol, Commentum, in loc.); for that is said to be a city, whereas Fair Haven is described as "a place near to which was a city called Lasma." Moreover, Mr. Pashley found (Travel in Crete, ii, 57) a district called Akte; and it is most likely that Kaloj Aipwv was situated there; but that the name of the district is in the west of the island, whereas Fair Haven was on the south. Its position is now quite certain. Though not mentioned by classical writers, it is still known by the old Greek name, as it was in the time of Beraulf (who calls it Calumene), Pococke (ii, 250), and other early travelers mentioned by Mr. Smith (Yog. and Shipwr. of St. Paul, 2d ed. p. 80-82). Lasma, too, has recently been most explicitly discovered. In fact, Fair Havens appears to have been practically its harbor. These places are situated four or five miles to the east of Cape Matala, which is the most conspicuous headland on the south coast of Crete, and immediately to the west of which the coast trends suddenly to the north. This last circumstance explains why the ship which conveyed Paul was brought to anchor in Fair Havens. In consequence of violent and continuing north-west winds she had been unable to hold on her course towards Italy from Cnidus (Acts xxvii, 7), and had run down, by Salamine, under the lee of Crete. It was possible to reach Fair Havens; but beyond Cape Matala the difficulty would have recurred so long as the wind remained in the same quarter. The looting of the "Isle of Gortyna" (Acts xxvii, 11), during which it is possible that Paul may have had opportunities of preaching the Gospel at Lasma, or even at Gortyna, where Jews resided (1 Mach. xv, 23), and which was not far distant; but all this is conjectural. A consultation took place, at which it was decided, against the advice of the Legates, to attempt to reach a good harbor named Phoenix (ver. 12). However, the south wind, which sprang up afterwards (ver. 13), proved delusive; and the vessel was caught by a hurricane [see EURYCLYDON] on her way towards Phoenicia, and ultimately wrecked.—Smith, s. v. See also Smith, s. v. See Euth., s. v. & s. v. See Conyers and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, ii, 32o. See CRETE.

Fairis (φαίρις, izeloumin; Sept. ἤφια, Vulg. sam. dorne, forum), a word which occurs only in Ezek. xxviii, and there no less than seven times (ver. 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 27, 38); in the last of these verses it is rendered "waxes," and this appears to be the true meaning of the word throughout (so Forst, 1100. Hunder, s. v.; but Gesenius, 1100. Lex. s. v., thinks it means "traffic in general, and also gain.") It will be observed that the word stands in some sort of relation to ἄφερα, maaraah', throughout the whole of the chapter, the latter word also occurring seven times, and translated sometimes "market" (ver. 13, 17, 19), and elsewhere "merchandise" (ver. 5, 27, 33, 54). The words are used alternately, and represent the alternation of commercial business in which the merchandising of Tyre was engaged. That the first of these words cannot signify "Fairis" is evident from ver. 12; for the inhabitants of Tarshish did not visit Tyre, but rice versi. Let the reader substitute "paid" or "exchanged for" for "waxes" for "occupied in thy fairis," and the sense is much improved. The relation which this term bears to maaraah, which properly means barter, appears to be pretty much the same as exists between exports and imports. The sense of 1100. (ἡφια, the presumed sing. form) thus becomes essentially that proposed by
Fairs (Commentarii Ling. Hebr. p. 194) and adopted by Havernick (Commentar. p. 464), namely, exchange, or equivalent. The requirements of the Tyrians themselves, such as slaves (ver. 16), grain (ver. 17), steel (ver. 19), were a matter of natural; but where the business of foreign commerce is one for forty days within a circuit of forty miles, they are the exchange and the forwarding office, and the political caucus, and the family gathering, and the grand feast and gala days, and undermining the whole is the ever-present idea and aim of making money."

See Bar. 2:12.

Faith (Gr. πίστις, Lat. fides, fiducia) is essentially trust. The various uses of the word (both objective and subjective) may be summed up as follows: 1. An objective body of truth: "the faith," designated by the schoolmen as fides qua creditur, the faith which is believed. See the Augsburg Confession speaks of "our holy faith and Christian religion." (This sense does not occur in N. T.) 2. A rule of thought, the fides penes quam crederit: so the Roman Catholics say such a thing is "of faith" (not found in N. T.). 3. A personal quality, act, or habit of the individual man; the fides, verae credendi actus, and as such is used in Matt. 22:41.

Faith, however, although not directly referred to by the above Hebrew terms, were doubtless, and nearly certainly, mentioned in the East. Dr. Thomas (Lament. and Book ii, 152 sq) thus describes the scene at these Oriental mercantile gatherings: "On Monday of each week a great fair is held at the khans, when, for a few hours, the scene is really and picturesque. These gatherings afford an excellent opportunity to observe the Syrian manners, customs, and costumes, and to become acquainted with the character and quality of her productions. Thousands of people assemble from all parts of the country either to sell, trade, or purchase. Cotton is brought in bales from Nabiya; barley, and wheat, and dates of Antioch, and the Hebron, the Huleh, the Hauran, and Eshdraelon. From Gilead and Bashan, and the surrounding districts, come horses and donkeys, cattle and flocks, with cheese, milk, oil, honey, and similar articles. There are miscellaneous articles, such as chickens and eggs, figs, raisins, apples, pears, melons, and dates, and vegetables in their season. The peddlers open their packages of tempting fabrics; the jeweller is there with his trinkets; the tailor with his ready-made garments; the shoemaker with his stock, from rough, hard-soled shoes and red military boots; the farmer is there with his tools, nails, and flat iron shoes, and drives a prosperous business for a few hours; and so does the Sadduce, with his coarse sacks and his gaily-trimmed cloths. And thus it is with all the arts and occupations known to this people. The noise is incessant, and at a distance sounds like that of many waters. Every man is crying his wares at the top of his voice, chickens, cackles, and squall, donkeys bray and fight, and the dogs bark. Every living thing adds somewhat to the many-toned and protracted uproar. It is now a miscellaneous comedy in full operation, where every one, and does his best, and is supremely gratified with his own performance. The people find many reasons for sustaining these antiquated and very curious gatherings. Every man, woman, and child has inherited the itch for trading, and, of course, all classes meet at this grand bazaar to talk over the state of the markets, from the price of a cucumber to that of cotton, or of a five-thousand dollar horse from the Hauran. Again, every Arab is a politician, and groups gather around the outskirts of the crowd to discuss the doings of the 'allied powers,' the last firm, the past year, the news of the day, supposing the state of the markets, from the price of a cucumber to that of cotton, or of a five-thousand dollar horse from the Hauran.

Again, every Arab is a politician, and groups gather around the outskirts of the crowd to discuss the doings of the 'allied powers,' the last firm, the past year, the news of the day, supposing the state of the markets, from the price of a cucumber to that of cotton, or of a five-thousand dollar horse from the Hauran. Every Arab is a politician, and groups gather around the outskirts of the crowd to discuss the doings of the 'allied powers,' the last firm, the past year, the news of the day, supposing the state of the markets, from the price of a cucumber to that of cotton, or of a five-thousand dollar horse from the Hauran.
much to say that, apart from this principle and practice of belief, man, even in the full exercise of all his other faculties, could be enveloped in such a cloud of ignorance on even the most ordinary subjects, that an arrest would be laid upon all the affairs of civilized life, and there must be an end of all social harmony and order. It is by this means that we obtain a certainty, not of sight, not of demonstration, not of intuition, but a real and efficient certainty in many matters of high practical importance concerning which we must otherwise be hopelessly ignorant and in the dark. This principle lies at the foundation of human affections and faith. Belief, sentiment and conviction of truth and of a large portion of our most valuable knowledge in science, and our highest attainments in art. Above all, it is thus that we obtain our knowledge of many things divine, and especially of relations subsisting between God and ourselves; an acquaintance with which, as we shall hereafter see, is of the utmost importance to us, while yet, independently of the exercise of faith, it is utterly beyond the reach of every man living" (Rogers, Reason and Faith; Riddle, Bampton Lectures, 1852, lect. i). Faith "is that operation of the soul in which we are convinced of the reality of things of which it is not or cannot be made known of what is through sense or any other directly cognitive power. It is certainly a native energy of the mind, quite as much as knowledge is, or conception is, or imagination is, or feeling is. Every human being entertains, and must entertain, faith. He who would exist on the level of having immediate knowledge must needs go out of the world, for he is unfit for this world, and yet he believes in no other. It is in consequence of possessing the general capacity that man is enabled to entertain specific forms of faith. By a native principle he is led to believe in that of which he can have no adequate conception—in the infinity of space and time, and, on evidence of his existence being presented, in the infinity of God. This enables him to rise to faith in all those great religious verities which God has been pleased to reveal" (McCosh, INTUITIONS OF THE MIND, pt. iii, bk. ii, ch. v; see also pt. ii, bk. ii, ch. iv).

Guizot, Méth. et Études Morales (trans. in Journal of Sacred Literature, xii, 450 sq.), has a thoughtful essay in which he distinguishes natural beliefs from faith as follows: "No one can doubt that the word faith has an especial meaning, which is not properly represented by belief, conviction, or certitude. Custom and universal opinion confirm this view. There are many simple and customary phrases in which the word faith could not be replaced by any other. Almost all languages have a specially appropriated word to express the idea of faith. Expressions like this which have an essential difference from all analogous words. This word, then, corresponds to a state of the human soul; it expresses a moral fact which has rendered such a word necessary. We commonly understand by faith a certain belief of facts and dogmas—religious facts and dogmas. In fact, the word has no other sense when employing it absolutely and by itself—we speak of the faith. That is not, however, its unique, nor even its fundamental sense; it has one more extensive, and from which the religious sense is derived. We see, I believe; these words; this faith is in itself, in his power, etc. This employment of the word in civil matters, so to speak, has become more frequent in our days; it is not, however, of modern invention; nor have religious ideas ever been an exclusive sphere, out of which the notions and the word faith were excluded. They were used in the application, proved by the testimony of language and common opinion, First, that the word faith designates a certain interior state of him who believes, and not merely a certain kind of belief. Secondly, that it is, however, to a certain species of belief—religious belief—that it has been at first and most generally applied. Now our natural beliefs germinate in the mind of man, without the co-operation of his reflection and his will. Our scientific beliefs, on the other hand, are the fruits of voluntary study. But faith partsake of, and at the same time differs from, natural and scientific beliefs. It is, like the latter, individual and particular, like the former, it is firm, complete, active, and sovereign. Considered in itself, and independent of all comparison with the natural or scientific, it is the sentiment and conviction of the truth and security of the man in the possession of his belief: a possession freed as much from labor as from doubt; in the midst of which every thought of the path by which it has been reached disappears, and leaves no other faith, either that of the natural or that of the scientific, a clearly established harmony between the human mind and truth."

II. Christian Faith. So far as faith is a voluntary act, quality, or habit of man, it is psychologically the same in the theological sense as in common life; the difference lies in the objects of the faith. In order to generate or love a following, we must believe in its worthiness; so, for the fear and love of God, which are fundamental elements of the Christian life, faith must pre-exist. But this direction of the soul towards God does not spring from the natural working of the human soul, nor from any gift of God (g. ii, 9), and is not a sentiment and conviction of the truth and security of the words of the Gospel and the free grace of Christ (Rom. x, 17; 1 Cor. i, 21). Eides daemon est, per quod Christum redemptorem nostrum in verbo Evangelii recte agnoscimus (Forum. Concord. iii, 11). Not that the Holy Spirit而言, but which are single purpose of receiving Gospel truth; but it quickens and directs an existing faculty, at the same time presenting to it an appropriate object. The true faith, thus excited, is an operation at once of the intellect, the heart, and the will. As said above, this faith, so far as it saves men in Christ, is not a faith that is fulfilled in Christ as a personal Saviour. In further treating it, we give, (I) The uses of the words πίστις, faith, and πιστικόν, I believe, in the Scriptures (condensed from Cramer, Wörterbuch d. N. Test. Græcisch, Gotha, 1866, &c.). (II.) A history of the idea of faith in Christian theologies up to the Reformation. (III.) The Protestant and Romanist doctrines of faith in contrast and comparison with each other. (IV.) Later Protestant statements of the doctrine.

(I) Use of the words Faith and believe in Scripture. —Hiereport, I. The profound and term of the word in the primary trust or confidence, such as one man can have in another; more seldom fidélity or faithfulness which one pledges or keeps; and also the pledge of fidelity, e. g. Sophocles, O. C. 1632: δός μοί χρῆσαι σεν πίστιν. Examples of the primary meaning (trust or confidence) are: Hebrews xii, 2; James iii, 24; 1 Pet. ii, 5; 1 Pet. v, 5; 1 Pet. iii, 19; see also Matthew xiii, 12; Acts xi, 24; Acts xiii, 26; Romans ii, 6; Romans iii, 24; Romans xiv, 25; Romans xv, 18; 2 Cor. iv, 7. "For we walk by faith (πιστήν), not by sight." Heb. xi, 27; "By faith (πίστις) he forsook Egypt." Heb. xi, 1, "Now faith (πιστικόν) is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Rom. iv, 18, "Who against hope believed (ἐμπιστοτέτοις) in hope;" John xx, 22, "Blessed (are) they
that have not seen and (yet) have believed (προανοιαγωγημένοι). But this opposition to "knowledge" or "sight" is not essential to the idea of faith, as is seen from John iv, 42; xi, 45; 1 Tim. iv, 8; Phil. 2, 6, et al. In fact, the N.T. faith differs from the profane πίστις generally in that it is not a conviction held without reference to any ground or authority (compare 1 Pet iii, 15; i, 21).

In the O.T. the word "faith" is comparatively seldom used; the relation of man to God and to his revelation is generally designated by some other term befitting the economy of the law, e.g., "doing God's will," "keeping the commandments," "remembering the Lord" (Exod. iii, 13), et al. Nevertheless, we do find (as one would expect among many passages of this relation) terms denoting "trusting," "hoping," "waiting on the Lord" (徭城, 运, 白侯, 卵侯, 卵侯, 卵侯). But in some of the most important passages of the Old-Test. history the word "faith" occurs; e.g., with regard to Abraham (Gen. xv, 6), "he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness;" of the people of Israel (Exod. iv, 31; compare i, 5, 8; xiv, 31); with regard to the possession of Canaan (Deut. ix, 23; comp. i, 2; Ps. lxxxvii, 22, 82; cvi, 21); with regard to the covenant of the law (Exod. xix, 9). In view of these important passages, we may say that the foundation laid for the N.T. faith is laid in the O.T. faith" (comp. Chron. xx, 21; Isa. iii, 1; vii, 9; xxviii, 16; Jonah iii, 5). But unbeliefe is far oftener spoken of in the O.T. than faith (comp. Ps. lxxxvii, 13; 2 Kings xvii, 14; Ps. lxxxvii, 22; 32; cvi, 24; Num. xx, 12; Deut. ix, 23; Isa. vii, 9; lili, 1; Numb. xiv, 11; Isa. cvi, 12; cxix, 66). The verb used in all these passages is πίστεω, Hiph. of πίστεω, to fasten, hold, make firm. From the last of these significations follows that of to support, to rely upon, to trust (Job xxxix, 11, 12; iv, 18; xxv, 15); holding a thing for certain and reliable (1 Kings x, 7; 2 Chron. ix, 6; Lam. iv, 12; Jer. xi, 14; Deut. xxxvii, 66; Job xix, 22). Used with relation to God, it denotes a cleaving to him, resting upon his strength, sure confidence in God, which gives fixedness and stability (2 Chron. xx, 20; Isa. vii, 9).

But there is apparently no corresponding noun to the verb πίστεω. For ἡ πίστις corresponds to the partic. in Kal and Niphal, הָפַד, הָפַד, and denotes steadfastness, stability (as an objective quality; e.g., Isa. xxxiii, 6). In other passages it denotes the personal quality of faithfulness, faithfulness (but not of holding fast by faith), e.g. 1 Chron. ix, 22; 2 Chron. xxxii, 18 (sense with which it is used in LXX in 2 Kings v, 14; Jer. vii, 28). In these passages, where the word refers to man, the Sept. translates it πιστεος; but where it refers to God it makes it ἀληθινα, e.g. Ps. xxxiii, 4. Here it may be remarked that the reference to this προανοιαγωγημένοι (faithfulness of God) by Paul (Rom. iii, 2 sq.) helps us to fix his idea of faith as definitely trust. As a designation of the religious relation of man to God, προανοιαγωγημένοι is only seldom used in the O.T. (see 1 Sam. xxvi, 25; Jer. v, 5). In these passages it denotes not simply condor, honesty, but rather faithfulness, i.e., faithfulness to the covenant (comp. Jer. v, 3 with i, 5 and Matt. xxii, 33). But, after all, we have not yet found our idea of faith. But Halâkukki, ii, 4 affords a passage in which is distinctly to be found the Pauline idea: הָפַד הָפַד וְהָפַד הָפַד (Sept. εἰς ἐπιστεόν ἐπιστεόν ἐπιστεόν) (Sept. εἰς ἐπιστεόν ἐπιστεόν). Apparently this passage was not understood by the Sept., which changed the suffix of the third person to that of the first, and referred it to the faithfulness and the reliability of God. But ἡ πίστις stands here with regard to the relation in which the just man, compared with the haughty Chaldæan, holds himself to the divine promises; and it refers, therefore, not to the relation it-
FALSE

Rom. iii, 22; Gal. ii, 16; iii, 22; Ephes. iii, 12; Phil. iii, 9; Gal. ii, 20; Acts iii, 16; Jas. ii, 1; Rev. ii, 13; xiv, 12; with Tit. i, 1, compare Rev. xviii, 24. (2) Without nearer definition, simply as faith, which adheres with full conviction and confidence to the N.T. revelation of salvation, and makes this its foundation (supposed to be) the essential meaning of the expression (Acts iii, 10), the faith which is by him, an expression which is used to point out the salvation arising from the mediation of Christ, through the looking unto Jesus, the author of faith (Heb. xii, 2). Under this class, besides the passages of the Synoptical Gospels, several other passages are found, as well as combinations (usually in the profane Greek) of εἰς τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὴν σάρκα, εἰς τοῦ θεοῦ, and also πιστεύω standing alone. The question is whether the original signification is confidence, or accepting as true.

(3.) In John, the expression πιστεύω in the significance to believe, to take for true, and hence to be convinced, to recognize (accept); (a) with the affirmation, John xi, 26, πιστεύω τοῦροῦ; comp. 25, 26; 1 John iv, 16; Acts xxi, 41; 1 Cor. xi, 18; 1 Tim. iii, 16; comp. Matt. xxiv, 23, 26; Luke xxii, 67; John x, 25; (b) with the infinitive after it, Acts xxvii, 25; see comment after it, Matt. ii, 22; Mark xi, 24; Acts xxvii, 26; Jas. iii, 19, εἰς πιστεύω τῷ τι σιν ἐστιν; compare Acts xxvii, 25; John iv, 21, πιστεύω μοι, ἵνα ἰρωτάσῃ ὁ οἶκος. This construction of πιστεύω is especially frequent in the writings of John, in the sense of taking for true (John vi, 6). As well as in Matt. xi, 28; 1 Thess. iv, 14; but in Rom. x, 9, ἵνα πιστεύσῃ ἵνα καθίσῃ σου ὁ οἶκος σου ἰρωτάση ἐν νεκρῶν, εὐθυγραμμία, the sense of trust predominates over that of taking for true. Compare also Heb. xi, 6, with xiv, 1; iv, 3.

In John this construction with εἰς is found in passages: John vi, 21; iv, 25; viii, 24; xiv, 6, 7; xii, 40; xvi, 27; Acts xxvii, 26; xxi, 37; 1 John iii, 23; 4 John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.

Let us look now at the constructions πιστεύω τοῦ of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e.g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); xiv, 27; (1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John vi, 40 (for ye believed not); ye would have believed me;) viii, 31; 54; xvi, 37; and note also the testimony of Christ and his fame that John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.

The passages in which the construction πιστεύω τοῦ of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e.g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); xiv, 27; (1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John vi, 40 (for ye believed not); ye would have believed me;) viii, 31; 54; xvi, 37; and note also the testimony of Christ and his fame that John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.

The passages in which the construction πιστεύω τοῦ of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e.g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); xiv, 27; (1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John vi, 40 (for ye believed not); ye would have believed me;) viii, 31; 54; xvi, 37; and note also the testimony of Christ and his fame that John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.

The passages in which the construction πιστεύω τοῦ of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e.g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); xiv, 27; (1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John vi, 40 (for ye believed not); ye would have believed me;) viii, 31; 54; xvi, 37; and note also the testimony of Christ and his fame that John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.

The passages in which the construction πιστεύω τοῦ of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e.g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); xiv, 27; (1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John vi, 40 (for ye believed not); ye would have believed me;) viii, 31; 54; xvi, 37; and note also the testimony of Christ and his fame that John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.

The passages in which the construction πιστεύω τοῦ of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e.g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); xiv, 27; (1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John vi, 40 (for ye believed not); ye would have believed me;) viii, 31; 54; xvi, 37; and note also the testimony of Christ and his fame that John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.

The passages in which the construction πιστεύω τοῦ of itself cannot signify to accept a person, but only to believe what he says, to trust his word; e.g. John ii, 22 (they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said); xiv, 27; (1 John iv, 1). In this sense also we understand John vi, 40 (for ye believed not); ye would have believed me;) viii, 31; 54; xvi, 37; and note also the testimony of Christ and his fame that John iv, 48 (Except ye see signs and wonder, ye shall not believe:); x, 37; xiv, 11; vi, 36; xx, 29; compare xx, 25; i, 51; iv, 39-42.
the testimony of God, (2) accepting the testimony of Christ concerning himself, and therefore (3) accepting Christ himself. The construction pιστεύω eis is found in John ii, 11; i, 16, 18, 36; iv, 39; vi, 29, 40 (47); vii, 5, 31, 38, 39, 48; viii, 39; ix, 35, 36; x, 24; xii, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 37, 43, 44, 45; xiv, 1, 12; xv, 7, 9, 12, 20; xvi, 1, 9; xvii, 10. The only passage in the writings of John in which another preposition occurs is John iii, 15, where Lachmann reads ἐν αὐτῶν, Tischendorf ἐν αὐτῷ, instead of ἐις αὐτῶν.

(2.) But the sense of admitting, accepting as true, that which is established by the whole of the doctrine of Christ in faith. It includes not only this, but also adherence to Christ; cleaving to him. See, for instance, the whole passage, John ix, 35-38, and comp. xiii, 48: x, 25, 27; vi, 62; i, 12. Both these are evidently misprints of ἐν αὐτῷ, and γινώσκω ἑαυτόν, which is found with but few exceptions in the whole NT, and even there with ὁ διότατος ἐν αὐτῷ (Luke xvi, 27; comp. with vi, 29; τί οὖν ποιεῖς ἐν σημαίνῃ, ἵνα λέεις πιστεύω σοι. (What sign shewest thou, that we may see and believe in thee?); 29: ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀνίστηται ὁ οἶος (that ye believe on him whom He hath sent). Compare especially also Matt. xxvii, 42; Mark xv, 32.

It is plain, now, that John’s idea of faith includes the element of cleaving to Christ as well as of accepting him; and this cleaving to him includes the idea of full trust in Christ as Saviour, as illustrated in the important verses, John ii, 23, 24; iii, 15: ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστιν πιστεύω (that whosoever believeth in me shall have eternal life). Here is the anguish, the believer, the bite of the fiery serpent, the earnest looking on in whom sin is crucified with the inner eye of faith” (Alford, loc. cit.). In this full sense of the word John uses πιστεύω by itself (to believe): in i, 6, 7, 11, iv, 41, 42, 48, 53, viii, 36, 64; ix, 38, x, 25, 26, xi, 15, 40; xii, 47, xiv, 29; xvi, 31; xix, 35; xx, 31 (comp. iii, 12; vi, 69; xx, 25, 26, 30). And this faith is the condition of the gifts of life, light, and salvation; John x, 25, 26; xii, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 32, 47; xv, 25, 26; xvi, 30, 31 (comp. viii, 38); viii, 24; ii, 12; xiii, 36, 40 (comp. viii, 12 and xi, 40).

(3.) Paul’s use of πιστεύω also includes the idea of intellectual conception, recognition; see the passages above cited under πιστεύω, and comp. also Rom. iv, 20 (strong in fide); i, 5; xvi, 26, and the relation of πιστεύω to κατασκευάζω (Rom. x, 14, 16; I Cor. xv, 2, 11; Ephes. i, 13). But the sense of trust in Christ as Saviour is always predominant in Paul. The construction πιστεύω τινι, to trust, rely upon, is found in 2 Cor. x, 18, where I have read πιστεύω, and the heend, the same as the relation of trust to faith in Romans iv, 20 (in fide); ii, 4; compare iv, 18. Instead of the dative we find πιστεύω εἰς, Rom. iv, 5, 6: εἰς τὸν διακονοῦντα τὸν δεικτήν (on him that justifieth the ungodly). iv, 24. The sense of πιστεύω eis always faith alone in Christ (Rom. x, 14; Gal. ii, 16; Phil. i, 29); likewise εἰς with the dative, 1 Tim. i, 6; Rom. ix, 33. And πιστεύω is used standing alone to designate the fullest trust of faith, Rom. i, 16; iii, 22; iv, 11, 18; x, 4, 10; xii, 11; xvi, 13; i Cor. i, 21; iii, 5; xiv, 22; 2 Cor. iv, 17; Gal. iii, 28; Ephes. i, 15, 19; 1 Thess. i, 7; ii, 10, 13; 2 Thess. i, 10.

In James ii, 19, to believe denotes intellectual assent, but in ver. 23 it denotes trust (see under πιστεύω). In Peter the two elements of assent and trust are connected (comp. 1 Pet. i, 9, with 4, 5, 7; i, 21. In the Apostle's Confession, the import of the word (whether assent or trust, or both conjoined) must be decided by the context.

The result of our examination is, that “faith” in the N. T. includes three elements, each and all necessary to the whole doctrine of the word, while one or another of them may become prominent according to the connection, viz.: (1) intellectual acceptance of the revelation of salvation; (2) adherence to the truth and to the person of Christ thus accepted; (3) absolute and exclusive trust in the redeeming work of Christ for salvation. In no one of the writers of the New Testament is any one of these elements wanting.

(11.) Early History of the Doctrine of Faith.—1. In the early Church, the Pauline doctrine of faith as a condition of justification was everywhere most firmly held. But the Eastern thinkers did not give much attention to faith in a doctrinal way, and its true meaning was not prominently developed, nor was the distinction between faith and works (as conditions) sharply drawn. During the Apostolic period (from A.D. 100 to A.D. 250), while the condition of justification was principally maintained as a moral and intellectual knowledge, faith was for the most part considered as historic-doctrinal faith in its relation to ἱστορίας. This gave rise to the opinion that knowledge in divine things justifies, while ignorance condemns. Mi- nucius Felix († 205) writes: “...and even as we en- nam, noticea procul ad veneri. Theophrastus of Antioch († 181) also knows of a fides historica alone, upon which he makes salvation to depend, i, 14: ἀσκείναις οὖν λαβών τῶν γνώμων καὶ πραγματευμάτων, ὡς ἀπείτω, ἀλλὰ πιστεύω πεπληρωμένον δεόν, μη ἐπιθύμησθε, μη ἐπικαθηκαί, ἐπίθυμησις ἀνώμοις τοῖς ἐν ἀνίστασις τιμωρίσω. (1) This was reserved for men of later times to investigate more profoundly the idea of justifying faith in the Pauline sense, yet correct views on this subject were not wanting. Thus, in the Hippocratic element of Rome († 100) says in a Pauline spirit, "Called by the will of God in Christ, we can be justified, not by ourselves, not by our own wisdom and piety, but only by faith, by which God has justified all in all ages. But shall we on this account cease from doing good, and give up charity? No! but all shall lay each an unweary seal as God, who has called us, always works, and rejoices in his works” (1 Ep. ad Cor. c. 82, 83). Irenæus († 202) contrasts the new joyful obedience which ensues on the forgiveness of sins with the legal stand-point. “The law which was given to the bondmen of old was to lead them outward corporal work, for it coerced men by a curse to obey the commandments, in order that they might learn to obey God. But the Word, the Logos who frees the soul, and through it the body, teaches a voluntary surrender. Hence the futilities of the law must be taken off, and man accustoms himself to the free obedience of love. The obedience of freedom must be of a higher kind; we are not allowed to go back to our earlier stand-point; for he has not set us free in order that we may leave him; this no one can do who has sincerely con- fessed himself to have been free when he has been enslaved, and the more he perseveres in justification out of communion with the Lord; and the more we obtain from him, so much the more must we love him; and the more we love him, so much greater glory shall we receive from him” (Irenæus, Herr. bk. iv, chap. xiii, 1, 23; Neander, History of Dogmas, Böyland, p. 216). Tertullian (220) adv. Marc. v, 8: et hæc libertatis libertas que est, sanctissima libertatis honor, non ex bis servitutis quisque jus- tuae ex fide vivit. According to Clement of Alexandria († 218), faith is not only the key to the knowledge of God (Coh. p. 9), but by it we are also made the children of God. By Clement's account, faith distinguishes between theoretical and practical unbelief, and understands by the latter the want of susceptibility of divine impressions, a carnal mind which would have everything in a tangible shape (Ström. ii, 4, p. 436). Origen (A.D. 250) in Num. Rom. xxxvi (Opp. iii, p. 369): “...quia fide est omne quod fide cognovit; sine fide nihil, saepe saepeque, sicut et in Ps. lxxviii, 39: Hist. of Doctrines, § 79; comp. also § 84). Apollinaris († 384) on John vi, 27, says: "The eternally enduring fruit, by which we are sealed by the Father and assimilated to Christ, is the faith which makes alive;"
and on ver. 28, "Faith both justifies and sanctifies without human works, seeing that it contains within itself the noblest energy, and is not slothful or inactive" (Dornen, Person of Christ, Edinb. tr., ii, vol. i, p. 408, &c.).

2. The Latins, more earnest on the practical than on the theoretical side, seem to have had deeper notions of faith (see Terrailian, cited above). But the minds of theologians were turned almost wholly to the doctrines of sin, grace, and free will (Pelagian controversy), and not to the appropriation of redemption by faith. The relations of faith to knowledge were set forth clearly and strongly, however, in the maxim Fide procedit intellectum, first announced by Origen, and adopted by Augustine (Epist. cxx, 8; ed. Migne, ii, 458, cited by Shedd, History of Doctrines, i, 162).

Compare also Augustine, De Utilitate Credendi, c. xxiii, where he shows the natural analogies for faith; e.g. that friendship among men, filial piety, etc., are grounded on faith. He makes a distinction between fides que sant and fides qua creditur (De Trin. xiii, 2); and uses the phrase fide catholica in the objective sense, to denote the body of doctrine "necessary to a Christian" (De temp. serv. 53; and ad. Jud. c. xix). Augustine, says Melancthon, did not set forth fides, but only fide in the proper sense of the word. Fides, he says, though he came nearer than the Scholastics (Letter to Bremius, op. ed. Bretschneider, i, 502).

3. In the scholastic period the idea of the kingdom of God degenerated into that of an ecclesiastical theocracy, and the outward side of the religious life (purity and good works) was prominent. Nevertheless, the great doctrinal truths of Christianity were carefully studied, and the aim of the greatest thinkers (e.g. Anselm) was to show that faith can be verified to the intellect as truth, while, at the same time, it is the ground of all science, and the true basis of all salvation. "First of all," he says, "faith must purify the heart: we must humble ourselves, and become as little children. He who believes not, cannot experience: he who has not experienced, cannot understand. Nothing can be done till the soul rises on the wings of faith to God" (De Fide Trinitatis, c. ii).

The great Greek theologian, John of Damascus (8th century), who may be considered as beginning the period of scholastic theology, defined faith as consisting of two things: 1. belief in the truth of revealed doctrine, the vr&tia &c. (De Fide, c. x, i, xii, and xii, 1); and 2. firm confidence in the promises of God, the faith which is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb. xi, 1). The first of these, he says, is the work of our own minds; the second is the gift of the Spirit (De Fide Ordin. c. iv).

Anselm comprises the whole doctrine of faith and morals in the question, how man appropriates redemption to himself. He says, "The mere idea does not make faith, although this cannot exist without an object; in order to true faith the right tendency of the will must be added, which grace imparts" (De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, c. vi).

He distinguishes (Monologium, p. 72; compare p. 75) between credere Drum, Christiam, and credere in Deum, in Christiam: the former denotes a mere outward faith which only retains the form; the latter denotes the tue, living faith, with its development. Hugo of St. Victor develops this general idea of faith in connection with the religious nature of man. Faith marks the manner in which invisible blessings dwell within our souls (quodam modo in nobis substanti), the real vital communion with God, his true existence in the human soul. For divine things cannot be apprehended by us through the senses, the understanding, or the imagination, since they have nothing analogous to all these, but are exalted above all images. The only vehicle of the possession of this true communion with God is the tue faith — the tendency of the disposition, and the matter of cognition. This latter is the object of faith, but its essence consists in the tendency of the disposition; and although this is never altogether without the former, yet it constitutes the value of faith. Bernard of Clairvaux agrees with Hugo in his view of the nature of faith: "even now," he says, "many who believe with confidence have only scanty knowledge; thus many in the O.T. retained firm faith in God, and received salvation by this faith, although they knew not when and how salvation would come to them." Expressions of this kind are also important (Sententia, c. iv). "Faith," he says, "always refers to the invisible, never to the visible. But how is this? When Christ said to Thomas, 'Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed.' What Thomas saw before him was one thing, what he believed was another. Thomas confessed the man whom he saw to be the Lord, in whom he believed. He saw the flesh, but he believed in the God veiled in the flesh." (Neander, Church History, Torrey, iv, 375).

"Not merely Abelard, but also most of the other scholmen, understood by fides the essence of all justification, but a subjective character of the disposition, which proceeds from faith, the true inward sanctification in love which arises out of faith. Bernard, on the other hand, was led by his experience to a more objective view: 'No one is without sin (Sermo on St. Monica's Song, c. vii, 31); for all righteousness is from me for me that he is gracious to me; who has redeemed me. Christ is not merely righteous (ib. 22, § 8), but righteousness itself." The scholastic doctrine on this point received a fixed form through Peter Lombard (Sentent. iii, dist. 28). He makes a threefold distinction in faith: fides, credere, fide. The first means faith as the essential principle of all the other two. The second means credere in Christum credere. The second term, for he who is a Christian, holds his faith to be a true virtue.

Applying to faith the Aristotelian distinction between the form as the formative principle (idea, forma), and the inorganic material determined by it (dein, materia), Peter distinguishes faith as the qualet est mensa informata, the mere support of faith, and the person of Christ; and adds, that the vivifying power of love is added to it, which forms and determines it. The fides formata is a true virtue and this faith, working by love, alone justifies' (Neander, History of Dogmas, Ryland, p. 522 sq).

The Scholastics generally recognised the distinction (hinted by Augustine) between objective and subjective faith (fides qua creditur and fides qua creditor) and also distinguished between developed (explicita) and undeveloped (imperflia) faith (Aquinas, Summa, ii, qu. 1, art. 7). But in all the scholastic period, the prevalence of the sacrificial theory of religion hindered, if it did not absolutely prevent, a just apprehension of the nature of faith, and naturally developed the theory of the merit of good works. Peter Lombard, indeed, says that good works are those only that spring from the love of God, which love itself is the fruit of faith (opus fides; Sententia, iii, dist. 22, De virtute fidei). Thomas Aquinas were not quite so scriptural; thus (Suma, pt. ii, 2, qu. 4, art. 7) he speaks of faith itself as a virtue, though he assigns it to the first and highest place among all virtues. He defines faith to be 'an act of the intellect assenting to the true truth of the opinion of the Spirit upon the will' (Summa, ii, 2, 1, 4), and reckons faith among the theological virtues, which he distinguishes from the ethical (Neander, Wis. Aekkwardia, ed. Jacobii, 1861, p. 42).

Such notions, however, led more and more to the
revival of Pelagianism, till the forerunners of the Reform-

formation returned to the simpler truths of the Gospel" (Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, § 186). According to Aquinas, the faith by which we are cleared from sin is not the faith of reason, which can comprehend the Christian faith, but the fides formata percharitat (faith informed by love). In justification there is a motus charitatis as well as a motus fidei (Summa, pt. iii, qu. 44, art. 1). This statement contains the germ of the later Roman Catho-

clic doctrine (see other passages in Möhler, Symbolism, N. Y. 1907.) On this true Pauline doctrine Dompengoesselhüt, 1864, p. 365). Its doctrine (as that of the period generally) is that justification is "not an active object, but some-
thing subjective, making man internally righteous by the communication of the divine life in fellowship with Christ. For the attainment of justificatio, moreover, faith must be the first step; it was not sufficient for justification, but love must be added; the grotia justifica was first given in the fides formata, making man internally righteous. Since this external idea of faith required that for effecting justification something must be added from without, the additional aid of the Church was demanded" (Neander, Dogmas, p. 661). See Justification.

4. John Wessel († 1498) was a precursor of the Reform-

ation in his views on faith, as well as on many other points. None of the theologians of the Schola-
tics down to 2, that is, the first principle of the Pauline spirit as Wessel. He considers it "not a mere taking for granted of historical facts, but the devotion of the whole mind to fellowship with God through Christ; it is the basis of the whole higher life; not merely in the relations of man to man, but also in the relation of man to God" (Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, Edinb. 1885, ii, 468).

Practically, at the dawn of the Reformation (and for ages before), Christian people were taught by their pastors that the pardon of sin was to be secured, not by faith in the merits of Christ, but by penitential ob-

servation and good works. "As the first step, it was not sufficient for justification, but faith itself was generally held to be simply the reception of the teaching of the Church. In practice, faith was transformed into credulity. (111) The Protestant and Roman Catholic Doctrines of Faith compared.—The Protestant Doctrine. —The central point of the Reformation, in a doctrinal point of view, was justification by faith. Its development will be treated in our article JUSTIFICATION; we can here only briefly give the distinction between the Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrines of faith: 1. that of the Reformed Church, and 2 that of the Catholic Church. 1. The Reformers. —The Reformers, in opposition to the Scholastic doctrine of justification as a subjective work (the making just), brought out prominently the objective idea of justification (as a work done for us by Christ). "On the other side, correspondingly, they regarded faith as subjective, and as the principle of the transformation of the whole inner life" (Neander, Dogmas, ii, 662). The prominent position of faith in the theology of the Reformers was a fundamental part of the change that was taking place, at the time, in the gospel teaching of Christendom. "The mind was not satisfied with an objective and outward salvation, however valid and reliable it might be. It desired a consciousness of being saved; it craved an experience of salvation. The Protestant mind could not rest in the Church, neither could it pretend to rest in an atone-

ment without faith. Upon his policy and the work of Christ on Calvary must become the subjective experi-

ence and rejoicing of the soul itself. While, however, the principle and act of faith occupies such a promi-

nent place in the soteriology of the Reformation, we should not fail to note that it is not represented as a primary cause of justification; it is only the instru-

mental cause. Protestantism was exceedingly care-

ful to distinguish justification from legal righteousness on the one hand, and from sanctification by grace on

the other. It could not, consequently, concede to any species of human agency, however excellent, a pecu-

liar and atoning efficacy. Hence we find none of that supplementary or perfecting of the work of Christ by the work of the creature which is found in the papal soteriology, and which is the most apparent in the act of faith itself. Faith itself, though the gift and the work of God, does not justify, speaking accurately, but merely accepts what does justify" (Shedd, History of Doctrines, ii, 337-8). Luther was led to the true Pauline doctrine of faith as a result of profound convict-

tion of the desperate condition of humanity, not sim-

ply from its sense of finiteness (which could only have led him to faith as a realization of the invisible and eternal), but also and chiefly from the crushing sense of personal guilt on account of sin. He regards faith not merely as a work, but as a (as something substantial and divine thing, so far as it cleaves to God, and God is in it. Faith is in the state of the unio mystica, union with God; and yet it is, at the same time, man's true existence. It is no mere intellectu-

al act, but a giving up of the whole man to trust in Christ; and conversely, a penetration of the whole man by the life of Christ. "Faith makes new crea-
tures of us. My holiness and righteousness do not spring from myself; they arise alone out of Christ, in whom I am rooted by faith" (Dornier, Person of Christ, 1993, i, 68, 64). Luther says: "Faith alone justifies, and it alone fulfills the law; for faith, through the merits of Christ, obtains the Holy Spirit. And then, at length, from the faith thus efficaciously working and living in the heart, freely (Amstaff) proceed those works which are truly good. . . . But faith is an energy in the heart; at once so efficacious, lively, breathing, and powerful as to be incapable of remaining inactive, but bursts forth into operation. Neither does he who has faith (moratien) demur about the question whether good works have been com-
manded or not; but even though there were no law, feeling the mutual love of God, he says: "As a loving and exerting itself in his heart, he is spontaneously borne onward to work, and at no time does he cease to perform such actions as are truly pious and Christian. Faith, then, is a constant fire, a trust in the mercy of God toward us; a trust in his help and efficaciously working in the heart, by which we cast ourselves entirely on God, and commit ourselves to him; by which, cer-
to freli, having an assured reliance, we feel no hesita-
tion about enduring death a thousand times." Luther laid the greatest stress at all times on the cer-

tainty of this faith; and it was his object to make this certainty of the Church and the Christian faith.

The ground certainty, on which all other cer-
tainty depends, is with him the justification of the sin-

ner for Christ's sake apprehended by faith; of which it is only the objective statement to say that to him the fundamental certainty is Christ as the Redeemer, through surrender to whom faith has full satisfaction, and knows that it stands in the truth" (Dornier, Geschicht der Prot. Theol., München, 1897, p. 224). To believe those things to be true which are preached of Christ is not sufficient to constitute thee a Christian; but the assurance that the things spoken of Christ are true must be also given to thee; otherwise God will not have satisfied either thee or any other, to whom the advantageous benefits of Christ are given and exhibited, which he that believes must plainly confess, that he is holy, godly, righteous, the Son of God, and certain of salvation, and that by no merit of his own, but by the mere mercy of God, which unto you is grafted forth [Luther, Sechs Und Sieben, Col. I, 4-7, in Fish, Masterpieces of Pulpit Elence, i, 468]. Zwingli held that faith, in the sense of the appro-

priation by man, through grace, of the redemptive work of Christ, is the only means or instrument of salva-

tion. And this habitat, that the Roman Catholic and Lutheran doctrines of the Eucharist that these doctrines detract from the glory of faith by rep-

resenting it as insufficient for salvation (Dornier, Per-


III.—15
a letter to Brentius, May, 1531, says: "Faith alone (sola) justifies, not because it is the root ( radix), as you write, but because it lays hold of Christ, on whose account no other justifying grace is necessary. It is not the fulfillment of the law, which justifies, but faith alone, not because it is a perfection in us, but only because it lays hold on Christ" (edit. Bretschneider, Hal. Sax. 1853, ii, 501). Calvin (Institutes, bk. iii, chap. xi) treats of faith at large, and distinguishes it from "a common assent to the evangelical history," and refutes the nugatory distinction made by the schools between fides formata and fides informata. "The disputes of the schools concerning faith, by simply styling God the object of it, rather mislead miserable souls by a vain speculation than profit them. A true sign of this grace God, 'dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto,' there is a necessity for the interposition of Christ as the medium of access to him." "This evil, then, as well as innumerable others, must be imputed to the schoolmen, who, have, as it were, concealed Christ by covering a hill over him; whereas, unless our views be immediately and steadfastly directed to him, we shall always be wandering through labyrinths without end. They not only, by their obscure definitions, diminish, and almost annihilate, all the importance of faith, but have fabricated the notion of implication, which they have made the most egregious instance of the grossest ignorance, and most perniciously deluded the miserable multitude." "Is this faith—to understand nothing, but obediently to submit our understanding to the Church? Faith consists not in ignorance, but in knowing, not only of things, but of the things of God. ... For faith consists of a knowledge of God and of Christ, not in reverence to the Church. ... In short, no man is truly a believer unless he be firmly persuaded that God is a propitious and benevolent Father to him, and promise himself everything from him; and he will certainly do this which they that are ignorant and in gross ignorance do; and most perniciously deluded the miserable multitude." Their "faith doth God impute for righteousness upon him" (Art. iv). The nature of saving faith is set forth in Art. xx: "It is to be observed here that a mere historical belief, such as wicked men and devils have, is not here meant, who also believe in the history of the sufferings of Christ, and in his resurrection from the dead; but that genuine faith is here meant which causeth us to believe that we can obtain grace and forgiveness of sins through Christ, and which giveth us the confidence that through Christ we have a merciful God, which also giveth us the assurance to know God, to call upon his goodness; unless he depend on the promises of divine benevolence to him, and foels an undoubted expectation of salvation. He is no believer, I say, who does not rely on the security of his salvation, and confidently triumph over the devil and death" (Calvin, Institutes, bk. iii, ch. ii).

The passage from Phil. ii concerning several Confessions will be given more fully in the art. Justification; we cite here a few. Augsburg Confession.—"Men are justified freely for Christ's sake through faith when they believe that they are received into favor, and their sins are forgiven, and that Christ's sake God imputeth righteousness upon them" (Art. iv).

The nature of saving faith is set forth in Art. xx: "It is to be observed that a mere historical belief, such as wicked men and devils have, is not here meant, who also believe in the history of the sufferings of Christ, and in his resurrection from the dead; but that genuine faith is here meant which causeth us to believe that we can obtain grace and forgiveness of sins through Christ, and which giveth us the confidence that through Christ we have a merciful God, which also giveth us the assurance to know God, to call upon his goodness; unless he depend on the promises of divine benevolence to him, and foels an undoubted expectation of salvation. He is no believer, I say, who does not rely on the security of his salvation, and confidently triumph over the devil and death" (Calvin, Institutes, bk. iii, ch. ii).

The passage from Phil. ii concerning several Confessions will be given more fully in the art. Justification; we cite here a few. Augsburg Confession.—"Men are justified freely for Christ's sake through faith when they believe that they are received into favor, and their sins are forgiven, and that Christ's sake God imputeth righteousness upon them" (Art. iv).
the seat of faith, as Bellarmine expressly puts it in his contrast between the Protestant and the Roman ideas of faith: "hereticas fidem sibi sanat" definitia; Catholica fidem in intellectu sedem habere voluit (De Justif., i. 4). How thoroughly external a thing this faith may become in practice is evinced by the fact that the recitation of a creed, in Romanist language, is called only "gestus" (action), that faith, in the strictest technical sense, is not an act, but a mere "beginning" of justification, and not its instrument. So Möhler, in commenting on this passage, expressly says that "Roman Catholics consider faith as the union with God in Christ especially by means of the faculty of knowledge, illuminated and strengthened by grace." (Symbolica, N. Y. 1844, p. 204). In the same vein is the definition given by the Catechism of Trent, viz. that the "faith necessary to salvation is that faith by which we yield our entire assent to whatever has been revealed by almighty God." (Baltimore edit. p. 19). It is plain that the notion of faith, as Protestantism holds it, and as is derived from Paul, is totally wanting in the Roman doctrine. Naturally, too, with this conception of faith, the Romanists deny that faith alone justifies, affirming, in the way of the Scholastics (see above), that faith must be informed by charity, as the gospels inform it, if it is to be genuine in that respect, and to be reformed and renewed by confession and absolution. So J. H. Newman (Difficulties of Anglicanism, cited by Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 113) declares that Roman Catholics "hold that faith and love, faith and obedience, faith and works, are simply separable, and ordi- narily separable, in faith; that faith does not imply love, obedience, or works; or that the sincerest faith, so as to move mountains, may exist without love—that is, true faith, as truly faith in the strict sense of the word as the faith of a martyr or a doctor." On this Hare remarks that "this belief is not faith. To many persons, indeed, it may appear that this is little more than a dispute about words; that we use the word 'faith' in one sense, and the Romanist in another, and that it is not worth while to argue about the matter. But when we call to mind how great are the power and the blessings that can be derived from the Gospel, surely it is a question of the highest moment whether that power and those blessings belong to a lifeless, inert, insani- mate notion, or to a living, energetic principle. This is the great controversy between Romanism and Protestantism. Their stay is the opra operum, our sola fides. The faith of God, the gospel in a world of sinners, through Christ, renewing the whole man, and becoming the living spring of his feelings, and thoughts, and actions." (Contest with Rome, note 1). A letter of Bun- sen's in 1840 illustrates the Roman idea of faith, as it had taken root in the mind of J. H. Newman before he went over to Rome. A pastor in Antwerp (named Spörlein) was troubled about episcopal ordination, and came to England for light. He was invited to break- fast at Newman's, and found him a number of his friends ready to hear him. "He unburdened his heart to them; and he made their decisions the verdict of a Newmannick jury on a case of conscience, viz. that 'Pastor Spörlein, as a Continental Christian, was subject to the authority of the bishop of Antwerp.' He objected that by that bishop he would be excommunicated as a heretic. 'Of course; but you will conform to his deci- sion,' he exclaimed Spörlein, 'with his threats of taking away my faith?' 'But your faith is heresy.' 'How? Do you mean that I am to embrace the errors of Rome, and to abjure the faith of the Gospel?' 'There is no faith but that of the Church.' 'But my faith is not what the Church says it is; you are not saved by Christ, but by the Church' (Memor of Bunsen, by his Widow, London, 1865, i. 614).

(IV.) Later Protestantism.—1. Whatever minor diff- erences may have arisen in Protestant theology as to faith, all evangelical theologians agree in the follow- ing points: 1. That saving faith not only recognises the supernatural, but also accepts and trusts absolutely on Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as Saviour; 2. that this saving power is the gift of God; 3. that it invari- ably results in genuine repentance; 4. that it is the express and necessary article of faith; 5. that every person who appropriates the merits of Christ must be a living faith; 6. that it is not the faith, nor the vitality of the faith, which justifies and saves man, but it is the ob- ject of the faith, i.e., the merits of Christ the Redeem- er, in the object of faith, that is the all-important thing. Now, something that is vital to the quality of any merely subjective faith. The earlier Reformers and Confessors made assurance an essen- tial part of saving faith, but this doctrine was not long held. See Assurance; Justification.

2. Divisions of Faith.—Faith is divided by the theologians into fides historica and fides superficiei (historical faith and saving faith). The former is intellectual knowledge and belief of the Christian doctrine; the latter a genuine appropriation of the merits of Christ unto salvation. True faith embraces both. The parts of faith, in theological language, are these: a. Notitia (act of the intellect, knowledge of the external and intellectual principles of the doctrine of Christ), b. Assensus (act of the will), assent to the doctrine, or reception of it as true and credible. c. Fiducia (act of the heart), trust or confidence in the divine word. "True and saving faith is the assent in faith in the word of God, that this is not a blind and superstitious trust in the sacri- fice of Christ, like that of the heathens in their sacri- fices, nor the presumptuous trust of wicked and im- penitent men, who depend on Christ to save them in their sins, but such a trust as is exercised according to the authority and direction of the word of God; so that to know the Gospel in its leading principles, and to have a cordial of belief in it, is necessary to that more specific act of faith which is called reliance, or, in systematic language, fiducial assent" (Watson, Instit., ii. 243).

3. Faith in Christ; justifying Faith — Faith as Condi- tion of Salvation.—(a.) Though the entire revelation of God is set forth, in one sense, as the object of faith (Luke xxiv. 25, 26; Heb. xi), yet Christ, the incor- nate Son of God, the dying and rising Redeemer, is the object of faith (1 Cor. i. 16; John xv. 21). In the evangelical churches, justifying faith is understood to be exercised specifically in Christ, as by his death making expiation and satisfaction for the sinner's guilt, or (to put the same idea in another light) in God's covenant with mankind in Christ, as offering them pardon, the sinner's true old death, and the right to the things of God in Christ; and so the object of faith is yet viewed merely as a condition of justifica- tion. (b.) "What faith is it, then, through which we are saved? It may be answered, first, in general, it is a faith in Christ; Christ, and God through Christ, are the proper objects of it. Herein, therefore, it is sufficiently, absolutely distinguished from the faith either of ancient or modern heathens, and from the object of a devil it is fully distinguished by this—it is not barely a speculative, rational thing, a cold, lifeless assent, a train of ideas in the head, but also a disposi- tion of the heart; and so is the faith in Christ, 'which the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' And, if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe with thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." It acknowled- ges his death as the only sufficient means of redeem- ing man, as the object of faith; (Gal. ii. 16; John xv. 21,) with the restoration of us all to life and immortality; inasmuch as he was delivered for our sins, and rose again for our justification." Christian faith is, then, not only an assent to the whole Gospel of Christ, but also a full reliance on Christ. It is a full reliance on, and confidence in, Christ as the object of faith; a reliance on, and confidence in, the object of his life, death, and resurrection; a recumbency upon him as our atonement and our life, as given for
us, and living in it. It is a sure confidence which a man hath in God that through the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favor of God; and in consequence thereof, a closing with him, and cleaving to him, as our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, or, in one word, our salvation (Wisbey). This faith, as it is called, is not meritorious, but instrumentally, the condition of our pardon. If Christ had not merited, God had not promised; if God had not promised, justification had never followed on this faith; so that the indissoluble connection and justification by our institution, whereby he hath bound himself to give the benefit upon performance of the condition. Yet there is an aptitude in faith to be made a condition; for no other act can receive Christ as a priest propitiating and pleading; the propitiation, and the promise of God for his sake to give the benefit. As receiving Christ and his gracious promise in this manner, it acknowledgeth man's guilt, and so man renounceth all righteousness in himself, and honoreth God the Father, and Christ the Son as the only Redeemer. It glorifies God's mercy and free grace in the highest degree. It acknowledges it on God's account. Theologically it will be known in heaven, that the whole salvation of sinful man, from the beginning to the last degree thereof, of which there shall be no end, is from God's great love, Christ's merit and intercession, his own gracious promise (Lawson). Wesley, speaking of faith as the condition of our justification, says, "We mean this much, that it is the only thing without which no one is justifieth; the only thing that is immediately, indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon. As, on the one hand, though a man should have everything else but faith, yet he cannot be justified; so, on the other, though he be supposed to want everything else, yet if he hath faith he cannot but be justified. For suppose a sinner of any kind or degree, in a full sense of his total ungodliness, of his total inability to think, speak, or do good, suppose I say, this sinner, helpless and hopeless, casts himself wholly upon the mercy of God in Christ (which, indeed, he cannot do but by the grace of God), who will affirm that any more is required before that sinner can be justified?" (Wesley, Sermon on Justification; Neander, Planting and Training, ii. 128 sq.). "Faith, as it is mere belief, may be preserved by rational evidence. But when that is attained, the work of grace in the heart is nowhere said in Scripture to be carried on by the natural operation of these credited truths. The contrary fact, that men often credited them, and did not be justified, is obvious. When a different state of mind ensues, it is ascribed to the quickening influence of the Spirit, an influence which may be ordinarily resisted. By that influence men are 'pricked in their heart;' and the heart is prepared to feel the dread impression which is conveyed by the manifestation of man's perishing state, not merely in the doctrine of the word, but as it stands in the Spirit's application to the heart and conscience. But, though this was previously credited, and is still credited; and though its import and meaning are now more fully perceived as the perishing condition of the awakened man is more clearly discovered, the faith of affiance does not therefore follow. A person in these circumstances is not to be likened to a man drowning, who will instinctively seize the rope as soon as it is thrown out to him. There is a perverted application of the opposite truth and duty, in any way, and to stand on terms with his Saviour. There is a reluctance to trust wholly in his atonement, and to be saved by grace. There is a sin of unbelief, an evil heart of unbelief, a repugnance to the committal of the soul to Christ, which the influence of grace, not merely knowledge of the opposite truth and duty, must conquer. Even when this is subdued, and man is made willing to be saved in the appointed way, a want of power is felt, not to credit the truth of the sacrifice of Christ, or its merits, or its sufficiency, but a want of power to trust wholly, and with confidence, in it, as to the issue. It is then that, like the disciples, and all good men in all ages, every man in these circumstances prays for faith; for this power to trust personally, and for him to be the means made for his sins. Thus be recognizeth Christ as 'the Author and Finisher of faith,' and faith as the gift of God, though his own duty: thus there is in the mind an entire renunciation of self on the one hand, and a seeing of God as the object of our faith. This act when exercised must be followed by the gift of faith, and by the joy which springs, not from mere sentiment, but from the attestation of the Spirit to our acceptance with God. Then the Holy Spirit is given, not only as the Comforter, but as the Sanctifier. It is in this way, too, that faith lives up to the command, by the exerted influence and power of God, through Christ. 'The life that I live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.' These are views which will, it is true, be a stumbling-stone and a rock of offence to the philosophers of this world, and not likely to turn many to God; and this is really a concession. Still this will stand, 'Whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein'" (Watson, Works, London, 1835, viil, 224).

Pye Smith (First Lines of Christian Theology, bk. v, ch. v, § 8) defines the specific act of saving faith to be that act of the mind which directly and necessarily arises from the principle of faith, which is the proper and characteristic exertion of that principle, and in which the real nature, design, and tendency of genu- in faith is manifestly expressed in Scripture by the terms "coming to Christ—looking to him—receiving him—eating the flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking his blood—trusting in him, and being fully persuaded of his truth and faithfulness." It is that which our old and excellent divines usually denoted by the phrase (perhaps too familiar, but very expressive and easily understood) closing with Christ. President Edwards expresses it thus: "The whole act of acceptance, or closing of the soul or heart with Christ." (Works, xlii, 546). "Faith is an assured resting of the soul upon God's promises of mercy and pardon to Christ for sinners here and glory hereafter" (Dr. Owen's Catechism).

4. It has been said (above) that Protestant theologians are substantially agreed as to the nature of saving faith. But there is a class of divines in the Church of England (called the so-called "mild party") who seem to have gone back wholly to the scholastic doctrine of faith, if not, indeed, to that of Rome. One of the best writers of this school is bishop Forbes, of Brechin, who, in treating on Art. xi of the Church of England, asserts the faith by which we are justified is not the fiducia of Luther, but is "that beginning and root of the Christian life whereby we willingly believe, etc.," thus adopting the very phraseology of Trent in framing his definition of faith. So also, he adopts Bellarmino's statement that "love is the vivifying principle of the faith which impetrates justification" but he admits that we often affirm that we are justified by faith alone, he adds that "they never intended, by the word alone, to exclude all works of faith and grace from the causes of justification and eternal salvation" (Explanation of the 59 Articles, London, 1687, i. 277 sq.). These views are not Protestant; yet bishop Forbes, and the set of theologians who agree with him in going back to Roman doctrine, still belong to a Church which calls itself Protestant. In happy contrast, we cite another divine of the same Church, Dr. O'Brien, who, in his excellent treatise on Justification by Faith and Duty, gives a clear statement of the nature of Christian faith as "trust in Christ; an entire and unreserved confidence in the
efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, a full reliance upon him and his work, protests against the error that, "in justification, faith is accounted to us for righteousness because it is in itself a right principle, and one which naturally tends to produce obedience." It also shows that, "while it is the final instrument of our justification, and the seminal principle of holy obedience, it is, notwithstanding, the instrument of our justification, essentially and properly, because it unites us to the Lord Jesus Christ, so that we are thereby justified and on that account justified." God having, in his infinite wisdom and mercy, appointed that we should be pardoned and accepted for the sufferings and for the merits of another, seems most fitly to have appointed, too, that our voluntary acceptance of this his mode of freely forgiving and receiving us, be putting our trust in him. For in these blessings are to be bestowed upon us, should necessarily precede our full participation of all the benefits of this gracious scheme, and that nothing else should. . . .

If for our justification it be essential, and sufficient, that we be united to Christ—ours with Christ—"found in Christ"—does not the act whereby we take him for our defense against that wrath which we feel that we have earned—whereby, abjuring all self-dependence, we cast ourselves upon God's free mercies in the Redeemer, with a full sense of our guilt and our danger, but in a full confidence in the efficacy upon which he has wrought and endured; does not this act, whereby we cleave to him, and, as far as in us, lies become, one with him, seem the final act whereunto to annex the full enjoyment of all those inestimable benefits which, however dearly purchased they were by him whom they bought, were designed in all that he has done and suffered, for our benefit? With less than this, our part in the procedure would not have been, what it was manifestly designed to be, intelligent and voluntary; with more, it might seem to be meritorious. Whereas faith unites all the advantages that a duty rightly done gives, in the instrument whereby we were to lay hold on the blessings thus freely offered to us: it makes us voluntary recipients of them, and yet does not seem to leave, even to the deceitfulness of our own deceitful hearts, the power of ascension to ourselves—ours with Christ—"found in Christ." (p. 119-121)

The relation of faith to works, and the question of the apparent difference between the doctrine of Paul and that of James on this point, will be treated in our article WORKS. We only remark here that the Protestant doctrine has been abundantly shown in this article (as the extracts already given) holds that true faith always manifests itself by love and good works (see Augustus Confession, Apology, c. iii); any other faith is mere belief, or what St. James calls "dead faith." The minor differences among Protestants as to the nature of faith depend chiefly upon differences as to the nature of justification. See JUSTIFICATION.
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FAITH, ACT OF. See AUTO DA FÉ.
FAITH, ARTICLES OF. See ARTICLES, and FUNDAMENTAL.
FAITH AND WORKS. See WORKS.
FAITH, CONFESSIONS OF. See CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

FAITH, FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLES OF. See FUNDAMENTAL.

FAITH, RULE OF. I. REGULA FIDEI. In the early Church the summary of doctrines taught to catechumens, and to which they were required to give their assent before baptism, was called in Greek πίστις, the faith; Ἱερός πίστις, the limit or determination of the faith; ἔκτος πίστεως, exposition of the faith; κανόνες, rule; and in Latin, Regula fidei, rule of faith. This rule was apostolic in the literal term which the Apostles' Creed. See CREED, APOTHESES; REGULA FIDEI.

II. From the ancient usage, the phrase has been adopted (not very aptly) in modern theology to denote (1) the true source of our knowledge of Christian truth; and (2) the criterion or standard of Christian doctrine. "Ecclesiastical apologists and apologists find this rule in the Scriptures alone; the Greek and Roman churches, and some Anglicans, find it not only in Scripture, but also in the Church, as the authorized (inspired) interpreter of Scripture, whose interpretations are embodied in tradition. The supreme authority, according to the Romanists, lies in tradition, and in the pope as its living exponent. Some of the mystics and the Quakers make the "inner light" the supreme rule: thus Robert Barclay says that the highest source of knowledge—divine revelation and illumination—is something internal, trustworthy, and self-evident, which commands reason to accept it by the indwelling evidence. The Rationalists make reason the final arbiter, and the mind of man the measure of truth.

(1.) THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE. I. One of the chief doctrinal elements of the Reformation was the sufficiency of the Scriptures. The phrase was introduced by John Calvin (1509-64), who anticipated the Reformation in asserting the authority of Scripture. "When we truly believe in Christ," he says, "the authority of Holy Writ is greater for us than that of any other writing." He makes the acknowledgment of the divine word to spring from the immediate relation of the soul to Christ, while Rome puts the Church between the soul and Christ. Luther also rejected all mediation between the soul and Christ. "Yet, before he had consciously developed the principle that the holy Scriptures must be the highest source of knowledge, the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture was formed upon it, and unconsciously he was guided by the principle to admit nothing which was at variance with the Scriptures. Controversy first brought him to carry out this principle with scientific clearness." It was, however, first scientifically stated by Melancthon on the above ground, and by Beza. In his "De Rerum Ecclesiasticarum," Ekk attacked a statement made by that reformer in one of his letters, which thus acquired notoriety. He says that it is a duty to abide by the pure and simple meaning of Holy Writ, as, indeed, heavenly truths are always the simplest; this meaning is to be found by comparing the Scriptures with each other, while Luther teaches us to study Holy Writ, in order to pass judgment on all human opinions by it as a universal touchstone" (Cont. Eckium Defensio, Melancthonii Opera, ed. Bretschne-
The chief Protestant Confessions agree as to the rule of faith. The Augsburg Confession repudiates the traditions of the Church of Rome as to penances, fasts, etc. (art. xv.), disciplina clerici, etc. (part ii., art. xvi.); and the Confession of the English Church (5th of the Sixth Article) states: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith." So the Creeds (art. viii.) are commended to reception and belief only because they may be proved by certain "warrant of holy Scripture;" works of supererogation (xiv.) are rejected as contradicted by the word of Christ; things ordained even by general councils are affirmed (xxxi.) to have neither strength nor authority save what is deduced from the Word of God out of holy Scripture; purgatory, pardons, image worship, relics, saintly invocation (xxi.), and transubstantiation (xxxvi.) are rejected as grounded "upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

The Romanist Doctrine.——The Council of Trent (sees iv. April 8, 1516, On the Canon.) declares that the "Gospel promised before the prophets in the sacred Scriptures was first orally published by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who afterwards commanded it to be preached by his apostles to every creature;" this, they assert, is the "authority and source of Church discipline;" and that this truth and discipline are contained both in written books and in unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the apostles from the lip of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hand of the same apostles, under the head of the Holy Spirit;" and names as canonical all the books of the O. and N. Testament, according to the Vulgate edition; declaring that the Council "doth receive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, which by the doctrine and discipline of the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether received from Christ himself or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession." The Catechism of the Council of Trent declares (Preface) that "all the doctrines of Christianity in which the faithful are to be instructed are derived from the Word of God, which includes Scriptures and tradition." These statements are not so decided as those of later Roman theologians, but they were nevertheless received at the time as ordaining the rule of faith in the Church. Bernard Gilpin (1538) had, in his sermon, a controversy about accepting Protestantism, but the publication of the decree of Trent decided him: "While he was distracted with these things, the rule of faith changed by the Council of Trent astonished him. For he observed that not only the ancient divines, but even the modern ones, Lombard, Scotus, and Aquinas, all confessed that the rule of faith was solely to be drawn from Scripture, whereas he found, according to the Council of Trent, that it might as well be drawn from human traditions. . . . The Church of Rome kept the rule of faith entire till it was changed by the Council of Trent. From that time he thought it a point of duty to forsake her communion, that the true Church, thus called out, might follow the Word of God." Life of Bernard Gilpin, p. 69, Gloucester, 1854, cited by Cramp, Text-book of Popery, ch. iii. Bellegrine (1621), perhaps the most famous of the theologians of the Romanist Church, has developed this theory more fully in his treatise De Verbo Divi. He divides it into the written and the unwritten word. The written word includes the Scriptures of the O. and N. T.; the unwritten is tradition, i.e. 1. direct tradition, including doctrines contained in the apostles' words and taught by them, but not recorded; 2. apocryphal tradition, doctrines taught by the apostles, but not recorded in their writings; 3. ecclesiastical tradition, including ancient customs and usages handed down in the Church. The necessity for these tru
ditions he maintains on the express ground of the insufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith and life (see, for instance in Scripture nor continenter expressa totam doctrinam necessariam sive de fide sive de moribus, De Verbo Dei, iv, 3). The substance of these passages is, that in the rule of faith tradition is an authority independent of Scripture, and in its respect equal to it in the Church for Möhler (Synderes, § 8) attempts to refine the Roman doctrine, but, in fact, disguises it under an ideal theory of his own, intended to be adapted to "the spirit of the age," or else inspired by it. But the substance of the Roman doctrine remains, in spite of his principle in his statement that the Church in which alone man arrives at the true understanding of Holy Writ. One of the latest and most skilful advocates of the Roman view is archbishop Manning, who, in his Grounds of Faith (London, 1852, §v6o), maintains that "universal tradition is the supreme interpreter of Scripture," and that this tradition is maintained only in the Church of Rome, of which the pope is the head and exponent. Dr. Schaff sums up the vices of the Romish doctrine of the rule of faith as follows: "The distinction between the divine and the human is unrecognised by it. This pantheistic feature runs through the whole system. In the respect shown towards the pope as lawfully holding and exercising the threefold office of Christ himself, too much is allowed, again, to human agency in the formation of the sacred Scriptures, by limiting the inspiration to the human ghost of its composition. Persons of such a rule, the uncertainty in its application would preclude the possibility of its being of any use. 8. Even if men in general are told that they need not inquire for themselves, but just receive what their 'authorised guides' choose to hold as necessary and binding. The Roman Church has for its object to subordinate the Bible totally, and to make it a subservient judge of truth, with power to determine at pleasure what is God's word and the doctrine of the Church, and to authenticate that which may go beyond its past decisions, even though, in the case of the Reformation and the Antinomians, it should be an actual deepening of the Christian consciousness himself" (Principle of Protestantism, p. 74).

(III.) The new Anglican Doctrine. The so-called "Tracts for the Times" of the Church of England adopted, almost at its beginning in Oxford, in substance, the Romish doctrine of the rule of faith; so, e. g., The Practical Dogmatic. The authors who wrote this series of tracts for the Times (No. 70): "Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it: Scripture is the document of tradition, the witness of it: Scripture and tradition, taken together, are the joint rule of faith. The truth was, that the men comprising this new party had already embraced several of the Romanist doctrines, and, not finding any warrant for them in Scripture, sought it in tradition. Thus Kebler (Sermon on Those who write such things) asserted that without tradition it would be impossible to demonstrate the doctrine of the "real presence," that of the "clergy as a distinct order," and that "consecration by apostolical authority is essential to the Eucharist" (see further in Goethe, Divine Rule of Faith and Practice, ii, 1846, some on these topics). His writings show that his object was the reform of Protestantism as a failure, and the Reformation as a schism; and the next step was to assert that the Scripture is both defective and obscure, and that many doctrines necessary to faith are not in Scripture at all, but must be learned from tradition, which is "partly the interpretation and partly the supplement of Scripture" (see an able article in the Princeton Rev. 1842, p. 508 sq.). Dr. Arnold remarks (Edinb. Rev. April, 1845), that, according to the Tractarian theory, the Scriptures are not the sole or a perfect rule of faith; they are to be supplemented by tradition; they furnish at best but the germ of an imperfectly developed Christiani
ty, which is to be found full blown and perfect somewhere. The Romanists (they can tell where) in the third, or fourth, or fifth, or sixth century, or what not, and the fathers have much to tell us of undoubted apostolical authority, which the apostles themselves have failed to tell. Infinite are the disputes which such a theory instantly gives rise to. In essence and spirit, the principle of the divinity of the Church is that it affirms both a written and an unwritten word; it differs only in the pleasant and gratuitously perplexing addition that it is impossible to assign the period within which the circle of Catholic verities may be supposed complete—the period when the slowly developed Church system became ripe, and had not yet become rotten. The unity of faith which is thus sought is farther off than ever, for the materials of discord are enlarged a thousand fold.
Church writers. According to the Protestant view, the Greek and Roman doctrine of the rule of faith takes away Christ, and puts an ecclesiastical corpora-
tion in his place. But Protestantism does not deny the value of tradition in transmitting Christian doc-
true; its value is inestimable. But it is not the rule of faith; it is a servant, not a master. In fact,
the question of the rule of faith is closely connected
that of the true idea of the Church, or, indeed,
identical with it in the last analysis. So, at the fourth
session of the Council of Trent, when the question of
 Scripts, led the Pope, Sixtus the fifth, Vincent
Cane, one of the members of the council, a Fran-
ciscan, "thought it would be preferable to treat of the
Church in the first instance, because Scripture derived
its authority from the Church. He added that if it
were once established that all Christians are bound to
obey the Church, and that the Church has the right to
say what the Bible is, that this was the only argu-
ment that would refute the heretics. "While Protestantism leads to Christ through the
Scriptures, and through Christ to the Church, Rome
pretends to lead through the Church to Christ and
the Scriptures; this doctrine is a conformity with revealed truth, that
of the Roman Catholic system the assumed infallibility of the Church.
In causa spiritualis necessario ad-
mitteremus a quiu suprems judex controversiarum (in
spiritual things there must be some final and su-
premum judge). The Augustinians, in the present instanta, is the
old postulate of those who contend for a visible Church
endowed with God's own infallibility. Grant them
their postulate, in their own sense of it, and the whole
theory of "Church principles," as the modern success-
ors of Hildebrand plausibly name their dogmas,
will inevitably follow. On the other hand, let it be
settled that the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone,
constitute the true rule of Christian faith and prac-
tice, and we shall have done forever with the juggling
priestcraft which has so long disgraced Christianity,
and which finds its only hope of support in ecclesiasti-
cal tradition. The question is a vital one. It is not
a mere matter of detail, about which men can differ at
pleasure; it is the Rubicon which separates Protest-
antism from Popery. It involves "a choice between
the Gospel of Christ as declared by himself and his
apostles, and that deadly apostasy which Paul in
his lifetime saw threatening—nay, the effects of which,
during his captivity, had nearly supplanted his own
gospel in the Asiatic churches, and which he declares
would come speedily with a fearful power of lying
wonders" (Stanley, Life of Arnold, ii. 110). The
Church, in fact, is to be the "interpreter of the
foundations of the prophets and the apostles; Christ
himself being the chief corner-stone;" according
to the traditionalist, upon the sands of antiquity as
well. From the beginning men have made the word
of God of none effect through their traditions. See
BIBLE, USE OF; FATHERS; INfallIBILITY; PROTES-
TANTISM; ROMANISM; and especially TRADITION
(Phil. 1841); Hawkins, Disquisition on Tradition
(Oxf. 1819, 8vo); Burnet, On 39 Articles; Browne, On
39 Articles; Forbes, On 39 Articles (each on art. vi).

FAITH AND REASON. Religion and science
express in the abstract and in the concrete the two
opposite poles of knowledge. In that vast field between
which must always be a difference, and has usually
been a discord. In all ages in which there has been any
notable activity of intelligence there has been a con-
trary, more or less violent, between the claims of
religious authority and the pretensions of human rea-
only, the stern solemnity of the Roman Fasii, the arbi-
trary credulities of Islamism, have all experienced
this phase of hostility, as well as Christianity, in the
various periods and forms of its dissemination. But
never has this war been more deadly in mode or in
severity than at the present moment, when the laws of
revelation are interpreted by insidious approaches,
and when science ejects its multitudinous batteries against all the ramparts of the Christian faith.
In other times, attempts, more or less unsuccessful,
have been made to restore natural amity between
the two great contending parties in these embittered
wars. There is no necessity now, so far as the Greeks
was an effort to explain the legendary sup-
iperstitions of Greece as to render them acceptable
to the enlightened doubts of Hellenic philosophy. See
EUSEBIUS. A second and more elaborate plan for
the maintenance of the existing reverence for the di-

gitudes of the pagan world was hazarded by the Neo-
Platonists. See NEO-PLATONISM. Both experiments
signally failed. In a much later period, with wholly
dissimilar weapons, and with much vaster interests at
stake, the illustrious Leibnitz undertook to reconcile
the religion and reason in a true and permanent sys-
tem, by the admission of a place for the classical elegance of its style, and for the vigor
and profundity of its argumentation. It was negative
in its character, and only offered a compromise. Such
was also the complexion of the admirable work of
bishop Butler on the Anatomy of Natural and Revealed
Religion. In the sequel, the gradual and, it may be
interpose as landmarks in the midst of the waves be-

tween the too-scepticism of the beginning and the
revolutionary atheism of the close of the 18th century.
The war has become more determined, even though it
may have gradually lost much of its earlier bitterness.
Extremists on both sides now declare that there is an
impossible antagonism between faith and science.
Ministers of religion may be found denouncing
the procedures and conclusions of science as "enmity
with God," and as incompatible with revealed truth; as if
the laws of the creation could be at variance with
the declarations of the Creator. Adept in scientific re-
search, on the other hand, proclaim the deceptive
and inanity of all religious doctrine as contradictory
to the clearly ascertained processes of the universe;
as if the phenomena of matter could controvert the
constitution of the human mind, and the incomparable
instincts, appetites, and requirements of the human
heart.

Yet, even in this apparently hopeless state of dis-
ord, renewed endeavors have been made to bring
the great adversary into the same curative path that
recent and the most notable of these is that of Herbert
Spencer, which is plausible in its pretensions, but most
delusive in its results. It is singularly insidious in
design and in execution. It betrays with a kiss, and
deals a mortal stab while inquiring, "How is it with
thee, my brother?" It recognises the universality,
the indefeasibility, the necessity of religious belief, 
admits the impossiibilitv of ignoring or dispelling 
the attributes of a Supreme Being, and yet attenuates ev
eything thus admitted till it sublimates these con
ceptions into a vaporous phantomism, a mist; chal
lenges the very constitution of the soul; revives 
the hallucination of the human mind under the perennial hy
pochondria of a morbid fancy. No suspension of arms has been obtained, because each party hopes for a 
decisive victory. But the prolongation and exacerbation of the most disastrous war is merely to 
the legitimate authority of religion, but to the equally legitimate demands of science. One portion of 
the Christian community is expelled from the prompt ac
ceptance and the zealous encouragement of the discov
eries of science by the apprehension that the bulwarks of 
revelation may be surrendered to an unprin
ning foe. Another portion rejects the teachings of the 
Church and of the Christian creed from disgust at an 
unreasoning and unreasonable opposition to science. 
A third party, intermediate between the two, extends a 
hand to both; surrenders whatever rational ques
tions may retain in a limited sense all 
that is essential in the dogmas of religion. Mean
while, those of vicious inclinations find an excuse for 
the indulgence of their passions and the rejection of 
moral restraints in an intelligent repudiation or in a 
denial of the basis of religion. The multitude, 
careless and stolid, pursues its private ambi
tions or personal whims without regard to the obliga
tions of this life, without concern for that great here
after which occupies no place in its thoughts. The 
conciliation of faith and science thus becomes more ur
gent than in any former time, and its urgency is in
creased by the difficulty of accomplishing it in the 
midst of contentions between reciprocally repel
tant combatants, armed on the one side with the thunders of 
the Almighty, the promises of heaven, and the terrors 
of hell, and on the other with the dazzling panoply of 
modern investigation, and with weapons reared 
with the laurels of a century of scientific achievements.

The re-establishment of fraternal union between two 
so widely alienated disputants must be an arduous and 
always a somewhat doubtful task. "Quis concordabilis 
tantum contrarietatis?" A mere truce will answer no 
inducement. It would simply convert the conflict into 
asore into a purulent condition of the whole system. 
The conciliation, to be efficient, must rest on an essen
tial harmony of principles, on a recognised dissimilar
ity of aims and applications. Even then the agree
ment is occasional and contingent rather than perma
nent; jealousies but room must be allowed for partial 
dissent, as in these high questions no more can be ex
pected than an unsteady complicity—discord conc
curs. Whether even this agreement is attainable must 
be uncertain till it has been attained; it may be re
served for that blessed expansion of our discernment 
when we shall no longer "see as through a glass darkly.
" But, in the mean time, there is a high obligation 
resting upon those who would repudiate neither the sanctifying influences of a holy life, nor the illumination of secular learning, to seek out the grounds of 
reconciliation, and press on to a changed and more arti
nal arts with theology. This seems to be the appropri
ate duty and the peculiar aspiration of the present 
are, and the imperfect or delusive efforts made in this 
direction indicate the latent consciousness that it is so. 
The ontological evidence, the watchwords of the oppo
nents, always precedes the solution of the great enigmas of 
humanity. Before any reasonable hope, however, of a 
satisfactory result can be entertained, it is necessary_to ascertain the conditions of the problem, and to dis
cover among the obvious and multitudinous discrepan
cies whether there is any essential identity between 
the opposing forces. If there is, there may be a pro-
pect of final accordance; if there is not, the antipathies are ineradicable and immeasurable.

The conditions under which the question presents itself are thus, the determination of the nature of the contending parties; the detection of any agreement in their intrinsic character; and the discernment of the 
causes of their opposition and diverse procedure. It 
becomes expedient, therefore, to ascertain the character and functions of faith and science respect
ively. This cannot be accomplished by any mode of 
more logical division and definition, because faith re
sides in our spiritual susceptibilities, and is incapable 
of verbal definition; and because science admits of 
no immutable boundaries, but "grows and grows and forever." But the character of each may be sufficiently 
described to permit the contradistinction of the two, 
to exhibit their contrasts, and to disclose any harmony 
that may exist between them.

Science is precise and assured, systematic knowledge, 
atained and co-ordinated by the application of human 
reasoning to admitted facts or observed phenomena. 
The conclusions of science are reached and are con
nected together by the discovery of the general prin
ciples which regulate the occurrence of the phenomena and reveal the conditions and relations of the prin
ciples are established by the employment of the two 
processes of deduction and induction; and science 
is the determination by the arts of reasoning of such 
knowledge as is apprehensible by the logical faculties 
of the human mind. The conclusions attained are 
more or less firmly believed according to the sufficien
cy or insufficiency of the reasoning; but, when firmly 
established, are believed on the strength of the evi
dence, and cannot be doubted except by remembering 
the finite power and comprehension, and consequent 
fallibility of the reasoning. Conviction, though properly—may, inevitably overlooked in the 
constitution and acceptance of scientific truth, can
not be safely disregarded in the estimation of the va
lidity and certainty of scientific procedure.

Faith is something more than rational belief—some
thing more firm and assured than scientific or philos
ophic conviction. Conviction is produced by the 
strength of the arguments adduced—by the influence of 
the demonstration or other evidence on the under
standing. Faith goes far beyond this, both in the as
surance conveyed, and in the disproportion between 
the text and the thing. For in faith not only "sees" but 
"believing," but he who "walks by faith" 
"walks not by sight." We believe in the results of 
science; we have faith in the truths of revelation. We 
believe that the earth is round; we have faith in the 
existence of God. We may in both cases entertain 
Conviction questions and scrutinize; faith confides, 
and does not cavil. The belief which is founded upon 
reasoning ponders the arguments propounded, the evi
dence presented; faith is itself "the substance of 
things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." 
This distinction may not be acceptable to persons of 
loose habits of thought, who employ words without dis
criminating their delicate shades of meaning; but it 
seems to be required by more than one passage of the 
New Testament, and is fully sustained by the mort 
acute, profound, and sagacious of the theologians, Thom
son (Quaestiones Theologicae, i. qu. ii, art. x; qu.
iv, art. i). It is of the essence of faith to transcend 
the logical evidence, to accept more than is contained in 
any logical premises, and to hold the tenet thus re
ainted with a more earnest tenacity than any demon
strative and inductive evidence could suggest. It is 
independent of evidence or testimony; but the co
gency of such proof is not intrinsic or indisputable in 
itself, but is derived from its acceptance, and from the 
submissive adherence of the recipient. It is "the Sprit
of truth" which "will guide you into all truth." 
This exposition may seem applicable to persons of 
religious faith, or to faith in supernatural truth; but it is with
faith of this kind that the controversy on the part of science is maintained. It is therefore in this domain that the essence of faith is to be specially considered. Nevertheless, a little reflection and examination will show that all faith possesses the same general charac-
teristics. The faith of science is no less the faith of a man, a naturally transcendent, and usually precedes the evidence; the faith which we hold in regard to the regular order of nature is manifest without thought of the argu-
ments by which that order is proved; the faith which we entertain in the necessity and generally beneficent action of the laws of nature is of equal force for us. Thus the founder of science, the most extreme of Transcendentalists, and the restorer of inductive philo-
sophy, concur in recognising that science is not self-
sustaining, but is dependent upon principles beyond the sphere of science. The foundations of science are isolated testimonies, but are merely echoes of the convic-
tions of philosophers of the most divergent schools (Plato, Timaeus, ch. i; Aristotle, Met., iii, 4; 5, 6; Theophrastus, Met.; v; Alex. Aphrodisias, Schol. in Aristotle, ed. Brandis, p. 523; 527, 605, 653; Asclepi-
dades, Ibid. p. 521; An, 662; 649; Lactantius, Divi-
tes, Med. ii; Spinosa, De la Reforme de l'Entendement, (Edition, ii, 281, ed. Saisset; ) Leibnitz, Opera, i, p. cxliv, cxi, ed. Dutens). A remarkable testimony to the same effect was recently (Aug. 1868) given by Prof. Tyndall in his introductory address before the Mathe-
matical Section of the British Association. They, he says, are identical in their foundations and in their point of de-
parture. It has been stated already that scientific rea-
soning proceeds by way of deduction or of induction. Deduction, however, proceeds from premises which are either established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-
sion of the uniformity of natural laws, are not induc-
tions; they are established by induction, or are received with-
out demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induc-
tion possible. First principles admit of neither defini-
tion nor proof. The conception of order, the admis-

innocence, the purity, and the heavenly illumination of his paternal home. But still the first lessons of faith—"the vision splendid"—of his youth—attend his course, return to his memory, recall his origin, and silently reclaim him to his early home.

When he has purged his guilt.

Science thus reposes on faith, upon principles of the same generic character as those which furnish the substance of religion; but it requires them only as premises in its reasoning, and soon left out and forgotten in its strictly ratiocinative development. It is willingly obvious of the fact that "there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy." Religion receives these and the like principles of faith as its commencement, beginning, and end.

Science commences where religion leaves off, but it is ushered into its career by faith.

These brief and undeveloped views may perhaps indicate the means of securing a valid conciliation of faith and reason, of religion and science, and of establishing the limits of their respective spheres, and the characteristics of their respective procedures. Interpreted as they have been here explained, their contrasts and functions remain distinctly marked, but they cease to be antagonistic, and have neither reason nor excuse for enmity.—Compare Shedd, History of Liberties, 1, 154 sq.; Chiébois, Stud. d. Krit., 1846, p. 993 sq.; La Morlaisie, 1846, Oct. 1846, p. 398 sq.; Study of the Gospels, p. 393; M'Cosh, Intuitions of the Mind, bk. ii, ch. i, and pt. iii, bk. ii, ch. v; Miles, Philosophical Theology (Charleston, 1830, 8vo).

Faith of Jesus, Sects of the (or Fathers of the Faith). An ecclesiastical order in the Church of the ancients. Piscanarii, T. is an enthusiastic, and formerly a soldier of the pope, under the authority of the archduchess Mariana. The intention of Piscanarii was to give to the Church a substitute for the order of the Jesuits, which had been suppressed by Clement XIV. The foundation of the society was laid by Piscanarii and twelve companions in 1784 at a villa near Spoleto, which a nobleman had offered to them for that purpose. The rule adopted by Piscanarii was almost identical with that of the Jesuits. Pope Pius VI, who was at that time kept a prisoner by the government of France in a monastery near Florence, sent to Piscanarii and authorized the new society, and recommended it to the pupils of the Propaganda whom the government of the Roman republic had expelled from their college. In 1793, Piscanarii, while on a visit to Rome, was arrested, together with several Jesuits, but they were discharged on the condition that they should leave the Roman territory. In the same year the "Society of the Sacred Heart," a society which had been established in 1794 by some ex-Jesuits for the purpose of reviving the order of the Jesuits under a different name, united, in consequence of an express order of the pope, with the Fathers of the Faith, and recognized Piscanarii as their superior. The latter, who up to this time had been a layman, now received minor orders at the hands of the papal nuncio in Vienna, and in 1800 was ordained priest. The society, which had already taken charges of foundling homes in Africa, established houses in Bavaria, Italy, France, England, and Holland, and in 1804 numbered about eighty members. Pope Pius VII was, however, not favorable to them. Some of the members joined the Jesuits, who had been restored, and (1804) in Naples, while others repudiated the authority of Piscanarii, and strove to establish themselves under the direct authority of the diocesan bishops. Piscanarii himself was summoned before an ecclesiastical court, and sentenced to life-long imprisonment.

The second invasion of Rome by the French restored to him his liberty, but the society was wholly dissolved in 1814, when its last members joined the order of the Jesuits, who in that year were restored for the whole Church. (Henroin-Fehr, Gesch. der Mönche-orden, ii, 62.)

Faithful. (1.) A title given in Scripture to Christians (1 Cor. iv. 17; Ephes. vi. 21, et al.). (2.) The term of the faithful (pideles), was the general and favorite name in the early Church to denote baptized persons. By this name they were distinguished, on the one hand, from the proselytes of the droma, such as were not Christians; and on the other, from the catechumens. (Bingham, Orig. Ecd. i. ch. iii, iv; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, bk. ii, ch. v.

Fakir (also spelled Faqiuh). This word, derived from the Arabic fakir (poverty), is used by the Arabs to designate those mendicant orders called by the Persians and Turks dervishes. By Europeans it is commonly used to denote certain Hindoo sects noted for asceticism and austerities. For a brief account of the Mohammedan Fakirs, see the article DERVISI.

We mention here, in addition, only a sect of them styled Caledizers, from the name of their founder, Santone Kalender, described by Knolles (History of the Turks) as Edircurers, whose motto is "This fakir is our to-morrow is his who may live to enjoy it," and in whose view the tavern is as holy as the mosque, and God as well pleased with their debaucheries, i. e. "liberal use of his creatures," as with the austerities of others (see D'Herbouet, s. v. Calender).

1. Caledizers. Although no religious devotees of this kind among the Mohammedans earlier than the 13th century after Christ, though the origin of Hindoo fakirism is by some writers referred back to Sakyamuni. See BUDDHISM. But a satisfactory explanation of the origin of fakirism may be found in that perverted human tendency which in all ages has sought to earn the favor of God and the praise of men through abstraction of the soul and chastenings of the flesh, and has been too prone to accord to such acts undue homage and sanctity. Nowhere has this tendency been more marked than among the imaginative and superstitious peoples of the East. The account which Strabo, on the authority of Megasthenes, Aristobulus, and others, has given us of the Gymnosophists, especially that class called by him Garmames, and by others Sarmanai or Sarmanai, shows that ascetics, very similar in modes of life, domes, and practices to those of the modern India, were found there at the time of Alexander's conquests. This conclusion is strengthened by the descriptions of Quintus Curtius, Arrian, Plutarch, Pliny, Clemens Alexandrinus, and other ancient authors, when treating of the philosophers of India. It seems not a mere speculative and metaphysical doctrine to the lack of the naked philosophers, so celebrated in ancient times, were, in an ethical sense at least, the progenitors of the modern Fakirs (see Heeren, Asiatic Nations, ii, 245, note).

Among the mendicant devotees who abounded in India at the date of the Mohammedan conquest we find the Fakirs mentioned as prominent in the veneration of the people, and exercising an almost unlimited influence over them; and frequent mention is made of these fanatics and their strange practices by the travellers who have described India since the period named. It has been estimated that there was in India 800,000 Mohammedan and 1,200,000 idolatrous Fakirs, while the number of both sorts is now estimated at 1,000,000. Fakirism, with other forms of superstitions fanaticism, seems to be rapidly losing ground under the influences and agencies which, since the prevalence of British rule, have been diffusing the light of the purer dogmas of the Gospel through India.

2. Sects or Fraternities. They are divided into sects or orders, each differing from the others more or less in dress, habits, etc. One was established in 1578, organized and the number of their fraternities, the accounts of travellers and other authorities in this re-
pect seem conflicting and fragmentary. Without attempting any precise classification, we may group them under two heads: 1. Those living in communities, either in convents, as Western monks, or wandering about in small groups; and 2. Those living singly, as hermits or as vagabond mendicants, passing from place to place, practising the arts and tricks of their order, and receiving from the credulous superstition of the people the entertainment and alms provided at public expense in the villages for their entertainment. Their other trades are long distances by rolling on the ground, receiving his food and drink from the hands of the people; one makes the singular vow to perform a long journey by rolling himself along as a sort of cart-wheel: having for this purpose fastened his wrist and ankles together, and caused a tire, made of chopped straw, mud, and cow-dung, to be fastened along the ridge of his back-bone, with a bamboo-stick passed through the angle made by his knees and elbows for an axle, he rolls himself to the first village on his route, where he is received with demonstrations of joyous respect, and conducted to the tank or well for ablation. A certain what house of the village promises the last cheer, thither he repairs, and there remains until the supplies fail. He then repeats the process of preparation, and journeys to another place. Some fakirs have combined traffic with their religious pilgrimages, and made a business of it, and have built colonies and considerable trade. Articles, carried in their belts and clothing, have made great gains in the pelf of the world which they so much affect to despise. The lives of some, perhaps, comport with the spirit of sanctity and self-denial professed, but most of them are in secret addicted to gross vices, and whenever favorable opportunity, on the pride and cruelty of their hearts display themselves.

4. Literature.—Strabo, § 712-719; Arrianus, Inoec. cap. xii; Quintus Curtius, lib. vii, cap. i x.; Plutarch, Visa Alexandri, Pliny, Hist. Nat. lib. vii, cap. i x.; Clemenes Alexandrinus, Stromata, lib. i, 96 d.; Boehlen, Das Alte Indische Cemn, Mythologia, iii, 225-30 (Bohn's ed. 1854); India, Iconographic Encylopedia, iv, 12-13 (New York, 1851); Herbelot, Bibliotheca Orientale, s. v. Fakir and Calender; Ennemoyer, History of Magic, i, 205-10 (Bohn's ed. 1848).

5. Peculiar Doctrines and Austerities.—The profession of poverty constitutes a fundamental principle of fakirism, as the name itself indicates. One author says the quality which God most loves in his creatures is poverty; and tradition reports Mohammed as saying, it is the poor whose hands are filled daily by the expenditure of valuables; that he that feedeth the poor shall be fed, and that the eyes in deep concentration of the soul to the point of the nose, and now the white light appears" (Ennemoyer, i, 205-6).

The Fakirs, or Yogoes, of the Senoose tribe travel over Hindostan, living on the charity of the other Fakirs. They are sometimes naked, but are generally clad in sable, or other silken, or other robus, handsome men. They admit proselytes from the other tribes, especially youths of bright parts, and take great pains to instruct them in their mysteries. Collected in large bodies, and armed, they make pilgrimages to sacred places, laying the country under contribution. Led by an old man endued with vast prestige, the Gargis and the Guises, two orders of Fakirs, as travelling armed, and in troops of thousands. The Iconographic Encyclopaedia (iv, 235) names three classes of Hindoo ascetics, viz. Sancha or Sanasha, Fakir, and Pomanana.

FALASHAS (Jewish). A large and peculiar race inhabiting the old home of Semen, on the shores of the Tana Sea, near Gondar and the mountainous regions of northern Abyssinia. The word Falaasha means exile, and sufficiently indicates that they were not natives of the soil. They have a skin more or less dark, without peculiar distinction between the two; they are the dominant language of the country—the Amharic, and a dialect of the Agmon language. They possess the whole of the Jewish Canon (O. T. Canon) in the Gueze language (a sister language of the Hebronine language of men, one has kept his arms in one position until they shrivelled up; another has kept his hands clasped together until the nails grew through the flesh. Some have buried themselves up to their chins in pits, and thus remained for days; others have imprisoned themselves for life in iron cages; one has had his cheeks and tongue pierced with a sharp iron, kept in its place by another passing under the chin; another wore a second link of which passed through the tenderest part of the body, the penis; one bears on his neck a heavy yoke, with heavy weights in his hands; another lies down on a bed of iron spikes; one suspends himself head downwards over a fire until his scalp is burned to the bone; another traverses long distances by rolling on the ground, receiving his food and drink from the hands of the people; one makes the singular vow to perform a long journey by rolling himself along as a sort of cart-wheel: having for this purpose fastened his wrists and ankles together, and caused a tire, made of chopped straw, mud, and cow-dung, to be fastened along the ridge of his back-bone, with a bamboo-stick passed through the angle made by his knees and elbows for an axle, he rolls himself to the first village on his route, where he is received with demonstrations of joyous respect, and conducted to the tank or well for ablation. A certain what house of the village promises the last cheer, thither he repairs, and there remains until the supplies fail. He then repeats the process of preparation, and journeys to another place. Some fakirs have combined traffic with their religious pilgrimages, and made a business of it, and have built colonies and considerable trade. Articles, carried in their belts and clothing, have made great gains in the pelf of the world which they so much affect to despise. The lives of some, perhaps, comport with the spirit of sanctity and self-denial professed, but most of them are in secret addicted to gross vices, and whenever favorable opportunity, on the pride and cruelty of their hearts display themselves. —Rep. of Egypt, 1276, II, 779. —The Fakirs are said to have a system of thought similar to that of the Heretics of the middle ages. —They are said to be an evil influence on the people of Abyssinia. —They have a peculiar form of worship, resembling the Canaanite worship. —They are said to have a peculiar form of worship, resembling the Canaanite worship. —They have a peculiar form of worship, resembling the Canaanite worship. —They have a peculiar form of worship, resembling the Canaanite worship. —They have a peculiar form of worship, resembling the Canaanite worship.
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brew, Arabic, and Aramean dialects, and from which the Amharic is derived), together with the apocryphal books accepted by the Abyssinian Church. Their priests, who live round the inclosures of the temple (which are situated near the edge of the Falasha villages, and have more the appearance of the ancient sanctuary than modern synagogues) observe the laws of purity with rigor, prepare their own food, and keep aloof from the world. They are principally engaged in the education of youth, making the Bible and the traditional practices the basis of their instruction. The Falashas deviate from Jewish usages in many respects. Thus the fringes, prayer-shawls, &c. (psalter, q. v.), the phylacteries (q. v.), are not used in their devotions. They retain the usage of offering sacrifices, but rather as commemorative ceremonies than as real sacrifices; the most common is the offering for the repose of the dead. No sacrifices can be offered on the Sabbath or on the day of atonement. The Falashas, with all other Jewish sects, hope for a return to the sacred city, Jerusalem. While polygamy is not forbidden by law, it is nevertheless censured. They have a special hatred of slave-dealers, yet slavery is tolerated among them; they instruct their slaves in the law of Moses, and manumiss them on conversion. They are a very industrious race, and have the reputation of being good farmers. They are also able warriors (many fought under King Theodore in the late Abyssinian war), and are averse to commerce, which they regard as an obstacle to fidelity and rigor in religious observances. The Falashas were formerly governed by an independent prince, whose residence was in the fastness of Alina Gideon, and it is only since 1860, after the extinction of the race of their original masters, that they have passed under the dominion of the princes of Tigray. They claim that their ancestors settled in Abyssinia as early as the time of Solomon, and it is that they came much later. The knowledge of Hebrew they have lost. In 1867, the central committee of the Jewish Alliance Universelle, which has its seat in Paris, sent M. Leon Halévy to Abyssinia to make a tour of research among the Falashas, and report on what might be done for their education, with a special view to counteracting the influence of the Christian missionaries who had been sent out from India. After his return, M. Halévy wrote, in July, 1868, a very interesting report on the Falashas, and announced the publication of an Essay on the Falasha," which will undoubtedly be the first thorough work on the subject. He brought with him a young Falasha, who will be educated in France.—"Pierer, Universal Lexicon, vi, 79; Israelites, vol. xvi, No. 21 and 25. (J. F. W.)

Falcandus, Hegu, a distinguished historian, lived in the 12th century. According to the Benedictine authors of the work L'Art de Véirer les Dames, he was a native of France (his original name being Fulcan- dus or Foucault); accompanied his patron Stephen de la Perche, archbishop of Palemon, and grand-uncle of the king William II, to Sicily, and finally became abbot of St. Denys, 1182. Gibbon is of opinion that he was a native of Sicily. His celebrated work, Historia Sicula, which procured for him the surname of the Sicilian Tacitus, was published in 1189 or 1190, and is of great importance, for the Church history of that period.—Weitzer u. Welsle, Kirch.-Lex. iv, 865.

Falcon, a bird of the hawk tribe, anciently trained to assist in hunting, and still used in the East for the same purpose. Dr. Thomson (Lam. i, 4 sq.) thus speaks of the practice in Palestine: "The beg at the castle of Tilim, which we are now approaching, always keeps several of these large falcons on their perches in his grand reception-hall, where they are tended with the utmost care. They have been out on the mountains to tame them, and it is a most exciting scene. The emirs sit on their horses, holding the birds on their wrists, and the woods are filled with their retainers, beating about and shouting, to start up and drive toward them the poor partridges. When near enough, the falcon is launched from the hand, and swoops down upon his victim like an eagle hasting to the prey. After he has struck its quarry, the falcon flies a short distance, and lights on the ground, amidst the redoubled shouts of the sportsmen. The keeper darts forward, secures both, cuts the throat of the partridge, and allows his caper to suck its blood. This is his reward. Now standing the exhilaration of the sport, I could never endure the falcon himself. There is something almost satanic in his eye, and in the ferocity with which he drinks the warm life-blood of his innocent victim. I once saw some men of Tortosa catching the Syrian quail with a small hawk. This was done on foot, each sportsman carrying his bird on the right wrist, and beating the bushes with a stick held in his left hand. These quails are less than the American; are migratory, coming hero in early spring, and passing on to the north. They hide under the bushes, and will not rise on the wing unless forced to do so by a dog, or by the hunter himself. I was surprised to see how quickly and surely the little hawk seized his game. His reward also was merely the blood of the bird. I do not know whether or not the Jews in ancient days were acquainted with falconry. They are notmentioned and there is no complaint that Saul hunted for his blood as one doth hunt for a partridge in the mountains (1 Sam. xxvi, 20); and this hunting of the same bird on these mountains, and giving their blood to the hawk, reminds one of the sad complaint of the persecuted son of Jesse. In the neighborhood of Aleppo the smaller falcon is taught to assist the sportsman to capture the gazelle. Neither horse nor greyhound can overtake these fleet creatures on the open desert, and therefore the Arabs have taught the hawk to fasten on their forehead, and blind them by incessant flapping of their wings. Bewildered and terrified, they leap about at random, and are easily captured. They are also trained to attack the bustard in the same region. This bird is about as large as a turkey, and highly prized by the lovers of game; but, as they keep on the vast level plains, where there is nothing to screen the cautious hunter, it is almost impossible to get within gunshot of them. When they rise in the air, the little falcon flies up from beneath and fastens on one of their wings, and then both come whirling over and over to the ground, when the hunter quickly seizes the bustard, and delivers his brave bird from a position not particularly safe or comfortable. They will even bring down the largest eagle in the
same way; but in this desperate game they are sometimes torn to pieces by the insulted majesty of the feathered kingdom." See Hawk.

FALCONER, THOMAS, A.M., a Church of England divine, was born at Bath in 1771; was made fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1794, and died in 1869. He published The Restoration of our Saviour (1786); Eight Discourses on the alleged Discourses in the Gospels, in reply to Everson (q. v.) (Hampstead Lecture, Ox., 1811, 8vo); --The Case of Eusebius of Cesarea (London, 1823, 8vo); and other critical and historical writings.

Faldistorium or Fald-stool, a stool folding like a camp-stool, formerly used in the inthronization of bishops, and in coronations, both for sitting and kneeling. In modern times the name is improperly given to a small stool at which, in some English churches, the Litany is read. In those churches in which it is used it is generally placed in the middle of the choir near the steps of the communion-table. The name is probably from faldum, plica, and stool, sedes. --Masskell, Mem. Ritu. ii, 96; Siegel, Altertümern, iii, 453.

Falkner, Thomas, a missionary Jesuit, the son of an eminent surgeon at Manchester, England, was born at Manchester about 1710, and was bred to his father's profession. He visited Buenos Ayres, and falling ill there, was nursed by the Jesuits, and under the influence of their kindness was led to abandon the Presbyterian Church in which he had been brought up, to enter the Roman Church, and to join the order of Jesuits. He devoted himself to missionary labors, in which his medical skill was of great use. He spent forty years in this service in various parts of South America. After the suppression of the order he returned to England, where he died January 30, 1784. He wrote a Description of Patagonia (London, 1774, 4to) -- Botanical and other Observations in America (4 vols. fol.). -- Migne, Dict. des Biog. Chr. s. v.

Fall of Man, a phrase which "does not occur in Scripture, but is probably taken from the book of Wisdom, chap. x. 1. It is a convenient term to express the fact of the revolt of our first parents from God, and the consequent sin and misery in which they and their posterity were involved."

I. Scriptural Account of the Fall. (1.) The Mosaic account is (Gen. ii, iii), that a garden having been planted by the Creator for the use of man, he was placed in it to dress it and to keep it; that in this garden two trees were specially distinguished, one as the tree of life, the other as the tree of knowledge of good and evil; that Adam was put under the following prohibition by his Maker (Gen. ii, 16, 17) -- "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" that the serpent, who was more subtle than any beast of the field, tempted the woman to eat, by denying that death would be the consequence, and by assuring her that her eyes and those of her husband should be opened, and that they should have wisdom, knowing good and evil;" that the woman took of the fruit, gave it to her husband, who also ate; and that for this act of disobedience they were expelled from the garden, made subject to death, and laid under various maledictions.

(2.) Whether this account be a literal history or not, has been matter of great discussion, not merely between Christians and unbelievers, but also among Christian interpreters. One theory is that the passage is an allegory, signifying the origin of sin in the sin of Adam, under which the apprentices of man were allowed to obtain supremacy over his higher powers. Another (later) view makes the narrative mythical. The general current of Christian interpretation has held the passage to be historical, and has interpreted it literally. Philo Judaeus (c. 40), speaking of the account of Genesis, says: "These a sort of fable seem to me to be symbolical; not mere fabulous inventions like those of the poets and sophists, but rather types shadowing forth allegorical truth according to some mystical explanation." So he makes the serpent the symbol of pleasure, etc. (On the Creation of the World, 26, transl. London, 1803, p. 459, note.)

Among the early Church writers, Clement considers the narrative of the Fall partly as fact and partly as allegory (Strom. v, 11, p. 689, 90), and, following Philo, makes the serpent the image of volupptuousness. Origens regards the account as allegorical (De pr. iv, 16; Contra Cels. iv, 40; comp. also Origin, Frag. in Gen. ad loc.). Ireneus held the passage to be historical; so also Tertullian, adm. Judaeos, ii, 184; De vig. reg. xi; adm. Marc. ii, 2. He insists upon the literal interpretation of the particulars of the narrative, as they succeeded each other in order of time (De resurr. cum. 61: Adam ante nomina animalibus ac seminavi, quam de arcuro decrepsit; ante etiam prophetavit, quam voravit). The Gnostics made it allegorical or mythical. On the Gnostic (Basilidian) doctrine of the Fall (inivos όρχείον), compare Clem. Strom. ii, 20, p. 488; Gieseker, Christliche Urkunden (1830), p. 286. The author of the Clementine Homilies goes so far in idealizing Adam, as to convert the historical person into a purely mythical being (like the Adam-Cadmon of the Cabalists), while he represents Eve as far inferior to him. Hence Adam could not trespass, but sin makes its first appearance when Eve transgresses; Baur, Gnose, p. 61, note. (In the church history, History of Doctrina, § 61). Among the later fathers, and in the scholastic period, the account was generally held to be historical. Augustine (De Civitate Dei, xiii, 21) asserts the historical verity of the narration, but adds that true spiritual and typical meanings are contained in it; e. g. Paradise in the Church, the tree of knowledge is the type of free-will, etc.

The theologians of the Reformation followed the Scholastics in adhering to the literal interpretation, but differ in the exposition of several parts of the narrative c. e. g. the serpent is held by some to be a natural serpent; by others, Satan in the guise of a serpent, etc. Calvin (Commentary on Genesis iii) speaks as follows: "It appears, perhaps, scarcely consonant with reason that the serpent only should be here brought forward, all mention of Satan being suppressed. I acknowledge, indeed, that from the time of Adam alone nothing more can be collected than that men were deceived by the serpent. But the testimonies of Scripture are sufficiently numerous in which it is plainly asserted that the serpent was only the mouth of the devil, for not the serpent, but the devil, is declared to be 'the father of lies,' the fabricator of lies, and the author of death. The question, how-
ever, is not yet solved why Moses has kept back the name of Satan. I willingly subscribe to the opinion of those who maintain that the Holy Spirit then purposely used obscure figures, because it was fitting that full and clear light should be reserved for the kingdom of God. At any rate, the time the prophecies were written, they were well acquainted with the meaning of Moses when, in different places, they cast the blame of our ruin upon the devil. We have elsewhere said that Moses, by a homely and uncultivated style, accommodates what he delivers to the capacity of the people, and for not longer prose than would suit him to instruct an untaught race of men, but the existing age of the Church was so puerile that it was unable to receive any higher instruction. There is, therefore, nothing absurd in the supposition that they whom, for the time, we know and confess to have been but as infants, were fed with milk. Or (if another more acceptable) Moses is by no means to be blamed if he, considering the office of schoolmaster as imposed upon him, insists on the rudiments suitable to children. They who have an aversion to this simplicity must of necessity condemn the whole economy of God in regard to man. A similar view is given by Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy* (Philadelphia, 1861), p. 174 sq. The modern extreme Rationalists generally interpret the narrative as mythical. Eichhorn (*Ubersicht *) finds truth in it in the form of poetry, that is, he regards it as a homily or didactic passage, and others, as Kant, Schelling, and other recent German philosophers and interpreters make it a "speculative myth." Von Bohlen (*On Genesis iii*) follows Rosenmüller in supposing that the narrator had the Zendavesta in view. Julius Müller gives up the historical character of the narrative, if now, he says, we turn to the narrator in the book of Genesis, we shall find that not sin, but physical suffering and death, are there connected with Adam's fall. This fact, and this lesson that man's ruin originated in himself, are the great truths which are to be gathered from the story, which must be regarded as fundamental, if true, although the story is in the form of a fable. That it is not to be taken literally is plain from Scripture, for the story in Genesis speaks of the serpent as the agent in the temptation of Eve. St. Paul speaks of the same temptation as coming from Satan. It is usual to assume that the serpent was the mere instrument of Satan, but there is nothing to lead us to this view in the words of the narrative. St. Paul, by interpolating this into the narrative, shows us that it is not to be taken as literally true. We find in John viii, 44, "the devil was a murderer from the beginning," an allusion to the man by the temptation. If this be so, it is a plain reference to Satan as the cause of man's bodily death. To bring in the idea of spiritual death seems less appropriate, for our Lord was rebuking the murderous intentions of the Jews. It was through conduct like that of the devil that they showed themselves his children" (*Doctrine of Sin*, Edinb. 1869, p. 78, 79).

The more recent German interpreters of the better class (e.g. Haverwick, Delitzsch, Keil, etc.) admit the historical character of the account, but there are, of course, various theories among them as to its interpretation. Martensen (*Christian Dogmatik*, vol. ii, 79-83) interprets the Mosaic account as a combination of history and sacred symbolism, a figurative representation of an actual event. Lange (*On Amest*, sn. p. 209) speaking of the narrative, says: "Like the Hebrews, who, as Friere remarks, especially in the primitive traditions of Genesis, it is a historical fact, to be taken in a religious-ideal, that is, a symbolical form. It is just as little a mere allegory. It is just as little a mere figure, as the speaking of the serpent is a literal speaking, or as the tree of life, in itself regarded, is a plant whose eating imparted imperishable life. That sin began with the beginning of the race, that the first sin had its origin in a forbidden enjoyement of nature, and not in the Cainitic fratricides or similar crimes, that the origin of human sin points back to the beginning of the human race, that the woman was ever more seducible than the man, that along with sin came in the tendency to sin, consciousness of sin, and the inclination to sin; all these are affirmations of the religious historical consciousness which demand the historicism of our tradition, and would point back to such some fact, even though it were not written in Genesis."

The interpretations of the *serpent* have been very varied. Even the moderns, as we have seen, for not longer prose than would suit him to instruct an untaught race of men, sea calls the evil spirit (gēros, φαινώ) by the name of "serpent," as he is "full of poison and malice." Adam Clarke (*Commentary on Genesis*, ch. iii) interprets the word *yāshā* (rendered "serpent") to mean "a creature of the ape or ourang-outang kind." His notes on the whole of the story of Genesis iii, 14-15 is a word of exegesis. We cite Lange (*Genesis*, Amer. ed. p. 229) as follows: "True it is that the serpent appears as the probable author of this temptation, but such probability is weakened by what is said in l, 25 cor ii, 20. The serpent was a good creature of God, though different, as originally created, from what it afterwards became" (Delitzsch). As a type, the serpent is just as well the figure of health and renovation as of death, since every year it changes its skin, and ejects, moreover, its venom. This double peculiarity makes the serpent, as the great serpent (tētā, Ps. xix, 12), inarguable, is indicated not only in language, but also in myths, in sculpture, and in modes of worship. In this relation, however, we must distinguish two diverging views of the ancient peoples. To the Egyptian reverence for the serpent stands in opposition the abhorrence for it among the Latins (see *Serpent*). Greeks, Persians, and Germans. "That Satan made use of the serpent, and that a serpent was somehow employed, is likely; the language of Jehovah subsequently, while it was literally true of the instrument, being in a higher sense true of the agent, the one being man, the other Divine. The serpent of the terms in which the serpent was addressed: 'Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.' 'The serpent, perhaps,' says Gill, 'formerly moved in a more erect posture, but was doomed to lick the dust.' 'Probably his original residence and food, as we say another, were in the trees, but now he is degraded to the earth.' That sentence evidently, whatever might be its literal application to the serpent, was eminently meant of Satan himself. 'Plainly figurative,' says Dwight, 'to express a state of peculiar degradation and suffering' (Wardlaw, *System of Theology*, vol. ii, ch. viii). (See also as does Holden, *Disertation on the Fall* (Lond. 1829, 8vo). Conyers Middleton (*Essay on the Allegorical and Literal Interpretation of the Fall*, Works, vol. i, ch. iv, ch. ii). Comp. Pye Smith, *First Lines of Theology*, bk. iv, ch. ii. A writer in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (i, 361 sq.) seeks to show that the common opinion that the serpent was the instrument of the tempter is untenable, on the ground that the Scripture does not state that the serpent was an instrument impregnated with literal application of the words of the narrative to a serpent as the instrument of Satan appears to be incon
sistent with the present relation of the serpent to other animals, and also with the testimony of geology as to fossil remains, &c. He maintains that under the name serpent Satan is meant, as there were "probable grounds for a mental tradition that during the earliest ages, the name of the Evil One, reflecting the conception of him that then prevailed." Bishop Newton (Disser. on Creation and Fall, 1st edit.) takes a similar view, viz. that Satan is spoken of in the passage under the "well-known" symbol or hieroglyphic of the serpent, as a proper name, in contradistinction to the deceiver of mankind, as in popular estimation it was held to be the most cunning and insidious of animals. Sherlock (Use and Intent of Prophecy, diss. iii.) refers to the "common usage of Eastern countries, which, to clothe history in parables and similitudes;" and remarks that "it seems not improbable that for this reason the history of the fall was put into the dress in which we now find it. The serpent was remarkable for an insidious cunning, and therefore stood as a proper emblem of a deceiver; and yet, being one of the lowest of God's creatures, the emblem gave no suspicion of any power concerned that might pretend to rival the Creator." What was the particular nature of the sin of our first parents it is not an easy matter to determine. Bishop Newton remarks (l. c.) that "eating forbidden fruit is nothing more than the act of disobedience, as it is the same thing to resist the preachers wherein the history of the fall was recorded before the use of litters. It was plainly the violation of a divine prohibition; it was indulging an unlawful appetite; it was aspiring after forbidden knowledge, and pretending to be wise above their condition. So many reasons there are to believe that if we had been wilder and lost ourselves in search of more particulars." In a later edition of this dissertation (Works, i, 91), bishop Newton modified the statement above given, and gave his adherence to the view that a real serpent was concerned in the fall (see Quarry, On Genesis). Bishop Pearson accords, and adds, "If we abide by the original narration, we may say that the serpent is the allegorical designation for a moral evil, which opposed itself to man in temptation." Dörnten-bach (in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xx, 209, art. Sünde) maintains that the serpent was a real serpent, the tree a real tree, etc. Quarry gives a copious dissertation on Paradise and the Fall in his Genesis and its Authorship, where he clearly explains the allegorical nature of the text and withdraws the scriptural statements "altogether from the range of physical interpretation." He cites a remark of Hengstenberg's (Christologie, th. i, abt. i, p. 26, ed. 1829), to the effect that if the serpent be symbolical, the whole history is symbolical, as, in a connected passage like this, unity of interpretation must prevail; and it is not allowable to follow at one moment the symbolical, and at the next moment the literal interpretation. Admitting the truth of this, Quarry states that, nevertheless, the narrative may be, as a whole, not simply an apologue illustrating true principles; but may be inspired by great facts, represented symbolically. He interprets the tree of life (comp. Rev. ii, 7; xxii, 2, 14), and the eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, as mystical; the former denoting the promise of eternal life conditioned on man's obe-dience, the latter, the loss of the same knowledge in the event of its moral consequences, consciousness of guilt and shame. He maintains that the supposition of a real serpent is untenable, as there is no ground for the belief that Satan can possess at will any living creature, or work such a miracle as to make a serpent speak. A natural serpent is literally spoken of, but this natural serpent is only the symbol of the real tempter; otherwise the innocent animal receives all the punishment, while the really guilty tempter escapes. The real sin itself must have arisen at some point at which "natural appetite passed into that stage of its progress when, as St. James says, lust has conceived, and at which the sin thus conceived has quickened into activity. This point, in the mystery which envelopes every beginning of initiative in the human mind, in material, or of, thought, act, or substance, was the real fall, and is better represented by the mystical symbol of the participation of forbidden fruit than by a historical narrative that should only specify the overt act in words to be taken in their literal and general sense, as of the deceiver of mankind, as in popular estimation it was held to be the most cunning and insidious of animals. Sherlock (Use and Intent of Prophecy, diss. iii.) refers to the "common usage of Eastern countries, which, to clothe history in parables and similitudes;" and remarks that "it seems not improbable that for this reason the history of the fall was put into the dress in which we now find it. The serpent was remarkable for an insidious cunning, and therefore stood as a proper emblem of a deceiver; and yet, being one of the lowest of God's creatures, the emblem gave no suspicion of any power concerned that might pretend to rival the Creator." What was the particular nature of the sin of our first parents it is not an easy matter to determine. Bishop Newton remarks (l. c.) that "eating forbidden fruit is nothing more than the act of disobedience, as it is the same thing to resist the preachers wherein the history of the fall was recorded before the use of litters. It was plainly the violation of a divine prohibition; it was indulging an unlawful appetite; it was aspiring after forbidden knowledge, and pretending to be wise above their condition. So many reasons there are to believe that if we had been wilder and lost ourselves in search of more particulars." In a later edition of this dissertation (Works, i, 91), bishop Newton modified the statement above given, and gave his adherence to the view that a real serpent was concerned in the fall (see Quarry, On Genesis). Bishop Pearson accords, and adds, "If we abide by the original narration, we may say that the serpent is the allegorical designation for a moral evil, which opposed itself to man in temptation." Dörnten-bach (in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xx, 209, art. Sünde) maintains that the serpent was a real serpent, the tree a real tree, etc. Quarry gives a copious dissertation on Paradise and the Fall in his Genesis and its Authorship, where he clearly explains the allegorical nature of the text and withdraws the scriptural statements "altogether from the range of physical interpretation." He cites a remark of Hengstenberg's (Christologie, th. i, abt. i, p. 26, ed. 1829), to the effect that if the serpent be symbolical, the whole history is symbolical, as, in a connected passage like this, unity of interpretation must prevail; and it is not allowable to follow at one moment the symbolical, and at the next moment the literal interpretation. Admitting the truth of this, Quarry states that, nevertheless, the narrative may be, as a whole, not simply an apologue illustrating true principles; but may be inspired by great facts, represented symbolically. He interprets the tree of life (comp. Rev. ii, 7; xxii, 2, 14), and the eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, as mystical; the former denoting the promise of eternal life conditioned on man's obe-dience, the latter, the loss of the same knowledge in the event of its moral consequences, consciousness of guilt and shame. He maintains that the supposition of a real serpent is untenable, as there is no ground for the belief that Satan can possess at will any living creature, or work such a miracle as to make a serpent speak. A natural serpent is literally spoken of, but this natural serpent is only the symbol of the real tempter; otherwise the innocent animal receives all the punishment, while the really guilty tempter escapes.
ture, shines from the cradle of the race—what then have you to say, ye manufacturers of myths, ye who would profane the revelation of God?" (Herder, aelt. Urkunde der Menschengeschichte; Werke, Carlraube, 1827, v. 187; vi. 4).

II. Doctrinal Import of the Narrative. — Whatever views we take of the nature of the narrative in Gen. ii, iii, all who believe it to be a record of divine revelation find in it the following points of doctrine:

1. That God, after creating man, placed him in a state of probation; 2. that the test of his probation was obedience to the divine law; 3. that the temptation to disobey was from an evil power of man; and 4. that the temptation appealed both to the intellect and to the senses, leading first to unbelief in God, secondly to putting "self" in place of God, and thereby to the beginning of evil lust; 5. that in the exercise of free will man yielded and sinned; 6. that the consequences of the sin were knowledge of good and evil, and separation from God, and death, the curse lighting upon man and upon nature also. Auberlen, referring to the three constitutions of the first sin named above, viz. unbelief, self-love, and lust, remarks as follows: "The first idea of the sin is not accidental, but substantially expulsive and exhaustive, is shown not only in the fact that all sin that comes before us in life may be referred to them, but also in the fact that they correspond to the three fundamental elements of man's being and consciousness—spirit, soul, and body. Unbelief is self-consciousness, self-love is self-consciousness, and both are opposed by world-consciousness. These have all become corruptcd and perverted. They have become, respectively, alienation from God, selfishness, love of the world. The first and highest element of human nature—the spiritual—is neglected, obscured, made powerless; the two others—the lower—are pushed into extreme but unhealthy prominence of activity. Man has become physically and physically. Unbelief is the negative, the union of self-seeking and the lust of the senses is the positive element in the idea of sin. Man no longer wishes for God; he is bent on having the creature in both ways, the material and the natural, the subjective and objective; he will have his own ego and the world too. According to Gen. iii, 5, 6, the selfishness is, as it were, the soul; sensuousness, the body of sin: the first is the deep, invisible root; the second, the external manifestation. The ego, separated from God, seeks in the world the elements on which it lives. Genesis thus comprehends the various opposing theories of man on the nature of sin, the theory of selfishness, which in recent times is represented by Julius Müller, and that of the senses by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. The ethical theory is but an attempt to a religious basis, and in that matter modern thought has a great deal to learn" (Divine Revelation, Edinb. 1887, p. 184).

The theological question of the connection between the sin of Adam and that of the whole human race will be treated under the article IMPUTATION; Sixth, the specific loss of man by the fall, in the theological sense, involving the difference between the Roman Catholic anthropology and the Protestant, see IMAGE OF GOD; JUSTIFICATION; Sixth. In this place we give the views of the various as to the general doctrinal significance of the narrative. Lange (On Genesis, Am. ed., p. 73 sq.) remarks that "the significance of Paradise is this, that it declares the original ideal state of the earth and the human race, the unity of the particular and the general, the unity of spirit and nature, the unity of spiritual innocence and the physical harmony of nature, the unity of the fall and the disturbance of nature; lastly, the unity of the facts and their symbolical meaning, which both the bare literal and mythical explanations of the records fail to answer." The doctrine of knowledge of good and evil existed in some form, but with all nature is in some measure designated as a test, but the serpent, as the organ of that temptation, is not only the type of temptation and of sin, but, as originally a worm, the type of its brutality, its degradation, and its subjection. The record of the actual fall stands there as an eternal judgment upon the theological, the human, view of moral evil, especially upon the error of Duhamel and Manselheim, Pelagianism and Pantheism. Hence arises the number of objections which the most diverse systems in old and modern times have raised against this record. The earthly origin of evil out of the abuse of freedom offends dualism, which derives it from an evil deity, or from Satan, or from free choice of man. Although the serpent sustains the doctrine that, prior to the fall of man, sin had existed in a sphere on the other side, working through demonsiac agency upon this (for the serpent was not created evil, Gen. i, 26; generally not even fitted for evil, and can only be regarded, therefore, as the origin of a far different evil power), yet the visible picture of the fall in this sphere is a certain sign that the fall in that sphere could only have risen through the abuse of the freedom of the creature. But if we observe the progress of sin from the first sin of Eve to the crucifixion of Christ; if we view the opposition between Cain and Abel, and the sacrifice of the moral freedom of Cain himself, so the Augustinian view, raising original sin to absolute original death, receives its illumination and its just limits. But how every Pelagian view of life fails before this record is, in its order, as it is, self-consciousness, self-preservation, and world-consciousness. Between the sin of the spirit world and that of man, between the sin of the woman and the man, between the sin of our first parents, and their own sinfulness, and the sinfulness of their posterity! If we take into view the stages of development of evil in the general history of the sin, how limited is the modern view, which regards the senses as the prime starting-point of evil! But when Pantheism asserts the necessity of sin, or rather of the fall, as the necessary transition of men from the state of pure innocence to that of conscious freedom, the simple remark that the ingenuousness of Adam would have been carried directly on in the proper way if he had stood the test, just as Christ through his sinlessness has reached the knowledge of the true distinction between good and evil, and has actually shown that sin, notwithstanding its limited existence, does not belong to its very being, clearly refutes this assertion. But how clear is the explanation of evil, of punishment, and of judgment, as it meets us in this account! That the natural evil does not belong to the moral, but, notwithstanding its inward connection with it, is still subject to the divine wisdom. The outward punishment is to redeem and purify; that from the very acme of the judgment breaks forth the promise and salvation. These truths, which are far above every high anti-Christian view of the world, make it apparent that the first judgment of God, as a type of the world-redeeming judgment of God, has found its completion in the death of Christ upon the cross." "The deceptive promise of the serpent was fulfilled: man's eyes were opened (ch. iii, 7), but he saw only his misery and nakedness. He was now brought to know good and evil, but with the painful consciousness of having trampled upon the one, and of being sunk in the depths of woe by the other. He had become as a god; he had boldly cast off all allegiance to the one God, and assumed cast ovt over himself. He had constituted himself a god, no longer the representative of God; but he had become the representative of God; but this likeness to God brought not with it the happiness which pertains to the divine Being, but was fraught with the deepest misery and woe!" (Kurtz, Bibl. and Astronomy, p. 171). Müller, after affirming that there is really nothing in the narrative of the fall obliging us to consider that event as the primary beginning of sin, in the strict sense of the word,"
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"that neither ‘the image of God,’ wherein man was created, nor God’s pronouncing everything ‘very good,’ prevents our believing that the fall was only the outward manifestation of a perversion of the will preceding the empirical life of man—the outcome of an evil already present in potential, which might, indeed, by a perverting of the endowment of his species, have been born with him as the basis of an original moral depravity in human nature. The endeavor of the tempter was to bring out to view, and into action, this hidden evil’ (‘Doctrine of Sin, Edinb. 1858, ii, 365). This view of Müller’s rests upon the view of man in his existent state, which he calls a ‘self-determination of the transcendental freedom before our individual existence.’ Rothe, on the other hand (Ezikil, i, 180), places the essence of sin chiefly in the necessity of matter. ‘The passage through sin, in his opinion, is a metaphysical necessity. He conceives of our first parents not as mature at their creation, but destined to spiritual development; consequently their material part, in the absence of training, must gain the upper hand; and imperceptibly, and without blame, they found themselves by their development, in sin. Hence in the creation of the first couple man was morally nothing permitted; it lies unavoidably in the creature, on account of his origin—in the fact of his coming into existence in contradistinction from God; but as creature-evil has been ordained in the plan of the world, so also has its determination, and as God therefore did not exempt the finner, God was Lord over the parents of our race and over the serpent; but if he by his own will restrained his highest power, and left free play-room to free created beings, and still retains the government, he is not the motive of evil, but the power to the free and worthy to be adored. Man should rather complain of himself, but give thanks to God that he has endowed him with such prerogatives, and glorify him with soul and body, which are God’s. ‘There was no necessity at all to sin; that complaint can only be established on the ground that, as Rothe teaches, evil inevitably developed itself. Besides, from the beginning of the world God had provided for the human race, whose fall foreseen, the most perfect means of grace and gifts, in order to make that injury abundantly good, and to lead back the fallen one to himself and his kingdom. Indeed, as all evil, so also the sin of our first parents redound to the praise of the merciful God, because by it he was conditioned the mission of the second Adam as the Redeemer of the world. But the possibility of the fall without blame to the Creator being admitted, another question arises: ‘Through what incitement did it become a reality?’ Even to this question the Scriptures give a satisfactory answer: it took place through outward prompting—through evil spiritual influence, which was already existing in creation. Upon the basis of a created but still spiritual existence, there is an evil possibility of action, which is perverted by an influence at enmity with God must be admitted.

The theophrastian view of our first parents, who were not isolated in the new world, corresponded exactly with the sublity of Satan in the form of a serpent. The kingdom of Satan, as a spiritual power, and the peculiarity of the first pair, whose pure self-determination was ensnared and obscured through that power, furnish a satisfactory explanation of the fall. The fall itself was certainly a free self-determination, otherwise no blame could attach to it; but not altogether in the same sense: both the true evil and the true good were one; the devil, as the murderer from the beginning: it was a co-operation of human freedom with the temptation of the evil principle itself. But, according to the Scripture account, the temptation of our first parents was gradual, and the motives to the fall are thus psychologically intelligible. In all the narratives of the temptation concerning the divine prohibition and the ruinous consequences of sin: ‘Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?’ ‘Ye shall not surely die.’ Then he awakened pride, inducing man to overstep the scheme of righteousness, and to use his freedom arbitrarily, and according to his own pleasure: ‘God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof then your eyes shall be opened, and
ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." After this preparation came the thought that the tree was good for food, and to look upon, and to be desired to make one wise. The sensual desire would now naturally start up, and the woman seduced became the seducer. The powers of the soul were corrupted before the actual sin took place; the faculty of knowledge by doubt and unbelief toward God, the faculty of delight by unceasing striving and proud excess, as the Grecian fable of Prometheus represents it; and, finally, the faculty of feeling, through sensual longing, which propinquity the religion of the Greeks sets forth by Erimhetes and Pandora. Thus did the possibility of the fall, which rests upon the freedom of the creature in reality under outward influences. The conversation between Eve and the serpent shows how accessible she was; the woman, as the weaker part, is first approached and misled, and not till then the man, and even then only through her; as also the apostle Paul expresses it (1 Tim. ii. 14), the woman was first in the transgression. Rothe, indeed (p. 221), thinks that the assumption of a satanical temptation does not at all help the difficulty, because that assumption always presupposes a real susceptibility of being tempted, a sinful predisposition, a moral weakness. But the possibility of being tempted to sin is not yet sin; with Rothe that predisposition is rather something already existing. It is certainly much more worthy of God to conceive of his creatures as pure and good—they first determining themselves to evil, and the enemy active therein. If even the Son of God could be tempted without injury to his sinlessness, much more the first Adam, whose personality and divine resemblance were specifically lower. If, in fine, we compare the scriptural theory, thus understood, with the modern philosophical explanations of the fall, the result will be that the former will be found to contain more plausibility and truth than the latter; although Rothe (p. 221) is of the opinion that the Biblical account of the fall can no longer be maintained, and that the fall cannot be explained from the Mosaic stand-point. Only the Bible (and perhaps, agreeing with it, the mythology of antiquity) tells us of a man created in the image of God, in a paradisiacal state of innocence; and, in accordance with this fact, shows how this state was interrupted and perverted into one of guilt. Dr. Julius Müller, on the contrary, although Paradise has still a place in his system, places Adam in it as already a sinner. In the same way Rothe presupposes what he ought to show, since he assumes evil as original and necessary in the development of the world. We cannot see, either according to Müller or Rothe, whence it could properly come into the natural world. Rothe, with his presupposition, is obliged to assume one of two things: either he must dialectically establish an evil principle in matter, and deny the pure creation of God, or he must ascribe the origin of sin, not to the perverted will, but to God himself: in both cases he has a Manichean life-view of sentient beings. Sin with him is not a free act of man, proceeding out of the heart and will; it springs from the overmatching power of material nature subdued his personality with inevitable necessity (p. 226). 'The origin of evil from pure good must forever remain inconceivable' (p. 222); thus he establishes an impure material creation. Is anything explained by this means? Whence comes, then, immaturity into the material creation before all acts of the will? Is not the question more easily explained by the abuse of freedom than by metaphysics; more easily through the devil and man than by the act of the Creator? The fall, according to the doctrine of the Church, says Rothe (p. 220), was a blunder in the work of the earthly creation, as it were, at the beginning. In order to avoid this, either an evil principle must have been co-operative in the creation, or else God himself must have ruined his own work at its commencement. Shall we call this escaping the blunder made at the beginning? Is it not rather increasing it, and carrying it over into the region of the perfect and the holy? The latter of these two opinions, strictly taken, is that of Rothe, since he assumes matter as created by God, and from matter deduces sin. But the positions, Matter was created by God, and Matter is the opposite of God, and hence the origin of sin, contradict each other."

**Literature.**—Besides the books already cited in this article, see Hagenbach, History of Doctrines; Neander, History of Dogmas; Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine (all under Anthropology); Hase, Evangel. Dogmatik, Lips. 1869, § 71-73; Fletcher, Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense; Doderlein, Inst. Theol. Christ. § 178; Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, i, 240 sq.; Richers, Schöpfungsgeschichte (Leips. 1854, 8vo); Middleton, Essay on the Creation and Fall of Man, Works (1755, 5 vols.), iii, 457 sq.; Zeller, Die ältesten Theodizee (Jena, 1868, 8vo); Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, Intr. 66; Cunningham, Historical Theology, vol. i, ch. xix; Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology (Edin. 1867), p. 147 sq.; Monsell, The Religion of Redemption (Lond. 1867), p. 29 sq.; Meth. Quar. Review, Oct. 1867, art. vii. On the effects of the fall on nature, see Nature.

**Fallow-deer (Dama dama, gaumur); Sept. δαμαδας [but ὀρατις in 1 Kings], Vulg. ibidu]s, mentioned among the beasts that may be eaten in Deut. xiv, 5, and among the provisions for Solomon’s table in 1 Kings iv, 23 [Heb. v, 5]. There are three animals of the Cervidae family with which different writers have identified it. See ZOOLOGY.**

1. Most commentators (following Bochart, Hieroz. i, 910; ii, 269) regard it as properly translated in our version, deriving the word from "dama, chumur", in the sense of being red, and thus referring it to a species of deer of a reddish color; probably the Cervus dama of Linnaeus, originally a native of Barbary, where it is still found wild. It is stated to be found very generally dispersed over Western and Southern Asia, and is said to have been introduced into England from Norway (see Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Deer). It is smaller than the stag (Cervus elaphus), having horns or branches serrated on the inside, which it sheds annually. The color in winter is a darkish brown, but in summer bay, spotted with white. The fallow-deer

(Common Fallow-deer.)

(Cervus dama) is deemed by most authorities to be undoubtedly a native of Asia; indeed, Persia seems to be its proper country. Hasselquist (Prorr. p. 211) noticed this deer in Mount Tabor. Oedmann (Form.
Samuel, i, 178) likewise believes that the yachmur is best denoted by the Ceraun dama. The female is called in the Talmud ניער, and is identified by Levy sohn with the German Damäskrack. It is, however, difficult to suppose that Jerusalem could have received any appreciable amount of flesh-meat from such a source, remote as it is from a forest country.

2. Kitto (Dict. Bibl. Deut. l. c.) says, "The yachmur of the Hebrews is without doubt erroneously identified with the fallow-deer, which does not exist in Asia," and refers the name to the Orzy leukoryz, citing Niebuhr as authority for stating that this animal is known among the Eastern Arabs by the name of yachmur. This is the opinion which we have adopted, from Hamilton Smith, who is the best modern authority on such questions. See Antelope.

3. Still others, on the authority of the Septuagint rendering in Deuteronomy, regard the term as denoting the Ailuropoda bulbata (Ibex); the Hippopotamus of the Greeks (see Herod. iv, 152; Aristotile, Hist. Anim. iii, 6, ed. Schneider, and De Part. Anim. iii, 2, 11, edit. Bekker; Oplian, Gym. ii, 300). From the different descriptions of the yachmur as given by Arabian writers, and cited by Bochart (Hieroz. ii, 284 sqq.), it would also seem that this is the animal designated; though Damar's remarks in some respects are fabulous, the history of its action, and the wonderful works and blessings of God (Deut. xxxi, 10-13). When Jehovah gave the Hebrews this remarkable institute, in order to guard them against the apprehension of famine, he promised, on the condition of their obedience, so great plenty in every sixth harvest that it alone would suffice for three years (Lev. xxvi, 20-22). However, through the avarice of the Hebrews, this seventh year's rest, as Moses had app chanced (Lev. xxvi, 34, 38), was for a long time utterly neglected (2 Chron. xxxvii, 21); for in all the years of the Hebrews' history, there was no mandation of the sabbatical year, nor of the year of jubilee.

The period when this wise and advantageous law fell into disuse may probably be understood from the prediction of Moses in Lev. xxvi, 38, 44, 45; comp. with 2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; Jer. xxx, 11. Thus was it foretold that the Hebrews, for the violation of this law, should go into captivity: "To fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had paid off her rebelliousness: for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfill threescore and ten years." Here it is taken for granted that seventy sabbatical years, including the jubilee years which are added every seventh sabbatical year, had been neglected by the unfaithful people. The Hebrews were frequently weary of the law; and at different periods during the commonwealth they appear to have utterly neglected the fallow or sabbatical years. Hence it appears that the captivity of the Hebrews and the destruction of their country was an act of retributive Providence, brought upon them for this very reason, that the land might pay off those sabbatical years of rest, of which the Hebrews had deprived it, in neglecting the statute of Jehovah their king (Lev. xxvi, 43), and while the fallow or sabbatical year appears to have been more scrupulously observed, as we learn from Josephus (Ant. xi, 11, 6). See Jubilee.

False Prophet (φελανδροφήγος, a pseudo-prophet), i. e. one falsely professing to come as a prophet or ambassador from God, a false teacher (Matt. vii, 15; xxiv, 11, 24; Mark. xiii, 6; Luke xiv, 15; 1 Pet. iv, 11; 2 Pet. ii, 1; 3 John, 7; Rev. ii, 2, 22). See Prophet. In Rev. xvi, 13, the term is distinctively used, "the false prophet," with reference to the mythological system of paganism, the second "beast" (q. v.), supporting the first or secular power of Rome; allegorically interpreted by the impiety of the antichristian churches, De pseudopropheteismo Hebraorum, L. B. 1859, 5vo.

Fama clama (general bad report), in the Scot-
tish ecclesiastical law, is a ground of action before a presbytery or synod against a minister or member of the Church, founded on common report, and not a charge by accusation. If the rumor, or *fama clausoae*, be referred by the presbytery or synod to the church, and inquired into without any accuser, for the vindication of the character of the church of the court, and with a view to the preservation of good morals in the community. See Hill, Church Practice, p. 49.

**Familia Charitatis.** See FAMILISTS.

**FAMILIARS of the Inquisition.** Officers of that tribunal whose function it is to apprehend accused or suspected persons and convey them to prison. They being the agents of the inquisition are therefore called *fumilii*. The office was formerly held in high honor, and men of noble family often held it, especially in Spain. Innocent III granted large indulgences to familiars. The same plenary indulgence is granted by the pope to each exercise of this office as was granted by the Lateran Council to those who succeeded the Holy Land. "When several persons are to be taken up at the same time, these familiars are commanded to order matters that they may know nothing of one another's being apprehended; and it is related that some of his three sons and daughters, who lived together in the same house, were carried prisoners to the inquisition without knowing anything of one another's being there till seven years afterwards," when those that were alive were released by an *Auto da Fé*. See Inquisition.

**Familiar Spirit** (2 Kgs, 9, 19, 21, 24; 1 Kings, 19; 1 Kings, 19, 1, 2, 10) is the medium between the dead and the living, the vessel containing the spirit of the dead, a necromancer, or sorcerer who professes to call up the dead by means of incantations, to answer questions (Deut. xvii, 11; 2 Kings xxi, 6; 2 Chron. xxviii, 6; Lev. xix, 31; xxx, 6; 1 Sam. xxviii, 8, 9; 1 Sam. viii, 19; xix, 9). But also specially for the *pythia* (Acts xvi, 16) or divining-spirit, by the aid of which such jugglers were supposed to confer (Lev. xx, 27; 1 Sam. xxviii, 7, 9) and for the shade or departed spirit thus evoked (Isa. xxix, 4). See Divination. The term is rendered by the Septuagint *γεγαμεριμνης*, "a ventriloquist," but is rather a wizard who asked counsel of his familiar, and gave the responses received from him to others—the name being applied in reference to the spirit or demon that animated the person, and inflected the belly so that it protuberated like the side of a bottle. Or it was applied to the magician, because he was reputed to be inflected to be in contact with the spirit (γαμαριμνης, like the ancient *Εφεσιαλης* [κυριαρχεις γαιστας ἐν αὐτῷ], *H. V. I. 1017, mactum spiritum per verna nasa naturae exequiatur; Sch. in Ar. Plut.]. The ob of the Hebrews was thus precisely the same as the pythia of the Greeks (Plutarch, De def. Or. 414; Cicero, De die, i, 10); and was used not only to designate the performer, but the spirit itself, *πνεύμων Πανσαραφηχος* which possessed him (see Levit. xx, 27; 1 Sam. xxviii, 8; also Acts xvi, 16). A more specific denomination of this last term was the *neκρομανσ* (literally seeker of the dead, *πνευμα πανσαραφηχος*, Deut. xviii, 10; comp. *πνευμα ἐν * &c., one who, by frequenting tombs, by inspecting corpses, or, more frequently, by help of the ob, like the witch of Endor, pretended to converse with the dead, and bring secrets from the invisible world (Gen. xii, 8; Exod. vii, 11; Lev. xiv, 20; Deut. xvii, 12-12). Compare the *διανοητικος*, anti-theists (*charmers*), of Isa. ix, 8. But Shuckford, who denies that the Jews in early ages believed in spirits, makes it mean "consultants of dead idols" (*Com. ii, 269;*). These ventriloquists, "squeak and gibber," "speak and gibe," Shaks. *Jul. Caesar* from the earth to imitate the voice of the revealing "familiar" (Isa. xxix, 4, 6; compare *σπειρομαντις*, Soph. *Frag. 3*). Of this class was the witch of Endor (Josephus, *Ant. vi*, 14, 2), in whose case intended imposture may have been overruled into genuine necromancy (Exclusa. xiii, 20). On this wide subject, see a *Chrysostom ad I. Cor. xi*, xii, *Ter- drullian, ad. Mer. iv*, 55; *De anima*, p. 57; Augsburg, *De doctr. Christ.* § 83; Cicer. *Tusc. Disput.* i, 16, and the commentators on *En. vii*; *Criucii Sacri*, vii, 331; Le Moyne, *Var. Sacr.* p. 93 sq.; Selden, *De Deis Syr., 1*, 2; and, above all, Böttcher, *De Inferius*, p. 101-121, where the whole subject is displayed is disguised. Those who sought inspiration, either from the demons or the spirits of the dead, haunted tombs and caverns (Isa. lxv, 4), and invited the uncanny communications by voluntary lots (Maimon, *De Idol. ix*, 15; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. ad Mutt. x*, 1). That the supposed *pythiae* was often acted by ventriloquists, is certain; for a specimen of this even in modern times, see the *Life of Benvenuto Cellini.* See Necromancy.

Closely connected with this form of divination are the two following: (1.) *χερί* or *che*br, a spell or enchantment, by means of a cabalistic arrangement of certain words and implements (Deut. xviii, 11; Isa. xlvii, 29, 32), spoken also of serpent-charming (Ps. liii, 8). See Charming. (2.) Sorcery (either wizard, *γηγαμεριμνης*, knowing one, Lev. xiv, 31; xx, 6; Deut. xviii, 11; 1 Sam. xxviii, 8, 9; spoken also of the imp or spirit of divination by which they were supposed to be attended, Lev. xx, 27; or some form of *γηγαμεριμνης*, to act the witch literally by ventriloquism (Deut. xxiv, 6; Exod. vii, 11; Deut. xvii, 10; Dan. ii, 2, 6, &c.), which signifies practising divination by means of the black art, with an implied collusion with evil spirits; applied usually to pretending to reveal secrets, to discover things lost, to hidden treasure, and interpret dreams. See Wizard.

**Familists.** See *Familia Charitatis*. Family of Love, a sect founded in the 16th century by Henry Nicholas, a native of Münster, in Westphalia, who, after residing for some time in Holland, went to England in the latter part of the reign of Edward VI, and there established (1592) his *familia charitatis* or *fratres des Lie- de* (Spry's *Cromar*, ii, 410). His doctrines have often been confounded with those of David Joris (see Joris), which they resemble in many respects, and generally with those of the Anabaptists. His followers, however, published a *Confession of Faith* in 1576 (given in Spry's *Cromar*), and soon after introduced into France, in which they attempt to prove the identity of their doctrines with those of the evangelical Confessions. The characteristic feature of this sect was a tendency to mystic contemplation, and the belief that, through love, man could become absolutely absorbed in and identified with God, in a subjective sense. Nicholas represented himself as the apostle of this "service of Love," and it is said went so far as to claim superiority over Christ, on the ground that Moses only preached hope, Christ faith, but he preached love. The sect was accused of confusing the divinity of Christ and of even rejecting the divinity of God himself, in his higher attributes, by maintaining that man would, in this life, become identified with God. They, on the contrary, maintained in their Apology their belief in the three general Christian creeds, and particularly in the satisfaction and pardon court of Christ, which they claimed to emulate the state of life exhibited by him. As they looked upon themselves as perfect, they could not acknowledge the need of forgiveness, and stated in their Apology that they who tried with all the heart to believe and keep the commandments of God, and perform all good, could only come from him. They distinguished themselves from the Anabapists by their recognition of infant baptism, and by their indifference as to the external part of the established worship, which the Anabaptists assailed with so
special violence. Nicholas, who at first persisted quietly, came out more boldly during the reign of Elisabeth, and announced himself as a prophet appointed by the Lord, and anointed by the Holy Spirit. He was an uneducated man, yet appears to have succeeded in gaining the ear of several theologians and persons of high rank. In 1580 Elisabeth issued a proclamation against the sect, and directed an inquiry to be made into their practices. They seem to have attracted considerable notice at that period, and accusations of all kinds were brought forward against them. Their books were ordered to be burnt in October, 1580. In 1604 they presented a petition to James I, to clear themselves from the imputations laid against them. From this time their numbers diminished, but they were not extinct even as late as 1654. King James I, in his Besleclio éçáwara, calls them insfem anabaptistorum sectam, quo fiamen an-
oria vocant. A person named Ethebrington was made to recant as a Familist in 1627; but he does not appear to have held precisely the same doctrine as the older Familists. See a subordination book by B. H. (John Boggs) entitled The Displaying of an horrible Sect naming them selfs the Family of Love (Lond. 1570); and Kneustub, Confusion of monstrous and horrible Herezes taught by H. W. etc. (Lond. 1579); Mosholm, Church History, cxxvi, § iii, pt. ii, § 25; Collier, Eccl. Hist. of England, v, 20; and others. Reforma, xlv. v. 20; yet truly, because its bond of union is spiritual, being the spirit of Christ. The basis of the Christian family is Christian marriage, or monogamy; the exclusive union of one man to one woman. The deepest ground of this union, and its true aim, without which Christian marriage and family are impossible, is the consciousness of an interest in Christ, or in the love of God in Christ, the source of individual sympathy, as well as of brotherly and universal love. Marriage has, in common with Christian friendship, the bond of tender sentiments; but the former is an exclusive bond between two persons of different sexes, whose personal identity is complete, so to speak, to the exclusion of all others. It is therefore a lifelong relation, while friendship may be only temporary. See Marriage.

The persons thus joined in marriage lay the foundation of a Christian family; indeed, they constitute the family, through a process of development. It awaits its completion in the birth of children. In proportion, however, as the married couple live in a state of holiness, so are the natural desires for issue and their gratification made subservient to the divine-ly ordered end of the marriage, and accompanied by a sense of duty on the part of the family. In this the family was the model of the monarchy, the earliest, as well as the simplest, form of government. When, by the birth and growth of children, and the death of the father, the original family is broken up into several, the heads of which stand to each other in a co-ordinate rather than a subordinated relation to one another, the branches of the family being the prototypes of the more advanced forms of government. Each brother, by becoming the head of a separate family, becomes a member of an aristocracy, or the embodiment of a portion of the sovereign power, as it exists in the separate constituent parts of a democratic government is composed. But at Rome the idea of the family was still more closely entwined with that of life in the state, and the natural power of the father was taken as the basis not only of the whole political, but of the whole social organization of the people. Among the Romans, as with the Greeks, the family included the slave as well as the wife, and ultimately the children, a fact which, indeed, is indicated by the etymology of the word, which belongs to the same root as frater, a slave. In its widest sense, the familia included even the intimate possessions of the citizen, who, as the head of a house, was his own master (fundus juris); and Gaius (ii, 102) uses it as synonymous with patriumion. In general, however, it was confined to persons—wife, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, if such there were, and slaves of a full-born Roman family were members of the family, and under the potestas of a common ancestor, had he been alive. In this sense, of course, the slaves belonging to the different members of the family were not included in it. The latter was a family in short, in the sense in which we speak of the royal family, etc.; with this difference, that it was possible for an individual to quit it, and pass into another by adoption. Sometimes, again, the word was used with reference to slaves exclusively, and, analogously, to a sect of philosophers, or a body of gladiators. See Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities.
climb the height of his knowledge—his virtual omniscience; nor can it conceive of a diviner guarantee than his promise. To see its parents bend in worship, and to hear them speak with holy awe of their Father in heaven, is itself solemn and suggestive as a ladder set up from the earth to heaven. The serenity and discipline, too, which leads the parent kindly to repress its selfish desires, and constantly to aim at its moal welfare, invariably begets in return the highest order of filial love and confidence; evincing the power of the child to discriminate between instinctive and moral affection, and preparing him to enter the true heart of the family, the centre around which all meet again, from whence they derive light and warmth, and whose genial influences will be felt through life. From the bosom of such a family the spirit of Christianity goes out with its healthful influence into the Church, the State, the school, and the material world.

See generally the writers on moral philosophy and Christian ethics, and especially Herzog, Real-Encyclopædie iv. 318; Rothe, Theolog. Ethik, iii. 605; Schaff, Apostolical Age, § 111; Harris, Patriarchy, or the Family (London. 1855, 5vo); Anderson, Lemma and Design of the Domestic Constitution (Edinb. 1826, 8vo); Thiersch, Ueber christliches Familienleben (4th ed. Frankf. 1859; translated into several languages).

Family, Holy. One of the most favorite themes of Christian art, from its earliest period in the Catacombs, has been the presentation of scenes from the infancy and childhood of the Saviour. The name 'Holy' is given especially to those paintings and sculptures in which the parents, Joseph and Mary, are worshiping the infant Saviour, or are holding him up for the adoration of spectators. In a wider sense, it is also applied to the birth of the Saviour, the adoration of the magi, of the shepherds, and of the mythical three stages, to the flight into Egypt, and the finding of Christ in the Temple disputing with the doctors, and all other scenes from the childhood of Christ that are drawn from the gospels. Accessory figures of angels, saints, and of persons contemporary with Christ or with the artist, and sometimes of the artist or the donor of the painting to the church, are often added. (G. F. C.)

Family of Love. See Family.

Family prayer. See Family; Prayer; Worship.

Famine (properly פָּדָה, pādāh, λείπειν, lēipein, whether of individuals or of nations). "In the whole of Syria and Arabia, the fruits of the earth must ever be dependent on rain; the wadis have few large springs, and the small rivers not being sufficient for the irrigation of even the level lands. If, therefore, the heavy rains of November and December fail, the crops are insufficient; in a season that this spirit inclined Him much more to serve others than to have them serve Him, and he will not be satisfied by rewarding his servants with wages only, but with all the spiritual blessings of which the family is the proper sphere. They should take part in the family worship, and even an active part, as in reading, singing, praying. The more they come to partake in the life of the family, in its interests, its joys, its griefs, and receive from it the sympathy and help they require, either for the body or the mind, the more does the grant of these goods lead a really Christian family.

The entire life of the Christian family is a continuous act of worship in the more extended sense of the word, and must gradually become more and more so, since all its actions are done in the name of Christ and for the glory of God. This thoroughly Christian conduct is put into practice by several characteristics of the family worship in the proper sense, in which the family, as such, seeks for strength in the Word and in the spirit of God. The more perfectly this family worship is organized, the more will it resemble public worship, consisting, like it, in the reading and expounding of the word, in prayer, singing, and prayer. The reader in the religious exercises of the family should be the father, as priestly head of the house.

This, however, is not to exclude the co-operation of the mother, children, and other members of the family; their participation, on the contrary, adds much to the interest of the service, and makes it an admirable supplement to public worship, as in the family the feeling of trust in each other and of self-dependence add much to liberality and the spirit of sacrifice."

'Egypt, again, owes all its fertility—a fertility that gained for it the striking comparison with the 'garden of the Lord'—to its mighty river, whose annual rise inundates nearly the whole land, and renders its cultivation an easy certainty. But this very bounty of nature has not unfrequently exposed the country to the opposite extremes of drought. With scarcely any rain, and that only on the Mediterranean coast, and with wells only supplied by filtration from the river through the limestone, a failure disastrous in the western deserts certainly entails a degree of scarcity, although if followed by cool weather, and if only the occurrence of a single year, the labor of the people may in a great
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measure avert the calamity. The causes of death and famine in Egypt are occasioned by defective inundation, preceded, and accompanied, and followed by prevalent easterly and southerly winds. Both these winds draw up the eastern edge of the lake, leaving on the north, the rather chief cause of the defective inundation, as they are also by their accelerating the current of the river—the north- easterly winds producing the contrary effects. Famines in Egypt and Palestine seem to be affected by droughts and plenty. A very small extent of Egypt, through the influence of Egypt, as far as the highlands of Abyssinia.

"It may be said of the ancient world generally that it was subject to periodical returns of death, often amounting in particular districts to famine, greatly bey- ond what is usually experienced in modern times. Various causes of a merely natural and economical kind contributed to this, apart from strictly moral con- siderations. Among these causes may more especially be mentioned the imperfect knowledge of agriculture which prevailed, in consequence of which men had few resources to stimulate crops of late harvests, or to make localities aid, the productive powers of nature; the defective means of transit, rendering it often impossi- ble to relieve the wants of one region, even when plenty existed at no great distance in another; the despotic governments, which to so great an extent chanced to be at the mercy of the fury of storms and skill; and the frequent wars and desolations, in a great degree also the result of those despotic governments, which both interrupted the labors of the field and after- wards wasted its fruits. Depending, as every return- ing harvest does, upon the meeting of many con- ditions in the soil and climate, which necessity vary from season to season, it was inevitable that times of scarcity should be ever and anon occurring in particular regions of the world; and from the disadvantages now referred to, under which the world in more remote times was labor, it was equally inevitable that such times should often result in all the horrors of fam- ine."

The Scriptures record several famines in Palestine and the neighboring countries. The first occurs in Gen. xii, 10, which is described as so grievous as to compel Abraham to quit Canaan for Egypt (Gen. xxvi, 1). Another occurred in the days of Isaac, which was the cause of his removal from Canaan to Gerar (Gen. xxvi, 17). The most remarkable one was that of seven years in Egypt, while Joseph was governor. It was distinguished for its duration, extent, and severity. It was one of the countries least subject to such a calamity, by reason of its general fertility. The ordinary cause of famine in Egypt is connected with the annual overflow of the Nile. But it would appear that more than local causes were in operation in the case noticed in Gen. xii, 10, for it is said that "the famine was sore in all lands," that "the famine was over all the face of the earth." By the foresight and wisdom of Joseph, however, provision had been made in Egypt during the seven preceding years of plenty, so that the people of other parts sought and received supplies in Egypt—"all countries came into Egypt to buy corn." Among other lands, Canaan suffered from the famine, which was the immediate occasion of Jacob sending his sons down into Egypt, and of the settlement in that land of the descendants of Abraham; an event of the highest consequence in the history of this people, and a parallel to the sending of Joseph, and at the same time enables us to form an idea of the character of famines in the East. The famine of Samaria resembled it in many particulars; and that very briefly recorded in 2 Kings viii, 1, 2, af- fords another instance. Among the peculiar rains which fall upon the Asiatic chains. These rains depend upon climatic laws of wide extent and great regularity. Yet there is scarcely a land on the earth in which famine has raged so often and so terribly as in Egypt, or a land that so very much needs the measures which Joseph adopted for the preservation of the people. The swelling of the Nile a few feet above or below what is necessary proves alike de- structive. A particular instance in familiar history has hand down to us are truly horrible, and the accounts of them are worthy of notice also, inasmuch as they present the services of Joseph in behalf of Egypt in their true light. Abbaddatif relates thus: "In the year 506 (A.D. 1195), the height of the flood exceeded the usual rule, and was small at Memphis, though very ample, through the dominion of Egypt, as far as the highlands of Abyssinia."

(See the account of this famine translated in the Am. Bibl. Repos. 1832, p. 635 sq.) Compare with this account the famines mentioned in the talmudic (Gen. xli, 6). "Of the horrors of this second year's famine, the year of the Flight, 507 (A.D. 1200), Abdol- latif, who was an eye-witness, likewise gives a n o t interesting account, stating that the people throughout the country were driven to the last extremities, eating offal, and even their own dead, and mentions, as an in- stance of the dire straits to which they were driven, that persons who were burnt alive for eating human flesh were themselves, thus ready roasted, eaten by others. Multitudes fled the country, only to perish in the desert—six to Palestine."

"But the most remarkable famine was that of the reign of the Fattimi Khalif, El-Mustansir bil'lah, which is the only instance on record of one of seven years' duration in Egypt since the time of Joseph (A.H. 457-464, A.D. 1064-1071). This famine succeeded in severity all others of modern times, and was aggravat- ed by the anarchy which then ravaged the country. Vehement drought and pestilence (sees Es-Suyuti, in his Itom el-Makhdarah, MS.), continued for seven con- secutive years, so that the [people] ate corps, and animals were died of themselves; the cattle per- ished; a dog was sold for five dinars, a sheep for four dinars... and an ardebil (about 8 bushels) of wheat for 100 dinars, and then it failed altogether. He adds that all the horses of the Khalif, save three, perished, and gives numerous instances of the straits to which the wretched inhabitants were driven, and of the organized bands of kidnappers who infected Cai- ro, and caught passengers in the streets by ropes furn- ished with hooks and let down from the houses. This account is confirmed by El-Mukri (in his Histat: Quatrebien has translated the account of this famine in the life of El-Mustansir, entitled "Geographiques et Historiques sur l'Egypte," from whom we further learn that the family, and even the women of the Khalif fled, by the way of Syria, on foot, to escape the peril that threatened all ranks of the popula- tion. The whole narrative is worthy of attention, since it contains a parallel to the sending of Joseph, and the services of Joseph, and at the same time enables us to form an idea of the character of famines in the East. The famine of Samaria resembled it in many particulars; and that very briefly recorded in 2 Kings viii, 1, 2, af- fords another instance. Among the peculiar rains which fall upon the Asiatic chains. These rains depend upon climatic laws of wide extent and great regularity. Yet there is scarcely a land on the earth in which famine has raged so often and so
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come upon the land seven years. And the woman arose, and did after the saying of the man of God: and she went with her household, and sojourned in the land of the Philistines seven years." Bunsen (Egypt's Place, etc., ii, 334) quotes the record of a famine in the reign of Secestereson I, which he supposes to be that of Joseph; but it must be observed that the instance in point is expressly stated not to be inspired by the whole land, and is at least equally likely, apart from chronological reasons, to have been that of Abra- ham.

"In Arabia, famines are of frequent occurrence. The Arabs, in such cases, when they could not afford to slake their thirst outside, would drink the blood, or mix it with the shorn fur, making a kind of black pudding. They ate also various plants and grains, which at other times were not used as articles of food. Thus the tribe of Hafiteh were taunted with having a famine king, which consisted of a dish of dates mashed up with clarified butter and a preparation of dried curds of milk (Stahā, M.I.)."

Famine is likewise a natural result, in the East, when caterpillars, locusts, or other insects destroy the produce of the land, the people being thus reduced to a miserable existence. The prophet Joel compares the locusts to a numerous and terrible army ravaging the land (ch. I). Famine was also an effect of God's anger (2 Kings viii, 1, 2). The prophets frequently threaten Israel with the sword of famine, or with war and famine, evils which frequently go together. Amos threatens (Amos viii, 11) that Jesus will come to the land, not as a famine of bread, nor as a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord" (Amos viii, 11). In ancient times, owing to the imperfect modes of warfare in use, besieged cities were more frequently reduced by famine than by any other means, and the persons shut up were often reduced to the necessity of devouring not only unclean animals, but also human flesh (compare Deut. xxviii, 22-42; 2 Sam. xxvi, 1; 2 Kings vi, 25-28; xxvii, 8; Jer. xiv, 15; xix, 9; xilii, 17; Ezek. v, 10-12, 16; vi, 12; vii, 18).

The famine foretold by the prophet (Amos xi, 28) was the same with that which is related by Josephus (Ant. xx, 2, 6) as having taken place in the fourth year of Claudius, and affected especially the province of Judea. (See Kuijln, Comment. proleg.). See Death.

FAN (fan, fann, φαν) a wind％snowed, with which grain was blown upon the wind, in order to cleanse it from the broken straw and chaff (Isa. xxiv, 23; Jer. xv, 7; Matt. ii, 11; Luke ii, 17; see Agriculture). At the present day, in Syria, the instrument used is a large wooden fork. (See Robinson's Researches, ii, 277, 571; Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Pala.) Both kinds of instruments are delineated on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, ii, 40-46). See Wind.

Fanaticism. (1.) The ancients primarily gave the name of fanatikos to those who uttered oracular announcements, or exhibited wild antics and gestures under the (supposed) inspiration of some divinity whose temples (fana) they frequented. The heathen seers, who pretended to prophecy under the guidance of an indwelling spirit (fanum), was called by the Greek writers iêthoc, and by the Latins fanaticus (see Suidas, s. v. Isôvus; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. xvi, 4). Thence the name was transferred to persons actuated by a frantic zeal in religion.

(2.) The word is sometimes improperly used to signify a blind and enthusiastic spirit in religious matters. It is equally applicable to any state of mind that is ApplicationDbContext, that is, "after rejecting from account that opprobrious sense of the word fanaticism which the virulent censorium of religion and of the religious assigns to it, it will be found, as we believe, that the elementary ideas attaching to the term in its manifold application is that of feticous fervor in religion, rendered turbulent, morose, or rancorous by junction with some one or more of the unsocial emotions. Or, if a definition as brief as possible were demanded, we should say that fanaticism is enthusiasm in religion." He classifies the chief varieties of fanaticism under four designations, of which the first will comprehend all instances wherein malignant religious sentiments turn inward upon the unhappy subject of them; the second class includes those who are long to be an object of fanaticism which looks abroad for its victims; the third embraces the combination of intemperate religious zeal with military sentiments, or with national pride and the love of power; to the fourth class must be reserved all instances of the more intellectual kind, and which stand connected with opinion and dogma. Our first sort, then, is sature, the second cruel, the third ambitious, and the fourth factious. Or, for the purpose of fixing a characteristic mark upon each of our classes as above named, let it be permitted us to entitle them as follows:—
The first, the spirit of persecution; the second, the spirit of intolerance or of personal infiction; the third, the fanaticism of the brand, or of Immmolation and cruelty; the fourth, the fanaticism of the symbol, or of creeds, dogmatism, and ecclesiastical virulence. (Fanaticism, p. 364.) See Jehovah, p. 114, 115.

The fanatic begins by rejecting the light of reason to abandon himself to the dictates of his fancy. He generally adopts some simple and exclusive ideas, which destroys the proper balance of his mind. This absorbing idea may have a religious truth, it may fasten itself upon him, and he will not divest it, if in another form, in others: he cannot admit that truth which has taken a certain shape for him may have taken another in the eye of his neighbor without ceasing to be true. He thus becomes exclusive, malevolent, and prone to persecution. The hatred of blood relations is more intense and fierce than that between strangers, and so the fanatic is all the more fierce and tyrannical against others in proportion as their views approach his own, without being identically the same. He will undergo any suffering rather than abate one jot of his claims, or retract a single jot of charity or mercy. He prefers darkness to light, the letter to the spirit, hatred to love, the wildness of passion to the calmness of inquiry. Fanaticism may show itself in all the relations of life, but its special field is found in politics and religion; and it becomes most dangerous when the two are combined. Being entirely one-sided, it is yet liable to go in the most opposite directions, and then goes all lengths. Thus we have in politics fanaticism of peace, who want peace at any cost, and under all circumstances; fanatics of unrest, who believe only in the overthrow of existing institutions; fanatics of progress, who think anything good if it is only new; and fanatics of the past, or conservatives, who wish to hold fast whatever is, no matter how bad it is: fanatics of liberty, who, however, require others to view liberty in the same light as they do, or else deny it to them; and fanatics of despotism, who wish all hearts to beat in unison, like so many well-regulated clocks. We find cosmopolitan fanatics, who glory in revelling their own country, and patriotic fanatics, who consider all other nations but their own as barbarian and heathen; the first is the spirit of faction, the second is the spirit of corruption, the third is the spirit of oppression, and the fourth is fanaticism of orthodoxy, who think the pope requires only might to make him perfect, and who pray for the re-establishment of the Inquisition and the stake. Fanaticism has left especially sad records of its excesses in the religious history of the world, not only among the heathen in India, the Moslems and the Jews, but also among Chris-
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I. The bloody encounters of the monks of Constantinople at the time of the controversy between the Eutychians and the Nestorians. It envenomed the quarrels of the Montanists and the Donatists. It perished the Jews in the Middle Ages. It organized the Inquisition, developed the methods of the early inquisitors (Laud, lixiv, 28), and invented a new sense for the words in Tit. iii. 10 (hæresiticum de vita); it instigated the crusades against the Albigenses, who, when they were indiscriminately massacred, were comforted with the assurance that "the Lord would know his own;" it aimed the dagger in the hands of Rasputin in the person of his king; it inspired the Te Deum of Gregory XIII as a thanksgiving for the massacre of St. Bartholomew's. In the Protestant world we find fanaticism in the Anabaptists of Münster, in the Crypto-calvinistic troubles, and in the wars of the Cavaliers and Roundheads of England (Beck, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 297 sq.). "Fanaticism is the most incurable of all mental diseases, because in all its forms—religious, philosophical, or political—it is distinguished by a sort of mad contempt for experience, which alone can correct errors of practical judgment" (Machine, Works, London, 1802, i, 671). See also Stillingfleet, Works, v. 19, 92, 130; Fletcher, Works (N. Y. ed.), iv, 283 sq.

FARREL or FANNO, FAVENTINO, a native of Padua, in Italy, one of the first martyrs of the Reformation in Italy. The Scriptures in Italian (probably Brucoli's version, 1532) fell into his hands, and he soon began to speak of the truth to his neighbors. When the ecclesiastical authorities heard of his course they arrested and imprisoned him. His wife and family came to him with entreaties and tears when first apprehended, and he yielded to their persuasions to gain his release from prison by recantation. Under the threat of death he continued to confess Christ openly, and he went publicly through Romagna preaching the Reformed doctrines. He was arrested at Bagni Cavallo, and condemned to the stake. He was removed to Ferrara, where, for eighteen months, persuasion, promises, and tortures were used in vain to induce him to recant. Soon after the accession of pope Julius III a brief was issued for the execution of Fanino. He embraced the messenger, saying, "I accept death joyfully for Christ's sake." Being urged to recant for the sake of his wife and children, whom he was about to leave without a protector, he refused, and the pope recommended the care of the best of the guardians." "What guardian?" "Jesus Christ! I think I could not commit them to the care of a better." He was ironed, and led out to execution; and on the way, being reproached by his enemies for his cholersomeness, when Christ was exceeding sorrowful at the approach of death, he answered, "Christ sustained all manner of pangs and conflicts with death and hell on our account, and by his sufferings freed those who really believe in him from the fear of them." He was strangled at dawn, and his body was burned at noon, in September, 1550. — Young, Life of Aonio Paladino (1860, ii, 111); M'Crie, Reformation in Italy, ch. v.

FANNO. See FANNO.

Fan-tracey. vaulting. "a kind of vaulting used chiefly in late Perpendicular work, in which all the ribs that rise from the springing of the vault have the same pitch and diverge equally in every direction, producing an effect somewhat like that of the bones of a face. This kind of vaulting admits of considerable variety in the subordinate parts, but the general effect of the leading features is more nearly uniform. It is very frequently used over tombs, chantry chapels, and other small erections, and fine examples on a larger scale exist at Henry the Seventh's Chapel; St. George's Chapel, Windsor; King's College Chapel, Cambridge, etc., in England. "Farel, Guillaume, one of the boldest pioneers of the Reformation in Switzerland and France, was born near Gap, in Dauphiny, in 1489. He studied at Paris with great success, and was for some time teacher in the college of cardinal Le Meine, to which post he was made a canon, recommended by Le Meine's chaplain, Jean Bull. At the accession of Charles V. he was made rector of St. Paul, and in 1529, bishop of Neufchatel. Guillaume became the leader of the Reformation in Lorraine. This period of his life he had no personal religious convictions; but yet, while devoted with a love of letters, he was zealous in the service of the Roman Catholic Church. But he was led, under the influence of Lefèvre, the translator of the Scriptures, about 1521 he went to Meaux, at the invitation of Lefèvre, and the bishop (Briçonnet, q. v.) gave him authority to preach. His mind was now fixed substantially in the Reformed doctrine, and he preached, perhaps, with more zeal than discretion; and in 1529, Briçonnet, now his chief temporal, sent him to Strasbourg as a young preacher. He soon found it best to retire to Switzerland. At Basel, Feb. 15, 1524, he sustained publicly thirteen theses on the chief points in controversy (Themata quaedam Latina et Germnicae proposita, Basel, 1526). During his few months' stay at Basel he visited the chief cities of the Swiss cantons, and became a sort of friend of Myconius, Haller, and Zwingli. At Basel, Ecolampadius was his warm friend, adorning his zeal and energy, but, at the same time, not unsparing of his lack of discretion. Farel was soon involved in a dispute with Eramus whoseMedianizing tendency was just the opposite of his own ardent and decided nature. He compared Erasmus to Balsam; but the scholar soon proved too strong for the young reformer, who was compelled to leave Basel. In one of his later letters, Erasmus says of him (Épist. p. 798, ed. Lond.): "You have in your neighborhood the new evangelist Farel, than whom I never saw a man more false, more virulent, more sedulous." But the abuse of Erasmus could not, in the long run, injure Farel. Towards the end of March, 1524, Farel went to Strasbourg, where he made the friendship of Bucer and Capito. Under the direction of Ecolampadius, he was admitted to a newly-formed society at Montédialard. Here he preached successfully, but yet with great violence. Once, on a procession day, he pulled out of the priest's hand the image of St. Anthony, and threw it from a bridge into the river; he narrowly escaped being torn to pieces by the enraged mob, because of his vehemence of language and Eloquence censured him for his impudence (see Correspondance des Réformateurs, Paris, 1866, i, 265). Leaving Montédialard in the spring of 1526, he spent a short time at Basel, and the next year partly in Alsace and partly in Switzerland. In 1527 he went to Aigle, and in 1528, when Berne became Protestant, he extended his labors to all the territory connected with Berne. Under his labors, Aigle and Bex became Protestant in 1528-9; Morat and Neuchâtel in 1530; Orbe in 1531. His labors during these years were not only vast, but perilous; but the government of Berne gave him strong and steady support. In 1581 he was sent as a deputation (with a. Saunier) to the Waldensian Synod at Angrogne. He always retained great influence among the Waldenses. In 1596, on his return from the Waldensian meeting, he came to Geneva, then full of religious strife. His first preaching was private, but it was too successful to be kept secret; and he was summoned before the episcopal council, at the time trembling for its authority, and therefore the more likely to severe. The meeting was adjourned; it was a session of confessions, and when Farel was leaving a gun was fired at him. He coolly remarked, "Your shots
do not terrify me." But he was forced to quit Gene-
va for the time, and sent from Montreux and Olivetan
to continue the work there. In 1588 he returned to Ge-
nea, where the Reformation was gaining ground.
Farel's situation here was full of trial and peril, but
his courage and devotion admirably fitted him for his
work. He urged his mother, when the city council,
by an edict, formally proclaimed the adhesion of
Geneva to the Reformation. Farel was full of toil
and anxiety in organizing the Reformed discipline
and worship, in which he was assisted especially by Viret
(q. v.). In 1586, Calvin stopped at Geneva to visit
the council, urged them to receive and, on Calvin's
refusal, thus addressed him: "I declare, in the name
of God, that if you do not assist us in this work of
the Lord, the Lord will punish you for following
your own interest rather than his call." Calvin,
struck with this denunciation, submitted, and was
appointed preacher and professor. See CALVIN. From
that time on Farel's labors were closely united with
those of Calvin. The confession of faith drawn up
by Farel, with Calvin's counsel, was approved by the
people in July, 1557. The same year the Council of
Geneva ordered Farel the bishop of the Burst, or city,
token of their respect and gratitude. But
the popular will was not prepared for the severe dis-
cipline of the Reformers, and in a short time the peo-
ples, under the direction of a faction, met in a public
assembly and expelled Farel and Calvin from the place.
Farel went to Neuchâtel, where the Church was in a state of disorder, in consequence of the troubles occasioned by the severity of the Re-
formed discipline. He dealt with offenders severely;
even a lady of noble birth did not escape. She had
left her husband; Farel urged her to return to him,
and on her refusal published the scandal and its author
publicly from the pulpit. A great strife arose, and
the people were on the point of expelling Farel; but
his energy overcame the factious party, and the council by vote, in 1542, proclaimed his triumph.
In that year he returned to Geneva, and went thence
to Metz, to organize the Reformed Church. He
preached first in the Dominican cemetery, amid the
ringing of the convent bells purposely to drown his
voice. Thousands afterwards flocked to hear him.
Once, when a Franciscan was preaching Mariolatry,
Farel contradicted him, and nearly fell a victim to the
fury of the mob, especially of the women. On Oct. 2,
1542, the council forbad his preaching in the city,
and he retired to the neighboring town of Montigny;
and afterwards to Gorze, where the count of Faretsem-
berg took him and his friends under his protection.
On Oct. 30, 1543, an armed band of preachers, among them
egalicia while celebrating the Easter communion.
Many were killed and wounded; among the latter
was Farel, who took refuge in the castle. He escaped
disguise, and went to Strasbourg, where he remain-
ed a few months. He then visited his old friends in
Neuchâtel and Geneva. Here he approved the exe-
cution of Servetus (q. v.). In 1557 he was sent, with
Beza, to the Protestant princes of Germany, to implore
their aid for the Waldenses, and on his return he went
advised the Reformation among the Jura Mountains.
At sixty-three he married a young widow.
Calvin's disgust, who spoke of him under the circum-
stances as our poor brother (père frère). In 1560 he
visited his native Dauphiny, established a Reformed
Church at Grenoble, and passed several months at
Gap, preaching against Rome with all the vehemence of
his hands. He returned to Geneva on Nov. 24, 1561, was
thrown into prison, but was rescued by his friends, who took him from the rampart in a basket. In 1564 he paid a visit
to the dying Calvin, and then passed some months with
his old flock at Metz. He returned to Neuchâ-
Tel torn out with fatigue, and died there Sept. 15, 1566.
Farel was an ardent, impulsive man, a missionary,
rather than an organizer, an iconoclast rather than a
theologian. His gifts admirably supplemented those of Calvin. Beza (Life of Calvin) says of Farel that
in his preaching "he excelled in a certain subtlety,
so that none could hear his thunders without trem-
bbling." Among his writings are sommaires; brevies
declaration d'ailleurs bien fort nécessaires a un chacun
Christien (Geneva, 1555); when the city council,
by an edict, formally proclaimed the adhesion of
Geneva to the Reformation. Farel was full of toil
and anxiety in organizing the Reformed discipline
and worship, in which he was assisted especially by Viret
(q. v.). In 1586, Calvin stopped at Geneva to visit
the council, urged them to receive and, on Calvin's
refusal, thus addressed him: "I declare, in the name
of God, that if you do not assist us in this work of
the Lord, the Lord will punish you for following
your own interest rather than his call." Calvin,
struck with this denunciation, submitted, and was
appointed preacher and professor. See CALVIN. From
that time on Farel's labors were closely united with
those of Calvin. The confession of faith drawn up
by Farel, with Calvin's counsel, was approved by the
people in July, 1557. The same year the Council of
Geneva ordered Farel the bishop of the Burst, or city,
token of their respect and gratitude. But
the popular will was not prepared for the severe dis-
cipline of the Reformers, and in a short time the peo-
ples, under the direction of a faction, met in a public
assembly and expelled Farel and Calvin from the place.
Farel went to Neuchâtel, where the Church was in a state of disorder, in consequence of the troubles occasioned by the severity of the Re-
formed discipline. He dealt with offenders severely;
even a lady of noble birth did not escape. She had
left her husband; Farel urged her to return to him,
and on her refusal published the scandal and its author
publicly from the pulpit. A great strife arose, and
the people were on the point of expelling Farel; but
his energy overcame the factious party, and the council by vote, in 1542, proclaimed his triumph.
In that year he returned to Geneva, and went thence
to Metz, to organize the Reformed Church. He
preached first in the Dominican cemetery, amid the
ringing of the convent bells purposely to drown his
voice. Thousands afterwards flocked to hear him.
Once, when a Franciscan was preaching Mariolatry,
Farel contradicted him, and nearly fell a victim to the
fury of the mob, especially of the women. On Oct. 2,
1542, the city council forbad his preaching in the city,
and he retired to the neighboring town of Montigny;
and afterwards to Gorze, where the count of Faretsem-
berg took him and his friends under his protection.
On Oct. 30, 1543, an armed band of preachers, among them
egalicia while celebrating the Easter communion.
Many were killed and wounded; among the latter
was Farel, who took refuge in the castle. He escaped
disguise, and went to Strasbourg, where he remain-
ed a few months. He then visited his old friends in
Neuchâtel and Geneva. Here he approved the exe-
cution of Servetus (q. v.). In 1557 he was sent, with
Beza, to the Protestant princes of Germany, to implore
their aid for the Waldenses, and on his return he went
advised the Reformation among the Jura Mountains.
At sixty-three he married a young widow.
Calvin's disgust, who spoke of him under the circum-
stances as our poor brother (père frère). In 1560 he
visited his native Dauphiny, established a Reformed
Church at Grenoble, and passed several months at
Gap, preaching against Rome with all the vehemence of
his hands. He returned to Geneva on Nov. 24, 1561, was
thrown into prison, but was rescued by his friends, who took him from the rampart in a basket. In 1564 he paid a visit
to the dying Calvin, and then passed some months with
his old flock at Metz. He returned to Neuchâ-
Tel torn out with fatigue, and died there Sept. 15, 1566.
Farel was an ardent, impulsive man, a missionary,
rather than an organizer, an iconoclast rather than a
all from us, and well-nigh left us naked." He died at his house in Milk Street in September, 1638. Three posthumous volumes of his sermons (folio) were published (1686-1670) in 1688, a second folio volume of his sermons conceived as a third in 1678 containing fifty. He also left in manuscript several memoirs of the life of Hales (q. v.) of Eton, his intimate friend. A new edition of his Sermons, with a Life of the Author by F. Jackson, appeared in London in 1849 (1 v., 8vo). They afford a fine specimen of English, and of rich and varied elocution. See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses; Hook, Ecclesiastical Biograpy, v, 57; Jackson, Life of Farissol, prefixed to the new edition of his sermons.

Farissol or Farissol, Abraham ben-Mordecai, a French Rabbi, distinguished alike in geography, polemics, and exegesis, was born at Avignon about the middle of the 16th century. In 1472 he went to Ferrara as minister to a Jewish congregation, and while there gave most of his time and attention to the study of the sacred writings. He published in 1500 a commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled ספר המים (the flower of lilies), which, according to De Rossi, was begun in 1486. Next followed an apologetic and polemic work, ספר המשה (the shield of Abraham), consisting of three parts, of which the first is an apology against Judaism, the second on Muhammadanism, and the third against Christianity. About 1517 he published a scholarly commentary on Job, ובב (Job), printed in the Venetian Rabbinical Bible (1517, fol.), and in the Amsterdam Rabbinical Bible (edited by Frankfurter, 1727-1728). In 1524 he published his famous cosmography, ספרFirestore (the book of geograph), translated and published in English by John Stow (London, 1539). In this last-named work Farissol describes the abodes of the ten tribes, the Sabaot (Elлад), and the garden of Eden, which he places in the mountains of Nubia (ch. xvii and xxx). A year later Farissol completed a Commentary on the book of Ecclesiastes, ספר התנין (the book of Proverbs), which has, however, never been printed. He died about the end of 1528, shortly after his return to Avignon, where he died, Greek, des Jésuites aux s. Scènes, ii, 129; Etheridge, Intro. to Heb. Liter. p. 458; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 614; Ritto, Cyclopaedia, ii, 4; Furst, Bib. Jud. i, 376. (J. H. W.)

FARM (דופן, elsewhere usually rendered "field"), a plot of arable land (Matt. xxii, 5). Moses, following the example of the Egyptians, made agriculture the basis of the Hebrew state. He accordingly ap- portioned to every Hebrew a certain quantity of land, and gave him the right of tilling it himself, and of transmitting it to his heirs (Num. xxvi, 33-54). This equal distribution of the soil was the basis of the Hebrew agrarian law. As in Egypt the lands all be-longed to the king, the Hebrews were not the proprietors of the fields which they cultivated, but farmers or tenants who were obliged to give to the king one fifth of their produce (Gen. xlvii, 20-25), just as Moses represents Jehovah as the sole possessor of the soil of the Promised Land, in which he was about to place the Hebrews by his special providence; and this land they held independent of all temporal superiors, by direct tenure from Jehovah their king (Lev. xxv, 23). Moses further enacted that for the land the Hebrews should pay a kind of quit-rent to Jeho- vah, the sovereign proprietor, in the form of a tenth or tithe; and a special and emporium at the priest's house. The condition of military service was also at- tached to the land, as it appears that every freeholder was obliged to attend the general muster of the national army, and (with few exceptions, Deut. xx, 5-9) to serve in it, at his own expense, as long as the occasion required. The Hebrews appear to have acquired in Egypt considerable knowledge of agriculture; but the physical circumstances of the land of Canaan were so many respects essentially different, as it was a land rarely refreshed with rain as Egypt (Deut. v, 10-15). The Hebrews, notwithstanding the richness of the soil, endeavored to increase its fertility in various ways. In order to avert the aridity which the summer drought so often occasioned, they dug water-courses and means of aqueducts communicating with the brooks, and thereby imparted to their fields a garden-like ver- dure (Psa. i, 8; lxv, 10; Prov. xxii, 1; Isa. xxxii, 2, 20). In the hilly part of the country terrace cultivation was practiced, so that the hills otherwise barren were rendered fertile (Deut. xxi, ii; Psa. liii, 16; cv, 10; Isa. xxx, 25). With the use of manure the Hebrews were undoubtedly acquainted; and that the soil might not be exhausted, it was ordered that every seventh and every fiftieth year the whole land should lie fallow. The dung, the carcasses, and the blood of animals were used to enrich the soil (2 Kings ix, 57; Psa. lxxii, 10; vii, 2; Jer. ix, 22). Salt, either by itself, or mixed in the dunghill in order to promote putrefaction, is specially mentioned as a compost (Matt. v, 18; Luke xiv, 54, 56). The soil was enriched also, by means of the ashes of burnt sacrifices, and the ashes of corn, brambles, grass, etc., that overspread the land during the fallow or sabbatical year, were reduced by fire. The burning over the surface of the land had also the good effect of destroying the seeds of noxious herbs (Prov. xxv, 8; Isa. xxx, 10). The soil of Pal- estine is very fertile, if the Jews of long spring, and the rains of autumn and winter are not witheld. "Never- theless," observes Hengstenberg, "it is to be con- sidered that the Canaan of which Moses speaks is in a manner an ideal land. It was never what it might have been, since the bond of allegiance, in conse- quence of which God had promised to multiply it and its rain in its season, was always far from being perfectly complied with." Among the Hebrews the occupation of the husbandman was held in high honor, and even distinguished men disdain not to put their hands to the plough (1 Sam. i, 6-7; 1 Kings xix, 19; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10). The system in which agriculture was held diminished as luxury increased, but it never wholly ceased; even after the exile, when many of the Jews had become merchants and mechanics, the easteem and honor attached to this occupation still continued, especially under the dynasty of the Ptolomies, who were agriculturists from religious motives. See LAND.

In ancient Egypt, the peasants or husbandmen, like the modern felâhs of the same country, seem to have formed a distinct class, if not caste, of society (Wilkin- son, Anc. Egypt., ii, 1, 2). The government did not interfere directly with the peasants respecting the nature of the produce they intended to cultivate, and the vexations of later times were unknown under the Pha- raohs. They thought to have the best opportuni- ties of obtaining, from actual observation, an accurate knowledge on all subjects connected with hus- bandry; and, as Diodorus observes, "being from their infancy brought up to agricultural pursuits, they far excelled the husbandmen of other countries, and had become acquainted with the capabilities of the land, the mode of cultivation, and the times to sow, reap, and reap, as well as all the most useful secrets connect- ed with the harvest, which they had derived from their ancestors, and had improved by their own experience." "They rented," says the same historian, "the arable lands belonging to the kings, the priests, and the milita- rary class, which was not a small sum; and empty a great part of the time in the tillage of their farms;" and the laborers, who cultivated land for the rich peasant, or other land- owners, were employed by the steward or owner of the estate, who had authority over them, and
the power of condemning delinquents to the bastinado. This is shown by the paintings of the tombs, which frequently represent a person of consequence inspecting the tillage of the field, either seated in a chariot, walking, or leaning on his staff, accompanied by a favorite dog. To one officer were intrusted the affairs of the house, answering to "the ruler," "the overseer," or "the steward of Joseph's house" (Gen. xxxix, 5; xliii, 16, 19; xlv, 1); others "superintended the granaries" (Isa. iii, 10).

At the present day the lower orders in Egypt, with the exception of a very small proportion, chiefly residing in the large towns, consist of fellahin (or agriculturists). Most of those in the great towns, and a few in the smaller towns and some of the villages, are petty tradesmen or artificers, or obtain their livelihood as servants, or by various labors. In all cases their earnings are very small; barely sufficient, in general, and sometimes insufficient, to supply them and their families with the cheapest necessities of life. Their food chiefly consists of bread (made of millet or of maize), milk, new cheese, eggs, small salted fish, cucumbers and melons, and gourds of a great variety of kinds, onions and leeks, beans, chick-pea, lupins, the fruit of the black egg-plant, lentils, etc., dates (both fresh and dried), and pickles. Most of the vegetables they eat in a crude state. When the maize (or Indian corn) is nearly ripe, many ears of it are plucked, and toasted or baked, and eaten thus by the peasants.

It is too dear to be an article of common food for the fellahin, and flesh-meat they very seldom taste. It is surprising to observe how simple and poor is the diet of the Egyptian peasantry, and yet how robust and healthy most of them are, and how severe is the labor which they can undergo (see Lane, Moi. Egypt., 2:71).

Dr. Thomson thus describes the modern lower class of farmers in Palestine (Land and Book, i, 581 sq.):

"These farmers about us belong to el-Mugbar, and their land extends to the declivity immediately above Gennesaret, a distance of at least eight miles from our dwellings. Our farmers would find it hard to travel so far before they began the day's work, and so would these if they had it to do every day; but they drive their oxen before them, carry bed, bedding, and board, plow, yoke, and seed on their donkeys, and expect to remain out in the open country until their task is accomplished. The mildness of the climate enables them to do so without inconvenience or injury. How very different from the habits of Western farmers! These men carry no cooking apparatus, and, we should think, no provisions. They, however, have a quantity of their thin, tough bread, a few olives, and perhaps a little cheese in that leather bag which hangs from their shoulders — the 'script' of the New Testament — and with this they are contented. When hungry, they sit by the fountain or the brook, and eat; if weary or sleepy, they throw around them their loose coats, and lie down on the ground as contentedly as the ox himself. At night they retire to a cave, sheltering rock, or shady tree, kindle a fire of thorn-bushes, heat over their stale bread, and, if they have shot a bird or caught a fish, they broil it on the coals, and thus dinner and supper in one. we achieved with the least possible trouble. But their great luxury is smoking, and the whole evening is whiled away in whiffing tobacco and bandying the rude jokes of the light-hearted peasant. Such a life need not be disagreeable, nor is it necessarily a severe drudgery in this delightful climate. The only thing they dread is an incursion of wild Arabs from beyond the lake, and to meet them they are all armed as if going forth to war." See Agriculture.

Farmer, Hugh, a learned Independent minister, was born in 1714, near Shrewsbury, England. He studied under Doddridge, and gained in 1755 the pastorate of Nantwich, in Cheshire. In 1760 he was appointed, he became assistant to Mr. David Some. His services, however, proving acceptable to the Dissenters in the neighborhood of Walthamstow, a place of worship was soon built, and for many years he continued to reside there. He died Feb. 6, 1867.

Dr. Thomson describes the wandering fellahin and their precarious life in Syria, in Passages from the Life of Jesus in Syria, p. 213, etc., which is worth reading. See also Noah, Narrative of a Mission to the Sick, p. 70. See also the well-known and highly popular novel of Dr. Foster, The Amateur Naturalist, etc.

Dr. Thomson thus describes the modern lower class of farmers in Palestine (Land and Book, i, 581 sq.):

"These farmers about us belong to el-Mugbar, and their land extends to the declivity immediately above Gennesaret, a distance of at least eight miles from our dwellings. Our farmers would find it hard to travel so far before they began the day's work, and so would these if they had it to do every day; but they drive their oxen before them, carry bed, bedding, and board, plow, yoke, and seed on their donkeys, and expect to remain out in the open country until their task is accomplished. The mildness of the climate enables them to do so without inconvenience or injury. How very different from the habits of Western farmers! These men carry no cooking apparatus, and, we should think, no provisions. They, however, have a quantity of their thin, tough bread, a few olives, and perhaps a little cheese in that leather bag which hangs from their shoulders — the 'script' of the New Testament — and with this they are contented. When hungry, they sit by the fountain or the brook, and eat; if weary or sleepy, they throw around them their loose coats, and lie down on the ground as contentedly as the ox himself. At night they retire to a cave, sheltering rock, or shady tree, kindle a fire of thorn-bushes, heat over their stale bread, and, if they have shot a bird or caught a fish, they broil it on the coals, and thus dinner and supper in one. we achieved with the least possible trouble. But their great luxury is smoking, and the whole evening is whiled away in

whiffing tobacco and bandying the rude jokes of the light-hearted peasant. Such a life need not be disagreeable, nor is it necessarily a severe drudgery in this delightful climate. The only thing they dread is an incursion of wild Arabs from beyond the lake, and to meet them they are all armed as if going forth to war." See Agriculture.

Farmer, Hugh, a learned Independent minister, was born in 1714, near Shrewsbury, England. He studied under Doddridge, and gained in 1755 the pastorate of Nantwich, in Cheshire. In 1760 he was appointed, he became assistant to Mr. David Some. His services, however, proving acceptable to the Dissenters in the neighborhood of Walthamstow, a place of worship was soon built, and for many years he continued to reside there. He died Feb. 6, 1867. He published A Dissertation on Miracles (London, 1771, 8vo); An Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness (London, 1776, 8vo, 8d ed.); and An Essay on the Damnation of the New Testament (London, 1776, 8vo), in which he endeavored to prove that these were not cases of real possession, but of persons afflicted with epilepsy or madness. "This publication was answered by the late Mr. Fell, one of the tutors of Homerton Academy; and a controversy ensued, in which much acrimony of temper was discovered on both sides. Mr. Farmer was rather of a high spirit and hasty temper; but, abating these defects, he was a most estimable man," though he allowed himself larger liberty in speculation than was common in that age. Thus he interpreted the temptation of Christ as a vision, and demoniacal possession as a disease. See DEMONIAC. A clause in his will directed his manuscripts to be burned; among them was a treatise on Balaam, and a revised edition of his essays on miracles. See Dobson, Memoirs of Farmer (London, 1806, 8vo); Jones, Christian Biography, p. 145.

Farnsworth, Ellis, an English divine, was born in the parish of Benssall, Derbyshire, England, of which his father was rector, pursued his studies first at Chesterfield School, then at Eton, and then at Jesus College, Cambridge. In 1768 he was presented to the rectory of Carrington, in his native county, where he died in 1783. His works, which are all translations, are: 1. Life of Pope Sixtus V, from the Italian of Gregorio Leti, with Preface, etc. (London, 1754, fol., and Dubl., 1778, 8vo); — 2. A short History of the Israelites, from abe Fleury's Les Mours des Israelites (London, 1756, 8vo; new edition by Adam Clarke, Lond. 1805); — 3. The History of the Holy War, translated N. H., in 16 parts, 1662. The History of the Civil Wars of France, from the Italian of Davila (1775, 2 vols. 4to);— 4. The Works of Machiavelli, translated, with Notes, Anecdotes, and Life (1761, 2 vols. 4to, and 1775, 4 vols. 8vo), a work not appreciated during the life of the translator, but now commanding a high price (Driesser, Cultivation of Authors, London, and N.Y. 1859 p. 84). See Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict., and Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s. v. (J. W. M.)

Farnovius (Stamnalis Farnovski or Farnovus), one of the principal Antitrinitarians of Poland, was a pupil of Peter Gonesius (q. v.). After residing for some time with the Socinians, he became in 1567 a vicar in the parish of Unorn, where he achieved, in one year, the task of teaching, in the true Arian sense, the subject of the Son to the Father, without, however, denying the pro-
existence of the supernatural part of his nature. The followers of his system are called Farnovians or Farnesian. Farnovius vigorously attacked the Socinian wing which maintained that Christ was essentially a man, but is to be worshipped as God since his ascension. He found it difficult, however, to retain the half-way position he had taken, and in the course of events most of his followers joined the main body of the Unitarians, especially when Socinus became the chief of that party. His own school vanished at his death, about 1614. — Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 381; Zelter, Hist. Crypto-Sociniani, i, 1201; Rock, Hist. Andirintiariorum; O. Fock, Socinianismus, i, 155 sq.; Moisheim, Church History, iii, 242; Trechsel, Die protest. Andirintiarier, vols. i and ii.

Faroe Islands. See DENMARK.

Farquhar, Richard, an eminent composer of music, and regarded as one of the fathers of Church music in England, was born in the early part of the 18th century, and died about 1765. His name appears on the list of gentlemen of the chapel to Edward VI in 1564, and he was afterwards organist and master of the choristers of St. George's Chapel, Windsor. His compositions for the Church, simple as they seem, are so solemn, so devout, so tender, and affecting, that they may challenge comparison with the sacred music of any age or country (Pictorial Hist.). Many of his pieces are found in the collections of Boyce and Barnard. The best are, "Hide not thou thy face," "Call to rememberance," and "Lord, for thy tender mercy's sake." — Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors; Pictorial Hist. of England, iii, 682 (Chambers's ed.). (J. W. M.)

Farthing is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. for two Roman coins of different values. See Money.

1. The assarius (Greekized ἀσσαίρος, Matt. x, 29; Luke xii, 6), properly a small as, assarium, but in the time of our Lord used as the G. equivalent of the Lat. as. In the texts cited it is put (like our "a copper") for any trifling amount. The Vulg. in Matt. x, 29 renders it by as, and in Luke xii, 6, puta dispensas for two assaria, the dispensas or dispensa being equal to two asses. The ἀσσαίρος is therefore either the Roman as, or the more common equivalent in Palestine in the Greco-Roman series, or perhaps both. The rendering of the Vulg. in Luke xii, 6 makes it probable that a single coin is intended by two assaria, and this opinion is strengthened by the occurrence, on coins of Chios, struck during the imperial period, but without the heads of emperors, and therefore of the Greek autonous class, of the words ACCAPION, ACCAPIA AYO, ACCAPIA TPIA. The half assarium of the same island has also been found, yet it is of the same size as the full assarium (Akerman, Numismatic Illustrations of the New Testament, p. 7).

The ass as a copper coin, the Roman unit of value for small sums, equal to a tenth of the denarius or diacronio, i.e. 1/10 cent (Smith's Dictionary of Classical Antig., s. v. As). See Penny.

2. The quadrans (Greekized ἀπαίροιντος, Matt. x, 26; Mark xii, 42), the fourth of an as, equal to two leptai (Mark, l. c.), a small copper coin, equal nearly to two fifths of a cent. The name quadrans was originally given to the piece of three ounces, therefore also called tetrans. Hence it bore three balls as its distinctive mark (Kitto, Pictorial Bible, note on Mark, I. c.). The leptai, αὐτός, was originally a very small Greek copper coin,

seven of which with the Athenians went to the γαλατεία, or bronze piece. The copper currency of Palestine, in the reign of Tiberius, was partly of Greek coins, partly of Greek-Roman (technically Greek Imperial). In the former class there was no common piece smaller than the as, equivalent to the ἀσσαίρος of the N. T. (above), but in the latter there were two common smaller pieces, the one apparently the quarter of the ἀσσαίρος, and the other its eighth, though the irregularity with which they were struck makes it difficult to pronounce with certainty; the former piece was doubtless called the κορφάρχος, or quadrans, and the latter the ἅλφιον, or leptai. See Mite.

Fascination. See Charm.

Fassari, Vincent, a Sicilian theologian, was born in Palermo in 1609, and died in the same city in 1668. He became a Jesuit in 1614, and taught successively belles-lettres, philosophy, theology, and the Scriptures. Of his religious and philosophical works, the most important are Disputationes philosophicae, de quantitate, ejusque Compositione, Essentia, etc. (Palermo, 1644, fol.); and Immortalitatem Deiperson Consecratio theologicae Communionis trinitatis ( Lyons, 1666, fol.)—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale; Mongitore, Bibliotheca Sicula; Bibliothèque des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus. (J. W. M.)

Fassoni, Librato, an Italian theologian, was born about A.D. 1700, and died at Rome in 1767. He was professor of theology in the college of St. Thomas in Rome. We have from him De Lebimitate Rei Trin. (Sinsagiglia, 1754, fol.):—De Graeco Sacramentum Liturg. Editione a LXX Interpretatione (Urbino, 1754, fol.);—De Pluronum in Iim Abarbec bestiudine ante Christi mortem (Rome, 1760, 4to.)—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale. (J. W. M.)

Fast (properly, δεκα, ten, strictly, to keep the mouth shut; ενετίσσει, strictly, not to eat). In the early ages of the world, when the spontaneous productions of nature and the spoils of the chase formed man's chief aliment, fasting from time to time was compulsory, in consequence of the uncertainty of obtaining food when wanted. It would be easy for such religious ignorance to interpret this compulsion into an expression of the divine will, and so to sanction the observance of fasting as a religious duty. The transition would be easier at a time and in countries when the office of physician was united in the same person with that of priest, for in his climates occasional fasting is not without its advantages on the health; and an abstinence which the state of the body required, but which the appetite shunned or refused, the authority of the priest and the sanctions of religion
would exact at once with ease and certainty. In the earlier stages of civilization no idea is more prevalent and operative than that the Deity is propitiated by voluntary sufferings on the part of his creatures. Flowers, fruits, and kinds of food, various invocations, and even the sacrifice of life itself. Nay, "the fruit of the body"—the dear pledges of mutual affection, the best earthly gift from the heavenly Father—children, were sacrificed in expiation of "the sin of the soul." Human enjoyments were held to be displeasing in the sight of God. The notion that the man was jealous of man's happiness runs through the entire texture of Greek and Roman mythology; and the development of this falsehood, as presented in Greek tragedy, has given birth to some of the finest productions of the human mind. But what more pleasant than food to man, especially to the semi-barbarian? The denial of such a pleasure must then be well-pleasing to the Divinity, the rather because, on occasions of family bereavement, of national disaster, or any great calamity, the appetite is naturally affected under the influence of grief, and is made to nauseate the food in its ordinary condition it finds most grateful. A connection between sorrow and fasting would thus be established which would carry with it a sort of divine sanction in being natural and inevitable in its origin. Accordingly, abstinence, which seemed imposed by Providence as a means of expiation of evil done, was as an accompaniment of sorrow, easily became regarded as a religious duty when voluntarily prolonged or assumed, and grew to be considered as an efficacious means for appeasing the divine wrath, and restoring prosperity and peace. "Climate, the habits of a people, and their creed, give it at different periods different characteristics; but it may be pronounced to have been a recognised institution with all the more civilized nations, especially those of Asia, throughout all historic times. We find it in high estimation among the ancient Egyptians, the Persians, the Egyptians, the Persians, and the Iranians. It forms a prominent feature in the ceremonies of the mysteries of Mithra, and found its way, together with these, over Armenia, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia Minor, to Palestine, and northward to the wilds of Scythia. The ancient Chii, and Hindus, and principally the latter, in accordance with their primal view—which they held in common with the Parsees—of heaven and hell, salvation and damnation, of the transmigration of the soul, and of the body as the temporary prison of a fallen spirit, carried fasting to an unnatural excess. Although the Vedas attach little importance to the external body, yet the body, by the due observance of which the Hindu believer is purified from all his sins, requires, among other things, an uninterrupted fast for the space of twelve days. Egypt seems to have had few or no compulsory general fasts: but it is established beyond doubt that for the initiation into the mysteries of Ahas and Osiris, temporary abstinence was rigorously enforced. In Siam, all solemn acts are preceded by a period of fasting, the seasons of the new and full moon being especially consecrated to this rite. In Java, where abstinence from the flesh of oxen is part of the religion of all Buddhists and worshippers of Brahma alike, the manner and times of the observance vary according to the religion of the individual. Again, in Tibet, the Dalai-lamas and Bogdo-lamas hold this law in common. That Greece observed and gave a high place to occasional fasting is evident from the third day of the festival of the Eleusinian mysteries, and that, for instance, those who came to consult the oracle of Trophonius had to abstain from food for twenty-four hours—is well known. It need hardly be added that the Romans did not omit to insert the elements of the festival, and ceremonies which they adopted from their neighbours, though with them the periods of fasting were of less frequent recurrence" (Chambers, Encyclopaedia, s. v.).

The Mohammedans fast (Ull Sulees) during the whole of their ninth (lunar) month Ramadan (see D'Herbelot, Bibl. Or. s. v.). (On this religious observance among pagan nations, consult Meiners, Gesch. der Relig. ii, 192; Lachmann, Amor. Græc. Sacr. p. 462; Wachsmuth, Alterthümer ii, 287; Böttiger, Künstweltköl. i, 132.) See ASCETICISM.

I. Jewish Fasting.—The word דָּעַת (yov'rà, jyv'rì) is not found in the Pentateuch, but it often occurs in the historical books and the prophets (2 Sam. xxii, 16; 1 Kings xxii, 9-12; Ezra viii, 21; Ps. lxxix, 10; Isa. viii, 3; Joel i, 14; ii, 16; Zech. viii, 19, etc.). In the law the only term used to denote the religious observance of fasting is the more significant one, יְבָשָׁא (yv'và, yv'ráh, yv'ráh; agg. yv'vàh, yv'ráh). Fasting (the soul) (Lev. vii, 29-31; xxiii, 27; Num. xxx, 18). The word דָּעַת, i.e. affliction, which occurs Ezra ix, 5, where it is rendered in A. V. "heavy-ness," is commonly used to denote fasting in the Talmud, and is the title of one of its treatises.

The sacrifice of the personal will, which gives to fasting its alluring influence, is expressed in the old term used in the law, affliction. The faithful son of Israel is taught that fasting is one of the "chastening" or "purifying" of the soul (Ps. lxxix, 10). But the frequent admonitions and stern denunciations of the prophets may show us how prone the Jews were in their formal fasts to lose the idea of a spiritual discipline, and to regard them as being in themselves a means of winning favor from God. In place of a true and holy spirit, the many themes of them in order to appear religious before men (Isa. viii, 3; Zech. vii, 5, 6; Mal. iii, 14; comp. Matt. vi, 16).

The Jewish fasts were observed with various degrees of strictness. Sometimes there was entire abstinence from food (Esth. iv, 16, etc.). On other occasions the restriction was limited to the fast itself, and occasional bullets from plain diet (Dan. x, 8). Rules are given in the Talmud (both in Yoma and Tosefith) as to the mode in which fasting is to be observed on particular occasions. The fast of the day, according to Josephus (Ant. iii, 10, 5), was considered to terminate at sunset, and St. Jerome speaks of the fasting Jew as anxiously waiting for the rising of the stars. Fasts were not observed on the sabbaths, the new moons, the great festivals, or the feasts of Purim and Dedication (Judith viii, 6; Tosefith, ii, 10).

Those who fasted frequently dressed in sackcloth or rent their garments, put ashes on their head and went barefoot (1 Kings xxii, 27; comp. Josephus, Ant. vii, 18, 8; Neh. ix, 1; Ps. xxxv, 18). The rabbinical directions for the ceremonies to be observed in public fasts, and the prayers to be used in them, may be seen in Tosefith, ii, 1-4 (see the Cod. Talm. ii, Tosefith, c. neras, et nois De Lundie, Trad. &c. in Rh. 1694. 5vo). Consult also Maimonides, Jod Ha-Chesviya, Hilkhat Tashmii, i, 315 sq. Lightfoot, Horae Hebraicae on Luke xlvii, 12; Schottgen, Horae Hebraicae on Luke xlviii, 12; Reland, Antiquitates Sacrarum Veterum Historiarum (1717), p. 558 sqq.; Bloch, in Geiger's Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für juridische Theol. iv, 295 sqq.; Fink, in Erzb. und Gruher's Encyclopädie, s. v. Fasten; Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten (Leipzig, 1857). i, 184 sqq.: Bauer, Gottsad. Verf. 1, 484 sqq.; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 258 sqq.

The solo fast required by Moses was on the great day of annual atonement. This observance seems always to have retained some prominence as "the fast (Acta xxviii, 9). But what the observance of the enlarged duty involved we are nowhere expressly informed, and can approximate to a knowledge of precise details about the nature of the fast of the Jews. It may be considered as affording a picturesque frail of this divinely-sanctioned ordinance. In these remarks the opinion is implied that "the fast," whatever importance it may have subsequently acquired, was orig...
inally only an incident, not to say an accident, in the great solemnity of the annual atonement. See ATONE-
MENT, DAY OF.

There is no mention of any other periodical fast in the year in Zech, vii, 1-7; viii, 18. From these
passages it appears that the Jews, during their captiv-
ity, observed four annual fasts in the fourth, fifth, sev-
enth, and tenth months. When the building of the
second Temple had commenced, those who remained in
Babylon sent a message to the priests at Jerusalem to
instruct them to observe the fasts in the fifth month
which should not be discontinued. The prophet
takes the occasion to rebuke the Jews for the spirit in
which they had observed the fast of the seventh month
as well as that of the fifth (vii, 5-6); and afterwards
(viii, 19) he devoting the subject an evangelical turn, he
declares that the whole of the four fasts shall be turned
to "joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts." Zechaniah
simply distinguishes the fasts by the months in which
they were observed; but the Mishna (Tosnikh, iv, 6)
and St. Jerome (in Zechaniah viii) give statements of
certain historical events which they were intended to
commemorate:

(1.) The fast of the fourth month.—Kept on the 17th
of Tammuz, to commemorate the making of the golden
calf by the Jews, the breaking of the tables of the law
by Moses (Exod. xxiv, comp. xxiii, 3); the failure of the
Cohah sacrifice for want of cattle during the siege,
and the storming of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar
(Jer. iii).”

(2.) The fast of the fifth month.—Kept on the 9th of
Av, to commemorate the decree that those who had
left Egypt shall not enter Canaan (Num. xiv, 27
etc.); the Temple burnt by Nebuchadnezzar, and
again by Titus; and the ploughing up of the site of the
Temple, with the capture of Bither, in which a vast
number of Jews from Jerusalem had taken refuge
in the time of Hadrian (comp. Josh, Esch. d. Jerusalem,
iii, 1).”

(3.) The fast of the seventh month.—Commemorating
the complete sack of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar,
and the death of Gedaliah (2 Kings xxv, 6), on the
3d of Tisri (comp. Sefer Olam Rabboc, c. xxvi).

(4.) The fast of the tenth month.—On the 10th of
Tebishah, to commemorate the receiving by Ezekiel and
the other captives in Babylon of the news of the destruc-
tion of Jerusalem (Ezek. xxxiii, 21; compare 2
Kings xxv, 1).

These four fasts have been Christianized, and tra-
dition tells us that their transfer into the Christian Church
was made by the Roman bishop Callistus (fourth A.D.
229). To deprive them, however, of their Jewish appearance, the whole year was divided into four
seasons (quattuor tempora), and a fast was ap-
pointed for one week of each season (compare Herzog,
Encyclopédie, iii, 326).

(5.) The fast of Esther.—Additional to the above;
kept on the 13th of Adar (Esth. iv, 16). See EESTHER
(Fast of).

Some other events mentioned in the Mishna are
omitted as unimportant. Of those here stated several
could have had nothing to do with the fasts in the
time of the prophet. It would seem most probable,
from the mode in which he has grouped them together,
that the original purpose of all four was to commemo-
rate the circumstances connected with the commence-
ment of the captivity, and that the other events were
subsequently connected with them in the mind of
some real or fancied coincidence of the time of occu-
rence. As regards the fast of the fifth month, at least,
it can hardly be doubted that the captive Jews applied
it exclusively to the destruction of the Temple, and
that the Exon was highly regarded as the reason of
their request to be released from its observance the
fact that it had no longer any purpose after the new
Temple was begun. As this fast (as well as the three
others) is still retained in the Jewish calendar, we must
in
er either that the priests did not agree with the
Babylonian Jews, or that the fast, having been discon-
tinued for a time, was renewed after the destruction
of the Temple by Titus.

The number of annual fasts in the present Jewish calendar has been multiplied to twenty-eight, a list of
which is given by Reland (Anqip., p. 274). See CALEND.

2. Public fasts were occasionally proclaimed to ex-
press national humiliation on account of sin or misfor-
tune, and to secure the presence of God in a time of
great undertaking or threatened danger. In the case
of public danger, the proclamation appears to have
been accompanied with the blowing of trumpets (Joel
i, 1-18; comp. Tossnikh, i, 6). The following instances
are recorded of strictness national fasts: Samuel de-
dered "all Israel" to Mirzeph and proclaimed a fast,
performing at the same time what seems to have been
a ritual symbolism of purification, when Jehoshaphat appointed one
"throughout all Judah, when he was preparing for
war against Moab and Ammon (2 Chron. xx, 8); in
the reign of Jeholakim, one was proclaimed for "all
the people in Jerusalem, and all who came thither out
of the cities of Judah," when the prophecy of Jeremiah
was publicly read by Baruch (Jer. xxxvi, 5-10; comp.
Baruch i, 6); and two are noticed in the book of the
Maccabe-
(e 1 Macc. xxxi, 48-47; 2 Macc. xiii, 10-12).

There are a considerable number of instances of cit-
es and bodies of men observing fasts on occasions in
which they were especially concerned. In the days of
Philip the first Anabate, who was not a day or a
night in the state (Acts, viii, 20), when the second Temple was completed, "the children of Israel assembled with fasting, and with sackcloths and earth upon them," to hear the law read, and to confess their sins (Neh. ix, 1). There are references to
general fasts in the prophets (Jer. vii, 14; ii, 15, 37; Isa.
iv, v), and two are noticed in the book of the Maccas-
bees (1 Macc. iii, 46-47; 2 Macc. xiii, 10-12).

Public fasts express on account of unseasonable
weather and of famine may perhaps be traced in the
first and second chapters of Joel. In later times they
assumed great importance, and form the main subject
of the treatise Tosnikh in the Mishna. The Sanbe-
drim ordered general fasts when the nation was threat-
ened with any great evil, such as drought or famine
(Josephus, Life, § 56; Tosnith, i, 5), as was usual with
the Romans in their supplications (Livy, iii, 7; v, 25).

3. Private occasional fasts are recognized in one
phrase of the passage (Numb. xxx, 13). The instances
given of individuals fasting under the influence of
crime, vexation, or anxiety are numerous (1 Sam. i, 7;
xx, 44; 2 Sam. iii, 55; xi, 16; 1 Kings xxi, 27; Ezra
x, 6; Neh. ii, 18; iv, 19; Deut. i, 10). The fasts for forty
days of Moses (Exod. xxiv, 18; xxxiv, 29; Deut. ix, 18)
and of Eliah (1 Kings xix, 8) are, of course, to be re-
garded as special acts of spiritual discipline, faint
though wonderful shadows of that fast in the wilder-
ness of Judaism, in which all true fasting finds its meaning (Matt. iv, 1, 2). As in the private fasts became very frequent (Lightfoot, p. 318), awaiting the call of no special occasion, but entering as a regular part of the current religious worship (Sueton. Aug. 76; Tacit. Hist. v, 4, 8). In Judith vili, 6 we read that Judith fasted all the days of her widowhood, "save the time of the new moons and the sabbaths, and the feasts of the new moons, and the new moons, and the feasts and the solemn days of the house of Israel." In Tobit xii prayer is declared to be good with fasting; see also Luke ii, 37; Matt. ix, 14. The parable of the Pharisee and Publican (Luke xviii, 9, 10; compare Matt. x. 14) shows how much more at the Pharisees were given to voluntary and private fasts—"I fast twice a week." The first was on the fifth day of the week, on which Moses ascended to the top of Mount Sinai; the second was on the second day, on which he came down (Tumidii, ii, 9; Herzog, Megillah, 75, 1). This bi-weekly fasting has also been adopted in the Christian Church; but Monday and Thursday were changed to Wednesday and Friday (Sesquis. v. et sexta, as commemorators of the betrayal and crucifixion of Christ. Of a similar semi-occasional character was the First-born sons' fast (112. 4272), on the day preceding the feast of Passover, in commemoration of the fact that while God on this occasion spared the firstborn of the Egyptians, he spared those of the house of Israel (comp. Exod. xii, 29, etc.; So2phism. xii, 8). See First-Born.
The Essenese and the Therapeutae also were much given to such observances (Philo, Vit. Contemp. p. 618; Eusebius, Prop. Ecles. ix, 5). Fasts were considered a useful exercise for purging the mind for special religious impressions; as in Dan. x, 2 sq. (see also Acts xiii, 3; xiv, 23). From Matt. xxvi, 21: "Howbeit this kind of (dámones) goeth not out but by prayer and fasting," it would appear that the practice under consideration was considered in the days of Christ to act in certain special cases as an exorcism.

Fasting (as stated above) was accompanied by the ordinary signs of grief among the Israelites, as may be seen in 1 Macc. iii, 47. The abstinence was either partial or total. In the case of the latter food was entirely foregone, but this ordinarily took place only in fasts of short duration; and abstinence from food in Eastern climates is more easy and less detrimental (if not in some cases positively useful) than keeping from food would be with us in these cold, damp Northern regions (Esth. iv, 16). In the case of partial abstinence the time was longer, the denial in degree less, and the reason assigned was either mourning for the dead (Ezra vi, 23), fasting (I Macc. iv, 14), or in the days of Nehemiah (vii, 4), he ate no "pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in his mouth." There does not appear to have been any fixed and recognised periods during which these fasts endured. From one day to forty days fasts were observed. The latter period appears to have been regarded with feelings of peculiar sanctity, owing, doubtless, to the above instances in Jewish history. There are monographs, entitled De jejunio Hebraeorum, by Opitz (Kil. 1690), Peninger (Holm. 1684), and Lund (Aboe, 1696).

II. In New Testament.—We have already seen how qualified the sanction was which Moses gave to the observance of fasting as a religious duty. In the same spirit which actuated him, the propheta bore testimony against the lamentable abuses to which the practice was turned in the lapse of time and with the increase of social corruption (Isa. viii, 4 sq.; Jer. xiv, 12; Zac. viii, 5). Continuity in the same species of influence and perfection that spirituality in religion which Moses began, our Lord rebuked the Pharisees sternly for their outward and hypocritical pretences in the fasts which they observed (Matt. vi, 16 sq.), and actually abstained from appointing any fast whatever as a part of his own religion. In Matt. ix, 14, the question of the reason of this avoidance is expressly put—"Why do we (the disciples of John) and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?" The answer shows the voluntary character of fasting in the Christian Church—"Can the children of the bridechamber fast? It is true that a period is alluded to when these children "fast, but the general scope of the passage, taken in connection with the fact that Christ's disciples fasted not, and with the other fact, that while John (Matt. xi, 18, 19) "came neither eating nor drinking," the Son of man "came eating and drinking," clearly shows that our Lord, having positively excluded fasting, so by the assertion that a time would come when, being deprived of the personal presence of the bridegroom, his disciples would fast, meant to intimate the approach of a period of general mourning, and employed the term "fast" derivatively to signify rather a sorrow corporal self-denial (Neander, Leben Jesu, p. 231, 250).

In his sermon on the mount, however (Matt. vi, 17), while correcting the self-righteous austerity of Pharisaic fasting, he clearly allows the practice itself, but leaves the frequency, extent, and occasion of its performance to the private conscience and circumstances of each individual.

That the early Christians observed the ordinary fasts which the public practice of their day sanctioned is clear from more than one passage in the New Testament Scriptures (Acts xiii, 2; xiv, 23; 2 Cor. vi, 6); but in most cases they did nothing more by this observance than obedience, as in general they thought themselves bound to do, to the law of their fathers so long as the Mosaic institutions remained entire. Although the great body of the Christian Church held themselves free from all ritual and ceremonial observances when God in his providence had brought Judaism to a termination in the rasure of the holy city and the closing of the Temple, yet the practice of fasting thus originated might easily and unobservedly have been transmitted from year to year and from age to age, and that the rather because to large a portion of the disciples being Jews (to say nothing of the influence of the Ebionites in the primitive Church), thousands must have been accustomed to fasting from the earliest days of their existence, either in their own practice, or the practice of their fathers, relatives, and associates (comp. Cor. vii. 19 to the Jewish Fasti).

Literature.—Cleaceius, De jejunio apud antiquos (Rom. 1699); Tiegenborn, Descriptio jejuniorum (Jen. 1607); Drexel, De jejunio (Antw. 1637); Dalilus, De jejunio et Quadragesimae (Dauentir. 1654); Ortol, De ritu jejuniorum (Vibor. 1696); Locher, De fastis (Hamb. 1700); Fawe, De fastibus divini celeberrimi in jejunia (Par. 1668); Fundo, De jejunio (Alten. 1663); Nicolai, De jejunio Christiano (Par. 1667); Sommer, De jejuniorum natura (Jen. 1670); Sagittarius, De jejunio pietatis et religionis (Jen. 1672); Vareninus, De jejunio Christianum (Rost. 1684); Saliden, De jejunio in Obita theolog. (Amst. 1684) p. 538 sqq.; Thomassin, Traité des jeûnes (Paris 1690); Hooper, Discourse concerning Lent (Lond. 1696); Ortol, De jejunio Mosis quadragesimae (Lips. 1701). Andry, Le regime de carême (Paris 1710); Pfannern, De jejunio Christiano. (In Obs. sacr. ii. 824-500); Malillia, De jejunio (In Estreorum p. i. 431 sq.); Hildebrand, De jejunio (Helmst. 1719); Böhrer, De iure etra jejunantes (Hal. 1722); Schütz, De quot. temporum jejuniorum (Wemitz. 1723); Volland, De jejunio Sabbaticae (Rost. 1741); Muratori, De quot. temporum jejuniorum (In Antic. ii. 244 sqq.); Bernhold, De jejunio corporali (Jena. 1727); Bernhold, De jejunio spirituali (Altorf. 1736); Carpasov, De jejunio Sabbaticae (Rost. 1741); à Seelen, De jejunio Sabbaticae (Rost. 1741-2); Becker, De jejunio vett. Christianorum (Leucop. 1742); Blich, De quadragesimae jejunio (Lips. 1743); Kugel, De zoroaphaeis jejuniorum (Bresl. 1746); Seidel, De jejunio, jehuim suave (Lond. 1747); Schickelanz, III. 16*
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De jejuo Sabbatico (Servest. 1768); Körner, Jejunium Christo propositum (Lips. 1776); Anon. Gesch. der Fasstenaltesten (Viein. 1787); Anon. Apologie du jeûne (Par. and Genev. 1790); Van Fakelkenhausen, Crô. d. 40 alt. Faste (1799); Raben, Die Faste in Israel (Viein. 1880); Morin, Jeûne chez les anciens (in Mémo. de l'Acad. des Inscr. iv, 29 sq.). On fasting in the Christian Church, see Fasting.

Fasting, or Abstinence, an English writer, and, according to some authorities, bishop of London in the 5th century. He is proved by Holstenius to be the author of a treatise from his own works, vol. ix, and published by Holstenius (Rome, 1668) under the title De Vita Christiana et Vestitad. Its precepts are good and practical, but Tillemont (Mém. xy, 16) considers it as tending to Pelagianism, inasmuch as it reduces Christianity to love of God and our neighbors, including good works. It is given, with prolongemena, in Galland, Bib. Vet. Patr. t. ix, and is reprinted in Migne, PatroL Lat. i, 577 sq.—Clarke, Succession of Sac. Lit. ii, 152; Cave, Hist. Lit. i, 401.

Fasting in the Christian Church. In the article Fast we have given an account of Jewish fasting, and also of the notices of fasting in the N.T. We confine ourselves in this article to a history of fasting in the Christian Church.

I. Early Church.—Fasting and abstinence have been practised in the Christian Church from the beginning [see Abstinence] as means of self-discipline. Where the ascetic spirit has prevailed, fasting has been used as a means of mortification and penance. Where it has existed as a part of the religious life in the N.T. fasting appears either (1) as a token of sorrow or repentance, or (2) as a means of preparation for and aid in the discharge of spiritual duties (e.g. prayer, etc.). It was free from superstition; and the N.T. nowhere makes fasting, of itself, a means of grace. But the ascetic tendency in the early Church led to reliance on fasting, etc., as not only helps to, but substitutes for, the inward and spiritual life. The theory which placed the origin and seat of sin in the body [see Sin] also tended to give value to the practice of fasting. It came at last to be considered as an effective means of securing forgiveness of sin. The earliest notices of fasting in the Christian writers are in a better vein. "The days of holy consecration, of penitence and prayer, which individual Christians appointed for their own use, were oftentimes also a sort of expiation. That they might be observed by sense while their minds were intent on holy things, they were accustomed on such days to confine their bodily wants within stricter limits than usual, or else to fast entirely; where we must take into consideration the peculiar nature of that hot climate in which Christianity first began to spread. Whatever they saved by their abstinence on these days was appropriated to the maintenance of the poor brethren" (Nean- der, Church History, Torrey's, ii, 274).

We cite some of the Apostolical Fathers. Hermas (1st century), Shepherd (Simp., v, ch. iii). This fasting is very good, provided that the commandments of the Lord be observed. Observe as follows the fasting you intend to keep. First of all, refrain both from speaking and from hearing what is wrong; and cleanse thy heart from all pollution, from all revengeful feelings, from all covetousness; and on the day thou fastest content thyself with bread, vegetables, and water, and thank God for these. But reckon up what thy meal on this day would have cost thee, and give the amount to some widow, or orphan, or to the poor. Happy for thee, if with thy children and whole householdest thou observest these things. (See also Smill., v, ch. i.) The Epistle of Barnabas declares that the Jewish fasts are not true fasts, nor acceptable unto God, and cites Isa. lviii, 4-9, as giving the true fast "which God hath chosen." The Epistle of Polycarp (2d century) exhorts Christians "to return to the word handed down from the beginning, watching unto prayer, and persevering in fasting" (ch. vii). Justin Martyr (+165) also cites Isa. lviii as giving the "true" fast, and says even the fasts of the Jews, however, of fasting being joined with prayer in the administration of baptism (Dial. c. Tryph. ch. xv). Ireneus (+200) speaks of the fast before Easter, and says, "Not only is the dispute respecting the day, but also respecting the manner of fasting. For some think they ought to observe it for one day, some for two, and others for three days; some compute their day as consisting of forty hours night and day; and this diversity existing among those that observe it is not a matter that has just sprung up in our times, but long ago among those before us, who perhaps, not having ruled with sufficient strictness, established the practice that arose from their simplicity and inexperience. And yet with all, these maintained peace, and we have maintained peace with one another; and the very difference in our fasting establishes the unanimity in our faith." (Ex. 24). Clement of Alexandria (+220?) notices the fact that many kinds of pagan worship required celibacy and abstinence from meat and wine in their priests; that there were rigid ascetisms among the Indians, namely, the Samanians, and hence argued that usages which may exist also in other religions, and even when combined with superstition, cannot, in themselves considered, be peculiarly Christian. He then adds: "Paul declares that the kingdom of heaven consists not in meat and drink, neither therefore in abstaining from wine and flesh, but in righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Austerity is shown, not by the castigation of the body, but by gentleness of disposition, so also abstinence is a virtue of the soul, not consisting in that which is without, but in that which is within the man. Abstinence has reference not to some one thing alone, but to the whole soul; and super- tition also to despoil man, to tame the tongue, and to obtain by reason the dominion over sin" (Strom. lib. iii). Clement also speaks of weekly fasts as the usage of the Church. It appears to be clear that weekly fasts were observed in the Church before the end of the 2d century, but that they were now enforced as essential means of grace. The Montanists were rigorous with excess to regard with fasting. "Besides the usual fasts, they observed special zere phagia (arous phagia), as they were called; seasons of two weeks for fasting only dry, or, properly, uncooked bread, salt, and water. They were also refused the Church unless they fasted the fasts of the seasons as a general rule, but allowed ascetics to carry fasting even to extremes. A confessor in Lyons, for example, lived on bread and water alone, but forsook that austerity when reminded that he gave offense to other Christians by so deepening the gifts of God" (Schaaff, Ch. Hist. i, § 90). Tertullian (+c. 220), in his De Jejumia, complains of the little attention paid by the Catholic Church to the practice of fasting, thereby showing that liberty of judgment was exercised with regard to it. Origen speaks of Wednesday and Fridays in the Churches of the Gentiles by the Christians of those days, on the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday and crucified on a Friday (Hom. x on Leviticus).

By the 8th century fasting ceased to be a voluntary exercise; for by the second Council of Orange, A.D. 541, it was decreed that any one neglecting to observe the stated times of abstinence should be treated as an offender against the laws of the Church. In the 8th century it was regarded as meritorious, and the breach of the observance subjected the offender to the penalty of excommunication. In later times, those who ate flesh during prescribed seasons of abstinence were punished with the loss of their teeth. These severities were, however, subsequently relaxed, and permission was given to use all kinds of food, except flesh,
FASTING

eggs, cheese, and wine. Afterwards flesh only was prohibited, eggs, cheese, and wine being allowed; and indulgence in them was granted by the Church, and led to a quarrel between it and the Western. The following fasts generally obtained: 1. Lent, the annual fast of forty days before Easter. At first the duration of this fast was forty hours; in the time of Gregory I it was thirty-six days; but afterwards, either by Gregory I or by some other (seventeenth century), the fasts of Moses, Elias, and our Saviour, it was extended to forty days. See LENT; QUADRAGESIMA. 2. Quarterly fasts, which cannot be traced beyond the 5th century, though Bellarmine asserts that they dated from the apostles' time. 3. A fast of three days before the feast of Corpus Christi, which is observed in the Churc of Vienne (5th century). In some places it was not observed till Whitsuntide. It was called jejium ro enlargement, or jejunium libetarum, the feast of rogations or litanies (hence rogation-days), on account of certain litanies said on those days (Blissang, bk. xxii. c. ii. § 8). 4. Monthly fasts, a day in every month, except July and August, being selected. 5. Fastes before fastescales, instead of the ancient vigils, which were abolished in the 5th century. 6. Weekly fasts, on Wednesdays and Fridays, entitled staciones, from the practice of the Romans of several of which are observed by the Romans. 7. There were also occasional fasts, appointed by ecclesiastical authority, in times of great danger, emergency, or distress (Tertull. De Jejun. c. 13)." The custom of the Church at the end of the 4th century may be collected from the following passage of Epiphanius: 'In the whole Christian Church, that day, and the following fast-days throughout the year are regularly observed. On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour (i.e. three o'clock in the afternoon), except during the interval of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, during which it is usual neither to kneel nor fast at all. Besides this, there is no fasting on the Epiphany or Nativity, if those days shall fall on a Wednesday or Friday. But those persons who especially devote themselves to religious exercises (the monks) fast also at other times when they please, except on Sundays and during the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide. It is also the practice of the Church to observe the forty days' fast before the sacred week. But on Sundays there is no fasting, even during the last-mentioned period (compare Doctr. de Fide)." But even at this late date there was no universal and uniform practice in the Church. On the establishment of the Church in the matter, neither had fasts been established by law. The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the Church, and its observance was altogether voluntary. This fasting consisted, at first, in abstinence from meat until the third hour or after noon. A custom was afterwards introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water" (Siegel, Aberthamer, ii. 77, translated by Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 440).

II. Roman and Greek Churches. — The Church of Rome prescribes the times and character of fasts by law (Concil. Trident. session xxv, De delect. ciborum). "Moreover, the holy council exerts all pastors, and beseeches them by the most holy coming of our Lord and Saviour, that as good soldiers of Jesus Christ they mark and own in all the practice of the observance of all the institutions of the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, and of the decrees of this and other ecumenical councils; and that they use all diligence to promote obedience to all their commandments, especially to the mortification of the flesh, as the choice of meats and fasts." The Church commands fasts, and desists from lawful comports is sin. '"See Abstract of the Bony Catechism" (p. 44): 'Slighting or neglecting the precepts of the Church, and living in habits of breaking fasts commanded, or of eating meat on Saturday, or other days of abstinence, without just dispensation, were sins which excluded from the benefits of the last judgment, unless exception found to the manner as drunkenness, swearing, and debauchery' (Instructions and Directions, etc., p. xxiv). But a papal dispensation changes the nature of the things: the Spaniard who has paid the pope for a flesh butt may feast even in Lent; while his neighbor, who has neglected to procure one or declare the cause of the total suspension of the fasts, is strictly prohibited from fasting and of abstinence. On the former but one meal, and that not of flesh, is tasted during twenty-four hours; on the latter, flesh only is abstained from. The following is the distribution of Church fasts as given in bishop Challoner's Garden of the Soul: 1. The forty days of Lent. 2. The Ember Days, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday of the first week in Lent, of Whitsun Week, of the third week in September, and of the third week in Advent. 3. The Wednesdays and Fridays of the four weeks in Advent. 4. The vigils of Whitsun Week, with the fastings of St. Peter and St. Paul, of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of All Saints, and of Christmas Day. When any fasting day falls upon a Sunday, it is to be observed on the Saturday before. Abstinence Days. — 1. The Sundays in Lent. 2. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Ascension Day. 3. St. Mark, April 25, unless it falls in Easter Week. 4. The Fridays and Saturdays out of Lent, and the Ember Weeks, or such as happen to be vigils; but should Christmas Day fall upon a Friday or Saturday, it is a day of abstinence. In the Proctor Catechism from the Sundays, fasts, and fasting, the reason assigned for observing St. Mark's Day as a day of abstinence is, that his disciples, the first Christians of Alexandria, under his own conduct were eminent for their mortification; moreover, that St. Gregory the Great, the apostle of England, first of all to protest in memory of the cessation of a mortality in his time at Rome. All Fridays and Saturdays, except those which fall between Dec. 25 and Feb. 2, are days of Abstinence; but in the United States there is a dispensation of Saturdays for twenty years from 1840. The fasting days in Lent are, every Lent except Sunday; the Ember Days; the vigils of Pentecost, Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas. In the Greek Church fasting is kept with great severity. There are four principal fasts. That of Lent, commencing according to the style of each year, in the week after Whitsuntide, and ending on June 29, so that it varies in length, and is called the Fast of the holy Apostles; one, for a fortnight before the Assumption of the Virgin (August 15), which is observed even to the prohibition of oil, except on the day of the Transfiguration (August 6), on which day both oil and fish may be eaten; and one forty days before Christmas.

III. Protestant Churches. — In these, fasting is not made imperative as a term of membership in the Church, but is generally recommended as a Christian duty, especially under circumstances of national or individual affliction.

1. Church of England. — 'In the reign of queen Elizabeth there was a royal ordinance for fasting; not, however, so much with a religious view as for the encouragement of the fasting system, particularly to the mortification of the flesh, as the choice of meats and fasts,' so far as the custom in its ecclesiastical law as to retain the fast-days and prayers, but has prescribed no regulation of diet. Abstinence from food is not, therefore, the duty which it enjoins on its members, but whatever each finds to be best adapted for self-discipline, and most suitable under his circum-
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stances for a repentant spirit. Mention is made of abstinence in the 'Collect for the first Sunt. y in Lent;' but it is not the abstaining from food, or particular kinds of food, but such abstinence as shall subdue the flesh to the spirit, i.e. the abstinence additive to fasting. Now it is not true to say that the title of the table of vigils, etc., she mentions 'fasts and days of abstinence' separately; but when she comes to enumerate the particulars, she calls them all 'days of fasting or abstinence,' without distinguishing the one from the other. It is true, in the text, the distinction is drawn between fasting and abstinence; so Wesley, (On Common Prayer, ch. v. § 4), "In the Church of Rome, fasting and abstinence admit of a distinction, and different days are appointed for each of them. But I do not find that the Church of England makes any difference between fasting and abstinence." It is true, in the text, the title of the table of vigils, etc., she mentions 'fasts and days of abstinence' separately; but when she comes to enumerate the particulars, she calls them all 'days of fasting or abstinence,' without distinguishing the one from the other. But for this reason it is that the Church, as I have said, nowhere makes any difference in the kinds of meat; but, as far as she describes, she does recommend an entire abstinence from all manner of food till the time of fasting be over; declaring in her homilies that fasting (by the decree of the six hundred and thirty fathers, assembled at the Council of Chalcedon, which was one of the four first general councils, which grounded their constitution on the sacred Scriptures, and long-continued usage or practice both of the prophets and other godly persons before the coming of Christ; and also of the apostles and other devout men in the New Testament) is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body for the determined time of fasting. The rule of this was fixed by the Church of England for fasting and abstinence are the following: 1. The forty days of Lent. 2. The Ember Days at the four seasons, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, the first Thursday after Easter, the first Thursday after Harvest, and the first Thursday after Trinity. 3. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Holy Thursday, or the Ascension of our Lord. 4. All the Fridays in the year except Christmas Day. These days are mentioned in 2 and 3 Edward VI, c. 19, and in 5 Elizabeth, c. 5; and by 12 Charles II, c. 14. January 30 is ordained to be a day of fasting and repentance for the 'martyrdom' of Charles I. But an act passed in 1590, the 22 Victoria, repeals all enactments requiring special Church service to be observed on January 30, May 29, November 5, and October 25. Other days of fasting are their determination upon the royal proclamation (Acts of the Metropolis Metropolitan), etc. 2. Lutheran Church.—Luther by no means rejected or discountenanced fasting, but discarded the idea that it could be meritorious (Comm. on Matt. vi. 16); The Augsburg Confession (art. x. xi) repudiates 'diversity of meats' and other traditions; but adds, 'The church, however, that we forbid the mortification of our sinful propensities, as Jovian asserts, is groundless. For our writers have always given instruction concerning the cross which is the duty of Christians to bear. We more correctly teach that it is the duty of every man by fasting and other exercises, to avoid giving any occasion to sin, but not to merit grace by such works. But this watchfulness over our body is to be observed always, not on particular days only. On this subject Christ says, Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting (Luke xxii, 34). Again, The devils are not cast out but by fasting and prayer (Matt. xvii, 21). And Paul says, Be ye imitators of me, as I am also of Christ. In short, it is to live in abstinence and in subjection (1 Cor. ix, 27). By which he wishes to intimate that this bodily discipline is not designed to merit grace, but to keep the body in a suitable condition for the several duties of our calling. We do not, therefore, object to fasting itself, but to the fact that it is represented as a necessary part of our duties and that specific days have been fixed for its performance.' 3. Calvin.—The views of Calvin on fasting have been very generally adopted in the Reformed Churches: 'Therefore let us say something of fasting, because, many, for want of knowledge, are perplexed at its necessity, and some reject it as almost superfluous; while, on the other hand, where the use of it is not well understood, it easily degenerates into superstition. Holy and legitimate fasting is directed to three ends, for we practise it either as a restraint on the flesh, to humble the judgment of God, and to prevent us from using the dispensation of life for the advantage of private fasting. The second end is common to both, such preparation for prayer being necessary to the whole Church, as well as to every one of the faithful in particular. The same may be said of the third, for it will sometimes happen that God will afflicted as a whole with some infestation with war, pestilence, or some other calamity; under such a common scourge, it behoveth all the people to make a confession of their guilt. When the hand of the Lord chastises an individual, he ought to make a similar confession, either alone or with his family. It is true, the guilt of the sins is common, but the effect is not so common. The Church, therefore, of which we are now treating, whenever supplications are to be presented to God on any important occasion, it would be right to join the union of fasting with prayer. Thus, when the faithful at Antioch laid their hands on Paul and Barnabas, the better to recommend their very important ministry to the Lord, they 'fasted' and 'prayed.' So, also, when Paul and Barnabas afterwards 'ordained elders in every church,' they used to 'pray with fasting.' In this kind of fasting their only object was that they might be more lively and unembarrassed in prayer. And in the first place, this agrees with the institution of God in fasting, and signifies that by such means that holy woman habituated herself to a constancy in prayer. Such was the fasting of Nehemiah, when he prayed to God with more than common fervor for the deliverance of his people. For this cause Paul declares it to be essential for the faithful man, by a temporary abstinence from lawful enjoyments, that they may be more at liberty to 'give themselves to fasting and praying,' for by connecting fasting with
prayer, as an assistance to it, he signifies that fasting
is of no importance in itself any further than as it is
directed, and that it is an addendum or means of the
intercession which
he gives in that place to husbands and wives, to 'rend-
ner to each other ' due benevolence,' it is clear that he
is not speaking of daily prayers, but of such as re-
quire peculiar earnestness of attention. That there
must be no mistake respecting the object, let us define
what fasting is; for we do not understand it to denote
mercy and abstinence in eating and drinking,
but something more. The life of the faithful, in
indeed, ought to be so regulated by frugality and sobri-
ety as to exhibit, as far as possible, the appearance of
a severe and pious life; but besides this, it is another
aspect of temporary fast, when we renounce anything from
our customary mode of living, either for a day or for any
certain time, and prescribe to ourselves a more than
commonly rigid and severe abstinence from food. This
restriction consists in three things—in time, in quality,
and in quantity of food. By time I mean that we
should perform, while fasting, those exercises on ac-
count of which fasts are instituted. As, for example,
if any one fast for solemn prayer, he should not break
his fast till he has attended to it. The quality con-
sists in abstaining from food, drink, and other
things, with simpler and humbler fare, that our appetite may
not be stimulated by delicacies. The rule of quantity is
that we eat more sparingly and slightly than usual,
only for necessity, and not for pleasure. But it is nec-
ecessary for us, above all things, to be particularly on
our guard against all approaches of the superstition, which
has heretofore been a great source of injury to the
Church. For it was far better that fasting should be
taken away, than that the practice should be dile-
gently observed, and at the same time corrupted with
false and pernicious opinions, into which the world is
constantly falling, unless it be prevented by the great-
est fidelity and prudence of the pastors. The first
caution necessary, and which they should be constantly
urging, is that suggested by Joel: ' Render your heart,
and not your garments;' that is, they should admon-
ish the people that God sets no value on fasting un-
less it be accompanied by a corresponding display of
heart, a real displeasure against sin, sincere self-ab-
horrence, true humiliation, and unfeigned grief arising
from a fear of God; and that fasting is of no use on
any other account than as an additional and subsidi-
ary means to correct the heart. Fasting is an useful
abomination to God than when men attempt to impose
upon him by the presentation of signs and external
appearances instead of purity of heart. Therefore he
severely reprobrates this hypocrisy in the Jews, who im-
agined that they had satisfied God merely by having fast-
ed; while the impressions and sincere thoughts were
in their hearts. ' Is it such a fast, saith the Lord, that
I have chosen? ' The fasting of hypocrites, therefore,
is not only superfluous and useless fatigue, but the
greatest abomination. Allied to this is another evil,
which requires the most vigilant caution, lest it be
considered as a meritorious act, or a species of divine
service. For as it is a thing indifferent in itself, and
possesses no other value than it derives from those ends
to which it ought to be directed, it is most pernicious
superstition to confound it with works commanded by
God, and to consider the act of fasting in reference to
any exterlor object. Such was formerly the folly of the
Manichaeans, in the refutation of whom Augustine most
clearly shows that fasting is to be held in no other es-
timation than on account of those ends which I here
mention, and that it receives no approbation from God
unless it is performed for their sake. The third and
most noticeable error is not so impious indeed, yet is pregnant with danger, to
enforce it with extreme rigor as one of the principal
duties, and to extol it with extravagant encomiums,
so that men imagine themselves to have performed a
work of peculiar excellence when they have fasted.
In this respect I dare not wholly excuse the ancient
fathers from having sown some seeds of superstition,
and given occasion to the tyranny which afterwards
prevailed. Their insinuations and sneering remarks
on this subject are sufficiently early, to denote them-
selves as performing an eminent act of obedience to
God, and the pastors commanded it as a holy imitation
of Christ; whereas it is plain that Christ fasted, not
to set an example to others, but in order that by such an
introduction to the preaching of the Gospel, he might
prove that it was not in the least contrary to those
revelations of the Old Testament' (Calvin, Instit., bk. iv, ch.
xxi, § 15-20).
The Westminster Confession declares that
'solenn fastings' are 'in their times and seasons,'
to be used in a holy and religious manner (xxxv, v),
and that the Westminster Casulian makes 'religious fast-
ing' one of the duties required in the second com-
mandment (quest. 109).

In Scotland there is generally a yearly fast 'ap-
pointed by the Kirk session of the Established Church
of the parish, or by concurrence of kirk sessions in
the county, or by the Presbytery of the town, or by
parishes, or by the Synod of the Kirk.' The date for
the fast-day is always some day of the week preceding the Communion Sunday, or Sunday set apart in
the Presbyterian churches for the Lord's Supper.
It is usually appointed as a day for 'fasting, humilia-
tion, and prayer.' Business is generally suspended,
and it is expected that people will spend the day in
public worship. By an act of Parliament passed not
many years since, factories are prohibited from carry-
on work on the parish fast-day; but, in conse-
quently of the ecclesiastical divisions in Scotland, it
has become more common than it once was for agri-
cultural and other kinds of work to be carried on
(Chambers, Encyclopedia, s. v.).

American.—The New England Puritans rejected the
ancient ecclesiastical fast-days. The Pilgrim fathers
observed 'seasons of fasting and prayer' before sail-
ing from Europe, and after their arrival in America.
They admitted the right and duty of the civil rulers to
set apart days for fasting and prayer. This right
has been recognised, and the duty observed, in most
states of the American Union. During the Civil War
(1861-5) the President of the United States appointed
days for fasting and prayer, on which praying was
observed by all the churches. The Methodist Episcopal
Church enjoins 'fasting, or abstinence,' upon the
people in the 'General Rules' (Discipline, pt. i, ch. i, §
8); advises weekly fasts to her clergy (pt. ii, ch. ii, §
5); and directs that 'a fast be held in every society on
the first day of the month, and every other meeting day' (pt.
ii, ch. ii, § 17). The Presbyterian Church adopts the
doctrine of the Westminster Confession on fasting (see
above); makes 'public solemn fasting' one of the
ordinances established by Christ in the Church (Form
of Government, ch. vii); ordains a fast-day in the con-
gregation before an ordination (ch. xxv), and declares
that while 'there is no day under the Gospel com-
manded to be kept holy except the Lord's day, which is
the Christian Sabbath, nevertheless, to observe
days of fasting and thanksgiving, as the extraordinary
day of the Lord, every one is free to do, as he may judge
both scriptural and rational. Fasts and thank-
givings may be observed by individual Christians or
families in private; by particular congregations: by
a number of congregations contiguous to each other;
by the congregations under the care of a presbytery
or of a presbyter, or by all the congregations of our
Church. It must be left to the judgment and discre-
tion of every Christian and family to determine when
it is proper to observe a private fast or thanksgiving,
and to the church-sessions to determine for particular
congregations, and to the presbytery or synods to de-
termine for: larger districts. When it is deemed ex-

pedient that a fast or sacrifice should be general; the call for them must be judged of by the Synod or General Assembly. And if at any time the civil power should think it proper to appoint a fast or thanksgiving, it is the duty of the ministers and people of our society, as well as we live under government, to pay all due respect to the same" (Directory for Worship, ch. xiv).

Besides all due respect heretofore quoted, consult Tillotson, Sermons (serm. 89); Bingham, Orig., Ecc. bk. xxii, ch. iii.; Coleman, Ancient Collections, p. 552 sq.; Bishop Morgan, in Meth. Church Review, 1842, Oct. 15; Aug. Augustus, Denkwurdigkeiten, xi, 311 sq.; Suicer, Theanum, s. v., n. 50a; Ducange, Glossarium, s. v., Jejunium; Ferraris, Promota Bibliotheca, iv, 867 sqq. (ed. Migne); Weasley, Sermons, i, 245.

For fasting, see Fasting. An old orthography for Fasting (qv.)

Fasting (prop. דק, che'lob). [For the use of the word as a verb, see Fatted Fowl.] The Hebrews distinguished between the fast, or pure fast of an animal (דק), and the fast which was intermixed with the lean (יִבְשָׂל, oily pieces, Neh. viii, 10). Certain restrictions were imposed upon them in reference to the former: some parts of the suet, viz., the stomach, the ears and the kidneys, and the tail of the sheep, which grows to an excessive size in many Eastern countries, and is a special delicacy, were forbidden to be eaten in the case of animals offered to Jehovah in sacrifice (Lev. iii, 3, 9, 17; vii, 28). The ground of the prohibition was that the fast was the richest part of the animal, and therefore belied to him (Gen. xvi, 16). It has been supposed that other reasons were superadded, as that the use of fat was unwholesome in the hot climates of Palestine (Maimonides, More Nebuchad., pt. iii, ch. xlvii). There appears, however, to be no ground for such an assumption (Bahr, Symbolik, ii, 382). The presentation of the fat as the richest part of the animal was agreeable to the dictates of natural feeling, and to the analogy in dedicating the first-born and first-fruits to God. This was also the ordinary practice even of heathen nations, as instanced in the Homeric descriptions of sacrifices (I. i, 460; ii, 423; Od. iii, 457), and in the customs of the Scythians (Herod., ii, 47), and Persians (Strabo, xvi, 782). Accordingly, Abel, who brought the first animal sacrifice, not only presented to the Lord "the firstlings of his flock," but "the fat thereof," which, by virtue of its being the best part, was the most suitable for the Lord; or, if the animal was the firstling of the flock (Gen. iv, 4); or if the word here means the fattest of his flock, the same idea is essentially implied. Indeed, the term che'lod is itself significant of the feeling on which the regulation was based, for it sometimes describes the best of any production (Gen. xlv, 18; Num. xviii, 12; Ps. lxxxi, 16; cxlvii, 14; compare 2 Sam. i, 22; Judg. iii, 29; Is. x, 16). With regard to the other parts of the fat of sacrifices or the fat of other animals, it might be consumed, with the exception of the liver offered either by a violent or a natural death (Lev. vii, 44), which might still be used in any other way. The burning of the fat of sacrifices was particularly specified in each kind of offering, whether a peace offering (Lev. iii, 9), consecration offering (viii, 25), sin offering (iv, 6), trespass offering (vii, 3), or redemption offering (Num. xviii, 17). The Hebraic fully appreciated the luxury of well-fattened meat, and had their stall-fed oxen and calves (1 Kings iv, 28; Jer. xlvii, 21; Luke xv, 25). This was, however, not a usual practice; and even at this day in the East, domestic cattle seldom undergo any preparatory feeding or fattening before being killed. Hence there is little fat in the carcass except that belonging to the parts specified in the prohibition, which is all more or less of the nature of suet. See Food.

The parts of the fat or suet of the victims which belong to God, and are especially to be applied to the altar, are given in Exod. xxix, 18-22, and Lev. iii, 3-5, as follows: 1. The fat which covers the entrails (םִנְּיָנָיו לִפְתַּלַתָּם בַּלָּבּ = לִשְׁוֹיָנָו), as Josephus rightly has it (Ant. iii, 9, 2; the omentum, which is only to be found in man and mammals, and is very fat in the ox (comp. Aristotle, Hist. Anim. i, 10; Pliny, Hist. Nat. xi, 80). 2. The fat which accumulates around entrails (םִנְּיָנָיו לִפְתַּלַתָּם בַּלָּבּ), and is easily separated therefrom, i.e., the reticular adhering to the colon. 3. The two kidneys, with the fat on them, at the internal muscles of the loins (םִנְּיָנָיו לִפְתַּלַתָּם בַּלָּבּ), as the most fat accumulates near the kidneys (Deut. xxiii, 14; Isa. xxxiv, 6), and to such an extent in sheep that they sometimes die of it (אֲלֹ הֵנָות לִשְׁוֹיָנָו הָאוֹרָו אֲלֹ הֵנָות לִשְׁוֹיָנָו, Aristot. De Part. Anim. iii, 9, and Hist. Anim. iii, 16; Pliny, Hist. Nat. x, 81). 4. The יַחַף, yocheth, which is taken by the Sept. and Josephus (Ant. iii, 9, 2) to mean a λοχος ὀρα ὑπορεος, the greater lobe of the liver, similarly the Syrso and Chaldee (נֵבֶג הַבֵּרָה); and is explained by the Talmud (Chullin, xix, 6), Raishi, Kimchi, Solomon ben-Melech, etc., as נֵבֶג הַבֵּרָה = רַם, whereby the Greeks, according to Hippocrates, understood the greater and thickest of the five segments of the liver (Bähr, Symbolik, ii, 384). This meaning of יַחַף is also defended by Peccatio (Bk. liv. ii, c. xiv), and followed by Lo Clerc, J. D. Rosenmüller, Kittel (on Exod. xxiii, 13), and others. But the Vulgate, Luther, Tyndale, the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Bible, the A. V., Piscator, De Wette, Knobel, Fürst, etc., take it to denote omentum minus, which is preferable, for the lobes have no accumulation of fat. 5. The tail (נֵבֶג יַחַף, יַחַף, A. V., "rump") of a sheep (Lev. vii, 5), which, in a certain species (ὄστεα λακτιακατο), contains a great quantity of fat. It is for this reason that the eating of fat is forbidden (Lev. iii, 17). It affords a delicate marrowy substance much used in pilaus and other messes which require to be lubricated by animal juices. The Rabbinical Jews maintain that the prohibition of it is restricted to the sacrifices, while the Karaites regard the eating of the tail as absolutely forbidden. See Sheep.

One of the metaphorical senses of fat (in the Hebrew) is noticed above. By a natural figure, "fat" is occasionally employed in Scripture as a figure for the abundance of mind, as if the heart were covered with thick fat, and therefore insensible (Ps. xvii, 10). See Oil.

Fatalism, the doctrine of an inevitable necessity, implying an omnipotent and arbitrary superior power. It is derived from the Latin fatum ("what is spoken or decreed," passive participle of fortis). The Greeks expressed it also by the passive participle ἐννιτομος (Destiny, the Goddess of Fate) and ἐννια (delay, destiny, goddess who dispenses fate) have an active meaning.

1. In Homer, ἔννια has a twofold force: it is sometimes considered as superior to marvel, then again as inferior to him; a twofold force which Nägelsbach correctly expounds (after Delbrück and Creuzer) by saying that in Homer the monarchial will of Zeus does not appear as directly opposed to the contrary efforts of the other gods. Yet the human mind has a monothetic tendency even among the heathens, who seeks to give to the heavens one supreme ruler, and to unite all the gods into one exclusive unity. On the other hand, however, this unity is inert and dead, and this leads Homer to identify it with the highest, the living god— with the "will of" the other gods. The gradual development of Greek philosophy led to the thought of representing the supreme ruling power by ἔννια: so we find it in Herodotus, i, 91, τετοιον.
FATALISM

Mother of all events, avert not thy purpose, ye gods.

This agency of Fate was afterwards made to apply to the regulation of the outward life of men, and the conception of Fate as the ruling power of the universe became deeper and more spiritual; so Anaxagoras recognizes it in his "World of Things," and Plato does the same, especially in Philebus (31, 4, τοῦ τοῦ δελετον λόγον μεν τοις διακριτως καταλαβειν ἐν τοις ἰδανικον). This same tendency towards a spiritualization of Fate is found in the tragic authors, especially in Sophocles, who has happily expressed these views in his "Oedipus Colone" (267, [ed. Schneidewin]): ἰουτί τοῦ γεγονον μου πιστον ιστι μάλιστα ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα ἤδειπνος (for my actions are rather to be called my <i>d. stining</i> than my own). But this fate does not exclude guilt on the part of man, for the curse rested from the first on the individual, as is shown especially in the revelation of fearful guilt in the "Edipus lar," and the possibility of pardon in the "Colom." The Greek tragedy is based on this very antagonism between individual being and the supreme world power. After Sophocles, the two notions of the word Μορφα were separated; the concept of gradually indiges out more distinctly. From Euripides down to the Epicureans a tendency prevailed to make the power of Fate subservient to human caprice, and to make it subordinate to Ίννα (chance), which plays an important part in Thucydides. Blind chance was made to rule the earth. The Epicureans, who emphasized the "essence of pure inarticulate world," "so that the gods no longer interfering in human affairs, it became matter of indifference whether they were worshipped or not. On the other hand, Stoicism maintained that to live in accordance with the laws of nature, i.e. to resign one's self to the necessary courses of things, is the true wisdom of life. In this point, as in others, the views of the Stoics and the Epicureans were directly opposed to each other [see Epicurean Philosophy], yet in the more inward and spiritual, as it is shown especially in the "indecisive future," whether the result of separate accidental chances or of the general law of nature, there is nothing to be done. The Moira, acting according to higher laws incomprehensible to humanity, is thus confounded with blind destiny.

(2) The conception of gradually indiges out more theories of fatalism is as follows: (1) Destiny is a dead, blind power; (2) human liberty is completely and irresistibly controlled by destiny. Under this twofold aspect, fatalism finds its most complete realization in Mocheus; but it has also been defended on scientific grounds within the sphere of Christendom. The doctrine of absolute predetermination, in its hidden <i>absolutum decr"etum</i> (see Luther, De servo arbitrio, and Ullmann, <i>Studien u. Kritiken</i>, 1847, i, 2), resembles the heathen conception of Fate. In its relation to spiritual and eternal life, fatalism is generally based on (1) the pantheistic view of the world, which swallows up individual freedom and responsibility, so that (as by Spinoza) all our thoughts and actions are represented as but the thoughts and actions of God manifested through us. This leads naturally to (2) the determinism of destiny, which considers the world as so ordered by the immutable laws of nature that individual life and actions are but cogs of one of the wheels of the universal machinery; and to modern materialism, according to which thought is but a natural secretion of the brain.

The Christian idea of God is directly opposed to all fatalism, whether modern or materialistic. In Christian thought, God is not blind chance, dead fate, or a dark, unknown force of nature; but God is spirit, a living God, a personal Being, who is love and the Father of the living; and this living God of the living God has endowed man with his own image, and therefore freedom, in the exercise of which endowment man is to become himself a participant in the fulfillment of the divine decrees, a "co-worker" with God, and, as such, not only capable of aiding in the spread and consummation of the kingdom (or royal sway) of God upon the earth, but also bound to aid in it.—Herzog, "Real-Encyclopädie," iv, 640 sq. (from which this article is chiefly a translation).—Cf. Intellectual System of the Universe, bk. i, chap. i; Hamilton, "Discussions in Philosophy;" Werner, "Geschichte der apololy. Literatur" (Schaffhausen, 1887). See Materialism.

Father (έα, ab, a primitive word, but following the analogy of τικειον, to show kindness, Gesenius, "Thesaurus," p. 6-8; Chaldee, 28, ἀρχήν). Compare Son.

This word, besides its obvious and primary sense, bears in Scripture a number of other applications, most of which have, through the use of the Bible, become more or less objectionable. See Gesenius's ἄρχη and Robinson's "Greek Lex." (1) Father is applied to any ancestor near or remote, or to ancestors ("fathers") in general. The progenitor, or founder, or patriarch of a tribe or nation was ordinarily or pre-eminently his father, as Abraham of the Jews. (2) Father is applied also as a title of respect to any head, chief, ruler, or elder, and especially to kings, prophets, and priests (Jude xvi, 10; xviii, 11; i Sam. xii, 12; 2 Kings ii, 12; v, 13; vi, 21; xiii, 14; Prov. iv, 1; Matt. xxiii, 9; Acts vii, 2; xxii, 1; 1 Cor. iv, 15, etc.). Also of protector or guardian (Job xxvi, 16; Ps. xxiii, 5; Dan. xxvii, 8). Hence of seniors, especially of Church fathers. See below.

(3) The author, source, or beginning of anything is also called the father of the same, or of those who follow him. Thus Jabal is called "the father of those who dwell in tents, and have cattle:" and Jabad "the father of those who dwell in tents, and have cattle:" (Gen. iv, 21, 22; comp. Job xxxviii, 28; John viii, 44; Rom. iv, 12). In the Talmud the term father is used to indicate the chief; e.g. the principal of certain works are termed "fathers." Objects whose contact causes pollution are called "fathers" of defilement (Mishna, Ḥak. u. Esa. 2, vol. ii, p. 29; Demarch, I, vol. ii, p. 137, Surenh.). This use of the word is exceedingly common in the East to this day, especially as applied in the formation of proper names, in which also the most curious Hebrew examples of this usage occur. See A� באנה.

(4) As an extension of all the foregoing senses, the term father is very often applied to God himself (Gen. xlii, 19, 20; Exod. iv, 22; Deut. xxxi, 6; 2 Sam. vii, 14; Psa. lxxxxix, 27, 28; Isæ. lxiii, 16; Isa. lvi, 4). Indeed, the analogy of language would point to this, seeing that in the Old Testament, and in all the Syro-Arabian dialects, the originator of anything is constantly called its father. Without doubt, however, God is in a more especial manner, even as by covenant, the Father of the Jews (Jera. xxxi, 9; Isæ. lxiii, 10; lxxiv, 8; John viii, 41; v, 45; 2 Cor. vi, 16); and also of all such, or, rather, of the whole race of believing persons, who are called "sons of God" (John i, 12; Rom. viii, 16, etc.). Thus Jesus, in speaking to his disciples, calls God their Father (Matt. vii, 4, 7, 15; x, 20, 29; xiii, 43, etc.). The apostles also, for themselves and other Christians, call him "Father." (Rom. i, 7; 1 Cor. i, 8; 2 Cor. i, 2; Gal. i, 4; and many other places). See ἀναμαρτανων ἀναμικνων, § 11. It lies, of course, at the root of that so-called patriarchal government (Gen. iii, 16; 1
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Coc. xi, 8), which was introductory to the more definite systems that followed, and that in part, but not wholly, superseded it. When, therefore, the name of "father of nations" ( שָּׁבָּעָה ) was given to Abram, he was thereby held up not only as the ancestor, but as the example of those who should come after him (Gen. xvi, 13; Rom. iv, 17). The blessing was regarded as conferring special benefit, but his male-child special injury, on those upon whom it fell (Gen. ix, 25, 27; xvii, 27-40; xliii, 15, 20; xlii); and so also the sin of a parent was held to affect, in certain cases, the well-being of his descendants (2 Kings, v, 27), though the law forbade the punishment of the son for his father's transgression (Deut. xxiv, 16; 2 Kings xiv, 6; 2 Esdr. xviii, 20). The command to honor parents is noticed by the apostle Paul as the only one of the Decalogue which bore a distinct promise (Exod. xx, 12; Ephes. vi, 2), and disrespect towards them was condemned by the law as one of the worst of crimes (Exod. xx, 15, 17; 1 Tim. i, 9; comp. Virgil, Æn. vi, 609; Aristoph. Rot. 274-778). Instances of legal enactment in support of parental authority are found in Exod. xxii, 17; Numb. xxix, 3, 5; xii, 14; Deut. xx, 19, 21; xxx, 9, 11; xxxii, 19, 21; Deut. xix, 13, 15, 21; Philo, L. c. 9). From the spirit of the law in this direction may be seen in Prov. xi, 1; xv, 5, xviii, 25; xix, 13; xx, 20; xxiv, 24; xxx, 17; Isa. xiv, 10; Mal. i, 6. The father, however, had not the power of death over his child under the Mosaic law (Deut. xxi, 18-21; Philo, L. c.).

The authority of a father was thus very great in patriarchal times; and although the law of Moses required the parent to bring his cause of complaint to the public tribunals (Deut. xxi, 18-21), all the more real powers of parental character were not only left unimpaired, but were made in a great degree the basis of the judicial policy which that law established. The children, and even the grandchildren, continued under the roof of the father and grandfather; they labored on his account, and were the most submissive of his servants. The property of the soil, the power of judgment, the civil rights, belonged to him only, and his sons were merely his instruments and assistants. If a man were killed by any body, the father was the head, and the sons the members, moving at his will and in his service. There were exceptions, doubtless, but this was the rule, and, with some modifications, it is still the rule throughout the East.

Filial duty and obedience were, indeed, in the eyes of the Jewish legislator, of such high importance that great care was taken that the paternal authority should not be weakened by the withdrawal of a power so liable to fatal and barbarous abuse as that of capital punishment. Any outrage against a parent—a blow, a curse, or incorrigible profligacy—was made a capital crime (Exod. xi, 15, 17; Lev. xx, 5). If the offense was public, it was taken up by the court as a crime against Jehovah, and the culprit was brought before the magistrates, whether the parent consented or not; and if the offense was hidden within the paternal walls, it devolved on the parents to denounce him and to require his punishment.

It is a beautiful circumstance in the law of Moses that this filial respect is exacted for the mother as well as for the father. The threats and promises of the legislator distinguish not the one from the other; and the fifth commandment associates the father and mother in precisely equal claim to honor from their children (see Gallic. Esprit de la Legislation Romaine, ii, 69, 122-129). Comp. WOMAN.

Among Mohammedans parental authority has great weight during the time of pupilage. The son is not allowed to eat, scarcely to sit, in his father's presence. Disobedience to parents is reckoned one of the most heinous of crimes (Burchhardt, Notes on Bed. i, 356; Lane, Mod. Epy. i, 84; Atkinson, Travels in Siberia, p. 569).

Father (God the) was usually represented in early Christian art by a hand, which was usually extended through a cloud. The principal subjects in which God the Father is represented by a hand are the scenes from the creation: Moses receiving the law, Moses at the burning bush, the sacrifice of Abraham, and the burning of the sacrifices at the passover. The hand is often given as holding out wreaths or crowns to saints and martyrs at their death, or their ascension to Paradise. As early as the fifth century, God the Father is represented as an old man. This symbol predominated during the later Middle Ages, and is the one now universally adopted by Christian artists. The figures of God in the creation by M. Angelo and Raphael, in the Sistine chapel, and in the Vatican, are among the grandest concepions in all art. God the Father is also represented as an old man in the representations of the Trinity (q. v.).—Martigny, Dictionnaire des Antiquitez Chrétiennes, 1860.

Father-in-law: 1. דָּם, chum (from תְּכֹב, to join in affinity; see MOTHER-IN-LAW), Gen. xxxviii, 13, 25; 1 Sam. iv, 19, 21. 2. תְּכֹת, cuthoth (participle of תְּכֹב, to marry), one marrying a daughter, Exod. iii, 1; iv, 18; xviii, 1-27; Num. x, 29; Judg. i, 16; iv, 11; xix, 4, 7, 9. 3. פָּרָשַת, strictly one related by marriage, like No. 1, John xviii, 18. See AFFINITY.

Father's Brother, דָּם, dov (strictly one beloved, a friend, as in Isa. v, 1), an uncle (q. v.), Num. xxxvi, 11; 2 Kings xxiv, 17; fem. FATHER'S SISTER, דָּם, dodah, 1 Esdr. vi, 20, an aunt (q. v.).

Fathers of the Church (Pateres Ecclesiæ), a name applied to certain ancient Christian writers, who have preserved in their writings, to a certain extent, the history, doctrine, and traditions of the early Church. The use of the name "father" for this purpose originated in the Oriental habit of styling the relation of teacher and pupil that of "father" and "son." So Alexander the Great called Aristotle his "father," Elisha calls Elijah his "father" (2 Kings ii, 12); the pupils of the prophets were called "sons of the prophets." At an early period in the Christian Church, this title was given to preachers and teachers; and later, the title "father" (papa, popa) was given to bishops exclusively.

The Greek Church closes the list of the "fathers," properly so called, with John of Damascus (+ 754), the Latin Church with Gregory the Great (+ 604). The use of the word "father" is by Protestants limited to the more distinguished teachers of the first five or six centuries, excepting, of course, the apostles, who stand far above them all as the inspired organs of the Holy Ghost. It applies, therefore, to the period of the eccumenical formation of doctrines, before the separation of Eastern and Western Christendom (Schaff, Church History, i, 454). The Roman theologians, in the following qualities as the marks of a "Church father," viz. antiquity, orthodoxy, sanctity of life, and the approval of the Church (Fessler, Institutiones Patrologiae, i, 26). Accordingly, the Roman Church denies the title fathers to such men as Origen, Tertullian, Laetantius, Eusebius, etc., because their writings are not held to be in all respects orthodox; they are designated, not as patriae, but as scriptores ecclesiastici (ecclesiastical writers). At a later period, the title doctors ecclesiæ (doctors of the Church) was given to writers supposed to have the qualities cited above as constituting the criterion of "substituting remissa erudiendos for antiquitatis. A decree of pope Boniface (A.D. 1298) assigns the title mætis ecclesiæ doctors to the four Latin fathers Ambrose, Au
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Clement of Alexandria succeeded Pantaenus in the catechetical school of the city that city 188 or 189; quitted Alexandria 202; died about 217. Tertullian became a Montanist about the year 200; his Apology was composed (188 or 205); his work against Mucian, 207; has left a great variety of tracts on the vices and customs of his age—as on the theses of the followers of the Church, idolatry, second marriages, the soldier's crown, and on flight in persecution, etc.; died about 240. Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus, wrote, besides many other pieces, Philosophomenon, newly discovered; died about 230. Origene, bishop of the best of the catechetical school at Alexandria 204; went to Rome, and returned to Alexandria, 218; went to Cæsarea, in Palatina, 215; ordained at Cæsarea, and afterwards settled there, about 220; retired to Cappadocia 235; returned to Cæsarea 239; a laborious scholar. In a letter to a Christian, he compiled a Hexapla, or Polyglott Bible; wrote commentaries on Scripture, some of which survive; a treatise on prayer; and a defence against Celsus; thrown into prison 250; died 254. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, 248; fled from Carthage into Africa, 250; was put to death 257; author of epistles, addresses, and tracts; advocate of Episcopacy; suffered martyrdom 258. Dionysius, named the great, bishop of Alexandria, a scholar of Origen, 247 or 248; died 255. Gregory (Thaumaturgus), bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, flourished at the same time, composed a creed, an oration in praise of Origen, and a paraphrase on Ecclesiastes; died about 270. Victorinus wrote scholia on the Apocalypse; died 308. Arnobius wrote his treatise of seven books Against the Gentiles about 305; died probably about 325.

The chief among them are (lists from Exdile, Riddle, Also.): Justin Martyr, born probably about A.D. 100; left Palestine 152; presented his first Apology to Antoninus about (140 or 148); wrote his second Apology in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, probably about 162–4; has left a variety of other works, and a Dialogue with Trypho the Jew; suffered martyrdom at Rome about 165. Hermas wrote his work, Vision of the Heathen Philosophers, probably about 170. Dio Chrysostom wrote some epistles; all lost except a very few fragments; 6170. Hesychius, originally a Jew, wrote History of the Church, of which only a few fragments survive, about 175. Tatian wrote an Oratio towards the Greeks, which has been lost; probably died about 175. Athenag. wrote an Apology for the Christians, and also on the resurrection, both of which have been translated into English, 176. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, wrote his work on religion to Polybius about 190; died 181. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyon, Gaul, in the latter part of the second century (became bishop about A.D. 177), wrote his work Against Heresies, or A Refutation and Subversion of Knowkedge falsely so called, between A.D. 182 and 186; died about A.D. 202. Minucius Felix wrote his Octavius, or Defence of Christianity, about 202.

I. The Apostolical Fathers are those Christian writers (of whom any remains are now extant) who are supposed to have been contemporary with one or more of the apostles. This is the only list which is given before A.D. 120. There are five names usually given as those of the apostolic fathers, i.e. there are five men who lived during the age of the apostles, and who did converse, or might have conversed with them, to whom writings still extant have been ascribed, viz. BARNABAS, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Theophilus, and Hermas. The following works are generally counted to these writers: 1. The Epistle of Barnabas [see Barnabas]; 2. Two epistles of Clement, bishop of Rome, to the Corinthians [see Clement of Rome]; 3. Several epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch [see Ignatius]; 4. An epistle of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, to the Philippians [see Polycarp]; 5. The Epistle (of an unknown author) to Diognetus [see Diognetus]; 6. The book entitled Pastor Hermæ [see Hermæ]. Certain fragments of Papæs are also commonly included among the apostolical fathers. See Papæs. Of the writings attributed to these fathers, some at least are of doubtful genuineness (on this point, see the individual titles referred to). See the article Apostolical Fathers, vol. i, p. 315.

II. The Anti-Nicene Fathers are those whose writings are ascribed to the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. The chief among them are (lists from Exdile, Riddle, Also.): Justin Martyr, born probably about A.D. 100; left Pale-
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Exandria 806; fled to Rome 841; returned to Alexandria 846; fled to the deserts of Egypt 856; wrote a discourse against the Gentiles, on the incarnation; against the Arians, on the incarnation; against Apollinaris, etc.; died 878.

Basil, surnamed the Great, born 292; bishop of Caisarea, in Cappadocia, 379; 379 to 379, 377, as patriarch, episcopis, panegyricis, Hexameron, and letters; died 379. Eiphraim the Syriac, deacon of Edessa; published a variety of commentaries, polemical treatise, and smaller works; died about 879.

Cyril of Jerusalem, born 315; bishop of Jerusalem 350; wrote On the Priority of the Baptist, a controversy; 386; died 386.

Gregory of Nazianzus, born 328; ordained deacon 361; bishop of Sussa 372; bishop of Constantinople 381; wrote discourses, poems, and letters; died about 390.

Gregory of Nyssa, born 305; bishop of Nyssa 372; wrote a Hexameron, life of Moses, on prayer, along with orations, panegyrics, tracts, and letters; died about 395.

Ambrose, born 340; archbishop of Milan 374; published annotations on Scripture, discourses, and miscellaneous treatises; died about 397.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, born about 380; wrote a Panarion, or a treatise on heresies, etc.; died 403.

Chrysostom, born at Antioch about 344; ordained presbyter in that church 386; bishop of Constantinople 386; deprived and restored 403; banished 404; was again ordained; was one of the most famous and eloquent of the Christian writers; wrote many commentaries, homilies, orations, with several controversial pieces; died 407.

Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, engaged in controversy with Jerome 384; published a great many Latin translations, as well as original works; died 410.

Jerome, born 318; in Rome 368; ordained presbyter about 387; translated or revised the Latin Vulgate; wrote commentaries on most of the books of Scripture, controversial tracts, an Onomasticon, and lives and works of preceding ecclesiastical writers; died 420.

Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, about 382; wrote commentaries, in which he expanded the grammatical sense; but only a few brief fragments remain; died about 428.

Augustine, born 354; baptized 387; ordained presbyter at Hippo 381; coadjutor of Valerius, Bishop of Hippo, 395; began his work, De Civitate Dei, 402; published Confessions; engaged in controversy with the Pelagians, Donatists, and Manichæans; composed a great variety of tracts bearing on systematic theology, many of which, both extant and otherwise, have no difficulty in answering the question, Where was Christianity then? for it existed then, as it exists still, in 'the Word of God, the Gospel of our salvation;' and it was neither dead nor asleep, but alive and active in the Church of the Catacomb' (Buchanan-Archeology of Justification, Edinb. 1867, p. 481).

III. Post-Nicene. The principal post-Nicene fathers are as follows:

Eusebius (Pamphylia), born about A.D. 270; bishop of Cesarea, in Palestine, 315; was a learned and laborious writer; besides many other things, the Evangelical Preparation, in fifteen books; Evangelical Demonstrations, in twenty books—the half of which is lost—but both works belong to Apologetics (q. v.); an Ecclesiastical History, in ten books; died 340.

Julius Firmicus Maternus, who wrote on the error of profane religions; flourished about 340.

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, born 305; banished to Phyrgia 355; wrote on the Trinity, on councils, against the Arians, with a commentary on the Psalms and Matthew; died 365.

Athanasius, born at Alexandria about 296; present as deacon at the Council of Nicaea 325; bishop of Al-
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IV. Use and Authority of the Father in Theology.—

On this subject there are three opinions: (a) The Roman and Fuyzeytive view, which puts the "consent of the fathers" in the form of advertisements or incipits to the rules of faith, along with Scripture. See Faith, Rule of. (b) That of the High-Church writers, who, though they acknowledge the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, yet appeal to the fathers as the proper expositors of Scripture and doctrine, and denounce as arrogant and presumptuous those who attempt to oppose modern opinions to what is held to be the sentiment of Christian antiquity. (c) The Protestant view, according to which the fathers are to be treated, like other theological writers, with the deference and respect to which their learning and their virtues may entitle them. "In the ancient church we must always bear in mind that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith, and that we have no right to insist upon the reception, as an article of faith, of any doctrine which is not to be found clearly revealed in Scripture, or which is not deducible from Scripture. Still, the judgment of antiquity on disputed points may be useful; and while we should not put these writers into the position of judges, they may be regarded as competent witnesses. They are also the historians of the Church, and report its customs in successive ages; we must, therefore, have recourse to their writings for information upon matters of ecclesiastical antiquity, just as we refer to the writings of historians for information upon matters of political antiquity."

The scholastic theology (q. v.) began with comments upon citations from the fathers, considered as authoritative (sententiae). When the Reformation began, the Roman divines found themselves driven anew to the authority of the fathers for authority for the doctrines and practices which Luther and his coadjutors showed to be without foundation in Scripture. More loudly than even the scholastics did the controversy of this period proclaim the authority of patristic tradition in settling questions of faith. We have here a clear polemical reason for the view taken of the fathers in Roman theology (see it stated in Alæus, Pædagogia, § 5; and in several articles Faith, Rule of; Tradition). Not unnaturally, then, have the Roman theologians been the most diligent workers in this field of Christian literature. But, on the other hand, the Roman theory that questions of doctrine can only be settled by councils (or by pope and council), has not been without effect in leading Roman writers to depreciate the early writers, or, at least, to see their defects clearly. So Petavius, whose Opus De Theodiciæ Dogmatibus (Paris, 1644–50; new edit. vol. i. Rome, 1857, fol.) is a storehouse of patristic learning, points out the theological errors of Athenagoras, Tertullian, and others, with great clearness. So also J. H. Newman, in the Introduction to his Essay on the Development of Christianity among the Early Fathers (pp. 12-13, N. Y. ed. 1841, 12mo), attacks the "incompleteness" and even of the "errors" of the ante-Nicene theology, even in the hands of such fathers as Irenæus, Gregory, and Cyprian. This whole Introduction may be considered as an argument against the so-called Tractarian view of the authority of the fathers, and as a polemic against the vaunted superiority and inestimable value of the Catholic Church.

2. The Protestant theologians have, until a late period at least, been divided into two wings on this question of the "right use of the fathers." One of these wings may be represented by Milton (+ 1674) and by Dillõle (+ 1670). Milton, in his tract De Preterial Episcopacy, speaks, in his strong way, of those who, "...content with the plentiful and wholesome fountain of Scripture, seek to themselves teachers, and cannot think any doubt resolved until they run to that undigested heap and fry of authors which they call antiquity. Whosoever time, or the heedless hand of blind and profane editors, or the rude ignorance or the malevolent curiosity, or the huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, those are the fathers." But yet, he adds, in another part of the same tract, "He that thinks it the part of a well-learned man to have read diligently the ancient stories of the Church, and to know the language and usages of the times, in which the fathers wrote, shall have all judicious men consent with him; not hereby to control and new-fangle the Scriptures, God forbid! but to mark how corruption and apostasy creep in by degrees, and to gather up, wherever we find the remaining sparks of original truth, whereunto we must, according to the apostle, continue to walk."

Milton, it is true, quotes the Gospel (Matt. xvi. 19) and the oracle, whereas the fathers hold the Epistle to the Romans, while Dillõle and others quote the Gospel (Matt. xvi. 19) and the oracle, whereas the fathers hold the Epistle to the Romans, and being an engagement upon ourselves of assenting to all that it charges upon us." Milton, it is plain, was writing against the Anglican admirers of antiquity as much as against the Roman Catholics.

Dillõle wrote a treatise, De Vera Usus Pastoralum (1556; Am. ed. The Right Use of the Fathers, Philadelphia, 1841, 12mo), which formed an epoch in the history of opinion on this subject. Warburton, in his Introduction to the Juvenal, and the Juvenal, its Defence, as follows: "When the great defection was made from the Church of Rome back again to the Church of Christ, the Reformed, though they shook off the tyranny of the pope, could not disengage themselves from the unbounded authority of the fathers, but carried that prejudice with them, as they did some others of a worse complexion, into the Protestant religion. For in sacred matters, as novelty is suspicious and antiquity venerable, they thought it for their credit to have the fathers on their side. They seemed neither to consider antiquity in general as a thing relative,
nor Christian antiquity as a thing positive; either of which would have shown them that the fathers themselves were modern compared to that authority on which the Reformation was founded, and that the Gospel was that true antiquity on which all its followers should repose themselves. The consequence of which is that they are swift to turn to the Church; the great names of the apostle Paul, Dr. Hooker, Andrews, and many others, show a list of patristic scholars hardly excelled in the Roman schools. Utter set great store upon the study of the fathers, not simply on polemical, but also on scientific grounds. Dr. Parr says of him: "Indeed, he had so great an esteem of the church fathers that he was likely to be endless; for, though the gross corruptions of Popery were certainly later than the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, to which the appeal was usually made, yet the seeds of them being sown, and beginning to pullulate, it was but too plain there was hold enough for a skilful debater to draw the fathers to his own side, and make them water the sprouts they had been planting: observing this, I say, he wisely projected to shift the ground, and force the disputants to vary their method both of attack and defence. In order to do himself justice, his observations on the Use of the Fathers, in which, with uncommon learning and strength of argument, he showed that the fathers were incompetent deciders of the controversies now on foot, since the points in question were not formed into articles till long after the ages in which they lived. This was brought home to him, as it is to the table: degrading them from the rank of judges into the class of simple evidence; in which, too, they were not to speak, like Irish evidence, in every cause where they were wanted, but only to such matters as were agreed to be within their knowledge. Had this learned critic stopped here, his book was done from blame; but at the same time, his purpose had in all likelihood proved very ineffectual, for the obliquity of old prejudices is not to be set straight by reducing it to that line of right which barely restores it to integrity. He went much farther; and by showing occasionally that they were absurd interpreters of Holy Writ, that they were bad reasoners in morals and very loose evidence in facts, he seemed willing to have his readers infer that, even though they had been masters of the subject, yet these other defects would have rendered them very unsatisfactory deciders. However, the work of this famous foreigner had great consequences, and especially with us here at home. The more learned among the nobility (which at that time was of the republic of letters) were the first who emancipated themselves from the general prejudic. It brought the excellent Lord Digby, and the learned both of the court and of the city, to turn his theological inquiries into a more useful channel; and his great rival in arts, the famous lord Digby, found it of such use to him in his defence of the Reformation against his cousin Sir Kenelm that he has even epitomized it in his fine letter on that subject. But what it has chiefly to boast of is that it gave birth to the two best defenses ever written on the two best subjects, religion and liberty—I mean Mr. Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants, and Dr. Jeremy Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying. In a word, it may be truly said to be the storehouse from whence all who have since written popularly on the character of the fathers have derived their materia" (cited in Preface to the Philadelphia edition of Dailie).

3. The other Protestant wing consists of the early writers after the Reformation who sought in the fathers to find weapons against Rome, and of their successors, especially in the Church of England, who have favored what are called High-Church views. Among Continental writers, Scultetus (Medalles Theologis Potrum Synagogen, Frankfurt, 1593; Heidel, 1613; Frankfurt, 1615) sought to show that the anti-Nicene fathers had been corrupted and misinterpreted by Roman writers, and that Protestant doctrines were nearer to the ancient than the Roman Catholic doctrines. The Anglican divines, from an early period of the Reformation, made great use of the fathers in the controversy with Rome. Moreover, they found, or believed that they found, the fathers very serviceable in their warfare for episcopacy. Patristic studies became fashionable in the Church; the great names of the apostle Paul, Dr. Hooker, Andrews, and many others, show a list of patristic scholars hardly excelled in the Roman schools. Utter set great store upon the study of the fathers, not simply on polemical, but also on scientific grounds. Dr. Parr says of him: "Indeed, he had so great an esteem of the church fathers that he was likely to be endless; for, though the gross corruptions of Popery were certainly later than the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, to which the appeal was usually made, yet the seeds of them being sown, and beginning to pullulate, it was but too plain there was hold enough for a skilful debater to draw the fathers to his own side, and make them water the sprouts they had been planting: observing this, I say, he wisely projected to shift the ground, and force the disputants to vary their method both of attack and defence. In order to do himself justice, his observations on the Use of the Fathers, in which, with uncommon learning and strength of argument, he showed that the fathers were incompetent deciders of the controversies now on foot, since the points in question were not formed into articles till long after the ages in which they lived. This was brought home to him, as it is to the table: degrading them from the rank of judges into the class of simple evidence; in which, too, they were not to speak, like Irish evidence, in every cause where they were wanted, but only to such matters as were agreed to be within their knowledge. Had this learned critic stopped here, his book was done from blame; but at the same time, his purpose had in all likelihood proved very ineffectual, for the obliquity of old prejudices is not to be set straight by reducing it to that line of right which barely restores it to integrity. He went much farther; and by showing occasionally that they were absurd interpreters of Holy Writ, that they were bad reasoners in morals and very loose evidence in facts, he seemed willing to have his readers infer that, even though they had been masters of the subject, yet these other defects would have rendered them very unsatisfactory deciders. However, the work of this famous foreigner had great consequences, and especially with us here at home. The more learned among the nobility (which at that time was of the republic of letters) were the first who emancipated themselves from the general prejudice. It brought the excellent Lord Digby, and the learned both of the court and of the city, to turn his theological inquiries into a more useful channel; and his great rival in arts, the famous lord Digby, found it of such use to him in his defence of the Reformation against his cousin Sir Kenelm that he has even epitomized it in his fine letter on that subject. But what it has chiefly to boast of is that it gave birth to the two best defenses ever written on the two best subjects, religion and liberty—I mean Mr. Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants, and Dr. Jeremy Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying. In a word, it may be truly said to be the storehouse from whence all who have since written popularly on the character of the fathers have derived their materia" (cited in Preface to the Philadelphia edition of Dailie).

4. A new impulse was given to the study of the fa-
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thers in England by the so-called Catholic revival in that Church in the first half of the 19th century. The old reliance on the authority of the laity and, more, on a blind following of their guidance, seemed to take pos-
session of the leaders of that movement. One of its
best fruits was the publication of the Library of the
Fathers (see below). The movement gave rise, as is
well known, to a bitter controversy, reopening the
whole question of the character of the Church, their
trustworthiness as witnesses, their authority as teach-
ers, and the general utility of studying their writings.

We cite a few specimens:

Coleridge, in his Notes on Huckle, especially on his
Sermans, remarks: "Let any competent judge read
Hackett's Life of Archbishop Wharton, or their theo-
spermons, and so measure the stultifying, nullifying ef-
fect of a blind and uncritical study of the fathers, and
the exclusive presupposition in favor of their authority
in the minds of many of our Church dignitaries in the
reign of Charles I." (Works, Harpers' ed. N. Y., v. 129.)

Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, who was a hearty hater of the
Tractarian movement, writes on the authority of the
fathers as follows: "In fact, it would greatly help to
clear this question if we understand what we mean by
allowing or denying the authority of the so-called fa-
thers. Is our authority as Augustine, according to
the sense in which I use it, I should either ac-
knowledge it or deny it. The writers of the first four
or of the first seven centuries have authority just as
the scholastics and ancient commentators have; some
of them, and in some points, are of weight singly; the
agreement of many of them has of such weight; the
agreement of almost all of them would have great
weight. In this sense I acknowledge their authority,
and it would be against all sound principles of criti-
cism to deny it. But if by authority is meant a de-
cative power, authority, which may not be question-
ted, then it is the clear authority which is an abso-
tute, to the great divines of the Reformation.

"There is much truth," he says, "though perhaps without
some exaggeration of phrase, in what Coleridge says
(Reformation, ii. 270) with reference to Luther, Melan-
cthon, and Calvin, that 'the least of them was not infe-
rior to Augustine, and worth a brigade of the Cyp-
rians, Firmilians, and the like.' Surely there is noth-
ing surprising in this. The marvel, the contradiction
to the whole course of history would be if this were
the case, unless we suppose that the special illu-
mination which has been granted to a race was stowed
on the chief teachers of Christianity down to the
last of the fathers, was then withdrawn, and has been
withhold ever since. But for such a limitation and
restriction of the gifts of the Spirit no ground can be
discovered, either in Scripture or in the nature of
man; nor can the history of the Church, as we have
facts to support it. . . . It is next to a moral impossi-
bility that men living in the desecration of the ancient
world, under the relaxing and palying influences of
the Roman and Byzantine empires, when all intellec-
tual and moral life was fast waning away, and the
grand and stirring ideal of the East, which carried
forth the energies of the classical nations in their
prime had been superseded by rhetorical tumor and
allegorical and grammatical trifling, should have mounted
to such a pitch of intellectual power as to be five
beyond the reach of the chief teachers of the Church.
When all the faculties of the now world were bursting
into life, and when one region of power another was
laid open to man, and called him to rise up and
possess of it. . . . There is no antecedent improba-
bility that a theologian in the sixteenth century
should have been wise enough to allow and an expounder
of theological truth as one in the fourth or fifth. Though
the earlier divines may have had certain special ad-
vantage, the advantages enjoyed by those in the later
period were far greater and more important; and if
they had peculiar temptations to lead them astray, so
had the others. The epoch at which a man lives does
not afford us a criterion for judging of the truth of
what he says, except so far as his testimony may be
appealed to concerning facts; in other respects the
value of his writings must be determined on different
grounds by candid and intelligent criticism. Nor is
such criticism of use needful with regard to the fathers
than to any other body of writers. . . . To those who
study the fathers critically and discerningly they still
yield grains of precious gold in abundance, as we see in
the excellent exegetical writings of Mr. Trench.

The superstitious and national passions are ever freed
of displaying their doting by picking out as the special
objects of their complacency not that which is really
valuable—other men might approve of that—but that
which in itself is worthless, nay, mawkishly silly or
wildly absurd. . . . And with which we may say is the
training of some of our patriots who are lapping
into Romanism here described! The issue, indeed, so
far as we are at present acquainted with it, has been
mainly in one direction—towards Rome. This is not
because the fathers of the first four or five centuries
are favorable to the errors and corruptions of Rome

who dare say to a Christian, 'You need not consider
what was the meaning of our Lord and his apostles;
the law is the last word, the last and final word of
Ambrose, or Chrysostom; that meaning has superseded
the meaning of Christ.' A Christian must find out
Christ's meaning, and believe that he has found it, or
else he must still seek for it. It is a matter, not of
outward submission, but of inward faith; and if in our
weariness we are person to person, their character of
true trustworthiness as witnesses, their authority as teach-
ers, and the general utility of studying their writings.

We cite a few specimens:

Coleridge, in his Notes on Huckle, especially on his
Sermans, remarks: "Let any competent judge read
Hackett's Life of Archbishop Wharton, or their theo-
spermons, and so measure the stultifying, nullifying ef-
fect of a blind and uncritical study of the fathers, and
the exclusive presupposition in favor of their authority
in the minds of many of our Church dignitaries in the
reign of Charles I." (Works, Harpers' ed. N. Y., v. 129.)

Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, who was a hearty hater of the
Tractarian movement, writes on the authority of the
fathers as follows: "In fact, it would greatly help to
clear this question if we understand what we mean by
allowing or denying the authority of the so-called fa-
thers. Is our authority as Augustine, according to
the sense in which I use it, I should either ac-
knowledge it or deny it. The writers of the first four
or of the first seven centuries have authority just as
the scholastics and ancient commentators have; some
of them, and in some points, are of weight singly; the
agreement of many of them has of such weight; the
agreement of almost all of them would have great
weight. In this sense I acknowledge their authority,
and it would be against all sound principles of criti-
cism to deny it. But if by authority is meant a de-
cative power, authority, which may not be question-
tioned, then it is the clear authority which is an abso-
tute, to the great divines of the Reformation.

"There is much truth," he says, "though perhaps without
some exaggeration of phrase, in what Coleridge says
(Reformation, ii. 270) with reference to Luther, Melan-
cthon, and Calvin, that 'the least of them was not infe-
rior to Augustine, and worth a brigade of the Cyp-
rians, Firmilians, and the like.' Surely there is noth-
ing surprising in this. The marvel, the contradiction
to the whole course of history would be if this were
the case, unless we suppose that the special illu-
mination which has been granted to a race was stowed
on the chief teachers of Christianity down to the
last of the fathers, was then withdrawn, and has been
withhold ever since. But for such a limitation and
restriction of the gifts of the Spirit no ground can be
discovered, either in Scripture or in the nature of
man; nor can the history of the Church, as we have
facts to support it. . . . It is next to a moral impossi-
bility that men living in the desecration of the ancient
world, under the relaxing and palying influences of
the Roman and Byzantine empires, when all intellec-
tual and moral life was fast waning away, and the
grand and stirring ideal of the East, which carried
forth the energies of the classical nations in their
prime had been superseded by rhetorical tumor and
allegorical and grammatical trifling, should have mounted
to such a pitch of intellectual power as to be five
beyond the reach of the chief teachers of the Church.
When all the faculties of the now world were bursting
into life, and when one region of power another was
laid open to man, and called him to rise up and take
possession of it. . . . There is no antecedent improba-
bility that a theologian in the sixteenth century
should have been wise enough to allow and an expounder
of theological truth as one in the fourth or fifth. Though
the earlier divines may have had certain special ad-
vantage, the advantages enjoyed by those in the later
period were far greater and more important; and if
they had peculiar temptations to lead them astray, so
had the others. The epoch at which a man lives does
not afford us a criterion for judging of the truth of
what he says, except so far as his testimony may be
appealed to concerning facts; in other respects the
value of his writings must be determined on different
grounds by candid and intelligent criticism. Nor is
such criticism of use needful with regard to the fathers
than to any other body of writers. . . . To those who
study the fathers critically and discerningly they still
yield grains of precious gold in abundance, as we see in
the excellent exegetical writings of Mr. Trench.
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The contest on this point has been waged again and again, and the victory, in the main, has always been on our side. But the very habit of looking with prostrate minds to outward human authority, and that, too, authority so remote from the special wants and yearnings of our age, and incapable of speaking to us with quick responsive activity of our own spirits—to authority, therefore, which can only speak imperatively, except to the few whose understandings are mature enough to consult it critically, and to distinguish the true from the erroneous, the relevant from the irrelevant—tends to exclude some classes of men which is incapable of standing alone, and will not be content with the help wherewith God has supplied us, but craves restlessly for some absolute authority whereby it may be enabled to walk in leading-strings all its life long. Such minds, when once prop and anchor given way under them, as they find out that no father can be appealed to as an absolute authority, least of all on the particular questions which agitate our times the most, will try to save themselves from falling into iniquity by catching desperately hold of infallibility. And where will they ever be when they have managed to beat their heads up?" (Hare, Vindication of Luther, p. 76-82).

5. But some of the opponents of an undue reverence for the fathers have not been wanting in just appreciation of their historical value. Dr. W. L. Alexander (Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolic, Edinb., 1845, 5th ed.) says: "The criticism of modern writers is at least estimating the importance and value of the fathers: "There has been among Protestants a great deal of foolish talking and much jesting that is anything but convenient upon this subject. Men who have never read a page of the fathers, and who could not read one word they try, have been disposed to jest at liberty to speak in terms of scoffing and supercilious contempt of these venerable luminaries of the early Church. Because Clement of Rome believed in the existence of the phaike, and because Justin Martyr thought the sons of God who are said in Genesis to have intermarried with the daughters of men were angels, who for the loves of earth were willing to forego the joys of heaven; and because legends and old wives' fables snow is found in almost all the fathers, it has been deemed wise to reject, despise, and ridicule their whole host of writings. The least reflection will suffice to show the unsoundness of such an inference. What should we say of one who, because lord Bacon held many opinions which modern science has proved to be false, should treat the Novum Organum with contempt? or of one who should deem himself emancipated from the traditions of antiquity, or of Baxtor in his Reformation, and the first that able and excellent men tried to prove the existence of Satan by quoting instances of his apparitions, and of his power over witches? There is no man, however good or great, that can quite be beyond the errors and credulities of his age. It becomes us, therefore, in dealing with the writings of a former generation, to take care that, in rejecting the bad, we do not also despise the good; and especially that we be not found availing ourselves of advantages which have reached us through the medium of these writings, while we are unjustly and unsteadily, and without any honor of the memory of those by whom these writings were penned."

In the height of the so-called Tractarian controversy in England, Isaac Taylor wrote his Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts (Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 5vo; 2d ed. 1864; reprint of vol. I, Phila. 1840, 12mo) for the purpose of laying "open the real condition, moral, spiritual, and ecclesiastical, of the ancient Church;" and the chief aim and tendency of the book is to lessen the authority of the fathers, especially of those of the ante-Nicene period. Yet Taylor was a convert who had a commendable confidence of the modern Church upon the ancient, and to deplore a "setting at naught" of patristic learning, "It is not we, may we be sure, those who possess much of this indispensable learning that in any such way set it at naught; and it is an acknowledged rule in all walks of science and literature that the scoops and captious objections of the ignorant need not be seriously replied to—'know what you are speaking of, and then let the matter concern the great mass of the world by laying down the comprehensive terms, either of admiration or contempt, to a body and series of writers, stretching through seven hundred or a thousand years, and these writers native as they were of distant countries, some of them simple and rude, while others were erudite and accomplished, some a plain proof of the most severe hardship, which is in any case incapable of standing alone, and will not be content with the help wherewith God has supplied us, but craves restlessly for some absolute authority whereby it may be enabled to walk in leading-strings all its life long. Such minds, when once prop and anchor given way under them, as they find out that no father can be appealed to as an absolute authority, least of all on the particular questions which agitate our times the most, will try to save themselves from falling into iniquity by catching desperately hold of infallibility. And where will they ever be when they have managed to beat their heads up?" (Hare, Vindication of Luther, p. 76-82).

6. But some of the opponents of an undue reverence for the fathers have not been wanting in just appreciation of their historical value. Dr. W. L. Alexander (Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolic, Edinb., 1845, 5th ed.) says: "The criticism of modern writers is at least estimating the importance and value of the fathers: "There has been among Protestants a great deal of foolish talking and much jesting that is anything but convenient upon this subject. Men who have never read a page of the fathers, and who could not read one word they try, have been disposed to jest at liberty to speak in terms of scoffing and supercilious contempt of these venerable luminaries of the early Church. Because Clement of Rome believed in the existence of the phaike, and because Justin Martyr thought the sons of God who are said in Genesis to have intermarried with the daughters of men were angels, who for the loves of earth were willing to forego the joys of heaven; and because legends and old wives' fables snow is found in almost all the fathers, it has been deemed wise to reject, despise, and ridicule the whole host of their writings. The least reflection will suffice to show the unsoundness of such an inference. What should we say of one who, because lord Bacon held many opinions which modern science has proved to be false, should treat the Novum Organum with contempt? or of one who should deem himself emancipated from the traditions of antiquity, or of Baxtor in his Reformation, and the first that able and excellent men tried to prove the existence of Satan by quoting instances of his apparitions, and of his power over witches? There is no man, however good or great, that can quite be beyond the errors and credulities of his age. It becomes us, therefore, in dealing with the writings of a former generation, to take care that, in rejecting the bad, we do not also despise the good; and especially that we be not found availing ourselves of advantages which have reached us through the medium of these writings, while we are unjustly and unsteadily, and without any honor of the memory of those by whom these writings were penned."

In the height of the so-called Tractarian controversy in England, Isaac Taylor wrote his Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts (Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 5vo; 2d ed. 1864; reprint of vol. I, Phila. 1840, 12mo) for the purpose of laying "open the real condition, moral, spiritual, and ecclesiastical, of the ancient Church;" and the chief aim and tendency of the book is to lessen the authority of the fathers, especially of those of the ante-Nicene period. Yet Taylor was a convert who had a commendable confidence of the modern Church upon the ancient, and to deplore a "setting at naught" of patristic learning, "It is not we, may we be sure, those who possess much of this indispensable learning that in any such way set it at naught; and it is an acknowledged rule in all walks of science and literature that the scoops and captious objections of the ignorant need not be seriously replied to—'know what you are speaking of, and then let the matter concern the great mass of the world by laying down the comprehensive terms, either of admiration or contempt, to a body and series of writers, stretching through seven hundred or a thousand years, and these writers native as they were of distant countries, some of them simple and rude, while others were erudite and accomplished, some a plain proof of the most severe hardship, which is in any case incapable of standing alone, and will not be content with the help wherewith God has supplied us, but craves restlessly for some absolute authority whereby it may be enabled to walk in leading-strings all its life long. Such minds, when once prop and anchor given way under them, as they find out that no father can be appealed to as an absolute authority, least of all on the particular questions which agitate our times the most, will try to save themselves from falling into iniquity by catching desperately hold of infallibility. And where will they ever be when they have managed to beat their heads up?" (Hare, Vindication of Luther, p. 76-82).
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but never so powerfully pervading the foreign substance it enters as to undergo no deflections itself, or to impose its influence, from age to age, in intensity, as well as in the particular direction it may take, so does it exhibit, from age to age, great variations of form and hue. But the men of any one age indulge too much the overweening temper that attaches always to human nature when they say to themselves Christianity is a living act, a lively reality, but that of such or such an age was a mere shadow of it. All mystification apart, as well as a superstitious and overweening deference to antiquity, nothing can be more simple than the facts on which rests the legitimate use and value of the ancient documents of Christianity. The history and spirit of the times immediately succeeding. These records contain at once a testimony in behalf of the capital article of faith and an exposition of minor sentiments and ecclesiastical usages, neither of which can be surrendered without some serious loss and dammage.

6. The more recent tendency among the theologians of Catholic and of the American church to study the fathers more thoroughly than ever, but to study them in a scientific way, for historical rather than polemical and dogmatical ends; or, where dogmatic interests are involved, to use the fathers historically, and not as authorities. The terms Patristics and Patrology have come into use to characterize the history and literature of the fathers on the one hand [see PATRISTIC], and their theology on the other [see PATROLOGY]. These branches have not yet taken fully scientific shape, but they are on the way to it (see the references below).
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III. Works on the Fathers; their literary history, their use, authority, etc.—1. Jerome (+420), De Viris illustris s. et catalogus Scriptorum. Eccles. (Migne, Patrol. Lat., vol. xxviii, 392, etc.), many editions and translations; the work is the basis of Fabricius, Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica, Hamburg, 1718, fol.); 2. Photius (+900), Bibliotheca (Migne, Patrol. Graec. vol. cii, cit.), containing sketches of 200 pagan and Christian writers; 3. Bellarmino, Liber de scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis (Rom., 1633, and often reprinted); Cave, Scriptores ecclesiasticos, vol. iv, Librorum, ad sec. xiv, (2 parts, Lond. 1868-96; Gen. 1705, 1720; Basel, 1741; Oxford [continued by Wharton, 1740-48, 2 vols. fol.); 5. Dupin, Novum Bibliothecarum Auctorum Ecclesiasticarum Parisiis, 1688-1687, 48 vols. 8vo, Amst. 1673-1715, 19 vols. 4to; Latin version, Paris, 1692 sq. vols. 4to [up to Augustinian]; English version, including 17th century, Lond. 1691-1707, 17 vols. bound in 7 or 8, Dublin, 1722-24, 3 vols. fol. [without the 17th century]; see Dupin); 6. Ceillier, Histoire Générale des Auteurs Sacrés et ecclésiastiques (Paris, 1722-29, 24 vols. 4to); 7. Leblond, Descriptive de l’histoire des ecclésiastiques, Paris, 1860-1865, 15 vols. imp. 8vo; see Ceillier); 7. Tillemont, Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique (Paris, 1698, 16 vols.); 8. Oudin, Commentarius de Scriptorum Eccles. origina, professing to fill up the gaps left by Cave, Dupin, etc. (Lipsiae, 1722, 9 vols. fol.); 9. Leclercq, Histoire des Auteurs Sacrés (Paris, 1718-19, 2 vols. fol.); 10. Tricarte, Bibliothèque portative des pères de l’Eglise (Paris, 1757-62, 9 vols. 8vo); 11. Spenzer, Theorarum rei patristicae (Würzburg, 1782-94, 3 vols. 4to); 12. Lumpfer, Hist. theologico-Criticae de vita scriptorium, cit. 85, Patrum (Augsburg, 1789-99, 19 vols. 8vo); 13. Fabricius, Bibliotheca Grammaticorum, (Hamb. 1788-1828, 14 vols., ed. by Harless, 1790 to 1812, 12 vols. including Index); Fabricius, Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica (mentioned above); Fabricius, Bibliotheca Latina (see Fabricius); 14. Walch, Bibliotheca Patristica (Jena, 1770; new ed. by Danz, Jena, 1834, 8vo); 15. (Introductio of Patristica et Patrologia), Wilhelm (R. C.), Patrologia ad unam academ. (Freib. 1778); 16. Gregory of Tours, Dialogues (translated by Engelhardt, 1870); 17. Meyer, Geschichte der Kirchen in der alten Christenheit (Erlangen, 1823); 18. Goldwitzer (H. C.), Bibliographie d. Kirchen-Väter (Nürnberg, 1834, 4 vols. 8vo, not of much value); Locherer (H. C.), Lehrbuch der Patrologie (Mainz, 1837, 8vo); 19. Peremander (H. C.), Patrologia generalis, specialis (Landshut, 1841-47, 4 vols. 8vo); 20. Möhler (R. C.), Geschichte der Patrologie (Berlin, 1840; only first vol. finished, covering first three centuries); Dussler (R. C.), Institutiones Patr. i, t. the Gregory the Great (1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo); Alzog (R. C.), Grandiosa d. Patrologie (1reib. 1866, 8vo); Donaldson, Critical History of Christian Literature, etc. (mentioned above, Lond. 1864, 8vo), of the Fathers, Mat. Bonaventura (H. C.), Traité de la lecture des Fiers (Paris, 1868-97); also in Latin, De syst. meth. legend. ecclesii. Patr. (August. Vind. 1756, 8vo); Daléil (see above), Right Use of the Fathers (The Phil. 1642, 17mo); Goode, Derived Rule of Faith, etc. (Lond. 1845, 3 vols. 8vo, Phil. 2 vols.); Peck, Apparatus for the Translations of Newman (York, 1844); and other works cited under Faith, Rule of (q. v.); also Campbell, Prem. Dia. to Four Gospels (dix. iv); Milton, Pretalitical Episcopacy (Prose Works, vol. I); Conybeare, Examination of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, 1st ed. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo; Orr, Christianity (Lond. 2 vols. 8vo); Hale, Vinchonissement of Luther; Blunt, Right Use of the Early Fathers, against Daléil and others (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Schaff, Church History, i, 458 sq.; Moses Stuart, in Bibliotheca Sacra, i, 125 sq.; Jahrhundert für deutsche Theologie, 2, 856; 1867, 1, 720; F. Nitzsch, in Jahrhundert für deutsche Theologie, x, 87 sq.; Schwann, Dogmengeschichte der zivilgeschichte der zivilgeschichte des Reiche. Zeit. (Münster, 1867, 8vo); Hübner, Die Philosophie d. Kirche (München, 1867, 8vo); Levestre, Dictionnaire de Patrologie (Paris, 5 vols. 8vo). Brief sketches of the lives of the fathers may be found in Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity (Lond. 1845-52); Evans, Biography of the Early Church (2d ed. Lond. 1850, 2 vols. 18mo); copious biographies of them in Böhmer, Kirchengeschichte in Biographien (Zürich, 9 parts, 1843-50).

Fathom (fathom), a nautical measure of six (Greek) feet in length (strictly 6·81 engi. feet); properly (as the word implies) the space which one can cover by extending the arms laterally (Acts xxviii., 29). See measure.

Fatio de Duillers, Nicolas, a learned mathematician and an eccentric religious enthusiast, was born at Bâle, in Switzerland, Feb. 16, 1664, and died in the county of Worcester, England, in 1768. He was educated in Geneva, visited and spent some time in Paris and the Hague, but finally chose England for his home. He early showed great ability in the exact sciences, and at the age of eighteen propounded a new theory of the earth and of the rings of Saturn in a letter to Cassini, to whose theory of zodiacal light he in 1666 gave new developments. He made several useful and ingenious applications of science to practical life, one of which was a new method of determining the speed of a vessel. In the controversy regarding the discovery of the differential calculus he was an earnest supporter of the claims of Newton. Later in life he advocated extravagant views on religious subjects, was a leader in the movement of the Covenants, and claimed for himself inspiration and the gift of prophecy and miracles. Neither the ridicule which Shaftesbury, in his letter on enthusiasm, aimed at him, nor his public exposure with two other persons on the pillory in London (Sept. 1707) for avverting Elias Marion himself and contravening the "prophecies," had the effect to cure him of his enthusiasm. He even went to Asia in the hope of...
converting the world, but, not meeting with success, returned to England again, and spent his time in retirement, pursuing his scientific labors, but still cherishing his extravagant religious opinions. Many scientific works from his pen are extant, but his writings in favor of the prophecies of the Covenants are now unknown.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biographie Générale, xxvii, 186.

Fautiling. 1. Nett,[b] meri', a fatted animal, especially bullock ("calf") for slaughter, 2 Sam. vi, 18; Isa. xi, 6; Ezek. xxi, 18. 2. Jep, a marrow beef (q. v.), especially of the fat-tailed variety (Ps. lxi, 15). 3. Improperly for नृिक, mish'koh, the second in rank, 1. e. of inferior quality, 1 Sam. xvi, 9. 4. (Corresponding with No. 1), sar'wrik, corn-fed, e. i. stooled, fat, Matt. xxiii, 4. See Fat.

Patou, Nicholas, a French mystic writer, born at Arras in 1644, died at St. Omer in 1694, took the vows of the Dominican order in the convent at Arras, and subsequently entered that at St. Omer. We have from him: 1. Le Paradis terrestre du Saint Bouvoyer de l'Augeus Vierge, mere de Dieu, etc., in 4 vols., of which only one vol. appeared (St. Omer et Lille, 1692, 12mo):—2. A treatise on the famous miracle of the holy candle, entitled Discours sur les Prodiges du Saint Cœur, etc., of which the first edition, quite rare, St. Omer, 1693; the second and third, Arras, 1696, sm. 8vo, and 1744, 12mo.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Gen.

Fatted Fowl (Niebás, birbirin al'sim). Sept. ἀνηθέαλα αὐθαλόνα αὐθαλόνα, Vulg. aves al'sim) are included in 1 Kings iv, 28 [v, 13], among the daily provisions for Solomon's table. Gesenius (Thes. Bibl. p. 240) prefers to translate this "fatted geese," Egyptians, whose monuments abound with illustrations of their rearing and culinary application. See Fowl.

Faucher, Denis, a French theologian, was born at Arles, A.D. 1457, and died at the abbey of Lérins in 1562. In 1508 he entered the Benedictine order at the convent of Polimne, near Mantua, and in 1515 was sent to the monastery of Lérins, of which he in advanced years became prior. His works are found in Vincent Barralle's (of Salerno) Chronica Sanctorum et A. Horace rimae, illustrations ad Acta Sanctorum, Lérinensis (Lyons, 1613, 4to).—Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Gen.

Faucher, Jean, a French Protestant preacher and controversialist, died at Nîmes in 1698. He was minister at Uzès, when he was sent in 1611 by the Protestant churches of Lower Languedoc as deputy to the Assembly at Sommières, and in 1615 to that at Grenoble. When this latter assembly was in the following year transferred to Nîmes, Faucher was chosen pastor and professor of theology in that city. He however, followed the assembly to Rochelle, and did not return to Nîmes until 1617, after the conclusion of a peace. He was a man of great energy of character, and agreed in opinion with those Huguenots who held force of arms to be a secure liberty of conscience, if not the triumph of the Protestant cause in France. He persistently advocated a policy in consonance with such views in the assembly from 1615 to 1617, as indeed also in that convoked by the duke of Rohan in August, 1622, to agree upon terms of peace with the king, declaring that to open their arms to the king would prove the sacrifice of their liberties. Only two works from his pen are known, viz., Exorcismes divins, or propositions Christianes pour chasser les démons et les esprits abuseurs qui troubent les royaumes (Nîmes, 1628, sm. 8vo), and Zacherie, ou la Sainteté du Mariage et particularité du Mariage des ecclésiastiques, contre l'usage des sous-introdissés et autres impostures des consciences éclésiastiques (Nîmes, 1627, sm. 8vo).—Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Générale; Hasag, La France protestante. (J. W. M.)

Fauchet, Claude, commonly known as the abbé Fauchet, and a prominent Girondist in the French Revolution. He was born at Dornes, in the department of Nièvre, Sept. 22, 1744, and was guillotined at Paris Oct. 31, 1798. After his ordination he became one of the priests of St. Roch, at Paris. When scarcely 50 years of age he delivered a paper on thebs on St. Louis before the French Academy, and was soon thereafter appointed grand vicar to the archbishop of Bourges; then one of the court preachers, and abbot of Montfort-Lacabre in Brittany. In a sermon delivered in 1788 at the fête de la Résistance at Sarthe, he manifested so strongly his sympathy with the revolutionary tendency that his name was stricken from the list of court preachers. Thenceforth an outspoken and zealous champion of the new political doctrines, he was active in the popular meetings in Paris, a participant in the movements against the Bastille, was named a member of the Commune de Paris, and assisted in the reorganization of the Church by composing the treatise entitled Religion Nationale, and was one of the editors of the Bouche de Fer (Iron Mouth). In 1791 he was made consular of Calvados, from which department he was chosen a deputy to the Assembly and the Convention, where, though a zealous Republican, he opposed the extreme measures taken in regard to the king and the Church, supporting his pen in the Journal des Amis the positions maintained by him in the Legislature. He consequently incur-

An ancient Egyptian Poulterer's Shop, showing the feeding and plucking of Geese.

Referring to the word to the root नृि, "to be pure," because of the pure whiteness of the bird. He gives reasons for believing that the same word in the cognate languages included also the meaning of songs (comp. Bochart, Hieros, ii, 127). Michaud's (Suppl. p. 226) less aptly interprets field animals (from the Chaldean, a field). Whether domestic poultry was much raised by the Hebrews has been a matter of dispute; but no good reason can be assigned why they should not in this respect have been as well supplied as their neighbors, the Egyptians, who gave great attention to them. See Nare. As it is pretty generally conceded that some kind of bird is intended by the proverb here designated, some can in this particular compete with the dung-hill fowl; and the fattening implies their domestication, while the fact of their daily consumption at the royal table argues their extensive cultivation and common use. Geese, however, may very probably be intended, as they were an esteemed article of food ancienly, especially among the...
FAUCHEUR 506  FAUNT

was Dananus (q. v.). After leaving Ghent, where he distinguished himself as a student, he spent a short time at the University of Leyden. In 1685 he was called to serve a Protestant church at Cologne, where he labored among the Huguenots amid severe persecutions. On June 27, 1659, he was installed over the Reformed church in Middelburg, the chief city of Zeeland, where he spent the remainder of his life. He had great reputation as a preacher. His learning was profound, his exhortations earnest and impressive, and his deportment exemplary. In ecclesiastical affairs he acted a conspicuous part. He was member and a

FAUCHEUR, MICHEL LE, a French Protestant divine of great talent as a preacher, was successively minister at Montpellier, Charanton, and Paris. He died in 1657. It is related of him that on one occasion he preached so forcibly against debts that maréchal De la Force, who heard him, remarked to some officers in the audience that, should a challenge be sent to him, he would decline it. He wrote, Sermôns sur les onze premiers chapitres des Actes des Apôtres (Gen. 1604, 4 vols., 12mo):—Traité de l'actio de l'orateur, ou de la prononciation et du geste (Par. 1657, 12mo):—Sermôns, Rom. iv, 23: The vages of sin and the reward of grace (translated in Cobin's French Preacher):—Traités sur l'Éucharistie (Gen. 1658), etc.—Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographie, s. v.

PAUCHON, J. R., is the rendering (Judith xiii, 6; xvi, 9) of the Greek dôma, (which the Romans also Latinized oecines), a Persian term for the short sword, usually represented as a straight, thick poniard on the Persepolitan figures (see Smith, Ancient Persian Sword.

Diet. of Class. Ant. s. v. Acinaces), and therefore appropriately employed in the apocryphal account of the deification of Holophernes by the Hebrews. See Sargon.

FANKELIUS, HERMAN, was born at Bruges about the year 1560. His parents were warmly attacked to the Protestant cause. At twenty we find him in a theological seminary at Ghent. Here he enjoyed the instructions of able professors, among whom

Ancient Persian Sword.
successively to the Jesuits' College at Louvain, to Paris, Munich, and Rome, where he was appointed di- 
vine to the Seminary of the Congregation of France, and de- 
veloped his lifelong devotion to the reform of the religious orders.

He was the author of several religious works, among which is the Dictionnaire des Novices (Paris, 1711, 4to).


Faure, Charles, a French Roman Catholic theo-
lologist, born at Lucigny, near Paris, in 1584; died Nov.
4, 1644. He was the first superior-general of the regular 
canonesses of the Congregation of France, and de-
voted his life to the reform of the religious orders.

Faure, François, a French prelate, born Nov. 8, 
1012; died May 11, 1687. He entered the Franciscan 
order at the age of seven years, and rose to the highest 
positions therein; was appointed sub-preceptor of 
Louis XIV, and finally bishop of Amiens. We have 
from him a condemnation of the Lettres Provinciales; 
an Ordinance contre le Nouveau Testament de Mons 
(1678); a Panégyrique de Louis XIV (Paris, 1680, 4to); 
an Oration sur la reine Anne de France (died 1666); and 
an Oraison funèbre de Henriette-Marie de France, 
reine de la Grande-Bretagne (Paris, 1670, 4to).


Faust, Dr., according to tradition, a celebrated dealer 
in the black art. (The following account, chiefly 
translated from Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, is taken from 
Chambers, Encyclopædia, s. v.) He was born probably 
about A.D. 1460, at Knittlingen (or Knittlingen), in 
Württemberg, or, as some say, at Roda, near Wilhelm.

He is said to have studied magic at Cracow. "After 
having spent a rich inheritance left him by his uncle, 
Faust is alleged to have made use of his 'power' to 
raise the Devil, with whom he entered into a contract for twenty-four years, obtaining during 
that time his fill of earthly pleasure, but at its termi-
nation surrendering body and soul into the hands of 
the great enemy. The devil gave him an attendant 
spirit or daemon, called Mephistopheles, though other 
names are given him by the later traditionists, with 
whom he travelled about, enjoying life in all its forms, 
and astonishing people by working wonders, till he 
was finally carried off by the Evil One, who appeared 
in terrible guise between twelve and one o'clock at 
night, at the village of Rimlich, near Wittenberg, 
though some say he was seen by others during the day.

Conrad Gesner (1561) is equally positive; and 
Luther, in his Table Talk, speaks of Dr. Faust as a 
man lost beyond all hope. The opinion that prevails, 
and which is reckoned to be intrinsically the more 
probable, is that some man of this name, possessed of 
varied knowledge, may have practised juggl-
ergy (for the wandering savages of the Middle Ages had all a touch of the quack about them), and thus 
been taken by the ignorant people for a dealer in 
the black art, and one who maintained a secret and 
infernal connection with the Evil Spirit. His widely 
diffused and celebrity not only occupied the writers' and 
worked by other so-called necromancers of an earlier age—Albertus Magnus, Simon Magnus, and Paracelsus—to be 
attributed to him, but likewise many ancient tales and 
legends of a marvellous character were gradually 
transferred to him, till he finally appears as the very 
hero of magicians. But while, on the one hand, the 
arraive of Faust's marvels afforded amusement to 
the people on the other hand, the word Faust's enter-
prizes and feats. The oldest of these now known 
appeared at Frankfort in 1588. Then came an 'im-
proved' edition of the same, by Widmann, entitled 
of John Dr. Faust, Hamburg. 3 vols. 1599; and in 1685, a 
work was published at Nürnberg by Pfister, based 
upon that of Widmann. The oldest of these books 
was translated into all the civilized languages of Europe. 
Impostors also published books of magic under the 
name of Faust, such as Faust's grosser und groblicher 
Holzespang (Faust's Great and Potent Book of Spells), 
Fausten's Mirakeln (Faust's Art of Performing 
Miracles), and Dreifache Holzespang (The Threefold 
Book of Spells). These wretched productions are fill-
ed throughout with meaningless scralls and figures, 
interpolations and texts from the Bibles, and almost always 
missapplied; but in the belief of the vulgar, they were 
supposed capable, when properly understood, of 
accomplishing prodigies. That the poetical art should in 
due time have seised on a subject affording so much 
material for the fancy to work upon, is a


the life of her parent, who was notwithstanding put to death. This confidence and affection, as is alleged by some, she abused so as to instigate the death of Cripus, Constantine's son by his first wife Minervina, a youth of rare promise and great popularity, because, as some say, he stood in the way of her own sons, or, according to others, of his to處ocate his illicit love. Helena, the mother of the emperor, however, avenged the fate of her grandson, and Fausta, whose perity and infidelity were made known, was suffocated in a hot bath. Other accounts, however, hold Fausta innocent of the death of Cripus, which, together with that of her own and that of the Licius, is attributed to the cruel suspicions of Constantine, engendered by success—that magnificens rerum seculendarum, as Eutropius style it, which perverted his nature and led to deeds of cruelty. The vague and contradictory statements in regard to her conduct, and to the time, cause, and manner of her death, leave the whole matter in doubt. In one account she is made to survive the death of her son Constantine, who was slain three years after his father's death, and in another is represented as the "most pious of queens." Her conversion to Christianity is also a matter of doubt, though she probably followed her husband in that respect.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ii, 162-3 (N. Y. Harpers', 1862, 6 vols. 12mo); Tilmille, Histoire des Emp. vol. iv, art. XIX, p. 224, and Notice sur Constantine, xvii; Eckel, Doctrina Nostri Hom. (2nd ed., Rome, 1740), 112; Eutropius, De Mortu Persecut. 27; Julian, Orig. 1; Zosimus, ii, 10; 29; Philostorgius, Hist. Eccles. ii, 4. (J. W. M.)

Faustinus, bishop of Lyons, lived in the second part of the third century. He became bishop about the year 250, and distinguished himself by his zeal for the faith, and the ardor with which he attacked Marcellus, bishop of Arles, the only Gallic bishop who had embraced Arianism. Unknown to it, he accomplished anything by himself, he made sure of the aid of the bishops of the Narbonnaise, and wrote to the pope, Stephen, to obtain the deposition of Marcellus. The pope hesitated, and Faustinus, in order to hasten matters, wrote to a Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. The two letters which he wrote no longer exist, but they form the material of the sixty-seventh letter of Cyprian to pope Stephen, which gives a curious picture of the Gallic Church at that period. Marcellus persisted in his schism, and the result of the affair is uncertain, but it is probable that he was deposed, since his name is not found in the list of the bishops of Arles.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xvii, 199.

Faustinus, a priest of the sect of the Luciferaeans (q.v.) in the fourth century. He shared in the persecution they experienced, but was set free by the intercession of the emperor Theodosius, to whom he presented a petition praying for protection to be extended to himself and others who associated with him; the emperor granted it, and Damasus' papal persecutions were stayed. He wrote a treatise, De Triaineta sie de Fide contra Ariana (Concerning the Faith, against the Arians). The discourse is dedicated to the empress Flacilla, and divided into seven chapters. He begins by stating the heresies of the Arians, and then combats them from Scripture. In chap. ii, he proves that the word Son belongs to our Saviour, but leaves unthought the question whether the word applies to him as God or man, taking for granted the former; in chap. v, he shows the omnipotence and perpetual endurance of God; in chap. vi, John the Baptist, in chap. vi, the qualifications implied in Acts ii, 36 are pointed out as belonging only to God; and chap. vii is a short dissertation on the Holy Spirit. He wrote also Fides Theodotio imp. obt. (according to Macrinius, about A.D. 387), a petition addressed to the emperors Valentinian and Theodosius, relating and requesting to be freed from the persecutions which he, Marcellus, and others were suffering in consequence of being Luciferaeans. A short account of this sect is prefixed to Faustinus to the petition. His remains will be found in Galland, Bib. Max. Patr. vii, 441, and in Migne, Patrolog. Cur. xiii, 38 sq.—Clarke, Success. Sac. Lit.; Lardner, Works, iv, 250.

Faustinus, who lived towards the close of the sixth century after Christ, was appointed bishop of Luxeuil, France, by authority of Gondwald, who, claiming to be a natural son of Clothaire I, aspired to the throne of Aquitaine, but was vanquished, betrayed, and slain. Faustinus was then deposed by a council held at Macon, which, curiously enough, also condemned Gondwald and had ordained him to provide for him in turn, and pay him 100 solidi annually.—Gregory of Tours, Epitome histor. Francorum; Hieor, Nouv. Biog. Gen. (J. W. M.)

Faustus, Dr. See Faust, Dr.

Faustus Rufinus or Rheginus (of Rhegium, or Riez, in Provence), so called from the diocese over which he presided, a pious and self-sacrificing prelate, although doctrinally he favored Semi-Pelagianism. He was born in about the beginning of the fifth century, and became a monk in Africa. When Maximus was made bishop of Rhegium, Faustus succeeded him in his abbacy of Lerins, and succeeded him again as bishop on his death, A.D. 454. He was present at the council held under Hilary at Arles in 466, and in 467, shortly before he died, he wrote 486. He wrote (1) De Gratia Div. et humanae mentis libero arbitrio (On Grace and Free-will) (Bib. Max. Patr. vili). In this treatise he opposes absolute predestination, but admits original sin and the necessity of grace to assist man's nature, but denies that grace is given by grace to save infallible, or that original sin is entirely destructive of every good, so as to leave man "a mass of corruption." He also shows that God's foreknowledge does not affect the salvation or condemnation of any, and interprets the various texts of Scripture which refer to the matter.—(2) Professio Fidei (A Confession of Faith) (Bib. Max. Patr. viii), directed against the doctrines of predestination and fate, addressed to Leontius, bishop of Arles. This is a recapitulation of his treatise De Gratia. (3) Epistola ad Lucidum Presbyterum, against the Presbyter of the monastery of Adalbertum. Lucidus was convinced by this letter, and subscribed to the points condemned in it (Mansi, Concil. v. 1007). This and other Epistolae, to Ruricius and others, are in Cambrai Lect. Antiqu. i, 352 (Antw. 1725, fol.), and in the Biblioth. Ambros. 1, also several Sermones. He treats De Gratia is also in Migne, Patrolog. cur. xvi, 775 sq., together with the Epistolae and Sermones. Angelo Mai, in his Speculum Romanae, gives three discourses of Faustinus never before printed. Neander gives the following judicial statement of the doctrines of Faustinus: "Although Faustinus adopted the Semi-Pelagian mode of exposition with regard to the relation of the free-will to grace, yet he unfolded this scheme in a way peculiar to himself. If he did not express himself so distinctly as to satisfy the acute and clear-headed theologian, yet we see presented in him, in a beautiful manner, such a harmonious tendency of Christian feeling, keeping aloof from all partial and exaggerated views, as prevented him from giving undue prominence either to the work of the creation, or so as to infringe on that of the creation, or to the work of redemption, so as to infringe on that of the redemption. 'As the same Being was not the Creator and Redeemer, so one and the same Being is to be adored both in the work of creation and of redemption.' Among the attributes which, as expressing the image of God, could not be destroyed in human nature, he included the freedom of the will. But even before the fall the free-will was insufficient; wind out the aid of grace, and still less can it be present,
since sin has entered, suffice by its own strength for the attainment of salvation. It has now lost its original power, yet it is not in itself destroyed; it is not altogether shut out from the divine gifts, but only it must strive once more to obtain them by intense efforts and the divine assistance. Like the author of the epistle of the Hebrews, he believes there is a distinction between general grace (gratia generalis), a term by which he designates the religious-moral capability which God has furnished to man's nature, and which, too, has not been wholly supplanted by sin, as well as the universal inward revelation of God by means of thin, and through the general sense of the divine grace so understood, and special grace, by which he means all that was first bestowed on mankind through Christianity. But the relation of these two kinds of grace to each other is defined by him quite otherwise than it is in the work above mentioned. Although, as a general thing, the grace of redemption, and in many cases, also, the calling, is antecedent to all human merit, still the operation of that special grace in man is dependent on the manner in which he has used that general grace; and in many cases the striving and seeking of the grace itself precedes that of the grace of grace. All this, the self-active bent of the free-will, is antecedent to that which is imparted to the man by this special grace: a thing which Faustus endeavors to show by examples similar to those which the Semi-Pelagians had been accustomed to adduce since the time of Caesarius of Heisterbach. He imputes the impossibility of good in human nature a spark of fire implanted within by the divine hand, which, cherished by man, with the assistance of divine grace, would become operative. He recognizes, therefore, a preparatory development of the religious and moral nature even among the heathen, and he shows that those who are willing to allow that, by a faithful use of that general grace, the heathen might have attained to the true service of God. From this it might also be inferred that Faustus was an opponent of the doctrine which taught that all the heathen would be unconditionally condemned; and that it was his opinion that the worthy among them would still be led, after the present life, to faith in the Saviour, and thereby to salvation; but on these points he does not express himself more distinctly. There is much good sense in the remarks of Faustus where he and touches on the two things, as in his manner of apprehending the relation of grace to free-will with the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. As in the doctrine concerning Christ's person some gave undue prominence to the divine, others to the human element, and, as he contends, both are necessary and, as in the Catholic Church, all are not on opposite sides, injured the doctrine of redemption, so he says it was also with the doctrine concerning human nature. Faustus deserves notice also on account of his dispute concerning the corporeality of the soul. He affirmed, as others before him had already done (e.g., Hilary of Poitiers, On Matt., v. 8, and even Didymus, in his work De Trinitate, bk. ii, ch. 4: 'Ωτ' ἁγγελοὶ πνεύματα, καθός πρὸς ἑαυτὰς ἀσώματα, σώματα ἐσώμασα διὰ τὸ ἁγγείον σοι πέσατο τοῦ κατοικίου πνεύματος), that God alone is a pure spirit; in the essential nature of the divine trinity is understood Man as well by time (a beginning of existence), so also by space; and hence all creatures are corporeal beings, the higher spirits as well as souls. He was led by his controversies with the Arians of the German tribes, to uphold these views still farther; for he supposed he could demonstrate that if equality of essence with the Father was not ascribed to the Logos, it would be necessary to regard him as a corporeal being. He found an opponent who surpassed him in philosophy, and its effects on the Church as well as by Christian the man of Logia, a man on whom the speculative spirit of Augustine had exerted a great influence. He wrote against Faustus his work De statu animae' (Neander, Church History, Torrey, ii, 645). — Clarke, Succession of Soc. Lic., ii, 255; Neander, History of Doctrina, Ryland, ii, 388; Moehmen, Ch. Hist. cent. v, pt. ii, ch. v, § 26, n. 60; Ceiller, Auteurs Sacres (Paris, 1861), x, 420-436. See Semi-Pelagians; Massilians.

Faustus, Socinus. See Socinus.

Faustus, St. (d'Aguena), was born about A.D. 460, but the date of his death is unknown. He became a monk in the convent of Aguna, in Valois, and in 508 went to Paris with Severinus, his abbot, who was called thither by Clovis in order to employ his medical skill in treating him for a chronic fever. On his return journey Severinus died, and Faustus, who had remained in France, was commissioned by Childebert to write his life. This work is commendable for its simplicity, exactness, and scant mention of miracles as wrought by its subject, in an age whose literature is replete with such marvels. The best edition is that by Mabillon in the Acta Sanctorum Ord. Sanci Bene dicati (Paris, 1668-1710, 9 vols. fol.; reprinted at Venice, 1728, 9 vols. fol.). The Acta Sanctorum assigns the martyr's death to the 11th of January to St. Esmun of Aguna.—Hoefer, Novis. Biol. Gén., xvii, 202.

Faustus, St. (de Glamfeul) was one of the Benedictine monks who came with St. Maurus to France, A.D. 548, and assisted in founding the first monastery of his order in that country at Glamfeul (Glanafollum), in Anjou. In 568, after the death of Maurus, he returned to Italy, and became an inmate of the monastery of Lateran at Rome, where, at the instance of his brother monks, he wrote a life of St. Maurus, and presented it to pope Boniface IV, who approved it about 607. Faustus died some time after this (on a 15th of February, according to the Bollandists), and was buried in the monastery of Lateran. His life of St. Maurus was a simple and vivid spirit of the life of the saint when he lived faith in the marvellous, and abounds in uninteresting and prolix details. Surius (Vita Sanctorum, etc.), Du Breul (Suppl. Antiq., etc.), and Mabillon (Acta Sancti Ord. Sanci Bene dicati) have edited it.—Hoefer, Novis. Biol. Gén., xvii, 202-3.

Faustus, the Manichæan, a prominent bishop of the Manicheans, was a native of Melle, in Nubia, of the family of the bishops of the Church of the Manicheans in Egypt. He was nearly the whole of his work of Faustus is quoted, Augustine relates of him that he led a life of luxurious ease, regarded himself as the Incarnate Wisdom, was for a time exiled for his Manichean opinions to an island, but subsequently released. The work of Augustine, Monemantibus, with a volume of his works in the Maurine and Munic editions. See AUGUSTINUS, MANICHIÆANS. — Herzog
FAVOR

FAVOR. See GRACE.

FAVOR. See FABER.

Fawcett, Benjamin, an English dissenting minister, was born at Saltford, Wiltshire, in 1715, and died in 1780. He was a pupil of Dr. Doddridge at Northampton, and preached first at Taunton, and then at Kidderminster, where he was pastor of a congregation of Dissenters for 35 years. He was a strict economist of time, and attributed his uninterrupted good health to his temperate mode of life and the habit of early rising. His works are, Sermons (1756-80), an abridgment of Baxter's Saints' Everlasting Rest, and Religious Melancholy (1780, 8vo). —Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors.

Fawcett, John D.D., an eminent Baptist minister, was born in Yorkshire Jan. 6, 1739, joined a Baptist church in 1758, and was ordained minister at Wainsgate in 1764. Here he opened an academy, at which many ministers were educated, among them Ward of Serampore. He was a self-taught, but well-informed man, and in theology he was more of the Calvinist. He died July 25, 1819. He published The Sick Men's Friend (1774); —Hymns (Leeds, 1781, 12mo); —Essay on Anger (Leeds, 1787, 12mo); —Devotional Family Bible (1806-11, 2 vols. 4to). —Jones, Christian Biography, s. v.; Jamieson, Cyclop. of Biblical. p. 194.

Fawcett, Joseph, minister of an Independent church at Walthamstow, died 1804. He was a very popular preacher, and published Sermons delivered at the Old Jery (London, 1795, 2 vols. 8vo).

Fawkes, Guy ("properly Grido"), the head of the conspiracy known by the name of the Gunpowder Plot, was born of a Protestant family in York in the year 1570. He became a Roman Catholic at an early age, and lived in the Spanish arm in the Netherlands. Inspired with fanatical zeal for his new religion, on his return to England he entered into a plot with several Catholic gentlemen for blowing up the king, his ministers, and the members of both houses at the opening of Parliament, November 5, 1605. Guy Fawkes was taken with the burning match in his hand, tried, and, after being put to the torture, was publicly executed January 31, 1606. In remembrance of this event, in most English towns, but particularly in London, a grotesque figure, stuffed with straw, is carried about the streets on the 5th of November, and finally committed to the flames. A political and religious significance was again imparted to this custom by what was called 'the papal aggression' in the year 1850, when the figure of Cardinal Wiseman (q. v.) was substituted for that of Guy Fawkes. —See GUNPOWDER PLA.

Fayditt, Pierre, a priest of the French Oratory, was born at Reims, in the first half of the 17th century. He was in 1671 excluded from the Oratory for having published, in spite of the prohibition of his superiors, from the Cartesian point of view, a work On the Human Mind (De Mensa Flammae). With this publication he was quarrelling with the French government, Fayditt, in a sermon on St. Polycarp, preached against the pope, whose conduct he compared with that of pope Victor toward the Asiatic bishops. The view expressed in these sermons he refuted himself in another sermon published at Liège; but in 1687 he again published at Maastricht an extract from his first sermon, with proofs for the facts quoted in it. In consequence of an Essay on the Trinity, in which he seemed to favor Trithelism, he was imprisoned in 1686 at St. Lazarus. Subsequently he was ordered to withdraw to his native city, where he continued to live until his death, 1702. Some ridiculous arguments some of the best works of his age, such as Fénelon's Théologie and Tillenouet's Mémoires Ecclesiastiques. He died in 1702. —Hoeter, New. Biog. Génér. xvi, 229.

FAVOR. See GRACE.

FEAR OF GOD. I. Old Testament. —There is no mention in the Scriptures of the sentiment of fear in the relations between man and God before the fall of Adam. After the transgression, Adam says, "I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid" (Gen. iii. 10). Fear of God (יהוה יראתי) stands thus in close connection with conscience, and with the fact of actual or possible, justly condemned in inferring from the narrative in Genesis that the sentiment of fear, in relation to God, is one of the consequences of Adam's sin. Since the Fall, fear is a natural and proper feeling on the part of dependent man with regard to the infinite God whom he has offended. Dependence alone, with fear, the consciousness of a sense of sinful tendencies and possibilities, would not engender fear. In sinful beings, however, fear is useful and necessary as a preventive and safeguard against transgression. As such it is enjoined in the O.T. especially. (Compare Exod. i. 17; Deut. vi. 2; Prov. iii. 7; xiv. 2). So in O.T. we find practical piety generally described as the fear of God: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" (Prov. i. 7); Job xxxvii, 8, "Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding": "The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever" (Psa. xxi, 9). Fear, therefore, is needed, if not in a large sense of the term, in communion with piety, did not (under the old covenant) exclude filial and even cheerful trust in God, and delight in his law and in his worship; the Psalms abound in illustrations of this. Under this covenant, too, the law of love prevailed (Deut. v. 6). And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might". The promise of a new covenant, also, added the grace of hope to the experience of O.T. believers (Jer. xxxi, 33-34). But a fear which is conjointed with love and hope is not a slavish fear, but a free and general veneration of grace, Deut. xxix, 6; Hosea xi, 1; Isa. i, 2; lixii, 16; lxiv, 8). Nevertheless, the sense of the filial relation to God through Christ, such as appears in the N.T., was wanting in the old covenant, and fear was, perhaps, under that covenant, the prevailing element in the consciousness of believers, so far as their relation to God was concerned.

II. In the sphere of the N.T., the fear of God, in the sense of slavish or untrusting dread, is completely dispelled. True, in the economy of salvation through Christ fear finds a useful place as a preventive of negligence and lapses, as an expression of respect for reverence, and, in the experience of the penitent to 2 Cor. v. 11; vii. 1; Phil. ii. 12; Eph. v. 21; Heb. xii, 28, 29), and is enforced in this sense by Christ himself (Matt. x, 28). But as a Christian experience deepens, and the soul is consecrated to God, the sense of fear vanishes, and love has its place (Rom. viii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 John iv. 18). On the other hand, where there is nothing more than the form of Christian life, without its inward power, the old Jewish and even pagan fear springs up. So the Roman Church does not admit a free and direct approach to God, but demands the intercession of saints, etc., and makes of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in which Christians are lovingly to surround his table, a tremendous and fearful mystery. In Protestant theology, on the contrary, the fear to approach God is considered as a consequence of the fall, and free access to God is felt to be the privilege of Christian life. Edwards, in his Tractate on Religious Affections, remarks as follows on the relations of fear and sin: "For so hath God contrived and constituted things, in his dispensations towards his own people, that when their love decays, and the exercises of it become cold or fall back, fear arises to keep them, that they may need it to restrain them from sin, and to excite them to care for the good of their souls, and so to stir them
Feast (properly ἑστάσεος, midhē, σεξό, when a hospitable entertainment; and ἐστίν, kagō, kērēin, when a religious festival). To what an early date the practices of hospitality are referable may be seen in Gen. xix. 3, where we find Lot inviting the two angels—"Turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house and tarry all night, and wash your feet; and he pressed upon them greatly, and they entered into his house; and he made befeasts for them." Gen. xxii. 3, "Wherefore did you thus steal away from me and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, and with tabret, and with harp?" See also 2 Sam. iii. 20; 2 Kings vi. 28; Job viii. 20; 1 Mac. xvi. 15. This practice explains the reason why the prodigal, on his return, was welcomed by a feast (Luke xiv. 16). Occasions of domestic joy were hailed with feasting; thus, in Gen. xli. 8, Abraham "made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned." Birthdays were thus celebrated (Gen. xi. 20): "Pharaoh, on his birthday, made a feast unto all his servants." Job i. 4; Matt. xiv. 6; compare Herod. i. 153. Marriage-feasts were also common. Samson (Judg. xiv. 10) on such an occasion "made a feast," and it is added, "for so used the young men to do." So Laban, when he gave his daughter Leah to Jacob (Gen. xxvii. 22), "gathered together all the men of the place and made a feast." These festive occasions seem originally to have answered the important purpose of serving as evidence and attestation of the events which they celebrated, on which account relatives and neighbors were invited to be present (Ruth iv. 10; John ii. 1). These processes in rural occupations by which the delicious bounties are gathered into the hands of man have been described in art and poetry. In the vigourous exercise, then, the fear and dullness, and they visit the gods, for there is no fear of death, no invitation to the gods, and the farmers' duties were performed in the presence of the gods, in observance of the religious festivals. In 2 Sam. xiii. 22, Absalom invites all the king's sons, and even David himself, to a sheep-shearing feast, on which occasion the guests became "merry with wine" (1 Sam. xxv. 2 sq.). The vintage was also celebrated with festive eating and drinking (Judg. ix. 27), and not only the Israelites, but also the Greeks, the Jews (2 Sam. iii. 8). In Jer. xvi. 7, among other funeral customs, mention is made of "the cup of consolation, to drink for their father or their mother," which brings to mind the indulgence in spirituous liquors to which our ancestors were given at times of mourning. The social customs of the Greeks and Romans, which has not yet entirely disappeared in Lancashire, nor probably in Ireland (Carleton's Irish Peasantry: England in the Nineteenth Century, vol. ii). To what an extent expense was sometimes carried on these occasions may be learned from Josephus (War, iv. 3, 1), who, having remarked that Archelaus "mourned for his father seven days, and had given a very expensive funeral feast to the multitude," states, "which custom is the occasion of poverty to many of the Jews;" adding, "because they are forced to feast the multitude; for if any one omits it he is not esteemed as a host." So a host had to be "the heart of God's children in proportion as they prevail, that is, when left to their own natural influence, without something adventitious or accidental intervening, as the distemper of melancholy, doctrinal Ignorance, prejudices of education, wrong instruction, false principles, superstitions, etc. For the Spirit of God no other way than by the prevailing of love; nor is it ever maintained by his Spirit but when love is asleep" (Edwards, Works, N. Y. ed., iii. 86). See, on the different dispensations of grace, Pritchett, Works, iii. 175 sq.; Stowell, Outlines, lect. i; Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedia, v. 280.

For further particulars as to social entertainments, see Banquet; and as to sacred occasions, see Festival.
Feasts, or Festivals, in the Christian Church, certain days set apart for the more particular remembrance of the prominent mysteries connected with our Lord in his redemption of mankind, and also for the commemoration of the labors and sufferings of his apostles.

1. History and Theory of their Observance.—(1.) Some Protestants object to the observance of these feasts on the ground that such observance is contrary to the injunction of the apostle Paul (Col. ii, 16), forgetting that in that passage the apostle alludes exclusively to Jewish feasts; others object to all such festivals as being popish, forgetting that they have been observed from the earliest ages of the Church. If a Church has been so long in existence as the Catholic Church, it was deemed necessary to give splendor and external attraction to the religion of the Gospel by the establishment of new festivals, or by converting Jewish and heathen ceremonies into Christian solemnities. It was thought that this might be done with safety, inasmuch as there was no danger whatever, in which the people, not contrary to Scripture, she has the power to set apart certain days in commemoration of the most important events and persons connected with the first promulgation of the Gospel to sinners’ (Eden). (2.) Festival days were hallowed in the Church long before the rise of the papacy. At first the religious festivals of the Church were observed voluntarily, and never by formal obligation; but in the 4th century various decrees of councils were passed, enjoining the observance of them as a duty. The number of festivals was increased, consisting now of Sundays, of Easter, Pentecost, and Ascension, and to these the Epiphany and Christmas were added at a later period.

The end designed by the observance of these festivals was to call to mind the benefits of the Christian dispensation, to excite Christians to holy living, to foster the spirit of charity, and to promote the cultivation of Christian graces. The discourses which were delivered on these occasions always referred to the most important topics of the Christian religion. Even the Lord’s day, according to Eusebius, was said to have a threefold origin, emblematical of the sacred Trinity—the grace of the knowledge of the God of heaven, the ascension of Christ, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit” (Bingham, bk. xx, ch. iv; Neander, Church History, i, 301). “The primitive Church was not careful to prescribe a specific time or place for the celebration of their religious festivals. The apostles and their immediate successors proceeded on the principle that these should be observed at stated times, which might still be varied as circumstances should direct. These seasons were regarded as sacred, not for any peculiar sanctity belonging to the day or hour in which they were observed, but in consequence of their being set apart from a common to a religious use. Some, however, have maintained that these festive days should be observed as holy time” (Cramer, Christian Antiquities, ch. xxii). After the 4th century festivals were so greatly multiplied in the Church that later times bear no resemblance in this respect to the first ages. “Many causes contibuted to this multiplication of festivals, among which may be mentioned as the chief, 1. The commemorations of martyrs and confessors already introduced, which led to the establishment of numerous festivals in honor of saints, and to the superstitions use of relics, invocations, pilgrimages, and the like; 2. The errors of some sects respecting existing festivals, to correct which the Catholic Church introduced new observances; 3. Several laws of Constantine relating to the celebration of Fasti, the religious observance of Friday in every week, and the feasts of martyrs; 4. The celebration of Christmas, which was introduced in the 4th century, led the way to the establishment of other festivals in connection with itself, such as those in honor of the Virgin Mary. 5. The propensity of many Christians to partake in the celebration of heathen festivals, and in Jewish observances had become a serious evil in the Church during the third and fourth centuries. In Homilies and decrees of councils of that date we find earnest protests against the amalgamation of Christian worship with Jewish and heathen rites, and a description of the dangers which threatened Christianity from this practice, which had begun to gain ground (see Chrys. in Hom. 1, 59, and St. John Chrysostom, Hom. in Ps. xix, 29, 37, 38; Conc. Hilber, c. 49, 50). This perversive attachment to forms and ceremonies altogether foreign to the Christian religion appears to have been a leading cause of the multiplication of festivals within the Church. The original simplicity of Christian worship had become obscured by the introduction of sacred objects, and it was deemed necessary to give splendor and external attraction to the religion of the Gospel by the establishment of new festivals, or by converting Jewish and heathen ceremonies into Christian solemnities. It was thought that this might be done with safety, inasmuch as there was no danger whatever, in which the people, not contrary to Scripture, she has the power to set apart certain days in commemoration of the most important events and persons connected with the first promulgation of the Gospel to sinners.”

2. Movable Feasts and Holy Days.—(1.) Besides the days observed by the whole Church as memorials of the acts of Christ’s life and death, other festivals were also introduced commemorative of the apostles and martyrs. Bingham states that these may be traced up to the 2d century (Orig. Ecc. xx, 7), and Moisheim agrees with him (cent. i, pt. ii, chap. iv, § 4). It is to be observed that while Christmas is celebrated as the birthday of Christ, the martyrs’ festivals were held on the days of their deaths—still, however, called birthdays (nativity and death) of these, as the names were generally puns to endless life. On the number of these festivals in the early Church, and the modes in which they were observed, see Bingham (i. c.; Neander, Ch. Hist. i, 300 sq.).

(2.) The Roman Catholic Church has retained all the early festivals, with the later ones of the apostles and martyrs, and has added largely to the number. She retains the right to enact festal days, and to fix the mode of their observance. The following list embraces the feasts of the American calendar:

Movable Feasts and Holy Days.—Feast of the Holy
Name of Jesus; Septuagesima Sunday; Ash Wednesday; Office of the Passion of our Lord; Office of the Most Sacred Crown; Office of the Spear and Nails; Office of the Five Wounds; Office of the Most Precious Blood; Sorrows of the B. V. Mary; Easter Day; Patronage of St. Joseph; Ascension of our Lord; Whit Sunday; First Sunday; Corpus Christi; Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; Feast of the Most Precious Blood of our Lord; Feast of the Holy Name of Mary; Feast of the Seven Dolors of B. V. M.; Feast of the Holy Rosary; Feast of the Maternity of B. V. M.; Feast of the Patronage of B. V. M.; Sundays after Pentecost; First Sunday of Easter; Second Sunday of Easter; Third Sunday of Easter; Fourth Sunday of Easter; Fifth Sunday of Easter; Sixth Sunday of Easter; Ascension of our Lord; Day of Pentecost; Trinity Sunday; Fourth Sunday of June; Corpus Christi; Day of Pentecost; Holy Trinity Day; Day of Ascension; Day of Annunciation; Day of Pentecost; Day of Ascension Day; Day of Christmas; Day of Epiphany; Day of the Assumption of Aug. 15; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Aug. 22; Mary, B. V., Conception of, Dec. 8; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Dec. 15; Mary, B. V., Espousals of, Jan. 28; Mary, B. V., Expected Deliverance of, Dec. 12; Mary, B. V., Help of Christ, May 24; Mary, B. V., Nativitatem, Mar. 25; Mary, B. V., Presentation of, Nov. 21; Mary, B. V., Purification of, Feb. 2; Mary, B. V., Visitatio of, July 2; Mathias, Apostle, Feb. 24; Matthias, Apostle, leap year, Feb. 25; Matthew, Apostle and Evangelist, Sept. 21; Michael, Archangel, Dec. 9; Michael, Angel, Sept. 29; Michael, Apostle, Sept. 8; Monica, Widow, May 5; Nazarius, etc., MM., July 28; Nereus, etc., MM., May 12; Nicholas of Tolent, C., Sept. 10; Nicholas of Myra, B. C., Dec. 6; Norbert, B. C., June 6; Pantaleon, B. C., July 27; Paschal Baylon, C., May 17; Patricius, C., Dec. 8; Paul, Concemoration of, June 16; Paul, First Hermit, C., Jan. 15; Paulinus, B. C., June 22; Peter's Chains, Aug. 1; Peter's Chair at Antioch, Feb. 22; Peter's Chair at Rome, Jan. 18; Peter, Martyr, April 29; Peter of Alcantara, C., Oct. 19; Peter Celestius, B. C., May 2; Paul de Chastelain, C., June 2; Paulinus, B. C., Dec. 29; Peter Damian, B. C. D., Feb. 28; Peter Nolasco, C., Jan. 21; Peter and Paul, Apostles, June 29; Peter and Paul, Octave of, July 6; Peter and Paul, Dedication of the Church of, Nov. 18; Philip Benitil, C., Aug. 28; Philip Neri, C., May 26; Philip and James, Apostles, Mar. 27; Pius, Pope, C., March 15; Pius, Pope, Feb. 13; Placidus, etc., MM., Oct. 5; Polycarp, B. C. M., Jan. 26; Praxedes, V., July 21; Primus and Felicianus, MM., June 9; Raphael, Arch., Oct. 24; Raymund of Pennafort, Jan. 29; Raymund of Nonnatus, C., Aug. 1; Regibusius, B. C., Oct. 1; Romuald, Ab., Feb. 7; Rose of Lima, V., Aug. 30; Sabas, Ab., Dec. 5; Saviour's Church, Dedication of the, Nov. 9; Scholastrica, V., Feb. 10; Seven Brothers, MM., July 10; Silvester, Pope, C., Dec. 21; Silvesterus, Pope, June 20; Simeon, B. M., Feb. 18; Simon and Jude, Apostles, Oct. 28; Soter and Callixtus, MM., Apr. 29; Stanislaus Kostka, C., Nov. 14; Stanislaus, B. B., May 7; Stephen, Proto-Martyr, Dec. 26; Stephen, Octave of, Jan. 2; Stephen, Finding of Relics of, Aug. 5; Stephen, Pope, C., Aug. 2; Stephen, King, C., Sept. 2; Theresa, V., Oct. 10; Thomas, Ap., Dec. 21; Thomas of Aquin, D. M., Mar. 7; Thomas, Martyr, Dec. 29; Thomas of Villanova, B. C. B., Sept. 22; Tiburtius, etc., MM., April 14; Timothy, B. M., Jan. 24; Transfiguration of our Lord, Aug. 6; Ubaldo, B. C., May 16; Valentine, M., Feb. 14; Venantius, M., May 16; Vincent of Paul, C., June 23; Vespasianus, M., May 8; John the Baptist, Beheading of, Aug. 29; John the Baptist, Nativity of, June 24; John the Baptist, O. C. I. —17
Feast of Fools, a festival celebrated during the Middle Ages in many countries of Europe, especially in France, with grotesque ceremonies. It was an imitation of the Saturnalia, and, like that festival, was celebrated in March. The chief feature was a ball on New Year's or Innocents' Day; but the feast continued from Christmas to the last Sunday of Epiphany. At first only the young boys of the choir and young sacristans played the principal parts in it, but afterwards all the inferior servants of the Church were engaged, and the bishops and the superiors of the monks, with the canons, forming the audience. The young people who played the chief parts chose from their own number a bishop or archbishop of fools, as he was called, and consecrated him, in the principal church of the place, with many absurd ceremonies. This mock-bishop then took the seat usually occupied by the bishop, and caused him to be dressed in the vestments of the bishop. The festival continued until it was abolished in the 18th century, but its features yet remain in the Carnival (q. v.).—Thillot, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la fête des fous (Lyon, 1761); Schröck, Kirchengeschichte, xxvi, 271; xxxii, 55; Siegel, Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthümer, iv, 118. See Boy-bishop.

Feather. 1. גלעִי or גלעִית, not a word (from גלע, to fly), a pinion or wing-feather, Ezek. xxvii, 3, 7 (false reading גלוי, 'ostrich') in Job xxxix, 13; but it means the excrement of the vulture or eagle (Heb. גלעוי), Job vi, 20. 2. גלעא, a pinion of the eagle, Job xiv, 20. נתח (as. גלעא, which has the same meaning), likewise a pinion or wing-feather, Ps. lxxxvii, 15; xcii, 4 (incorrectly 'wing'). Deut. xxxii, 11; Job xxxix, 13. 3. Incorrectly for גלעא, חצאית, Job xxxix, 13, the stork, as elsewhere rendered. See Wixo.

Feathering, or Foliation, an arrangement of small arcs, separated by projecting points or cusps, to ornament the inside of larger arches, or triangular or circular openings in Gothic architecture. Feathering was first introduced at the close of the early English style, and continued till the supplanting of the Early by the Renaissance architecture. When smaller arcs are added to ornament these small arcs, the feathering is said to be double. It is also sometimes made triple in the late decadence of the Gothic architecture.—Parker, Glossary of Architecture.

Feathers Tavern Association, a society of English clergymen and laymen, formed to secure a reformation of the English liturgy in the latter part of the 18th century. The name is derived from the "Feathers Tavern," in London, where their meetings were held. The number of clergymen in the body was nearly 500. Gilbert Wakefield (q. v.) was a leading spirit in the association. "They signed a petition requesting the excision of the damnable clauses in the Athanasian Creed, and the relief of their consciences in the matter of subscription; and with this, no doubt, many of them would have been satisfied. But the clergy went much further. In the hands of pamphlets which this affair created, some of them spoke of the Reformation, the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Thirty-nine Articles with ridicule. When the matter was debated in the House of Commons, the doctrines of the Church of England were treated with contempt. The work was gladly extended, and the Thirty-nine Articles, 'said one of the speakers, 'for a foible, of which the subject should be the peace of the Church.' The doctrine of the Trinity was denounced by one of the writers of the association as 'an imposition—a deception of a much later date than Athanasius—a deception, too, which an article of the doctrine professed. The whole system of Christian doctrine, as taught by the Church of England, was assailed. The same writer affirms, with a degree of effrontery that might have
well rouse the indignation of the clergy, 'that certain parts in the public service and doctrine of the Church are wanting'.... His publications is given in the Theocibus devarum et catholicae (Wurzb., 1843). -Hersog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 344; Wetzer u. Weise, Kirchen-Lex., iii, 928. (A. J. S.)

Federal Theology (Lat. fides, a compact; adj. fidealis), a method of stating divine truth, according to which all the doctrines of religion are arranged under the heads of certain covenants God has made with men. We set forth (I) the doctrine, as stated by its author; (II) its history.

I. Doctrine.—The fundamental idea of the system is that man has always stood towards God in the relation of a covenant, though a covenant of a peculiar character. The ordinary idea of a covenant, which is that of a mutual compact between one or more parties, each bound to render some benefit to the other, is obviously excluded by the nature of the case. Where God and man are the parties, the benefits must be all on one side and the obligations on the other. The relation must be determined and be imposed upon man by God in his right of a sovereign ruler. And yet it is something more than a mere law or promise. It involves a law and a promise, but goes beyond both; it is not simply a law or promise. But beyond that, it is a promise, a promise of mercy, a promise of forgiveness. In the case of a covenant, it is an agreement which the parties enter into in presence of God, and which is recorded in his word. There is ever a virtual implication of mutual consent and obligations, for on the one hand God graciously binds himself to the performance of certain engagements with the view of securing results that shall manifest his glory; and man freely consents, when with this understanding, he enters upon a course of obedience. Such a promise on God's part, suspended upon the performance of a condition on man's, is a covenant. The advocates of this system have usually made two such covenants: viz. 1, that of nature or of works; and, 2, that of grace. These have been successive in their revelation to man, since the former was an arrangement before the Fall, and the latter was not made known until after that event; and yet the latter must have been agreed upon before all worlds, whereas the former could not have been formed until the creation of man; and some contend that those who refuse their consent to the covenant of grace must necessarily remain, even now, under the obligations and penalties of the covenant of works. In both we have the same contracting parties, God and man; the same blessing to be attained, eternal life; and the same requirement of perfect obedience, but not the same form. The covenant of grace is a dispensation of mercy to sinners, is through a divine Mediator, and secures the blessings of eternal life without the possibility of a failure.

1. The covenant of nature, or of works, is nowhere spoken of under that name, but is supposed to be more than once alluded to in the Scriptures. Some have thought they had discovered an express mention of it in Hos. vi, 7: "They, like Adam, have transgressed the covenant" (compare Job xxxi, 38; Ps. lxxxii, 7). The apostle often speaks of the law of works in connection with the law of faith. It is a question whether the covenants (Gal. iv, 24), and not unfrequently of an old and a new covenant. It is not denied that by these expressions he usually meant the Mosaic or Sinaitic dispensation, in distinction from the evangelical; but it is thought that such a dispensation could be designated a covenant. Other covenants besides the above are the covenant of Works (Gen. xiv, 27), and the covenant of Law (Deut. xxv, 15). But there is a greater resemblance towards the latter, as being made with men of all sorts and conditions. The contrast and resemblance which Paul also draws between the first and the second Adam (Rom. v, 12), may be supposed to have no meaning without the understanding of a covenant with our great
progenitor. All the essentials of a covenant, too, are
discernable in the constitution under which Adam
was placed by his Maker. Not only was he, as a
moral being, under obligation to conform to the law
written upon his heart, and to obey the positive pre-
ccepts of his constitution, but also his very eternal
life was promised him on condition of his obedience.
He was constituted the representative of his race, and
a limited period was assigned him in which the desti-
y of all was to be decided. That this is a true state-
ment of the case was inferred from the fact which actually
followed—suffering and death, the consummation of our
first condition, and must have been more or less clearly known to them.
To such an arrangement those who had been created
in the image of God could do no otherwise than yield
a cheerful assent, insomuch as far higher blessings
were accounted by him than by any merely legal relation.
We have reason to suppose, also, that their powers were
quite ample for the performance of the condition.
Many have thought that before the Fall they were
endowed with such supernatural gifts as secured to
them the possession of their original righteousness;
but, as our Lord has said, they were never intended,
and as they appeared to many inconsistent with the
possibility of man's fall, most writers contend that the
divine image consisted wholly in the knowledge and
moral excellence which Adam had within himself.
That he would have secured eternal life to himself
and his posterity, since our first parents, and must
have been more or less clearly known to them.
To such an arrangement those who had been created
in the image of God could do no otherwise than yield
a cheerful assent, insomuch as far higher blessings
were accounted by him than by any merely legal relation.
We have reason to suppose, also, that their powers were
quite ample for the performance of the condition.
Many have thought that before the Fall they were
endowed with such supernatural gifts as secured to
them the possession of their original righteousness;
but, as our Lord has said, they were never intended,
and as they appeared to many inconsistent with the
possibility of man's fall, most writers contend that the
divine image consisted wholly in the knowledge and
moral excellence which Adam had within himself.
That he would have secured eternal life to himself
and his posterity, since our first parents, and must
behave as though they were abandoned the price of
their sins. The first act of misfortune, and the one
which would certainly follow that act. It is conceded
that in the last day none will be condemned for any but
their own personal sin, and yet it is contended that in
the first sin all are rendered liable to both the sin-
fulness and the misery of the present state.

2. The covenant of grace is that glorious scheme of
wisdom and goodness by which eternal life and salva-
tion have been provided for men in a way of free grace
and mercy. It is sometimes distinguished from the
covenant of possession, inasmuch as the latter phrase
may be applied to that arrangement in eternity be-
 tween the persons of the Trinity, and the former to
the engagement into which God enters in time with
believers. On the other hand, some have contended
that the covenant of redemption is that stricter ar-
rangement according to which believers are delivered
from all sin, which is the grant, which is the gift,
according to which a sufficient atonement was provided
for all men. It has, however, been most common to
speak of all God's arrangements for the salvation of
men as under a single covenant, which, however, may
be distinguished by its different relations, the con-
cessive of the whole race as fallen, and then of a scheme
of mercy which provides first a door of mercy suffi-
ciently open for all mankind to enter, and finally a
system of means which should secure the actual sal-
vation of a limited number; or he may conceive of the
eye of God being fixed first upon a limited number
of our fallen race, and for their sake alone providing an
atonement sufficient indeed for all men, but designed
and efficient for the salvation of only a definite num-
ber. The latter was the aspect in which the covenant
of grace has usually been presented by its advocates.
They have supposed that first God had in view the
temporary character of the covenant of works, and
determined upon another arrangement, by which a por-
tion of mankind might be saved from the ruins of the
apostasy. Why he did not include the whole or a
larger portion of mankind, who had professed to en-
joy mercy, they prefer to leave out of discussion as an
unapproachable mystery. That he had sufficient rea-
sons without implying a want of benevolence they as-
sert without hesitation, but they think it best never to
attempt a definition of them. Negatively they con-
tend that the fear of God would lead men hereinafter
in natural goodness, since many of them confess them-
selves to be the chief of sinners. The effort to
find a sufficient reason in the anticipated circumstances
by ordinary generation, were henceforth to be treated
as guilty and fallen creatures. Only his first sin was
thus imputed to them because the original covenant
was broken by that alone, and Adam must afterwards
have stood as a single person, and not as a public rep-
resentative. Insomuch as God, communal with God, com-
mon of works was henceforth abolished and forbidden,
and yet all men are under obligation to obey the law,
and on their own disobedience they must endure its pen-
salty, unless they are redeemed by Jesus Christ.
God has encouraged no to the arrangement in eternity by an obe-
dience to the law, for, even if such an obedience were
possible, no one has ever realized it, and God has
provided no promises for a merely hypothetical case.
If, therefore, no other scheme had been proposed to
man, each individual of our race had lain under the
penalty of the first commandment, which would have
formed to a hopeless abandonment by his Maker, to all the evils
of a dying state in this world, to final death itself, and
to an everlasting banishment from God in the world in
the world to come. Not that each person was judicially con-
demned to all these evils exclusively on account of
the first sin, which was his own, but such as all of them
would certainly follow that act. It is conceded
that in the last day none will be condemned for any but
their own personal sin, and yet it is contended that in
the first sin all are rendered liable to both the sin-
fulness and the misery of the present state.

2. The covenant of grace is that glorious scheme of
wisdom and goodness by which eternal life and salva-
tion have been provided for men in a way of free grace
and mercy. It is sometimes distinguished from the
covenant of possession, inasmuch as the latter phrase
may be applied to that arrangement in eternity be-
 tween the persons of the Trinity, and the former to
the engagement into which God enters in time with
believers. On the other hand, some have contended
that the covenant of redemption is that stricter ar-
rangement according to which believers are delivered
from all sin, which is the grant, which is the gift,
according to which a sufficient atonement was provided
for all men. It has, however, been most common to
speak of all God's arrangements for the salvation of
men as under a single covenant, which, however, may
be distinguished by its different relations, the con-
cessive of the whole race as fallen, and then of a scheme
of mercy which provides first a door of mercy suffi-
ciently open for all mankind to enter, and finally a
system of means which should secure the actual sal-
vation of a limited number; or he may conceive of the
eye of God being fixed first upon a limited number
of our fallen race, and for their sake alone providing an
atonement sufficient indeed for all men, but designed
and efficient for the salvation of only a definite num-
ber. The latter was the aspect in which the covenant
of grace has usually been presented by its advocates.
They have supposed that first God had in view the
temporary character of the covenant of works, and
determined upon another arrangement, by which a por-
tion of mankind might be saved from the ruins of the
apostasy. Why he did not include the whole or a
larger portion of mankind, who had professed to en-
joy mercy, they prefer to leave out of discussion as an
unapproachable mystery. That he had sufficient rea-
sons without implying a want of benevolence they as-
sert without hesitation, but they think it best never to
attempt a definition of them. Negatively they con-
tend that the fear of God would lead men hereinafter
in natural goodness, since many of them confess them-
selves to be the chief of sinners. The effort to
find a sufficient reason in the anticipated circumstances
of men has usually proved so confusing to the finite intellect, that most thinkers have concluded to leave the origin of discriminating grace where the Scriptures have left it, in the mere good pleasure (beneficium) of God. As we read of some who were chosen in the foundation of the world, it has been inferred that there must have been in eternity an agreement or covenant between the persons of the sacred Trinity, according to which a seed was given to the Son to serve him, and that he became surety to satisfy the claims of justice upon them, to give them a title to eternal life, and to bring them to everlasting glory. The Father (who in this transaction is usually regarded as personating the Deity as such) engaged to spare his beloved Son, to furnish him with all suitable endowments and preparations for his work, to support him to it, to deliver into his hands all power in heaven and on earth, to pardon and accept all who should come unto God by him, and to confer upon him a glorious reward forever and ever. The Holy Spirit, who must also be looked upon as having a part in this covenant, also engaged to become the efficient agent in the regeneration, sanctification, and glorification of his person, and to be the way seed. Without ascribing to this transaction the technicalities of a human compact, and conceding that the whole mode of viewing it is anthropomorphic, it is contended that something equivalent to this, and amounting to a law or covenant understanding must be found among the persons in the sacred Trinity. An equal love towards men is supposed to have existed in each of the divine persons. But as man was under condemnation, and could not therefore act for himself, the Son of God acted in behalf of all of whom he was to be the spiritual head. To constitute a natural ground for his headship, his Son was to become a man, uniting divinity in one person with humanity. He thus became a new federal head for his spiritual seed, similar to that which Adam had sustained to his natural descendants. In this relation he was to act in all he did as their representative. He was to share with them all the blessings which the first sin had brought upon the human race, not shrinking even from death in its most terrific form. Though this endurance was not the same with that which they would have endured in its spiritual results or in eternal duration, it was supposed to be infinite in value on account of the existence of his person and of the way seed, and was indeed sufficient in objective worth to expiate for any amount of sin in any number of worlds. It has actually conferred innumerable benefits upon all men. Pardon and salvation is offered to every one who hears the word of the Lord, and believes in him; and means of grace are afforded to all, and sufficient is done to leave those inexcusable who deny the Lord that bought them. But confessedly all are not made partakers of salvation, and only a portion of men were eternally given to Christ by the Father. Obviously it was not left to an uncertainty whether his work would be in vain or not. A seed was secured to him by covenant, and it was with an ultimate reference to these that he entered upon his work. Adapted to all, and sufficient for all as his work may be, it must have been specially designed just as much for the salvation of the proper head and representative, since they alone are ingrafted into him by a living and active faith. To them alone is his perfect righteousness imputed, as if he had suffered and obeyed in their stead. By his sufferings and death, the law has been satisfied, and the perfect obedience to the law he has obtained for them a title to eternal life. He thus becomes their surety, not merely to make them inherently holy, but to perform what is required of them. He satisfies in this way both the penalty and the precept of the broken covenant. That covenant required obedience only for a limited period, and he has fulfilled the law during the time allotted him by the Father. The whole person of the Redeemer in both natures was subject to the law, and as such an obedience (at least in this special form of it) was not obligatory, but voluntary on his part, it became available for an infinite righteousness.

Such was the covenant of grace as formed in eternity. To this must be added its actual administration in time. Of course the only administrator of it was the Son of God himself, the mediator between God and man. He has power over all flesh, in order to give eternal life to as many as had been given him. He it was who represented the divine alder in all the dispensations of mercy of which the sacred history informs us. Although at different periods of human history the outward forms of religion have been changed, the covenant of grace, which lay at the basis of them all, was always the same. Salvation has in all cases been by Christ alone where the subjects of grace were not or could not, or would not, respect him. None have ever been saved by the law of works, and none have had their hopes bounded by promises of an earthly home. The antediluvians, the patriarchs, Job and his friends, the Israelites in Egypt and under the Mosaic dispensation, looked to a different and more limited provision. Hence the less enlarged measures of the divine Spirit at some periods than at others. Ordinarily there have been reckoned but two principal economies or dispensations, viz. that under the Old and that under the New Testament. Although the same word in the original languages of the Bible is applied to all covenants between God and man, the advocates of the federal system have translated them differently when applied on the one hand to the great covenants of nature and of grace, and on the other to the different economies under the covenant of grace. Availing themselves of the double meaning of the word, they have usually designated these latter economies by the name of testaments, to indicate that they were that peculiar kind of arrangements which acquire validity only after the decease of him who makes them. Though the Redeemer had not, in fact, died before the covenant of grace was established, it was looked upon as slain from the foundation of the world, and the dispensations of mercy were even then constituted in anticipation of his death. Hence, when speaking of the communication of benefits to men, no mutual conditions are implied, but Jesus Christ is set before them as the means of grace. The Messiah is the Son of God. In the way of nature the Holy Spirit is given in his plentitude, no other is conceivable. Jesus Christ will continue to administer it until the whole world shall be subdued unto him. Finally, the present economy of things shall cease, the law and the testament shall be put away, for the new and better covenant made in the blood of Christ, and his human being shall be judged at Christ's bar for sins, not only against God as a moral ruler, but against himself as the mediatorial king, and sentence shall be passed upon each according to his works.
session of his kingdom, he will present to the Father as the economical representative of the Godhead, either in token of the completeness of his work, or as indication of the Father’s own peculiar office (1 Cor. xv. 28), or only brings his mediatorial kingdom into some new relation, he will then complete the scheme of the covenant of grace, and receive his eternally betrothed Church into an everlasting union with himself.

2. History.—The words rendered covenant are frequently used in the original Scriptures in application to God’s dealings with his creatures. The Hebrew וְקֹרֵ֣ב signifies undoubtedly in its primary meaning a mutual compact (Robinson’s Gesenius’s Lexicon), and yet it is not unfrequently applied to transactions in which such an idea in its strictness is impossible (Gen. ix. 9–18; Jer. xxxiii, 20–21). With a true sense of its usage and idea, if not strictly according to its etymological significance, the LXX have translated this word by a concord, and the generic meaning of which is a disposition or arrangement, and lapes into the idea of a mutual compact or testament only when the author or authors of it happened to be mutual stipulators or testators. But neither in the Septuagint nor in the New Testament is the word ever applied to the practical and legal constitution between God and man, but the ways to some transaction or dispensation under the covenant of grace (Heb. vi. 7, with this, its signification, is doubtful). Nor has any clear instance of such an application of the word to man’s primeval state been found in any theological writer before the commencement of the 17th century. (See, however, Bede on Gen. xvii. 14.) Certainly no one had attempted to arrange all the materials of a systematic theology under the general heads of divine covenants. And yet there was an obvious tendency in that direction among the Reformers that had been inherited by all the Calvinistic school. These had become familiar with the word in relation to Christ and his people, and with all the principles involved in a covenant with Adam. They had seen that Adam’s original position was not that of a mere subject of law, but that promises had been made to him whereby he should be blessed. And the generic meaning was represented on a limited probation in him. It is generally conceded that the federal system had its origin with Kleppenburg, a professor of theology at Franeker (tied in 1652). The first, however, who had the genius and the capacity to give definite form to all the federal system was John Koch (Coccres), a pupil of his, and a successor in the same chair. In his Summa doctrinae de fide et testamento Dei (1648), and still further in his more enlarged Summa Theol. Graec. (2d edit. 1663), he comprises all the doctrines of the Christian religion under the two great categories of the covenants of nature and of grace. The method he pursued has gained for him the appellation of “the Father of Biblical Theology;” and, laying aside the practice usual with his predecessors, of viewing divine truth in its subjective form, either as logically constructed by a human mind, or as it was supposed to lie in the divine mind around the great central doctrine of predestination, he professed to come to the Scriptures, reverently to read them, and derive his system from the inspired historical arrangement. The events of human history were regarded in their anthropological aspect as well as related to the divine efficiency. The final cause of salvation he can indeed find nowhere else than in the divine mind, and he has no occasion to impinge against the highest style of contemporary orthodoxy, and yet he succeeded in giving to theology a new character and spirit. Although he, like all predecessors, conceived of man as receptive and God alone as communicative, he still represented man as coming under an obligation to perform certain duties which were looked upon as a virtual condition of the divine promises. This fidelity to the scriptural representation compelled him to develop his system according to the successive periods of the sacred history (Eccard, Dogm. § 40; D. Schenkel, Chris. Dogm. § 129, note). As often occurs when great changes are introduced in formal statements of truth, this system was as bitterly opposed as if it had been an essential error. Other principles, on which the author was more vulnerable, were introduced into the controversy; but the main features of his system soon obtained a remarkable degree of acceptance in all the Reformed churches of France, Switzerland, Holland, Scotland, and among the English Puritans. The orthodox Roman Catholics have always regarded it with aversion, and the Jansenists in the whole conception of a covenant with Adam as an innovation upon Augustinianism and needless to explain the natural effects of the first sin (Fathers Paul’s Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 177–201; Jansenius, Augus. ii, 208–11). The Lutheran divines have in general rejected it on account of the prominence it sets to the fear of God and the principles of external obedience, and because, when the word covenant was divested of the idea of a mutual compact, it offered no advantages over the words which had long been in use (Thoma- sius, Christ. Person und Werk, § 25). The Arminians of Holland were partially conciliated by those juridical and metaphysical considerations by which they defended their system, and many of them accepted of it with some important modifications. The object of these was to limit the direct consequences of Adam’s sin to a privation of original righteousness, or the loss of those spiritual attributes which they made the original moral image to depend, to temporal evil, and to bodily death, together with such a deprivation of our mental and moral state as renders us incapable of obedience, and so to extend the benefits of Christ’s death that he should not only be regarded as dying for all men alike, but as a representative man, from the belief that in him we trusted, we should be possessed of such supernatural aids as, if properly used, would enable them to lay hold upon the great salvation (Nich- ol’s Calvinism and Arminianism in Watson’s Theol. Hist. ii, 45). Notwithstanding the objections raised against the federal system, its principles were carried still further forward by the fearless and analytical speculation of Francis Burman, a pupil of Koch, and a professor in the University of Utrecht. In his Synopsis of Theology, and especially of the Economy of the Covenants (1671), he endeavored to show that all the details of the covenant of grace should be inferred from the idea of the divine image in man in connection with what we know of the divine goodness, since that goodness would of course desire to bring man into the highest communion with itself, and would not be satisfied with the prescriptions of a mere natural justice. The difficulties, however, with which the system was pressed by its opponents were sought to be removed by Hermann Wilzius, a successor and former pupil of Burman in the theological chair of the University of Utrecht. In his Economy of the Covenants, the first edition of which appeared in 1695, some important distinctions maintained by his predecessors were given up (as, e. g. that between the τραγεία of the Old and the δεσμος of the New Testament, as shown in Rom. iii, 25, 26, and the three dispensations or economies of the covenant of grace); a minute parallel is drawn between the two covenants by the introduction of four sacraments into Paradise (the tree of life, the tree of knowledge, the Sabbath, and Paradise itself); and a sacramental character is given to a multitude of things under the economy before the law (the coals of skins, the ark, the rainbow, etc., bk. ii, chap. viii, § 10; bk. iv, chap. vii). In 1696 a further attempt was made by the federal system by Melchor Leydenker, another professor in Utrecht, who, though not in the strictest sense a Federalist, professedly wrote under its spirit and tendency. In his Sermon on the Truth of the Christian Religion, he endeavors to trace the econ-
any of the covenant of grace to the several Persons of the sacred Trinity, by showing that the Father reveals himself, especially in the Old Testament, as the universal Ruler maintaining the cause of justice; the Son, especially during his life on earth, as the Mediator dispensing mercy; and the Holy Ghost, especially since the time of the Apostles, as the promised divine and saving power. This arbitrary assignment of the divine attributes, however, has never been acceptable. Though the Heidelberg Catechism was composed before the federal theory was distinctly broached, most of its propositions and articles which have been written upon it were written by Federalists. The mature fruit of that system may be seen in the writings of Solomon van Til (Tilanus), a professor in Dort and Leyden, whose Compendium of Natural and Revealed Theology, 1704, and Compendium of Theology, Borne, 1703, were the organic union of the three great tendencies of Scholasticism, Federalism, and Cartesianism, and have obtained general acceptance in the schools of Holland; and in those of F. A. Lamps, the pastor of several influential congregations and a professor in Utrecht (1720–27), whose doctrinal and practical writings wereormerly extolled in the borders of the Reformed churches. It has never been either condemned or sanctioned by the public synod, and such has been the balance of parties that, by right of long-established custom, one Federalist must be appointed in each of the universities of Holland (Ebrard, Christ. Dogm. § 41).

A modification both of the Scholastic and Federal theology made its appearance among the Protestants of France. The rival theological schools of Saumur and Montauban zealously adopted the federal system. But John Cameron, a Scotchman, who at different times was a professor in both institutions [see Lambarçon, and his pupil, Moïse Amyraut (Amyraldus) and Joshua de la Place (Placentus), who were associated as professors at Saumur (1633–64), proposed, and for many years maintained, a peculiar system, which attempted to reconcile it with the doctrine of a universal redemption. See Amyraut and Placentus, Præ disposition. The result was a crude syncretism of an ideal or hypothetical Universalism with a rigid and real Particularism. Amyraut maintained that there were three instead of two general covenants with man—the natural, with a posthumous redemption, and a promise of eternal life in Paradise; a legal, promising the land of Canaan on condition of a life of faith; and the gracious, promising eternal life on the condition of faith in Christ. La Place also drew a distinction between a mediate and an immediate imputation, according to which Adam's sin might be imputed to his posterity, either medially, on account of a previously recognised inherent depravity in them; or it might be imputed to them immediately, simply on account of their federal representation in Adam. This whole system was strenuously opposed by the older Spanheim, of Geneva and Leyden; J. J. Heidegger, of Zurich; and Francis Turelin, of Geneva. At the two last national synods ever held in France (Charenton, in 1645, and Loudun, in 1639) the authors successfully defended themselves from the charge of heresy, and maintained that their view, as opposed to the traditional doctrine, which had been universally held by the orthodox Church since primitive times, and especially by Augustine and Calvin; but a statement of opinions implied to them (incorrectly, as they maintained) was condemned at a synod at Charenton (1642), and the Formula of Concord was composed principally by Heidegger (1675), and was adopted and sent forth to guard the churches against such views. Although this is one of the most scientific and highly esteemed of the Calvinistic confessions, and is the only one among the Continental confessions which is constructed expressly upon the basis of the federal system, its authority has never been acknowledged in France, and it was received by only five of the Swiss cantons. It was endorsed by the civil magistrates, and finally lost all public sanction within fifty years from its promulgation (Ebrard's Christ. Dogm. § 41; L. Noack's Christ. Dogmenuzsch. § 74; Sheil's Hist. of Ch. Doc. ii, 412).

In Scotland and Ireland, it has been written especially in those churches which adhere to the confession of faith put forth by the Synod of Westminster (1643–8), and we have the stronghold of the federal system. The representatives of the English Church at the Synod of Dort (1618–19), and especially bishop Davenant, had maintained a system similar to that of Amyraut, and found some party in that Church have always held views based upon the federal theology. Even Jeremy Taylor maintained it (1649), with some Arminian, and even Pelagian modifications, in one of his treatises (On Repentance, ch. i, § 1). The celebrated Richard Baxter, though a Unitarian, was not without his reservations. In the Roman Church, as in other countries, the question always has been, not except limitation, or exposition of any word. ' was an ardent defender of the federalism, as qualified by Amyraut (Preface to the Saints' Rest, 1650; Cath. Theol. 1675; Univ. Redemp. 1651; Orme's Life of Baxter, vol. ii, 1675). At Westminster, in fact, contemporary with the first publication of Koch's principal work on the covenants (1648), and deserves a credit, perhaps, equal to his for the origination and precise statement of the doctrine. The national Scotch Church, with its affiliated branches in Scotland and Ireland, has always upheld the system in its utmost consistency and extreme form. The United Presbyterian Church alone is said to maintain it, with some modifications connected with the theory of a general atonement (Wardlaw, On the Extent of the Atonement, § 13–15). Among the orthodox churches of England it has also been accepted, and found some of its most able defenders. The Wesleyans of England and America claim that they are enabled, by their peculiar modifications of it, to carry through the system with greater consistency than the Calvinists themselves, inasmuch as they more easily accommodate it to the scriptural and religious inclinations in those who never give evidence of actual conversion. By their doctrine of a general redemption, they maintain that in spite of the loss of the supernatural aids through the Fall, and the consequences therefrom, an efficacious grace is given to all. And, inasmuch as the word redemption properly signifies more than what is obtained simply by the expiatory work of Christ, and includes an entire deliverance from sin. They therefore use the word atonement to signify the objective and general work of Christ, and contend that this is for sin, and for all men, while redemption implies the salvation of men, and must, of course, be confined to such as shall be saved (Dr. W. R. Weeks, in Park's Collections on the Atonement, p. 579). Such an atonement is not merely hypothetical, and properly confined to such as shall be saved, but really operates the effects of primary redemption upon all who are supposed, even since the Fall, to possess all those faculties and powers which render them responsible for
a compliance with the terms of salvation. And yet, so certain are all men to use their powers, and the best external means of grace, to their perdition, that no reason can be assigned for the repentance and faith of late; consequently from sins, and they, of course, confine its application to the elect. They speak in the largest terms of the sufficiency of the work of Christ for the pardon of all sin, but regard it as limited in the purpose and design of God to such as are effectually called of the Spirit, and are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation (Princeton Theol. Essays, vol. vili, and xiv; A. Fuller's Gospel, etc., in Works, i, 312-340, vol. i, art. viii and xiv).}
FELICISSIMUS

GLASGOW, Gospelzaal Nederl. blz. 460 en verv.; Geschiedenis der Christelijke Kerken in Nederland door B. ter Hoar, W. Moll, E. P. Swaule, etc., ii Deel, blz. 598 en verv. (Amsterdam, 1860); Evangelische Gesangen, introduced in 1807. (J. P. W.)

FELGENHAGEN, Paul, a Protestant theosophist and mystic, was the son of a Lutheran clergyman in Bohemia. He was born in Prague, in 1658. He studied medicine at the University of Wittenberg, but soon after returning to his native country appeared (1820) in public as a writer on theological subjects. In his Chronology he maintained that Christ was born in the year 4286 after the creation of the world, and as the world was not then 6000 years old, but last mustered more than 6000 years, it could not come to an end in A.D. 1765. As, however, the time was to be shortened on account of the elect, he assumed that the end of the world would occur before that year, although he claimed no special revelations on the subject. At Zeitenberg he denounced corruption of the Church and of the Lutheran clergy. The persecution of Protestantism in Bohemia compelled him to leave his country. He first (1623) went to Amsterdam, where he published a number of mystical and allegorical writings, the theological views of which may be described as Sabellianism and Monophysitism, resting on a pantheistical and cabalistical basis. The large circulation of some of his works alarmed the Lutheran clergy, and many wrote against him. Not satisfied with this, the clergy of Hamburg, Lubeck, and Lüneburg requested the ministry at Amsterdam to arrest the circulation of the works of Felgenhagen, and the spreading of his views, if necessary, by force. From 1635 to 1638 he lived at Bederkesa, near Bremen, where he held meetings of his adherents. Ex- pelled from Bremen, he returned to Holland, where he, however, soon left again for Northern Germany. In 1657 he was pursued by order of the governors of Zelle and Hanover, and imprisoned at Syke. The efforts of several Lutheran clergymen to convert him to the Lutheran creed failed. About 1669 he lived in Hamburg. The year of his death is not known. A complete list of his works (forty-one in number) he gave in Adelung, Gesch. der menschl. Naturk., iv. 400.

FELDBIEN, Jacques, a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Chartres in 1668, and distinguished himself in youth by success in study, especially of the Scripture. In 1696 he became pastor at Vines; in 1698, canon of Chartres; and in 1699, archdeacon of Vendome. He died at Chartres Nov. 23, 1716. Besides various practical works, he wrote Le Symbole des Apôtres expliqué par l'écriture Sainte (Blais, 1696, 12mo);—Comment. in Oecum (Chartres, 1702, 4to);—Fenestriculius Historicus et fonte Hidrico, etc. (Chartres, 1703, 4to). This book gave rise to much clamor, and Felbien was obliged to suppress various passages in which he was supposed to have departed from the orthodox interpretations. Moreover, as it had been printed with the permission only of the bishop, and without that of the papal curia, the book was suppressed by the latter, and all the printed copies confiscated.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xvii, 274.

FELICISSIMUS, the author of a schism in the Church of Carthage in the 3d century, was appointed dean in Carthage by the presbyter Novatus, without a previous understanding with Cyprian, who, a short time before, had been elected bishop. Cyprian, who learned this, endeavored to have him en consecrated upon his episcopal prerogatives, but did not depose him. During the Decian persecution Cyprian was for some time absent from Carthage, and some of the presbyters, who claimed greater rights than Cyprian was willing to concede to them, began to cry up the communion of the Church in consequence of the libelli pachii given by the martyrs, without having an under-
standing on the subject with Cyprian. The latter re-
proached the presbyters with too great laxity, and
sent a commission to Carthage which was to investi-
gate the conduct of the lapsed, and to regulate the sup-
port of the church, which should appear before the cop-
ial commission. Felicitas denounced the conduct of
Cyprian as an encroachment upon his rights as de-
ome, among which belonged, in the Church of Africa,
the administration of the treasury of the Church; and
he even went so far as to exclude from the communion
of the church those who should have committed these
crimes. Felicitas was joined in his opposition by
five presbyters and a number of confessors, and his
church became the centre of all the lapsed who wished
to have their cases decided before the return of Cypri-
ian. After the return of Cyprian to Carthage in 251,
a synod regulated the affair of the lapsed, and excluded
Felicitas and the presbyters acting with him from the
Church. Felicitas, however, not only persisted in
his opposition, but his party, strengthened by the
accession of several African bishops, elected Fortun-
atus, one of the five presbyters siding with Felicitas,
bishop of Carthage, and sent Felicitas himself
himself to Rome—where, in the mean while, the Novatian
controversy had broken out—for the purpose of gain-
ing the Roman bishop Cornelius over to their side.
The mission was, however, unsuccessful, and the
cause of the heretics was soon after to become
extinct.—H. Ziegler, Real-Encyclop. iv. 384; Schaff,
Church History. (A. J. S.)

Felicitas, a saint of the Roman calendar, supposed
to have suffered martyrdom A.D. 164. According
to the legend, she was a woman of high birth, who
embraced Christianity and brought up her seven sons in
the faith. She was denounced to Marcus Aurelius,
who ordered an inspection of her house. The prefect
ordered her to sacrifice to the gods; she refused, as did her children.
When vain efforts to break her constancy, the prefect
reported the case anew to the emperor, who ordered a
trial before special judges. The lady and her children
were all put to death. The story is plain of com-
parative modern invention. Felicitas is commemorate-
dated in the Church of Rome Nov. 18, and her seven
sons July 16. The bones of two of her sons are said
to be preserved in Germany!—Bolland, Acta Sanctor-
orum, July 10; Butler, Lives of Saints, July 10.

Felicitas, an African slave who suffered martyr-
dom at Carthage along with Perpetua (q. v.), in the
time of Severus, A.D. 202. They are both said by
Lactantius, the distinguished Christian historian, to
seems to have disproved this in his Disser. Apol. pro
SS. Perpetua et Felicilse. They were arrested at Car-
thage while still catechumens, and were baptized in
prison. All efforts were tried in vain to induce them
to abandon their faith; they were condemned to be
thrown to the wild beasts at a festival in honor of the
anniversary of Geta's nomination (Annales Caesar.
After this judgment they were remanded to prison to
await the fatal day. For the account of Perpetua, see
PERPETUA. "As to Felicitas, on her return to the
gedown she was seized with the pains of labor.
Jailer said to her, "If thy present sufferings are so
great, what wilt thou do when thou art thrown to the
wild beasts? This thou didst not consider when thou
refusedst to sacrifice." She answered, "I now suffer
myself all that I suffer; but then there will be snaker
when I am free in the presence of the emperor who
hath taken me; he will be not so cruel to me as
him." A custom which had come down from the times
of human sacrifices, under the bloody Baal-worship of
the Carthaginians, still prevailed, of dressing those
criminals who were condemned to die by wild beasts
in priestly raiment. It was therefore proposed, in the
present case, that the men should be clothed as the
priests of Saturn, and the women as the priestesses
of Ceres. Nobly did their free, Christian spirit protest
against such a proceeding. "We have come here,
said they, 'of our own will, that we may not suffer our
freedom to be taken from us. We have given up our
lives that we may not be forced to such abominations.
"The pagans themselves acknowledged the jus-
tice of these vicissitudes. They were not torn by the wild
beasts, and were about to receive the merciful stroke which was to end their sufferings, they
took leave of the other for the last time with the
mutual kiss of Christian love." Felicitas is commemo-
rated in the Church of Rome March 7.—Neaner, CA.
Hist. Torrey, 67; Bull. Lippincott Catholic commission.

Felix (happy, Grecized Φελις, Acts xxiii.-xxiv; in Tacitus, Hist. v. 9, called Antonius Felix; in Sul-
das, Claudius Felix; in Josephus and Acts, simply
Felix: so also in Tacitus, Ann. xii. 54), the Roman
procurator of Judea, before whom Paul so "reasoned of
righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come
that the judge trembled, saying, 'Go thy way for this
time; when I have a convenient season I will call for
thee" (Acts xxiv, 25; see Ablich, De Claudio Felice,
Vitich. 1729; Eckhard, Paulii oratio ad Felicem, Iesn. 1779). The context shows that Felix had expected a
bribe from Paul; and, in order to procure this bribe,
he appears to have had several interviews with the
apostle. The depravity which such an expectation
implies is in agreement with the idea which the histori-
cal fragments preserved respecting Felix would lead
one to form of the man, if he had been more attentive
to the study of the history of the times.

The year in which Felix entered on his office cannot be
strictly determined. He was appointed by the em-
peror Claudius, whose freedman he was, on the ban-
ishment of Vettius Cumanus, probably A.D. 53.
Tacitus (Ann. xii. 54) states that Felix and Cumanus
were joint pendant, and Cumanus having Gallus, and
Felix Samaria. In this account Tacitus is directly at
issue with Josephus (Ant. xx, 6, 2), and is generally
supposed to be in error; but his account is very cir-
sumstantial, and by adopting it we should gain great-
ner justifications of the expression of Paul (Acts
xxiv, 10) that Felix had been judge of the Nazarene
for many years."

Those words, however, must not even thus be
closely pressed; for Cumanus himself only went to
Judea in the eighth year of Claudius (Josephus,
Ant. xx, 5, 2). From the words of Josephus (Ant.
xx, 7, 1), it appears that his appointment took place at
the twelfth year of the emperor Claudius. Eusebius
fixes the time of his actually undertaking his duties
in the eleventh year of that monarch. The question
is fully discussed under CHRONOLOGY, vol. ii, 211, 212.

Felix was a remarkable instance of the elevation
to the imperial throne of common men in the lowest
condition. Originally a slave, he rose to lit-
tle less than king's power. For some unknown,
but probably not very creditable services, he was manu-
mitted by Claudius Cesar (Sueton. Claudio. 28; Tac-
itus, Hist. v. 9, on which account he is said to have
taken the praenomen of Claudius. In Tacitus, how-
ever (L.c.), he is surnamed Antonius, probably
because he was also a freedman of Antonia, the emperor's
mother. Felix was the brother of Claudia's powerful
freedman Pallus (Josephus, War, i, 12, 8; Ant.
xx, 7, 1, 13); and it was to the circumstance of
witnessing his master's death (Tacitus, Ann. xiv.
65) that Felix was retained in his procuratorship by
Nero. In speaking of Pallus in conjunction with an-
other freedman, namely, Narcissus, the imperial pri-
mary secretary, Suetonius (Claudius, 28) says that
the latter was "in the emperor's confidence; and he
honors that a subject could enjoy, and suffered them
to carry on a system of plunder and gain to such an
extent that, on complaining of the poverty of his ex-
chequer, some one had the boldness to remark that he
would abandon the wealth if men were taken into partner-
ship by his two favorite freedmen.
The character which the ancients have left of Felix
is of a very dark complexion. Suetonius speaks of
the military honors which the emperor loaded him
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with, and specifies his appointment as governor of the province of Judea (Claudius, 29), adding an innuendo, which loses nothing by its brevity, namely, that he was the husband of three queens or royal ladies ("triun pars reginarum mariam"). Tacitus, in his History (v, 9), declares that, during his governorship in Judea, he indulged in great cruelty and impelled his province to a frightful power with the disposition of a slave; and, in his Annals (xii, 56), he represents Felix as considering himself licensed to commit any crime, relying on the influence which he possessed at court. The country was ready for rebellion, and the unsuitable remedies which he gave were attended only with the gravest con- sequences and to incite to crime. The contempt which he and Cumanas (who, according to Tacitus, governed Gallies while Felix ruled Samaria; but see Josephus, Ant. xx, 7, 1) excited in the minds of the people, encouraged them to give free scope to the passions which arose from the old enmity between the Jews and Samarians, while the two wily and base procurators were enriched by booty as if it had been spoils of war. This so far was a pleasant game to these men, but in the prosecution of it Roman soldiers lost their lives, and finally for the protection of one consul, governor of Syria, a rebellion would have been inevitable. A court-martial was held to inquire into the causes of this disaffection, when Felix, one of the accused, was seen by the injured Jews among the judges, and even seated on the judgment-seat, placed there by the presid- ium of Claudius Galerius. Felix was sent to the province of Judea to publish the sentence against the accusers and witnesses. Josephus (Ant. xx, 8, 6) reports that under Felix the affairs of the country grew worse and worse. The land was filled with robbers and impostors who deluded the multitude. Felix used his power to repress these disorders to little purpose, which Felix contemptuously gave no warning to punish. Thus, having got one Dinaeus, leader of a band of assas- sins, into his hands by a promise of impunity, he sent him to Rome to receive his punishment. Having a grudge against Jonathan, the high-priest, who had ex- postulated with him on his murder of Onias, and the assassins Josephus accuses, under Providence, the overthrow of the Jewish state. Among other crimes, some of these villains misled the people under the promise of per- forming miracles, and were punished by Felix. An Egyptian impostor, who escaped himself, was the occasion of two miracles of life among the priests, and, of the loss of liberty to two hundred, thus se- verely dealt with by Felix (Josephus, Ant. xx, 8, 6; War, ii, 13, 5; comp. Acts xxi, 38). A serious misunder- standing having arisen between the Jewish and the Syrian inhabitants of Caesarea, Felix employed his troops, and even and plundered till prevailed on to de- sist. His cruelty in this affair brought him on, after he was superseded by Festus, an accusation at Rome, which, however, he was enabled to render nugatory by the influence which his brother Pagas had, and, ex- empted him, almost, with the emperor Nero. Josephus, in his Life (§ 3), reports that, "at the time when Felix was procurator of Judea, there were certain priests of my acquaintance, and very excellent persons they were, whom, on a small and trifling occasion, he had put into bonds and sent to Rome to plead their cause before Caesar. At the end of two years' term, Porcius Festus was appointed to succeed Felix, who, on his return to Rome, was accused by the Jews in Caesarea, as above noticed (Ant. xx, 8, 9). This was in A.D. 56 (not in the year 60, as Anger, De temporibus in Act. Apostol. ratione, p. 106; Wissler, Chronik der Apostlesgeschichte, p. 89-92). While in his office, he was in a passion for the beautiful Drusilla, a daughter of king Herod Agripp- pa, who was married to Azius, king of Emesa, he em- ployed one Simon, a magician, to use his arts in order to persuade her to forsake her husband and marry him, promising that if she would comply with his suit he would make her a happy woman. Drusilla, partly charmed by the art and partly impelled by a desire to avoid the envy of her sister Berenice, was prevailed on to transgress the laws of her forefathers, and consented to a union with Felix. In this marriage a son was born, who was named Agrippa: both mother and son perished in an eruption of Mount Vesuvius, which took place in the days of Claudius (Josephus, Ant. xx, 7, 2). With this adul- teress was Felix seated when Paul reasoned before the judge, as already stated (Acts xxiv, 24). Another Drusilla is mentioned by Tacitus as being the wife (the first wife) of Felix. This woman was niece of Opeophytus and Antony. See De Floria. By the mar- riage Felix was connected with Claudius. Of his third wife nothing is known. (See Sale, De Felice et Drusilla, Amst. 1684.

Paul, being apprehended in Jerusalem, was sent by a letter from Claudius Lylias to Felix at Cæsarea, where he was at first confined in Herod's judgment- hall till his accusers came. They arrived. Tertullus appeared as their spokesman, and had the audacity, in order to conciliate the good-will of Felix, to express gratitude on the part of the Jews, "seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy apostles and teachers are seduced by the providence (Acts xxiii, xxiv). Paul pleaded his cause in a wor- thy speech; and Felix, consenting the apostle to the custody of a centurion, ordered that he should have such liberty as the circumstances admitted, with per- mission that his acquaintance might see him and min- ister to his wants. This imprisonment the apostle suffered for a short period (not two years, as ordinari- ly supposed, that expression having reference to Felix's whole term of sole office), being left bound when Felix gave place to Festus (q. v.), as that unjust judge "was willing," not to do what was right, but "to show the Jews a pleasure" (Walch, De Felico procuratore, Jena, 1747; also in his Dissert. in Act. iii, 29; Smith's Dictionary of Classical Biography, a. v.).

Felix, Martyr, and his companion Regula, were, according to tradition, the first Christian missionaries in the region of Lucania, which, before this time, had not been evangelized as patrons, and still has their names in the town seals. They are said to have been exe- cuted by order of the emperor Maximin. Nothing certain is known about their history. — Herzog, Real- Encyclop. iv, 591.

Felix of Nola was a native and presbyter of Nola. After his property had been confiscated during the persecution of Decius, he supported himself by cul- tivating a garden and some rented land. According to a legend, he concealed himself during the persecu- tion in the fissures of an old building, and a spider saved him from the search of the messengers by draw- ing her web over him. His sickness and miraculous recovery was recorded by Paulinus, bishop of Nola, and many pilgrims visited his grave. — Herzog, Real- Encyclop. iv, 555.

Felix the Manichæan was a contemporary of Au- gustine. He was an elder or elect of the Manichæans, and had gone to Hippo to gain converts for his sect. Augustine had a discussion with him in the church of Hippo. Felix was excused by the council for two days. The proceedings were taken down by not- aries, and are still extant (vol. viii of the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works: De actis cum Felice Ma- nichœo, libri ii). On the day before the disputation, Felix declared his readiness to be bound and his books to be making wort had been found in them; but during the disputation he is reported to have been
timid, weak, evasive, and it was thought that he wished to flee. Before the disputation began, his books were taken from him, and placed under the public seal. For two years, the Paraclete, who was Felix, was the Paraclete who had been promised by Christ, and he was used as an argument the information given by Mani on the construction of the world, on which nothing could be found in Paul and the writings of the other apostles. Augustine replied that the Paraclete had the mission to teach the truths of religion, but not to expound mathematics. The result of the disputation was that Felix declared himself refuted, and publicly renounced and cursed Mani. The protocol of the disputation was signed by both Augustine and Felix. Posthumously, in the thirteenth century, the name of Felix, after the third meeting, acknowledged his error, and accepted the faith of the Church.—Hergo, l.aut. Encycl. iv. 580.

Felix (Prætensis), an eminent Jewish scholar of the 16th century, was born in Prato, Tuscany. He was the son of a rabbi, who taught him the Oriental languages. He travelled in Italy after the death of his father, and, becoming convinced of the truth of Christianity, was baptized, and shortly after entered the order of St. Augustine. The date of his profession of Christianity is uncertain, but it probably took place before 1508. He translated the Psalms into Latin, dedicating the work to Leo X, and received a copy of it from the pope to translate the other books of the Old Testament. He revised the text of the two first Hebrew editions of the Bible published by Bomberg, carefully correcting the proofs himself. He died in 1557. His works are: I. Psalmerum ex hebraeo ad versum frâ tractatum adjicere notationibus (Venice, 1515, 4to); this version has been inserted in the Psalmerum Septuaginis (Lyons, 1590, 8vo).—2. Biblia sacra hebraea, cum utrque masculo et turgum, item cum Commentariis rubrano- rum; eur et studio Felixis Prætensis, cum præfatione latina Léoni X muneputat (Venice, 1518, 4 vols. fol.). It is said to be a version of Job and other books of the Bible by Felix, but they have never been published.—Biographie Universelle, iv. 273.

Felix, bishop of Urgel (Urgel), in Spain, 9th century. Of his early life little is known. He became bishop of Urgel in 781. Elibandus of Toledo, who had been his pupil, consulted him as to the doctrine of the person of Christ, with regard to which he seems to have given him some confused doctrine. See EIBLANDUS. The answer of Felix was that Christ, with respect to his divine nature, was truly and properly the Son of God, begotten of the Father, and hence he was the true God, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, in the unity of the Godhead. Eiblandus having requested an explanation of his doctrine, Felix explained that the Son of God by adoption, born of the Virgin by the will of the Father, and thus he was nominally God, Hence, according to the opponents of the Felician, it followed that there was a twofold Sonship in Christ, and that he must consist of two persons. The opin ion of Felix was considered by the orthodox as nothing more than a development of the Nestorian heresy. The doctrine of Felix was adopted by Elibandus, who, being the primate of Spain, propagated it through the different provinces of Spain, while Felix himself contributed to spread it throughout Narbonne and other parts of Gaul! (Carwithe, Church History, p. 179.) It appears to be clear that Felix had read some of the writings of the Theodore of Mopsuestia (q. v.), in which a similar doctrine is taught. Felix seems, moreover, to have engaged in controversy with the Mohammedans, and, in connection with this, he wrote a Dialogue against them; and it is not unlikely that he was led to the Adoptionist view by his desire to render the doctrine of the incarnation less offensive to the Mohammedans. Alcuin (q. v.) entered into controversy with Felix, and we learn from him a large part of what is known about the controversy (Alcuin, Opera, ii. 769 sq.). Neander gives the following statement: "Felix distinguished between how far Christ was the Son of God and God according to the eternal distinction, and how far he was so by virtue of grace, by an act of the divine will (gratia, voluntate), by the divine choice and good pleasure (electione, placito); and the name Son of God was given to him only in consequence of connection with God (suscipiens); and hence the expressions that are distinguished are not, first of all, secundum adoptionem. Felix appealed to the fact that, though the name of Son by adoption (di' vioteticia) is not applied in the Bible to Christ, yet there are other designations which express the same idea. He adduces John 10:36, 37, in which Jesus speaks of his father the God (car' adiaphros), and referred to the passage in the Old Testament, in which men are called Elohim, where Christ placed himself as a man in the category of those who were called 'god's suscipiens', and not in a strict sense. Then as to the passage, 'None is like God', from this it appears that as man he was not to be called good in the same sense as God, and that only the divine nature in him was the source of goodness. He would allow an interchange of the divine and human predicates only in the same manner as Theodore; it could not be made without limitation. The different senses of the words, according as they were attributed to the divine or human natures. He charged his opponents with so confounding the two natures by their doctrine of the singulatricus persona that they left no distinction between the suscipiens and the suscipiens. Expressions like this, then in connection with God was born, never occur in Scripture, which also never says that the Son of God, but that the Son of man was given for us. On the latter point Alcuin could easily have confuted Felix by other passages, but both were wrong in not distinguishing the various things which the names of God and the term Son of God from the Church use of it, and in taking the idea everywhere in a Church sense. Like Theodore, Felix asserted Agnosticism of Christ. It is also a point of resemblance between them that both sought for an analogy between the union of the man Christ with the divine Being, and the relationship of believers to God. Felix says that Christ in an improper sense (suscipiens) was called the Son of God conjointly with all who are not God according to their nature, but by the grace of God in Christ have been taken into the communion with the true person of God. In this order also the Son of God is, in respect of his human nature, both according to nature and grace. He maintained that, as far as Christ is reckoned among the sons of God, all believers are his members; considered according to his divine nature, believers are the temple in which he dwells. He did not wish by that to deny the specific difference between Christ and believers; whatever resemblance existed between them belonged to him in a far higher sense; he was united to God by generation, and was the medium of the communion of the rest with God. Felix also perfectly agreed with Theodore in the thought that the communion with God into which Christ was received as a man might be represented as a revelation of the divine being according to the measure of the various stages of the development of his human nature, and thus supposed various degrees of it up to the highest revelation after the glorification of Christ. It might be peculiarly offensive that he should compare the baptism of Christ with the regeneration of believers; but he certainly did not mean to say that Christ thus became partaker of communion with the divine nature, and without the specification of a stage or degree, but only to point out an analogy so far as baptism marked a distinct stage in Christ's life, after which the operation of the divine life in him was peculiarly conspicuous. It is therefore evident that the doctrine of Felix was altogether that of Theodore, excepting that the latter could express himself more freely in an
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One God, one Christ, one bishop." But Sozomen says that Felix was an adherent of the Nicene faith, and a "nameless manuscript. The great importance of the antagonism in which he stood to the Church doctrine is likewise manifest; it included not merely Christology, but also Anthropology; for the doctrine of the revelation of the Divine Being in Christ, conditioned by various stages of development, was connected with one main principle, the principle of free self-determination. It is uncertain how far Felix consciously developed his principles; but there is no question that these were throughout contradictory to the prevalent Augustinian doctrine. Felix lived in the Frankish territory, where the Frankish Church was drawn into the controversy. In A.D. 792, Charlemagne convoked an assembly at Ratibson, at which Felix appeared, and was induced to recant. He was then sent to Rome, where he made similar explanations (Alcuinus aed. Epsipannni, c. 16; Mansi, Concil. xiii, 383). But, on being permitted to return home, he repented of the steps he had taken, took refuge in Saracenic Spain, and again promulgated his doctrine. Alcuin, who had been summoned to take a part in the controversy, endeavored to win him over by a friendly epistle; but Felix regarded regard of the controversy the most important, and thus it was carried on in his writings (Alcuinus Libellus aed. Harerico Felici, Opp. Alci, i, paras ii, 759). The Spanish bishops interceded for Felix with the emperor, and applied for a new investigation (Alcuin, Gesta carol. Gesta, c. 143), and an ecumenical council was called a second synod at Frankfurt-on-the-Main in A.D. 794, which again decided against Felix (Mansi, xiii, 883); and since the Adoptionists had spread themselves even as far as France, the emperor sent a commission of three persons into those parts in order to oppose them. Felix came with them, and was prevailed upon to appear before the synod at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aix), in A.D. 799. After Alcuin had disputed with him for a long time, Felix declared himself to be convinced. He made a recantation in Spain; yet he was not altogether trusted, and was placed under the oversight of Leidrad, bishop of Lyons. He could not at once give up a dogmatic tendency which was so deeply rooted; he still was always inclined to Agnosticism, and after his death a series of questions was found which showed that he firmly adhered to his fundamental views" (Hist. of Doctrines, p. 444; Vig. and Ev. Euseb. p. 1177). In 801 he was condemned (Dorner, Dogma, cent. vii; Neander, Ch. History, iii, 156; Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. viii, ch. v, § 8; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, § 179; Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Edinb. transl, div. ii, vol. i, 348 sq. See ADOPTIONIS; CHRISTOLOGY.

Felix I, bishop of Rome. According to the Acta Smaucoruius, he succeeded Dionysius in 385, and died in 378. The church was opposed to him by the Council of Ephesus on account of his sufferings for Christ," but he did not die by violence. There is extant a letter of his against the Sabellians and Paul of Samosata. Other writings, not believed to be his, are to be found in Migne, Patrolog. Lat. vol. v, and in Gailland, Bull. Pat. iii, 542.—Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vii, 50; Baronius, Anales, p. 272-275; Bower, History of the Popes, i, 78.

Felix II, Anti-pope, was placed in the episcopal chair of Rome A.D. 355, by the Arian emperor Constantius, in place of Libierius (q. v.), who was exiled by the emperor. The clergy refused to acknowledge Felix, and Constantius recalled Libierius to hold the see conjointly with Felix; but when the decree was read in the circus, the people rejected it with the city,
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das (Oxford, 1865, 12mo)—Cypricm Opera (Oxford, 1677)—also Athenaeum, Hermes, and Justin's Apologia;—Not Testament Libri Omnes; accuratissimum Paralella Script. loc. necnon variis lectiones, etc. (London, 1863). by A. A. Franch, 1702; Oxford, ed. by Gregory, fol. 1708; Oxford, ed. by Jacobson, 1852, 8vo)—Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Epistles of St. Paul (London, 1675, 8vo); but from the edition of 1708 it appears that this book was the work of A. Woodhead, R. Allstroem, and O. Walker. "corrected and improved" by Fell. A new edition of the N. T. gave a new impulse to critical science, which he further aided by the assistance he furnished, in money and otherwise, to the critical labors of John Mill (q. v.). Indeed, bishop Fell is said to have de- vested his "whole substance" to works of piety and charity. He died July 10, 1086.—Hook, Eccles. Bibl. v, 74; Wood, Athenae Oxonienses; Bibl. Sacra, a. v.

Fell, John, an English Independent minister, was born at Cockerham, 1725, and became pastor at Thaxted, Essex. His early opportunities were not great, but by his talents and industry he became a very respectable scholar. He was made tutor in the ancient languages in the dissenters' seminary at Homerton. He is said to have been dismissed from his office there for reading newspapers on Sunday."

"His friends got him an annuity of £100, and he was "asked to deliver lectures on the Evidences at the Scots' Church, London Wall." He had only delivered four when he died, Sept. 6, 1801. Published (in controversy with Dr. Hugh Farmer, q. v.) Democrito, an Inquiry into the Heathen and Scripture Doctrine of Demos (London, 1779, 8vo):—The Idolatry of Greece and Rome distinguished from that of other Heathen Nations (London, 1801, 8vo). After his death Dr. Hunt published his Lectures on the Evidences (London, 1798, 8vo).—Bogue and Bennett, Hist. of Dissenters, ii, 518; Kitto, Cyclopaedia, s. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographical, s. v., 1125.

Fell, Philip, Phillip-Emmanuel de, a philan- thropist and earnest lover in the cause of education, was born at Berne, Switzerland, June 27, 1771. His father, who was a member of the government of Berne, laid the foundation of his intellectual culture, but he received his moral bent and self-sacrificing spirit from his mother, a great granddaughter of the Dutch ad- miral Van Tromp. After some time spent at the University of Tubingen in the study of science, he de- voted himself especially to politics and philosophy. "In order to acquaint himself with the moral state of his countrymen, he spent much of his time in traveling through Switzerland, France, and Germany, usually on foot, with his knapsack on his back, residing in the villages and farm-houses, and in the labor and occupations, and partaking of the rude lodging and fare of the peasants and mechanics, and often extending his journey to the adjacent countries." On his return to Berne in 1796 he rendered important service as "commandant of the quarter" in the revolution- ary disturbances. In 1799 he purchased the estate called Hofseyl, two leagues from Berne, and founded there, successively, a school of agriculture, a manu- factory of agricultural implements, schools for the poor, for the better classes, and a normal school. He devoted the remainder of his life to education with great success, but not without opposition. He died Nov. 21, 1844. See Vericoud, Rapport sur les Instituts de Hofsee; Hasm, Fellenberg's Leben und Wirken (Berne, 1845); Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Générale, xvii, 307.

Feller, Francois Xavier, a Flemish Jesuit, was born at Brussels, Aug. 18, 1783, entered the order of Jesus, February 28, 1798, was a very learned and voluminous writer, his publications amounting to 120 volumes. Among them are Reply to Fabronius [see Hontheim], 1771; Observ. Philos. sur le Systeme de Newton (3d edit. Liège, 1778); Cate-


Felloes (ケンチャ, chishakuin, joining, 1 Kings vii, 30) probably denotes rather the spokes that connect the rim with the hub of a wheel, being a kindred term with that used to denote the coupling-rods of the tabernacle (Exod. xxv, 10). See CHARLOT.

Fellow, besides its contemptuous use (as a rendering of סנה, a man, etc.), and its frequent employment (usually as a rendering of סנה, a friend or equal), in the sense of companionship, stands in one remarkable passage (Zech. xii, 7) as the rendering of רכש, society, in the phrase רכש יד, man of my association, i.e. my associate; corresponding with רכש, my shepherd in the parallel member, and referred to himself by our Saviour (Matt. xxvi, 51) as the great Pastor and Sacrifice for his people; not so much in the sense of simple equality of nature with the Father, as of copartnership with him in the great work of caring for and redeeming mankind. See NEIGHBOR.

Fellow of a College. See Fellowship.

Fellows, Robert, was born in Norfolk, England, in 1770; studied at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, took holy orders in 1795, and died in 1847. His theo-

logical speculations gradually led him to reject the doctrines of the Established Church, and to adopt the opinions found in his Religion of the Universe, published in London in 1836. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Farr and baron Masere, the latter of whom left him the greater part of his large fortune, to be dis-

persed in literary and benevolent enterprises. He was for some time editor of the London Review. He was an early advocate of the establishment of the University of London, of which he was a liberal benefi-

cator. Among his works are Christian Philosophy (1798, 2d ed. 1799, 8vo);—Supplement to do. —Religion without Cost (1801, 8vo);—Guide to Immortality (1804, 3 vols. 8vo);—Manual of Piety (1807, 8vo);—A Book of Theology (1807, 2 vols. 8vo).—Appleton, Cyclopaedia, s. v.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 584.

Fellowship in a college, a station of privilege and emolument enjoyed by one who is elected a member of any of those endowed societies which in the English and other universities are called colleges. The person so elected shares the benefits of the foundation in common with the other members, and from such participation derives the name of fellow, the Latin name for which in the statutes of most of the colleges is socius. See Universitatis. In Oxford and Cambridge the fellowships were either constituted by the original founders of the colleges to which they belong, or they have been since endowed. In almost all cases their holders must have taken at least the first degree of bachelor of arts or student in the civil law. One of the greatest changes introduced by the commissioners under the Universities Act of 1854 was the closing open of the fellowships to all members of the university of requisite standing, by removing the old restric-

tions by which many of them were confined to found-

ers' kin, or to the inhabitants of certain dioceses, arch-

diocesans, or other districts. Fellowships vary great-

ly in value, and are at their best at Oxford and Cambridge; in good years, are said to reach £100 or even £200, whilst there are others which do not amount to £100, and many at Cambridge which fall short of that sum. Being paid out of the college revenues which arise from land, they also vary from year to year. On an arrangement, on the other hand, their general value with reference to the value of commodities is preserved nearly unchangeable, which would not be the case if they consisted of a fixed payment in money. The
senior fellowships are the most lucrative, a system of promotion being established among their holders; but they all confer on their holders the privilege of occupying apartments in the college, and generally, in addition, certain perquisites as to meals or commons. Many of these stipendary fellows of the college, in general, they are forfeited should the holder attain to certain preferments in the Church or at the bar, and sometimes in the case of his succeeding to property above a certain amount. In general, also, they are forfeited by marriage, though this disability may now be removed by the college permitting the fellow to retain his fellowship notwithstanding his marriage. With the single exception of Downing College, Cambridge, in which the graduates of both universities are eligible, the fellowships are confined to the graduates of the university to which they belong.

Fellowship (sozwia), "joint interest, or the having one common stock. The fellowship of the saints is twofold: 1. With God (1 John i, 3; 1 Cor. i, 9; 1 Cor. xii, 14). 2. With one another (1 John 1, 7). Fellowship with God consists in knowing, or of his will (Rom. xvi, 21). Agreement in designation (Amos iii, 2), mutual affection (Rom. viii, 38, 89); enjoyment of his presence (Psa. iv, 6); contentment with his image (1 John ii, 1; 1 John i, 6); participation of his felicity (1 John i, 4; Eph. iii, 14-21; 1 Cor. xii, 14). Fellowship of the saints may be considered as a fellowship of objects (Rom. xii, 6); a fellowship of persons (1 Thess. v, 17, 18; James v, 16); of ordinances (Heb. x, 24; Acts ii, 46); of graces, love, joy, etc. (Heb. ii, 24; Mal. iii, 18; 2 Cor. viii, 4); of interest spiritual, and sometimes temporal (Rom. xii, 13; Heb. xiii, 16); of sufferings (Rom. xv, 2, Gal. i, 3; Rom. xii, 13); of eternal glory (Rev. vii, 9). See Communion.

Feltham, Owen, an English writer of the reign of James I, who was a native of Suffolk, lived many years in the earl of Thomsmond's family, and died about 1678. The work by which he is remembered is Reences, Divine, Political, and Moral, which has passed through many editions, and is still reprinted.

Felton, Henry, D.D., a learned English divine, was born at London in 1673, and was educated at Westminster school, the Charter House, and Edmund Hall, Oxford. In 1711 he became rector of Whitehill, Dorsetshire, and was finally appointed principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. He died in 1722. His principal works are, A Dissertation on Reading the Classics (London, 1723, 12mo) — The common People taught to defend their Country with the Church of England (Oxf. 1727, 8vo) — The Christian Fitch asserted against Dilet Arianism, and Socinians (Oxf. 1728, 8vo) — The Resurrection of the same numerical Body asserted (London, 1738, 8vo) — Sermons on the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of Man, etc. (London, 1748, 8vo) — Nineteen Sermons, 1748 (posthumous). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, s. v.; Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict. s. v.

Female Ecclesiastic. (For monographs, see Voltaire, vol. p. 184.) See Ministry, Deaconess, Agape.

Fence (Psa. lxxii, 8), "gazer, a wall (g. v.) rather than hedge (as elsewhere generally rendered). The Hebrews use two terms to denote a fence of different kinds: יָשָׂר, gazer, or יָנָר, gazerah, and יָנָר, mezcool. According to Vitringa, the latter denotes the outer thorny fence of the vineyard, and the former the inner wall of stones surrounding it. The chief use of the former was to keep off men, and of the latter to keep off beasts, not only from gardens, vineyards, etc., but their flocks and herds (see Prov. xv, 19; xxviii, 1). See Brdock. From the root the Phoenicians called any enclosed place gudnar, and particularly gave this name to their settlement in the south-western coast of Spain, which the Greeks from them called Gidnapa, the Romans Gades, and the moderns Cadiz. See Gederah. In Ezek. xii, 5; xxxii, 80, gazer appears to denote the fortifications of a city; and in Psa. xix, 8, the wicked are compared to a tottering wall and a broken fence, and in Ezek. xliv, 21, this destruction comes suddenly upon them. Fenced cities (see below) were such as were fortified. See Agriculture.

Fenced City (יוֹדָע, metoraphah, intrenched, 2 Chron. xi, 10, 23; xii, 4; xiv, 6; xxii, 18; rendered "stronghold," 2 Chron. xi, 11; "fort," Isa. xxiv, 9; "military," ii, 1, "metoraphah, a fortress, is also sometimes rendered "fenced" in connection with יָר, a city, Num. xxxiii, 17, 36; Josh. x, 20; xix, 35; 1 Sam. vi, 18; 2 Kings iii, 19; x, 2, xvii, 9; xviii, 6; 2 Chron. xvii, 19; Jer. x, 17; Dan. xi, 15; elsewhere "stronghold," etc.). The broad distinction between a city and a village in Biblical language consisted in the possession of walls. See City. The city had walls, the village was unwalled, or had only a watchman's tower (טָשַׁת, wiper, turris custodiun; comp. Geen. Thee. p. 267), to which the villagers resorted in times of danger. A threefold distinction is thus obtained: 1. A city, having walled villages with castles or towers (1 Chron. xxvii, 25). The district east of the Jordan, forming the kingdoms of Moab and Bashan, is said to have abounded from very early times in castles and fortresses, such as were built by Uzziah to protect the cattle, and to repel the inroads of the neighboring tribes, besides unwalled towns (Amnian. marc. vii, 9; Deut. iii, 5; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10). Of these many remains are thought by Mr. Porter to exist at the present day (Dasmacenas, ii, 197). The dangers to which unwalled villages are exposed by the marauding tribes of the wilderness, and also the fortifications by which the inhabitants sometimes protect themselves, are illustrated by Sir J. Malcolm (Sketches of Persia, c. xiv, p. 148) and Frazer (Persea, p. 370, 380; comp. Judg. v, 7). Villages in the Bauran are sometimes enclosed by a wall, or, rather, the houses, being joined together, form a defence against Arab robbers, and the entrance is closed by a gate (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 212). See Wall.

A further characteristic of a city as a fortified place is found in the use of the word יָד, build, and also "fortify," so that to "build" a city appears to be sometimes the same thing as to fortify it (comp. Gen. viii, 20, and 2 Chron. xvi, 6, with 2 Chron. xi, 5-10, and 1 Sam. xii, 7). See Wall.

The fortifications of the cities of Palestine, thus regularly "fenced," consisted of one or more walls crowned with battlemented parapets, גֹּז, having towers at regular intervals (2 Chron. xxxiii, 5; Jer. xxxix, 38), on which in later times engines of war were placed, and watch was kept by day and night in time of war (2 Chron. xxxvi, 9, 15; Judg. ix, 45; 2 Kings xiii, 17). Along the oldest of the three walls of Jerusalem there were ninety towers, in the second fourteenth, and in the third sixtieth (Joseph, War, v, 4, 3). One such tower, that of Hananeel, is repeatedly mentioned (Jer. xxxi, 38; Zech. xiv, 10), as also others (Neh. iii, 1, 11, 27). The gateways of fortified towns were also fortified and closed (Neh. ii, 18; Neh. ii, 18, 3; Judg. xii, 3, 2; 1 Sam. xxxii, 7; 2 Sam. xviii, 24, 38; 2 Chron. xiv, 7; 1 Macc. xiii, 88; xxvii, 4). In advance of the wall there appears to have been sometimes an outwork (אֵיל, porticoxu, in A. Vers. "ditch" (1 Kings xxii, 23; 2 Sam. xx, 15; Gesenius, Thee. p. 484), which was perhaps either a palisade or wall lining the ditch, or perhaps some raised embankment within the town. Both of these methods of strengthening fortified places, by hindering the near approach of machines, were usual in earlier Egyptian fortifications (Wilkinson,
Anc. Eg. i, 401), but would generally be of less use in the hill forts of Palestine than in Egypt. In many towns there was a keep or citadel for a last resource to the defenders. Those remaining in the Hauran and Leja are square. Such existed at Shechem and Thebez (Judg. ix, 46, 51; viii, 17; 2 Kings ix, 17), and the great forts or towers of Psephinus, Hippicus, and especially Antonia, served a similar purpose, as well as that of overlooking the town at Jerusalem. These forts were well furnished with cisterns (Acts xxii, 24; 2 Macc. v, 5; Josephus, Ant. xviii, 4, 3; War, i, 5, 4; v, 4, 2; vi, 2, 1). At the time of the entrance of Israel into Canaan there were many fenced cities existing, which first caused great alarm to the exploring party of searchers (Num. xiii, 30), and afterwards gave much trouble to the people in subduing them. Many of these were refortified, or, as it is expressed, rebuilt by the Hebrews (Num. xxxii, 17, 34-42; Deut. iii, 4, 5; Josh. xi, 12, 18; Judg. i, 27-33), and many, especially those on the sea-coast, remained for a long time in the possession of their inhabitants, who were enabled to preserve them by means of their strength in chariots (Josh. xiii, 3, 6; xvii, 16; Judg. i, 19; 2 Kings xviii, 8; 2 Chron. xxvi, 6). The strength of Jerusalem was shown by the fact that that city, or at least its walls, or "stronghold of Zion," remained in the possession of the Jebusites until the time of David (2 Sam. v, 6, 7; 1 Chron. xi, 5). Among the kings of Israel and Judah several are mentioned as fortifiers or "builders" of cities, e.g. Solomon (1 Kings ix, 17-20; 2 Chron. vii, 4-9), Jeroboam I (1 Kings xii, 20), Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 5, 12), Baasha (1 Kings xv, 17), Omri (1 Kings xvi, 24), Hazael (2 Chron. xxvii, 8), Asa (2 Chron. xiv, 6, 7), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 12), but especially Uziah (2 Kings xiv, 22; 2 Chron. xxvi, 2, 9, 15); and in the reign of Ahaz the town of Jericho was rebuilt and fortified by a private individual, Hiel of Bethel (1 Kings xvi, 34). Herod the Great was conspicuous in fortifying strong positions, as Masada, Macheras, Herodium, besides his great works at Jerusalem (Josephus, War, vii, 6, 1, 2; 8, 8; i, 21, 10; Ant. xiv, 18, 9). See Forts.

The so-called Golden Gate of Jerusalem, showing supposed remains of the old Jewish wall.

But the fortified places of Palestine served only in a few instances to check effectually the progress of an invading force, though many instances of determined and protracted resistance are on record, as of Samaria for three years (2 Kings xviii, 10). Jerusalem (2 Kings xxi, 9) for four months, and in later times of Jotapata, Gamala, Macheras, Masada, and, above all, Jerusalem itself, the strength of whose defences drew forth the admiration of the conqueror Titus (Josephus, War, iii, 6; iv, 1 and 9; vii, 6, 3-4 and 8; Robinson, i, 292). See Fortresses.

The earlier Egyptian fortifications consisted usually of a quadrangular and sometimes double wall of sun-dried brick, fifteen feet thick, and often fifty feet in height, with square towers at intervals, of the same height as the walls, both crowned with a parapet, and a round-headed battlement in shape like a shield. A second lower wall with towers at the entrance was added, distant thirteen or twenty feet from the main wall, and sometimes another was made of seventy or one hundred feet in length, projecting at right angles from the main wall, to enable the defenders to annoy the assailants in flank. The ditch was sometimes fortified by a sort of tansille in the ditch itself, or a ravine on its edge. In later times the practice of fortifying towns was laid aside, and the large temples, with their enclosures, were made to serve the purpose of forts (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. i, 408, 409, abridgm.).

Slab from Kourunjik, presenting a double-walled city, with arched gateways and inclined approaches leading to them from the outer walls. Within are warrens and houses; outside the fortifications is a narrow stream or canal, planted on both sides with trees, and flowing into a broad river, on which are large boats holding several persons, and a raft of skins, holding a man fishing, and two others seated before a pot or caldron. Along the banks, and apparently washed by the stream, is a wall with equidistant towers and battlements. The earlier Egyptian fortifications consisted usually of a quadrangular and sometimes double wall of sun-dried brick, fifteen feet thick, and often fifty feet in height, with square towers at intervals, of the same height as the walls, both crowned with a parapet, and a round-headed battlement in shape like a shield. A second lower wall with towers at the entrance was added, distant thirteen or twenty feet from the main wall, and sometimes another was made of seventy or one hundred feet in length, projecting at right angles from the main wall, to enable the defenders to annoy the assailants in flank. The ditch was sometimes fortified by a sort of tansille in the ditch itself, or a ravine on its edge. In later times the practice of fortifying towns was laid aside, and the large temples, with their enclosures, were made to serve the purpose of forts (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. i, 408, 409, abridgm.).

Slab from ancient Thebe, representing a Phalanx of the Kheps-ka (Canaanites) drawn up as a corps de reserve, with the fortified town (fig. 1), surrounded by double ditches, over which are bridges (figs. 2 and 3).
The fortifications of Nineveh, Babylon, Ecbatana, and of Tyre and Sidon are all mentioned either in the canonical books or the Apocrypha. In the sculptures of Nineveh representations are found of walled towns, of which one is thought to represent Tyre, and all illustrate the mode of fortification adopted both by the Assyrians (for instance in 1675-22, 54; Amos, i, 10; Zechar. ii, 8; Ezek. xxvii, 11; Nah. iii, 14; Tobit i, 17; xiv, 14, 15; Judith i, 1, 4; Layard, Nim. ii, 275, 278, 288, 353; and Bab. b. p. 281, 358; Mon. of Nim. pt. ii, pl. 39, 43). See Fortification.

Fencing the Tables, a special address in the ministration of the Lord's Supper among the Scotch Presbyterians. It is a lecture from the minister just before the distribution of the elements, pointing out the character of those who have and of those who have not a right to come to the Lord's table. It was formerly called "debarments," because in it the ministry debarred from the sacrament those who were not supposed to be worthy.

Fénelon, François de Salignac de la Mothe, the most venerated name in the modern history of the Roman Catholic Church, was born Aug. 6, 1651, at the castle of Corbeaux in Berry. He was the younger son of the marquis of Fénelon. He was carefully trained at home up to twelve years of age, when he was sent to the University of Cahors, and afterwards to the College of Plessis at Paris. His mind was very early turned towards the Church; he preached his first sermon at the age of 21. He was ordained to the theological seminary of St. Sulpice, and then under the charge of the abbé Tronson, from whom he is believed to have imbued the views of sanctity and of "disinterested love" which were so strongly brought out in his letters. He was ordained for the presbyterate in 1672, and for the next three years was one of the priests of the parish of St. Sulpice. Before his ordination he was strongly inclined to a foreign mission in the Levant or in Canada, but was kept back, it is said, by his uncle. The Correspondence Littéraire (July 25, 1683) gives a letter (from the archives of the French Ministry of Marine) in Colbert's handwriting, date of 1678, to Frontenac, governor of Canada, in which Louis XIV says, "I have blamed the action of abbé Fénelon, and have ordered him not to return to Canada. But I ought to say to you that it was difficult to institute a criminal process against him. The people of Paris were inclined to the seminary of St. Sulpice, at Montreal, to testify against him; and it was necessary to remit the case to his bishop or the grand vicar to punish him by ecclesiastical penalties, or to arrest him and send him back to France by the first ship to the West Indies." This was actually done in Canada (Am. Pres. Review, July, 1863). About the year 1678 he was appointed superior of the "Novelles Catholiques," a society formed to educate and proselyte the children of Protestants. In this office he wrote his first work, De Fédération des fidèles, which has been translated into English. In 1688 he became intimate with Bossuet, and under his guidance wrote Réfuta- tion du Système de Malebranche sur la nature et la grâce; and also a treatise entitled Du Ministère des Pasteurs, in which heretics are attacked, though with moderation. Louis XIV, then about to revoke the edict of Fontainebleau, desired a special mission to the Protestants of Poitou. He accepted the charge on the condition that no means of conversion were to be used but persuasion. In 1689 he was entrusted with the education of the young duke of Burgundy. Later in his history he was named "the Orator of the Monarch." After five years' service, he was elevated to the archiepiscopate of Cambrai in 1694. He had previously become intimate with Madame Guyon (q. v.), and his relations with her, and the complications which grew out of them, embittered more or less his whole after life. His health began to decline, and he was required to recount somewhat in detail. For the special history of Quietism, see the article under that title. Suffice it here to say, that the particular form of it taught by Madame Guyon began to spread widely, and to alarm the leading clergy of the Church of France. Bossuet was soon vigorously enlisted against her. He conducted the controversy against Madame Guyon with his usual skill. He, together with the bishop of Chartres, made a special mission to St. Sulpice, and were paid a visit by the commissioners to inquire into the doctrines advanced by Madame Guyon. The conferences between the parties lasted for six months. Bossuet was little conversant at this time with mystical theology, and at his request Fénelon prepared a treatise in which he extracts from the writings of the mystical writers. The commissioners assembled at Issy, a retired country house belonging to the congregation of St. Sulpice. They drew up thirty articles, in which certain alterations were made by Fénelon, by whom four were added. There was no mention in them of Madame Guyon or her doctrines, but they were supposed to express the doctrines of the established Church of France on the principal subjects in dispute. Their conclusion amounts to little more than this, that spiritualism, or an aim at the very highest human attainments, was to be disallowed by the Church. Madame Guyon immediately expressed her acquiescence in the articles of Issy. The whole question seemed now to be set at rest. Fénelon, having been nominated before these transactions to the archiepiscopate of Cambrai, was consecrated as such on February 12, 1695, and was installed, at his own earnest request. But Quietism continued to gain ground, and, to stop its progress, Bossuet published his Instruction sur les actes de l'oraison, for which he sought the approbation of the new archbishop; but Fénelon refused on the ground that he had not the right to give it. The controversy was continued for four years. The understanding of God, and that its censures of Madame Guyon were too severe. Thus began the bitter controversy between these two distinguished prelates, which for a long time disturbed the peace of the Church of France. Fénelon published his Explication des maximes des sçons sur la vie intérieure, but not before it was carefully examined by the cardinal de Noailles and abbé Tronson, two of the committee at Issy, and by M. Pirot, a theologian of eminence attached to Bossuet. These pronounced the Maximes to be a golden work. But no sooner was it published than in the same year Bossuet condemned this controversy Louis XIV and Madame de Mainte- non took part against Fénelon. Bossuet had the support of the court, and made vigorous use of all the weapons at his command. Fénelon defended himself with spirit. An appeal was made to a cardinal, and was artfully delayed. In communion with Louis with bear upon the court of Rome, and inculcated that Fénelon was, in his own diocese, considered a heretic, and that, as soon as Rome should speak, Cambrai, and all the Low Countries, would rise against him. The pope (Inno- cent XIII) proceeded cautiously, and delayed his decision. In the mean time the friends of Fénelon were persecuted by the court, and he himself was suspended from his office of preceptor to the royal dukes; but never, amidst all the indignities he suffered, did he lose the pious serenity of his mind. "Yet but a little while," he wrote to Madame Guyon, "and the small- ful dream of this life will be over. We shall meet in the kingdom of truth, where there is no error, no di- vision, no scandal; we shall breathe the pure love of God; he will communicate to us his everlasting peace. In the mean time let us not refuse grace. Jesus Christ was disgraced for us; may our disgrace tend to his glory." At length the pope appointed a congregation of cardinals, who met twelve times without coming to any resolution; he then appointed a new congregation of cardinals, who met fifty-two times, and were extracted from Fénelon's work several dispositions, which they re-
ported to the pope as censurable. Meantime Louis XIV was urging the pope to condemn Fénélon, although the pope himself was unwilling to come to a final decision. It was difficult to censure Fénélon without the papal permission, and this would have clanged orthodoxy. Holy, too, as Fénélon was, it was considered that to submit to a decision against him was an act of such heroic humility that it could scarcely be expected, and that a schism might be caused equal to that of the Reformation. The parties inclined to issue a brief, stating the doctrine of the Church, or calling upon each party to abstain from future discussions. But even a pope may stand in awe of worldly consequences. Louis XIV, urged on by Bossuet, insisted upon the condemnation of Fénélon, and the pope at last (March 15, 1683) issued a brief, by which twenty-three propositions were extracted from Fénélon's work and condemned, "though the expressions used in the condemnation of them were so gentle, that it is evident that if the pope had feared God as much as he feared the French king, Fénélon would have escaped all censure. By threatening his friends and his adversaries mortified; and their mortification was increased by an expression of the pope, which was soon in every one's mouth, that Fénélon was in fault for too great love of God; his enemies equally in fault for too little love of their neighbour" (Kingsley, vol. ii, p. 320).

The controversy had been going on in France during the time occupied by the investigation at Rome. "Bossuet published a succession of pamphlets. Several of the bishops who had espoused the cause of Bossuet issued pastoral in the same sense. Fénélon defended himself vigorously against them all in several publications, explanatory as well of his principles as of the personal imputations in which some of his adversaries did not scruple to indulge. The last blow against the ancient friendship of the great rivals was struck on March 15, 1683. A brief of the Holy See, called the 'Défense et Légitimation,' was pronounced against the See of Cambrai. Fénélon was wounded to the heart. The copy of Bossuet's pamphlet which first came into his hands is still preserved in the British Museum, and the margin is literally filled with remarks, annotations, replies, denials, and rejoinders, in the singularly delicate and unceasingly thoughtful manner of Fénélon's epistolary style. The copy now in the British Museum is at present probably one which, as we learn from his correspondence, he sent to his agent at Rome, and on the margin of which he corrected, for the guidance of his friends, the errors of the Benedictines, and especially of his great antagonist. The substance of these replies he gave to the public in a most masterly defence, written, printed, and published within little more than a fortnight from the appearance of Bossuet's 'Défense et Légitimation.'"

When the papal brief arrived, Fénélon submitted at once, and ordered all copies of the book that were in circulation to be burnt that he might burn them with his own hand. He read the brief from his own pulpit, and addressed a pastoral to the people of his diocese, in which he said, "Our holy father has condemned my work, entitled 'Marinae diatoma,' and has condemned in a particular manner twenty-three propositions extracted from it. We adhere to his brief, and condemn the book and the propositions simply, absolutely, and without a shadow of reserve. He even presented to the cathedral a piece of gold plate, on which is a picture engraved representing the angel of truth trampling on several erroneous books, among which is his 'Marinas.' This submission appears to us Protestants to have been at once weak and ostentatious, but in the Roman Catholic Church it is one of Fénélon's highest titles to glory of Bossuet's account, though it is variously represented: according to one account he was really touched by the conduct of Fénélon, and desired to be completely reconciled to him; according to others, he retained at heart his bitter feeling, and kept up the same spirit in the mind of the king. About this time Fénélon sent a complete and corrected copy of 'Telemaque' to the duke of Burgundy. The copyist, it seems, made a duplicate, and printed it at Paris, without the knowledge of Fénélon, and it was immediately suppressed by order of the king, but was printed again in Holland in 1699, spread throughout Europe, and was translated into almost every tongue. By the courtiers of Louis XIV 'Telemaque' was regarded as a satire upon that monarch and his satellites, whereas it was intended by Fénélon to represent the King, Claude, Madame de Montespan; Protosilas, Leuvis; and Eucharis, Mademoiselle de Fontanges. This scandal shut Fénélon out of the court of Louis XIV for the rest of his life. He was ordered to remain within his diocese, and was forbidden all intercourse with his pupil, the duke of Burgundy. But the displeasure of the court did not diminish the reputation of Fénélon either in France or in Europe generally. He devoted the remainder of his life to diligent care of his diocese, and to literary labours. He founded a seminary at Cambrai, to which he gave all his personal attention. During the War of the Succession his diocese was often the scene of military operations, and he did his best to assuage the horrors of war. He brought together into his palace the wretched inhabitants of the country whom the war had driven from their homes, and took care of them, and fed them in his own person. Seeing one day that one of these peasants ate nothing, he asked him the reason of his abstinence. "Alas! my lord," said the poor man, "in making my escape from my cottage I had not time to bring off my cow, which was the support of my family. The cow will drive her away, and I shall never find another so good." Fénélon, availing himself of his privilege of safe-conduct, immediately set out, accompanied by a single servant, and drove the cow back to itself to the peasant. "This," said cardinal Mauvy, "is perhaps the finest act of Father Fénélon's life, and the act of the man who reads it without being affected." Another anecdote, showing his tenderness to the poor, is thus related of him. A literary man, whose library was destroyed by fire, has been deservedly admired for saying, "I should have profited but little by my books if they had not taught me how to do the good of them," The remark of Fénélon, who lost his in a similar way, is still more simple and touching: "I would much rather they were burned than the cottage of a poor peasant. In 1709, the duke of Marlborough, by his cense commissioned me to go page, while that general himself and his allies showed the aged prelate every mark of courtesy.

In the Jansenist disputes Fénélon wrote against Jansenius, and expressed himself very strongly, though at first charitably, against Quenel and Pascal. See Jansenius; PORT ROYAL. He wrote a Père Memoire commanding a judgment from the pope to settle the controversy by a dogmatic decision, to which all must submit. This Père Memoire was laid before the pope (Clement XI), and his bull 'Fveralat' shows evident traces of its influence. He also wrote "De Sommis Pontifici Assertio" (in his Exercit, Versailles for 1720, tom. ii), in which he yielded more to the papal claims than became him as a Gallican bishop. Denying the direct temporal power of the pope, he admits a potestas directoria, equivalent to what is called the indirect temporal power. See Pope, TEMPORAL POWER OF.

In his personal habits Fénélon was temperate almost to abstemiousness, took no repose except a few hours daily in the exercises of walking or riding, while the rest of his time was devoted to social intercourse with his friends, to visiting the poor, and to the performance of spiritual functions. The most of his revenues were devoted to benevolent uses. He died at Cambrai Jan. 7, 1715.

We cite a passage from Dr. Channing on the character and writings of Fénélon: "His works have the
FENELON

great charm of coming fresh from the soul. He wrote from experience, and hence, though he often speaks a language which must seem almost a foreign one to men of the world, yet he always speaks in a tone of reality. That he has excesses we mean not to deny, but they are of a kind which we regard with more than ordinary indulgence. Common fanaticism we cannot approve, but it is essentially vulgar, the working of animal passions, sometimes of sexual love, and often of earthly ambition. But when a pure mind err by aspiring after disinterestedness and purity not granted to our present infant state of grace, even the error, sterner, more we recognise in them an essential truth. They only anticipate and claim too speedily the good for which man was made. They are the misapprehensions of the inspired prophet, who hopes to see in his own day what he was appointed to promise to remoter ages. Fénélon saw far into the human heart, and especially into the lurkings of self-love. He looked with a piercing eye through the disguises of sin. But he knew sin, not, as most men do, by bitter experience of its power, so much as by his knowledge and experience of himself. Deformation was revealed to him by his refined perceptions, and intense love of personal beauty. The light, which he carried with him into the dark corners of the human heart, and by which he laid open its most hidden guilt, was that of celestial goodness. Hence, though the severest of censors, he is the most patient and most fit of aspirers. The poet himself, in his Ad Astra, looks on human error with an angel's tenderness, with tears which an angel might shed, and thus reconciles and binds us to our race at the very moment of revealing its corruptions" (Christian Examiner, vi, 7).

Literature. The writings of Fénélon are too numerous to be mentioned in detail. They are classified as follows in the Verselles edition of his works (1819, 22 vols. 8vo): Metaphysical and Theological Writings, vols. i.-iii; The Quietistic Controversy, and Discourses on Bossuet, vols. iv.-ix; writings on Jansenism, vols. x.-xvi; Education of Girls, Sermons, Religious Meditations, vols. xvii., xviii.; Fables, Dialogues, smaller writings, vol. xix; Télemaque, vol. xx; Dialogues on Eloquence, Correspondence, Lives of Ancient Philosophers, vols. xx., xxii. There are many collective editions of the writings of Fénélon, of which the most complete is that of Bélial, commenced in Verselles 1820-24, in 22 vols. 8vo., with 11 vols. additional of Correspondances (Paris, 1827-29), and 1 vol. of Tables et Index (Paris, 1880), making 54 vols. in all. The best (in some respects the best) is that of the abbé Gossevin (Paris and Besançon, 1851-52, 20 vols. imperial 8vo., with a complete literary and biographical index, and a Memoir of the Author). Of editions of his select works, the best are those of Périas (Paris, 1842, 4, large 8vo.); that of Dufour, the first volume of which is a Vie de Fénélon (Paris, 1828, 12 vols. 8vo.); and that of Leflèvre, with Vie by Almé Martin (Paris, 1885); and by Didot, 1888, 8 vols. large 8vo. Of his sermons, the editions are too numerous to be mentioned here. Many of his writings have been translated into English; among them are, On the Education of Daughters (Lond. 1703; Albany, 1805); Dialogues on Eloquence (Lond. 1808; Boston, 1813); Demonstrations of the Sentences of God (London, 1749, 12mo); Spiritual Works, translated by Houghton, with Life (Dublin, 1771, 2 vols. 8vo); Telemachus (many editions; best by Hawkesworth, Lond. 2 vols. 12mo, 1808); Lives of the Anc. Philosophers, with Life of Fénélon, by Cornich (N. Y. 1841, 12mo); Selections from the Writings of Fénélon, with Memoir of the Author, by Mrs.ollen (Boston, 1829; new ed. 1859, 12mo). Of Lives of Fénélon, besides those already cited in connection with editions of his works, we name Ramsay, Vie de Fénélon (Paris, 1725, 12mo); Querbeuf, Vie de Fénélon (Paris, 1777, 12mo; new ed. 1816, 12mo); Bénédict, Vie de Fénélon (Paris, 1783, 12mo); L. H. Nicholson, Life of Fénélon (Paris, 1787, 12mo); Madfrud, Life of F. (trans. from the French by Baug set, Lond. 1810, 2 vols. 8vo); Butler, Life of Fénélon
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Fenestella, the niche at the side of an altar, containing the piscina (q. v.) or water-drain, into which was poured the water in which the priest washed his hands, and that with which the chalice was rinsed at the celebration of the mass. There is frequently a shelf above the water-drain, on which could be placed certain vessels which were required at the altar. A second niche, at the side of the fenestella, sometimes held the credence-table. In England the fenestella is almost universally at the south side of the altar.

FERDINAND, WILLIAM, B.D., an English Puritan, was born in 1600, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. He was appointed rector of Rochford, Essex, in 1629, and died about 1640. He was a very popular preacher, and his works, which have become very scarce, are written in a plain, earnest, and impressive style. The apostle of the Dissenters of his time, he looks on human error with an angel's tenderness, with tears which an angel might shed, and thus reconciles and binds us to our race at the very moment of revealing its corruptions" (Christian Examiner, vi, 7).

Ferdinand, William, B.D., an English Puritan, was born in 1600, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. He was appointed rector of Rochford, Essex, in 1629, and died about 1640. He was a very popular preacher, and his works, which have become very scarce, are written in a plain, earnest, and impressive style. The apostle of the Dissenters of his time, he looks on human error with an angel's tenderness, with tears which an angel might shed, and thus reconciles and binds us to our race at the very moment of revealing its corruptions" (Christian Examiner, vi, 7).
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Ferguson, James, minister of Kilwinning, Scot-
land, a preacher and commentator of some emi-
nence. Little is known of his life; he died about 1670. He
published Brief Exposition of Philippicns and Colossians
(1663).—Brief Exposition of Galatians (1663). After his death appeared his Brief Exposi-
tion of 1 and 2 Thessalonians (1674). Orme (Bibb).
(See) says that these "expositions are uncommonly sensa-
tible." They have been republished in one vol-
ume (London, 1641, large 8vo).

Ferguson, Samuel D., a Methodist Episcopal
minister in the city of New York in 1768, but
removed with his parents at an early age to Dela-
ware County, where he was converted at fourteen. He
entered the New York Conference in 1819, and
died in New York, December 30, 1855. He was a high-
ly influential and useful minister, and an able presid-
ing elder. He was three times a delegate to the Gen-
eral Conference, in 1835, 1856, and 1844. He served
some time as agent for the Troy Conference Seminary,
and spent four years with eminent success as superin-
tendent of the Leake and Watts Orphan House, New
York.—Minutes of Conferences, vi. 64.

Ferroni, Severus Antonius, a Roman ecclesias-
tic, born in the States of the Church in 1748. He
employed himself for thirty years on a History of the Va-
riations in the Discipline of the Church, which was to
form 50 vols., and was on the point of completion when
the French army entered Rome in 1798. His papers
were destroyed and his labor lost. Ferroni was soon
after engaged on the side of Napoleon, wrote homilies in
his favor, and was made theologian to the privy
 council of the viceroy at Milan. Among other things
he wrote a treatise De Ascendititate Ecclesiae, main-
taining French lessons, but the censor would not allow it
to be printed. He died at Milan, 1813.—Vigne, Biogra-
phies Chrisl., s. v.

Fermoe (or Fairholme), Charles, a Scotch divine,
was born in Edinburgh, and was educated at the uni-
versity there, where he became M.A. in 1587. In
1593 he was made one of the regents of the university. He
afterwards became minister at Fraserburgh, and (1600)
principal of the college there; he died at Fraserburgh
in 1617. He wrote a Logical Analysis of the Epistle of
Paul to the Romans, which was published under the
care of Dr. Adamson in 1671, and has been republished
d by the Wodrow Society (Edinburgh, 1800, 8vo). In
the preface of the latter edition, Dr. Adamson gives the
work high praise, even saying, "So sagacious, ex-
act, and perspicuous a commentary on the Romans I
had not before had the good fortune to peruse."

Ferment. See LEAVEN; WINE.

Fermentariums (Fermentaris), a name given to
the Greek Church of the Latins, because the former
used leavened bread in the Eucharist; the Greeks call-
ing the Latin Asymines (q. v.). The word fermentum
was used, even in the Latin Church, at an early pe-
riod, to designate the Eucharist, showing that then fer-
mented bread was used.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk.
xv, ch. ii, § 5.

Ferrand (Ferrandus, Ferdinand, or Fer-
rand), a Belgian monk and reformer, was born at
Bruges in 1450. He either lost his sight in childhood
or was born blind, which, however, did not prevent
him from studying philosophy, theology, rhetoric, po-
etry, and music. He pursued these studies in Paris,
and at Chartres; and afterwards went to the Uni-
versity of Paris, in 1485, as a student in the college of
belles-lettres in the University of Paris. It is pos-
bile that he may also have occupied the chair of theo-
ology. In 1490 he entered the order of the Benedic-
tines, and soon after, by special dispensation from the
pope, he was allowed, in spite of his blindness, to take
discern's orders, and began to preach. He died in 1496.
His blindness did not prevent him from writing many
books, among which are Epistolae Caroli Pernandi,
Isaigninis (Paris, no date, 4to);—De Animi Tranquilli-
tute libri duo (Paris, 1512);—Speculum monasticum di-
iscipulorum Patris Benedicti Magni, etc. (Par., 1515, fol.);
—Elegies de Contemptu Mundi; Odarum in laudem
rale, xvii. 180.

Ferron, Henry, D.D., bishop of Chester, was
born at York in 1609, and was educated at St. Mary's Hall,
Oxford, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he
became a fellow. He was made chaplain to the
bishop of Durham, and was successively presented to
the livings of Masham, of Medoorn, and to the arch-
deansey of St. Asaph. He took his Doctor's degree in
1642, and espoused the cause of Charles I, who made him
his chaplain. On the Restoration Charles II gave him
the mastership of Trinity College, and he was twice chosen vice-chancellor. He was made bish-
op of Chester in 1659, died in 1661, and was buried in
Westminster Abbey. He published four tracts against
the rebellion, 1642-48; two sermons, 1644-49; and
five treatises in defense of the Church of England
against Romanism and Presbyterianism, 1647-60. He
is said to have aided Walton in the Polyglot Bible.—
Hook, Eccles. Biog., v. 89.

Ferron, Louis, a French Orientalist. He was
born at Tournai, October 8, 1645, and was educated in
his native city and at Lyons, where he studied Hebrew
and other Oriental languages. At twenty he went to
Paris, and soon after to Mayence, to undertake a transla-
tion of the Hebrew Bible. This project not succeed-
ing, he returned to France, studied law, and was re-
ceived as advocate in the Parliament of Paris. He,
however, occupied himself much less with his new pro-
fession than with controversial writings, and works on
the history of the East. He died Mar. 11, 1699. His
works are, Conspectus rerum Synagogae libri hebraici qui in
scripturis sanctis explicatur (Paris, 1670, 8vo);—Rexitiones
in la Re-
ligion Christiana, contenant les prophéties de Jacob et de
Daniel sur la venue du Messie, etc. (Paris, 1673, 2 vols.
dmo);—Liber Psalmorum, cum argumentis, paraphrasi-
bus et annotationibus (Paris, 1689, 4to);—Traite de l'Eglise,
contre lex hereticas et principalement contre les calva-
ristes (Paris, 1685, 12mo);—Reponse a l'Apolo gear pour la
Riformation, pour les reformateurs et pour les reformes
(Paris, 1685, 12mo);—Paeanae de Davide in latine et en
française selon M. Vulgate (Paris, 1686, 8vo);—Lettera a Mr. Ferrando de la Riforma sulla Monastica (Florence, 1686);—Summa Augustinianum (Journal des Savants);—Disqui-
dis ou l'on fai
voir que saint Augustin a ete moine (Paris, 1689, 12mo);—
Summa Biblica seu dissertations prolegomenae de
Sacra Scriptura (Paris, 1689, 12mo).—Hoefler, Nouv.
Biog. Genér. vii, 468.

Ferrandus Fulgentius. See FULGENTIUS, FER-
RANDUS.

Ferrar, Nicholas, a clergyman of the Church of
England, eminent for piety, was born in London in
1592, and was carefully trained at home both in reli-
gion and letters. At fourteen he entered the Univer-
sity of Cambridge, and was eminently distinguished
there by his abilities and learning, so that his tutor used
to say of him, "May God keep him in a right mind:
for if he should turn schismatic or heretic, he would
make work for all the world." In 1612 he went abroad,
studied at Leipsic and Padua, and, after visit-
ing Rome, returned to England in 1618, and soon after
became actively engaged in the affairs of a great com-
pany for colonizing Virginia, of which he was chosen deputy governor. In 1624 he was elected to
Parliament, where he was highly distinguished for elo-
quency and ability, but soon decided to quit public
life and devote himself to a religious life. In the
Church of Rome he would have been a monk, and he
came as near to it as possible for a Protestant. He
purchased in 1613 the manor of Little Gidding, in
FERRAR, Robert, bishop of St. David's, a martyr of the reign of queen Mary, was born at Halifax, Yorkshire, and was educated at Oxford, where he became B.D. and a regular canonic of the order of St. Augustine. The duke of Somerset, lord protector in the reign of Edward VI, was his patron, and employed him in carrying on the Reformation. He was one of the committee for the consecration of the bishop of Hereford, and was one of the committee for the consecration of Ferrar, who was consecrated bishop in 1547 (under Edward VI), soon procured him many enemies among the Papists, and after the fall of his eminent patron he was, under a false charge, committed to prison some time before the death of the king. On the accession of Mary he was tried on the new charge of heresy as a Protestant, degraded from his ecclesiastical functions, and, in company with Hooper, Bradford, Rogers, Saunders, and others, delivered over to the secular power for punishment. A little before this good bishop suffered, a young gentleman who visited him lamented the severity of the kind of death he was about to undergo. Ferrar replied, "If you see me once to stir while I suffer the pains of burning, then give no credit to those doctrines for which I die." By the grace of God he was enabled to make good this assertion. "I read in the scriptures," said he, "that the down in the flames by a blow on his head. He was burned at Caerarthen, in Wales, March 30, 1565.—Middleton, Ecclesiastical Biography, 346; Burnet, Hist. of Reformation (4 vols.), ii, 541 sq.; Fox, Book of Martyrs; Hook, Ecclesi. Biography, v, 96.

Ferrara, Council of (Concilium Ferrarense), falsely styled conciliar. Eugene VI having published a bull Sept. 18, 1487, for the transfer of the Council of Basile (q.v.) to Ferrara, a few bishops and abbots assembled Jan. 8, 1488, viz. cardinal Julian, who presided, five archbishops, eighteen bishops, ten abbots, and some generals of the monastic orders; of these bishops and abbots, left the Council, and continued its sitting, justly regarding the pope's bull as illegal, and passing sentence of suspension on him Jan. 24, 1488. Charles VII, indeed, forbade any of his subjects to attend at Ferrara. On Jan. 10 the first sitting was held, in which the translation of the council from Basile was pronounced to be canonical, and thence the ecumenical Council of Ferrara lawfully assembled. Pope Eugene presided in the second session, March 15, at the head of seventy-two bishops, and promulgated a decree against the fathers at Basile. The Greek emperor, John Manuel Palaeologus, was the titular, and the patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II., arrived Feb. 9 at Venice, and were received with great pomp, together with Mark, archbishop of Ephesus; twenty-one other prelates (among whom was Isidore, a Russian bishop, and Besanion of Nicea), and other ecclesiastics, amounting in all to seven hundred persons. Before holding the first session with the Greeks, a scheme was drawn up of the different questions to be debated: 1. The procession of the Holy Spirit; 2. the addition "Agnus Dei" to the creed; 3. purgatory, and the intermediate state; 4. the use of unleavened bread in the holy Eucharist; 5. the authority of the Roman see, and the primacy of the pope. These questions were debated in thirteen sessions, up to the sixteenth, Jan. 10, 1489, when it was proposed to transfer the council from Ferrara to Florence, and, this being agreed to, publication was made of the change. —Laubbe, Conc. xiii. 1-222, 925-1081: Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 242; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xv, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 18; Mansi, t. xxix, xxxi; Flokules, Christianum's Divisions, Lond. 1867, pt. ii, ch. vii. See Florence, Council of.

Ferrara (Renata), Duchesse de, celebrated for her virtues and for her attachment to the Reformation, the daughter of Louis XII and Anne of Brittany, born at Blois Oct. 25, 1510. In 1527 she was married to Hercule d'Este, duke of Ferrara and Modena. She is said to have been very learned, excelling in mathe-
maties, especially in astronomy. Her husband died in 1569, and the next year she left Italy on account of her religion, and returned to France, where she was permitted to profess the Protestant faith. She resided at Montargis, and there gave protection to as many as she could accommodate till she was forced to depart. During the civil war in France she fed and maintained in her castle a great number of Protestants who had fled to her for refuge. She interceded strongly for the prince of Condé when he was imprisoned at Orleans in the time of the young king Francis, but was afterwards displaced with him, because neither she nor her ministers approved of the Protestants taking up arms. She died at Montargis June 12, 1575, in full profession of the Reformed faith, though the Jesuit Le Laboureur seeks to show that she adhered her religion.

—Boyle, Dictionary, ed. Des Malzeaux (Loud. 1796), iii, 80.

FERRARI, FRANCISCO BERNARDINO, an Italian archaeologist, was born at Milan in 1576. Entering the Congregation of St. Ambrose, he studied philosophy and divinity, as well as the Latin and Greek languages, and was admitted doctor. Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, appointed him to go over various parts of Europe to purchase the best books and MSS. to form a library at Milan. Ferrari passed over part of Italy and Spain, and collected a great number of books, which formed the foundation of the famous Ambrosian Library. About 1588 he was appointed director of the library of the college of San Vincenzo in Naples, which office he discharged two years, and then, on account of indisposition, returned to Milan. He died at Milan Feb. 8, 1669. Among his writings are, De Antiqvo Eccles. Epistolarum Generis libri tres (Milan, 1618); De Vita Scroccorum Ecclesiae Cathedralis conscientia libri tres (Milan, 1620); Utrecht, 1692, cum prefatione Joannis Georgii Gravi) —De Veterum acclamationibus et placuam libri sex (Milan, 1627; also in vol. vi of Gravius's Theorar. Antiq. Rom.). His writings are full of learning; he is very judicious in his conclusions, and exact in his quotations.—Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles., xvii, 109 (Amst. 1771).


FERRER, BONIFACIO, brother of St. Vincent Ferrer, and prior of the Carthusian monastery of Portaceli, in Valencia. He translated the whole Scriptures into the Valencian or Catalan dialect. This translation, which was printed at Valencia in 1478, although it was the work of a Roman Catholic author, and had undergone the examination and correction of the inquisitor James Borrell, had scarcely made its appearance when it was suppressed by the Inquisition, and consigned to the flames. He died in the year 1417.

McCrie, Reformation in Spain, ch. v.

Ferrer, Rafael, a Spanish missionary, was born at Valencia. Having entered the order of the Jesuits, he devoted himself to the preaching of the Gospel in the desert bordering on the Amazon River. It was, in particular, the fertile and fertile nations of the Cofanes, which had never yet seen a missionary, and which, divided into twenty tribes, occupied a territory about sixty miles from Quito, to which he devoted his labors. The Cofanes had never been subjected to Spanish rule, and had recently destroyed the town of Ecija and a number of villages. In 1600, after fourteen months of labor, Ferrer succeeded in organizing the mission of S. Martín de las Almas del Cofan. In 1604 two other villages swelled the number of the converted population to 6500. In 1605 Ferrer followed the course of the Guayacoco, penetrated into the

Napo, and altogether, in the course of two years and a half, travelled more than 1000 miles, and acquired a better acquaintance with the savage nations in the vicinity of the Amazon than any man of that time. In 1608 he returned to the Cofanes. He then prepared a Grammar of the language of the Cofanes, and translated for them the Catechism. He next undertook a journey to Quito, to induce the authorities to establish new missions. His petition having been granted, he again returned to the Cofanes, when his earnest sermons against polygamy cost him his life in 1611, one of the chiefs whom he had compelled to give up his concubines precipitating him from a steep rock.—Hoefer, Nouv. Dic. Géner. xvii, 555.

Ferrer or Ferrer, Vincentius (St.), a Dominican monk, was born in Valencia Jan. 23, 1857. He entered the order in 1874, and in 1880 he went to the University of Barcelona, where he spent two years. In 1894 he was made doctor at Lerida. In 1895 he was called to Avignon by pope Benedict XIII as master of the palace, and here he conceived the idea of devoting his life to the healing of the schism in the popacy which then threatened the destruction of the Roman Church. He carried out this ideal by declaring for Martin V, and by striving for a reunion in many writings, and by vast labors and travels in Spain, France, Italy, and the British Islands. He died at Vannes, in Brittany, April 5, 1419, and was canonized by pope Calixtus IV. His writings are said to be poor in thought and language.—Monheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xv, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 75: Butler, Lives of the Saints, April 5.

Ferret, evidently a conjectural rendering for ama-kaθ (ʾāmāqāth, a sighing; Sept. μυαλία, Vulg. mugdā), one of the unclean creeping things mentioned in Lev. xi, 30. The Rabbinical writers seem to have identified this animal with the hedgehog (see Levysohn, Zool. des Talmud, § 129, 184). The Sept. and Vulg. refer to an animal which, according to Aristotle (Hist. Anim. viii, 24), is the Mus araneus, or shrew-mouse; but the associated names render it more probable that the animal referred to in Leviticus was a reptile of the lizard tribe (so Bochart and Gesenius), deriving its name from the mournful cry, or wail, which some lizards utter, especially those of the Gecko family. The Lacerta gecko (otherwise called "fan-foot" lizard; Gecko labialis, the Podarcis of Hassequin) is perhaps the animal intended. "The geckos are small lizards, usually somewhat clumsy in form, stealthy and cat-like in their actions, secreting themselves in holes and crevices by day, and at night in pursuit of insects. The form of the eye indicates their season of activity, for the pupil, which is capable of great expansion and contraction, closes to a vertical line. The animals crawl with ease and confidence on perpendicular walls, and even on the under side of ceilings, beams, and the like, provided they have a somewhat roughened surface. Thus curious power, the rapidity with which they disappear in some crevice when alarmed, and their sombre and lu-
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rid hues, their association with night, their loud and harsh croak, their slow and stealthy pace, and especially a certain sinister expression of countenance, produced by the large globular eye, unprotected by an eyelid and divided by its linear pupill, have combined to give to these reptiles in all countries a popular reprobation for malignity and venom, and they are generally much dreaded. This reputation, however, appears to be wholly groundless; and the story told by Hasselquœt of a man who would lay hold of the reptile, and whose hand instantly became covered with red pustules, inflamed and itching, must be received with suspicion. Still more incredible is another account by the same naturalist, to the effect that he saw at Cairo two women and a girl at the point of death from having eaten some cheese over which a gecko had crawled! The most interesting point in the economy of these curious lizards is the structure of their feet, by which they are enabled to defy the laws of gravity. The feet are nearly equal, short, stout, and terminated by five toes, differing little in length, which radiate as if from a centre, so as to form two thirds of a circle. The under surface of the toes is, in most of the genera, much widened, and furnished with small plates or lamellæ, overlapping each other in a regular manner, which varies in different genera and species. The toes are frequently united by a membrae at their base. The claws are pointed, hooked, and kept constantly sharp by an apparatus, so they are capable of retraction, like those of the cat. It is by means of the singular lamellated structure of the under surface of the toes that these reptiles, or at least many of them, are enabled to cling to vertical or even inverted surfaces, as house-dies do. The mode in which this is effected we do not thoroughly understand; but we may conjecture that it is by the raising of these imbricated plates by muscular action, so as to form a vacuum beneath the sole, when the pressure of the external air causes the toe to adhere firmly to the surface. The similarity of the structure to that of the corneal sucker in the remora suggests this explanation. A familiar illustration of the principle is seen in the leathern suckers which child'en make, which adhere so firmly that large stones are lifted by them. See LIZARD.

FERRIER, JEAN HENRI, a French Protestant minister, was born about 1560, became professor of theology at Nimes, and is remarkable for having become a Papist, even after having maintained in a public dispute in 1619 that "pope Clement the VIIth was properly the Antichrist." The Parliament of Toulouse having ordered his arrest, if became necessary for Henry IV to intervene to save him from the results of his temerity. In gratitude for this, Ferrer favored the restrictive measures adopted by the court against the Protestants. For this he was suspected by his Protestant friends, and was forbidden to preach by the Synod of Privas in 1612. He did not, however, change his religion till a popular tumult arose against him, in which his house was plundered, and himself so near being murdered, that, for the sake of escaping, he was obliged to lie three days concealed in a tomb. He then became a Roman Catholic, and removed to Paris, where he was subsequently made counsellor of state by Louis XII. He died Sept. 28, 1626. He wrote a treatise, De l'antichrist et de ses marques, contre les ennemis de l'Eglise catholique (Paris, 1615.—Hoëffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xvii, 560; Bayle, Dictionary (London, 1786), iii, 89.

Ferry, Paul, a French Protestant divine, was born at Metz Feb. 24, 1591, and was educated at the Seminary of Strassburg. He became pastor at Metz in 1612, and held that position during sixty years. He was one of the most eloquent men in the province, and by his powers of mind, his activity, and his prudence, he gained the esteem of the most influential men of his time, and early obtained great influence over Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. As Bishop of Metz, he was troubled by the divisions which existed among the Protestants, and hoping to do something towards removing them, he held a correspondence on the subject with Dureius [see DURY], the great "pacificator." Dury even came to Metz in 1662 to discuss the subject. Nothing substantial came of it; but Ferry carried his love of conciliation so far that he even regarded as possible the reunion of Protestants and Romanists; at all events, it is certain that he had on this subject a long correspondence with Bossuet. It occurred to Ferry that he had published a Calchismes général de la Réformation, in which he showed that the Reformation was a necessary reaction against the corruption of the Church. Bossuet, at that time canon and archdeacon of Metz, wrote a refutation of this little work. The discussion led to a mutual esteem between the disputants; and when, in 1657, the project of the reunion of Protestants and Roman Catholics was considered by the government, Ferry was consulted, and entered into correspondence with Bossuet on the subject. This correspondence is printed in vol. xxiv of the Œuvres de Bossuet (edition of Versailles), and it has been proved almost beyond doubt that Ferry was one of the ministers gained over by the cardinal Richelieu to agitate in favor of the reunion of the two religions, and that he received a pension of five hundred crowns for so doing. The receipt of Ferry for this sum is said to be shown in the Imperial Library of Paris. Ferry died at Metz July 28, 1669. He left a large number of writings, most of which remain in MS. Those which are published are, besides a volume of poetry, Scholasticæ orthodori Specimen, hoc est Bulatia nostre methodos omnium, ex ipsa Scholasticæ corum veterum et recentiorum insignia juritur (Geneva, 1616, 8vo.; 2d ed. Leyden, 1684, 8vo.);—Le dernier Discours de la Tradition contre l'écriture (Sedan, 1618, 8vo.);—Réflexions sur les Colommes semées nouvellement contre certain endroit de l'œuvre du dernier Discours de la Trad. de la Tradition (Sedan, 1624, 8vo.);—Des marqueaux d'histoire sur le "Discours de la vie et de la mort de St. Sever," publiés par le Sieur de Ramberviller (1624, 8vo.);—L'indiscuòse pro Scholasticœ ordolare, lonicæ Leon., Perninsum, Jesuit., in quibus agitur de praedestinatione et memoria, de gratia et libero arbitrio, de causis peccati et justificatione (Leyden, 1630, 8vo.);—Quatre Sermons prononcés en divers lieux et sur divers sujets (La Ferté-au-Col, 1646, 12mo.);—Lettre aux ministres de Genève, vol. ii of the Bibliothèque Anglica. —Hoëffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xvii, 663; Bayle, Dictionary (London, 1786), iii, 88; Haag, La France Protestant, 2 vol. 8vo., vol. i; London Rev. July, 1856, p. 409 sq.

Ferry, Paul. See FERRY.

Ferry-boat (77722, abordage, passage; Sept. 2d, 1804), a vessel for crossing a stream (2 Sam. xix, 18). The Syriac and Vulg. refer this word to the men mentioned in the above text, and accordingly Boothroyd renders the passage, "And these went over Jordan before the king, and performed the service of bringing over the king's household," which, as some of the Rabbins understand, was accomplished by carry-
ing over on their backs the women and children who could not conveniently ford the river. This, however, is not in accordance with the construction of the original (which, moreover, has the article emphatically), and a ferry-boat crossed. Some suppose (see Josephus, Ant. vii, 11, 2) that there was a bridge of boats employed on this occasion, and others that a ferry-boat of some kind was used for this purpose (see Kitto, Pact. Bib., note in loc.). It is probable that a raft, or boat, was constructed: if not, some kind of boat, for the use of these must have been known to the Hebrews, as we find vessels apparently of this description delineated among the paintings of ships on the Egyptian monuments. Floats of various kinds, buoyed up by inflated bladders, calabashes, wicker-work, and even earthen or metallic vessels, have been used from the earliest ages on the Nile (Isa. xviii, 2) and Tigris, for transporting passengers or goods; and modern travellers frequently allude to similar modes of conveyance at the present day among the Arabs. See Boat. Similar scenes are depicted upon the Assyrian monuments (Layard's Nineveh, i, 576). See Boat.

Ancient Assyrian Ferry-boat for Funerals.

**FEUS, JOHANNES** (originally Wilt), a Franciscan monk and cathedral preacher at Mentz, lived in the 16th century. He published a large number of sermons and Biblical commentaries. Of the latter several were put on the Roman Index. Ferus clings to the literal meaning of the Scriptures, and avoids allegorical interpretations. He recommends the reading of the Scriptures, and refutes the objection that the Scriptures are obscure. He complains of the prevalence of a Pharisaic spirit in the Roman Catholic Church, since there was in it a great deal of outward ceremonial, but little truth. He preached that repentance does not consist in outward works, such as fasting, praying, and giving alms, but that it begins, on the one hand, with the announcement of the divine law; the conscience, and of one's sinfulness, and the fear of the judgment of God, and, on the other hand, with the announcement of the grace of God, and with confidence in the divine promise. Ferus thought that popes, emperors, councils, and the diets could do nothing so long as the Church was full of errors and her doctrines corrupt. He died in 1554.—Herzog, Real-Encyclop., xvi, 141.

**Fesch, Joseph**, a French cardinal, was born in Ajaccio, Corsica, Jan. 3, 1763. His father's second wife was the mother of Jules Bonaparte. He studied at the College of Aix, in Provence, entered the Church, and was archdeacon and provost of the chapter of Ajaccio when the revolution broke out. The Bonaparte family being exiled from Corsica in 1793 for their opposition to Pius VI, Fesch followed them to Toulon, where his circumstances compelled him to enter the commissariat of the army. In 1795 he was appointed to the commissariat of the Army of Italy, just placed under the command of his nephew, Napoleon Bonaparte. After the 18th Brumaire he resumed his ecclesiastical functions, and was actively engaged in the negotiations concerning the Concordat of July 15, 1801. Napoleon made him archbishop of Lyons, and Fesch took possession of that see Aug. 10, 1802. Six months later he was created cardinal of St. Laurent in Lucina. In 1804 he was appointed ambassador to Rome, and was accompanied in this mission by Châteaubriand, who thus began his diplomatic career. He subsequently decided Pius VII to come to Paris to crown the emperor. Napoleon appointed him high almoner, commander of the Legion of Honor, and senator. Fesch paid great attention to the interests of his diocese, and established a high theological school. During the difficulties between Napoleon and the pope he showed much consideration for the latter, declining in 1809 the archbishopric of Paris, which was offered him by the emperor, and even rejecting the petition of the council of the clergy in 1810, and at least administering the diocese. In 1811 Napoleon called a council to settle his difficulties with Pius VII, and appointed Fesch its president, in which capacity he seemed not to have acted according to the views of the emperor, for he was sent back to his diocese. A letter of his addressed to the pope, then at Fontainebleau, caused him to be deprived of his stipend. He introduced into France the order of the "Brethren of the Christian Schools," founded at Lyons a college of home missions, and was instrumental in procuring the recall of the Jesuits. When Napoleon I was sent to Elba, Fesch went with him to Rome, where he was well received by Pius VII. During the "hundred days" he returned to France and into his archbishopric. After the battle of Waterloo he returned to Paris and became tutor to prince Carolaht's sons. In 1791 Fessler became a Protestant. After remaining a long time in Berlin he went to Russia, and became professor of Oriental languages and hermeneutics in the University of Lemberg. He afterwards joined the freemasons, and withdrew from the Capuchins. In 1787 the representation of a tragedy of his, entitled Sidney, which was denounced as impious, obliged him to retire to St. Pölten, where he became tutor to prince Carolaht's sons. In 1791 Fessler became a Protestant. After remaining a long time in Berlin he went to Russia, and became professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of St. Alexander Newuki, but was afterwards accused of atheism, and lost his situation. After being for a while a member of the Legislative Assembly, he went in 1817 to Sarepta, the head-quarters of the Moravians in Russia. In 1820 he became superintendent of the evangelical community at Saratof, and in 1835 general superin-
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tendant of the Lutheran congregation at Petersburg, where he died Dec. 15, 1889. His principal works are,
Marc-Auré, a historical novel (Bresl. 1790-92, 8 vols.):—Mathias Corvinus (Breslau, 1739):—Arístides u. The-
isteke (Berlin, 1792 and 1818, 3d ed.)—Attilla (Bres-
lau, 1734);—Geach. d. Ungarn, etc. (Lpz. 1812-20):—
Rübbelke a. meine 70 jährliche Würdekraft (Breslau, 1817):—August von Wagner, Annalen, etc. (Potsdam, 1840-43).

Festival (properly 27, chag, iopri, “feast”), Reli-
igious, of the Israelites (compare Lev. xxiii). These were occasions of public religious observances, recurr-
ing at certain set and somewhat distant intervals. In a certain sense, indeed, each day was such an
occasion, for at the daily service two lambs of the first year were to be offered at the door of the taber-
nacle; one in the morning, the other in the evening, a continual burnt-offering. With each lamb was to
be offered one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with one
fourth of a hin of fresh oil, for a meat-offering, and one fourth of a hin of wine for a drink-offering.
Frankincense was to be placed on the meat-offering, a
handful of frankincense, was burnt, and the remainder was to be eaten by the priest in the holy place, without leaven. The priests were
to offer daily the tenth of an ephah of fine flour, half
in the morning and half in the evening, for themselves.
The high-priest was to dress the lamps in the tabernacle every morning, and light them every evening
and at the same time burn incense on the altar of incense. The people provided oil for the lamps which were to burn from evening to morning: the ashes were removed by a priest, dressed in his linen
robe and his linen drawers, and then carried by him out of the camp in his common dress. Great
stress was laid on the regular observance of these require-
ments (Num. xxviii, 1-8; Exod. xxx, 38-42; Lev. vi, 8-23; Exod. xx, 7-9; xxx, 20; Lev. xxiv, 1-4; Num. viii, 2). See DAILY SACRIFICE.

Fiest — A Scotch word, chiefly used in Scotland and a yearly festival, as will presently appear. At the New-
moon festival, in the beginning of the month, in addi-
tion to the daily sacrifice, two heifers, one ram, and
seven lambs of the first year were to be offered as
burnt-offerings, with three tenths of an ephah of flour,
mixed oil; one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for the ram; and one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for every lamb; and a drink-offering of half a hin of wine for a heifer, one third of a hin for the ram, and one fourth of a hin for every lamb. All kinds of the goats was also burnt and incense on a sacrifice (Num. x, 10;
xxvii, 11-15). See New Moon.

I. Pre-exilian Festivals.—The religious times or-
dained in the law fall under three heads: 1. Those formally
connected with the institution of the Sabbath.
These were the following:
(1.) The weekly Sabbath itself,—On this day two
lambs of the first year, without blemish, were to be
offered for a burnt-offering, morning and evening, with
two tenths of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for
a meat-offering, and one half of a hin of wine for a
drink-offering. Thus doubling the offerings of the ordinary
days. Twelve cakes of fine flour were to be placed
every Sabbath upon the table in the tabernacle, in two
plies, and pure frankincense laid on the uppermost of
each pile. These were to be furnished by the people:
two were offered to Jehovah, the rest were eaten by the
 priest (Exod. xxv, 1-2; Lev. xxv, 1; Num. xvi, 15-17; Exod.
xxiii, 1; xxvii; Exod. xix, 30-30; xx, 8-11; xxiii, 12; Deut. v, 12-15; Lev. xxiii, 8; xxv, 5-9; Num.
15, 35; xxviii, 9). See SABBATH.
(2.) The seventh New Moon, or Feast of Trumpets.—
The first day of the seventh month was to be a Sab-
 bath holy convocation; a day of blown trumpets. In addition to the daily and monthly sacrifices, one ram and seven lambs were to be offered
as burnt-offerings, with their respective meat-offer-
ings, as at the usual new-moon festival (Num. xxviii,
11-15; xxix, 1-6; Lev. xxiii, 23-26). See TRUMPETS, Feast of.
The other septenary festivals were: (3.) The Sab-
batical Year (q.v.), and (4.) The Year of Jubilee (q.v.).
2. The great feasts (Zehir, set times); in the Tal-
 mud, zimmur, pilgrimage feasts) are: the Passover; the feast of Pentecost, of Weeks, of Wheat-harvest, or of the First-fruits of the feast of Tabernacles, or of In-
gathering. In the arrangement of these festivals like-
wise a sabbatic order remarkably prevails (compare Middrash Rabba on Lev. xxiii, 24), and serves to furn-
ish a strong proof that the whole system of the festi-
vals of the Jewish law was the product of one mind. Pentecost occurs seven weeks after the Passover; Passover and the feast of Tabernacles last seven days each; the days of Holy Convocation are seven in the
year—two at the Passover, one at Pentecost, one at the feast of Trumpets, one on the Day of Atonement, and two at the feast of Tabernacles; the feast of Tab-
ernacles is celebrated on the first day of the seventh month of the sacred year; and, lastly, the cy-
cle of annual feasts occupies seven months, from Nisan to Tier. See SEVEN.
On each of these occasions every male Israelite was commanded “to appear before the Lord,” that is, to
attend on the celebration of the tabernacle, and to
make his offering with a joyful heart (Deut. xxvii,
7; Neh. viii, 9-12; comp. Josephus, Ant. xi, 5, 5).
The attendance of women was voluntary, but the
zealous often went up to the Passover. Thus Mary
attended it (Luke ii, 41), and Hannah (1 Sam. i, 7; 11,
19). As might be supposed, there was a stricter obli-
gation regarding the Passover than the other fests,
and hence there was an express provision to en-
able those who, by unavoidable circumstances or legal
impediment, had been prevented from attending at
the proper time to make their offering in the same, or
in the succeeding month (Num. ix, 10-11); none were
to come empty-handed, but every one was to give ac-
cording as Jehovah had blessed him; and there before
Jehovah was every one to rejoice with his family, the
Leviite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow
(Exod. xxv, 14-16; Exod. xxiii, 12; Deut. xvi, 11, 12).
On all the days of Holy Convocation there was to be
an entire suspension of ordinary labor of all kinds
(Exod. xii, 15; Lev. xvi, 29; xxiii, 21, 24, 25, 30).
But on the intervening days of the longer festivals
work might be carried on. The law always speaks of the days of Holy Convocation as Sabbath; and in Mishna there is a distinction, and states in detail what acts may be performed on the former, which are un-
lawful on the Sabbath, in the treatise Tosf. while in
Mishna it lays down strange and burdensome
conditions in reference to the intermediate days. See
CONVOCATION, HOLY.

Brown has spoken (Antiquities of the Jews, i, 522) of
the defenceless state in which the country lay when all
the males were gathered together at Jerusalem.
What was to prevent an enemy from devastating the
land, and slaying women and children? He refers
the protection of the country to the express interpre-
tation of God, citing "the promise," as found in Exod.
xxiv, 23, 24. He adds, "During the whole period
between Moses and Christ we never read of an enemy
invading the land at the time of the three festivals.
The first of the seven-day feasts at which the Israel-
ites were to have withdrawn from themselves the divine
protection by imbruing their hands in the Saviour's
blood, when Cestius, the Roman general, slew fifty of
the people of Lydda, while all the rest had gone up to
the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 66" (Josephus, War, ii, 10, 19). The objection, however, to the above
historical statement is founded on the assumption that the law was
strictly, uniformly, and lastingly obeyed. But the re-
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quirement that all males should appear three times a year before Jehovah is not without some practical dif-

ficulty. During the sojourn in the wilderness its ob-
servation would not only be easy, but highly useful in

preventing the dispersion of individuals or numbers

from the main body—an influence the more necessary

because many, more or less, were away from their

time to time in search of pasture. In subsequent and

more settled times it must have been a serious incon-

venience for all the males of the nation to leave their

families unprotected and their business neglected for

so many days. This, as well as the duty of making the

journey to and from Jerusalem. It is true that the sea-

sons of the festivals were well fixed and distributed

for the convenience of an agricultural people. Yet

to have to visit Jerusalem thrice in seven months was

a serious thing, especially in later times, when Israel-

ites to say the least, found food so hard. E., in his days, as

was, as many think [see Assessment], a small con-

sideration, yet the interruption to domestic life and the

pursuits of business must have been very great; nor

would it be an exaggeration to say that the observance

was an impossibility to the Jews, for instance, when

visiting Rome, Venice, Italy, Mantua, Turin, Genoa, Mi-

nor, etc. How far the law was rigorously enforced or

strictly obeyed at any time after the settlement in

Palestine, it would not be easy to say. Palfrey [Lec-

tures on the Jewish Script. I, 199] supposes that "a man

who neglected to observe this festival at the Pentecost

who appeared before the Lord (not in person, but) with

his offering, sent by the hand of a friend, as a suitor is

said in our common speech to appear in a court of jus-

tice when he is represented there by his attorney;"—

a conceit which, to our mind, savors too much of modern

ideas and usages. That some relaxation took place,

at least in the latter days, "appears from John vii.

8, in which more or less of what is voluntary is

obviously connected in the mind and practice of our

Lord with "the feast," though it must be allowed that

the passage is an evidence of the general observance,

not of an absolute law. The virtual permission is given

to this significance, in the names by which Pentecost

and Tabernacles are often called, and also by the offer-

ing of "the first-fruits of wheat-harvest" at Pentecost

(Exod. xxxiv, 22), and of "the first of the first-fruits

of the new wine" at the Pentecost (Exod. xxiii, 19). It

even suggests that the origin of the feasts was patri-

archal (Ewald, Alterthumes, p. 386), and that the his-

torical associations with which Moses endowed them

were grafted upon their primitive meaning. It is per-

haps, however, a difficulty in the way of this view that

we should take stock for the institution of agricul-

tural festivals among an agricultural than a pastoral

people, such as the Israelites and their ancestors were

before the settlement in the land of promise. The

times of the festivals were evidently ordained in wis-

dom, so as to interfere as little as possible with the in-

dustry of the people. The Passover was held just be-

fore the work of harvest commenced, Pentecost at the

conclusion of the corn-harvest and before the vintage,

the feast of Tabernacles after all the fruits of the

ground were gathered in. In winter, when travelling

was difficult, there were no festivals. See Sasanus.

1. The first of these three great festivals, that of

Unleavened Bread, called also the Passover, was held

in the month Abib, in commemoration of the rescue

of the Israelites by Jehovah out of Egypt, which took

place in that month. The ceremonies that were con-

nected with it were most exactly described in the Bible

and could be detailed. Every one who was ritually

clean, not on a journey, and yet omitted to keep the

Passover, was to be cut off from the people. Any one

who was disabled for the observance, either by uncleanness

or being on a journey, was to keep the Passover on

the fourteenth day of the next month. In order to make

the season more remarkable, it was ordained that

henceforward the month in which it took place should

be reckoned the first of the national religious year

(Exod. xii, 2). From this time, accordingly, the year

began in the month Abib, the Nisan (March), while the

civil year continued to be reckoned from Tisri (Septem-

ber—October) (Exod. xii, 3, 14, 27, 43—49; Lev. xxiii, 5; Num. xxviii, 16; Deut. xvi, 1—7).

The Passover lasted one week, including two Sabbath

(Du Wette, Archäologie, p. 214). The first day and the last were to be separate Sabbath days, the former in the

public temple, and to rest from all labor (Exod. xii, 16; Lev. xxiii, 6; Num. xxviii, 18; Deut. xvi, 8). The modern Jews observe the 15th and 16th, and the 20th and 21st days of Nisan, as holy days in

connection with this festival. See Nisan.

On the night of the 14th of the month Abib, on the feast of Passo-

ver, a sheaf of the first-fruits of the barley harvest

was to be brought to the priest to be waved before Je-
The feast of Pentecost or of Weeks was kept to celebrate the descent of the Holy Spirit. It was celebrated on the day after the feast of Unleavened Bread, on which the sheaf was presented. The festival lasted but one day. The Jews of the present day, however, hold it during two successive days. It is said to have been designated to commemorate the giving of the law on Mount Sinai (Deut. xvi. 9-11; Lev. xii. 15-21; Num. xxvii. 28-31; xv. 17-21). See PENTECOST.

(8.) The feast of Ingathering or of Tabernacles began on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, and continued eight days, the first and last being Sabbaths. During the feast all native Israelites dwelt in booths made of the twigs of herbs, branches, leaves, and branches of thick-leaved trees, and of the willows of the brook, when they rejoiced with their families, with the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, before Jehovah. Various offerings were made. At the end of every seven years, in the year of release, at the feast of Tabernacles, the people presented to Jehovah offerings of every kind, by the priests in the hearing of all the Israelites (Deut. xvii. 15-18; xxxi. 10-13; Lev. xxvii. 38-42; xxxix. 12-30; 40). The feast of Tabernacles was appointed partly to be an occasion of annual thanksgiving after the ingathering of the harvest (Exod. xxv. 1-17); Lev. xxiii. 38, 39; Deut. xvii. 18), and partly to remind the Israelites that their fathers had lived in tents in the wilderness (Lev. xxxi. 40-45). This feast took place in the end of the year, September or October. The modern Jews observe it for seven successive days, the first two and the last two of which are kept as holy convocation (Deut. xxvi. 1-11; xvii. 11). See FEAST OF.

(4.) The festival of New Year's Day (Rosh ha-ba'ash-Sha-a'dah in the Talmud) is held by modern Jews for two days at the beginning of Tisri. See TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.

The twentieth day of the seventh month was the Day of Atonement—a day of absolution and a day of holy convocation, in which all were to afflict themselves. Special offerings were made (Lev. xxiii. 26-32; xvi. 1-34; Num. xxix. 7-11; Exod. xxx. 10). See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

11. Additional Post-aestival Festivals. — 1. The term "the feast of Booths" (iyprü, K̄orókôô) is applied by Philo (Op. v. 51) to the offering of the first-fruits described in Deut. xxvi. 1-11, and occurring on the 16th of the first month (Nisan). See First-fruits.

2. The Festival of Acre, which was instituted by Simon Macceabaeus, B.C. 141, to be celebrated on the 28th of the second month (Heshvan), in commemoration of the capture and purifying of Acre (q. v.), and the expulsion of the Hellenists from Jerusalem (1 Macc. xiii. 50-52). See MACCABEES.

3. The Festival of Wood-carrying, as it was called (iyprü râv hêlôpôrôn), is mentioned by Josephus (War, ii. 17. 6) and the Mishna (Tâbûnî, iv. 6). What appears to have been its origin is found in Neh. x. 34. It was celebrated on the 15th (21st) of the fifth month (Ab). See XYLOPHORIA.

4. The Festival of Water-drawing (îmûn hâlôkôô), which was held on the 22d of the seventh month (Tisri), the last day of the feast of Tabernacles (comp. John vii. 37; Mishna, Seder, iv. 9; vi. 1-9; see Philo, De leg. Melchor ex fabro tabeulorum, Altorf, 1744). See SILOAM.

5. The Festival of Dedication was appointed by Judas Maccabeus on occasion of the purification of the Temple and reconstruction of the altar after they had been polluted by Antiochus Epiphanes. The hatred of this monarch towards the Jews had been manifested in various ways: he forbade their children to be circumcised, and he even threatened them by setting up an image of his divinity, carved in the form of an ox, on the altar of incense, the sheen-bread table, and the golden candlestick, with the other vessels and treasures of the Temple, and went to such extremes as to sacrifice a sow upon the altar, and even, as a mark of their submission, to build a heathen altar on the top of that sacred pile, and with broth of swine's flesh to sprinkle the courts and the Temple (1 Macc. i. 2; 2 Macc. v.; Pudeux, sub A.C. 167-8, 170). The new dedication took place on the 25th day of the ninth month, called Kislev, in the year before Christ 170. This would be in December.

The day was chosen as being that on which Antiochus, three years before, had polluted the altar by heathen sacrifices. The joy of the Israelites must have been great on the occasion, and well may they have prolonged the observance of it for eight days. A general festival is implied, for a pian of dedication was held as part of the feast of Lights. Ap. ii. 89).

See DEDICATION, FEAST OF.

6. The Festival of Nicanor, to commemorate the defeat by Judas Maccabeus of the Greeks when the Jews "smote off Nicanor's head and his right hand which he stretched out to proudly," caused the people to rejoice greatly, and they kept that day a day of great gladness; moreover, they ordained to keep yearly this day, being the thirteenth day of Adar—the twelfth month (1 Macc. vii. 47; Josephus, Ant. xii. 10, 5; Tānūh, xii.; Talm. Jerus. Tannîh, ii. 12; Josippon ben-Goration, iii. 292; ed. Breith.). See NIHANOR.

7. The Festival of Purim or of Lots originated in the gratitude of the Jews in escaping the plot of Haman designed for their destruction. It took its name from the lots which were cast before Haman by the astrologers, who knew his hatred against Mordecai and his wish to destroy the Jews, especially the Jews of the Persian nation, and who threw the lots up to whomever it (Ex. 2, 5). The feast was suggested by Esther and Mordecai, and was celebrated on the 13th, 14th, and 15th days of the twelfth month (Adar). The 13th was a fast, being the day on which the Jews were to have been destroyed; and the 14th and 15th were a feast held in commemoration of their deliverance (see 2 Macc. xxv. 36). The fast is called the Fast of Esther, and the feast still holds the name of Purim. Pudeux (Comex) styles it the banchalania of the Jews. See PURIM.

The slaughter of Holophernes by the hand of Judith, the consequent defeat of the Assyrians, and the deliverance of the Jews, were commemorated by the institution of a festival (Judith xiv. xv). See HOLOPHERNES. Some other minor festivals may be found noticed in Brown's Antiquities, i. 586, and in Simon's Dictionnaire de la Bible, art. "Fêtes." See CALENDAR, JEWISH.

Lit. ratur.—Josephus, Ant. ii. ii., xiii. xv.; War, ii, 3, and many other places; Philo, De Spec. et Fest. diebus (Hîrî râv êkÔkôûm, Op. vol. v. p. 21, ed. Tauch.); the Mishna, Tracts respecting the Festivals, or hâlôkôô, especially the Talmudical tract Chagîa (Mishna, ii. 12), vide de trib. festa solemn. c. xxv. et Bartenore comment. (edit. Lapidus, Lips. 1696, 1712); also Hengstenberg, i. 32, 33, 102, ed. comp. of His. Christiani, ii. 170). Otto, Lex Rhod. p. 288; Johnston, De festis Hebreeor. et Graecor. (Vratial. 1660; Jen.
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1670); Mayor, De tempore. et festa d»c. Hebravor. (Amst. 1724); also in Ugelini Theaur. i); Creder, Joel, p. 218 sq.; Baur, in the Thlhub. Zeit. 1889, ii, 125 sq.; George, Die alle jud. Festes (Berlin, 1885); Fauoirban, Typology, ii, 405 sq.; Meusel, Bibl. histr. 1, ii, 166 sq.; Cuf, L'histoire des fetes, etc. (Zur. 1859); Priem, De festae. Hebravor. (Bamb. 1765); Seligmann, Dis jud. Ceremonieli bei Festen (Hamburg, 1729); Spencer, De Legibus Hebravorum Ritusculi et erum rationibus (Cantabrigiae, 1777); Bahr, Symbolik der Mosaarchen Cultus (Heidelberg, 1889), ii, 526 sq.; Ewald, Die Volker der Antike (Gottingen, 1854). p. 579 sq.; De Pericul. Hebravorum origine ac rationibus (Gottingen, 1841); Creuzer, Symboli, ii, 597; Saalehuts, Archiologie der Hebrer (Konigb. 1856). p. 207 sq.; Hersfeld, Geschichte des Volker Israel (Nord. 1857), ii, 100 sq.; Jost, Geschichte des Judenl. (Leipzig, 1857), i, 189 sq.; Raphall, Festivals of the Lord (Lond. 1889); Hufeld, De festa Heb. ex legi. Mosaics (Hal. 1865). See SACRIFICE.

Festivals in the Christian Church. See Feasts.

In the Feast of St. John the Baptist (Greek: Πάσχα του Θεού Φιλήτου, the successor of Felix as procurator of Judea (Acts xxiv, 27; Joseph. Ant. xx, 8, 9; War, ii, 14, 1). See Felix. A few weeks after Felix fled to Rome, he heard the story of the persecutions of Herod Agrippa II. and Benjamin his sister. Not finding any thing in the apostle worthy of death or of bonds, and being confirmed in this view by his guests, he would have set him free had it not been that Paul had himself previously (Acts xxiv, 11, 12) appealed to Caesar. In consequence, Felix sent him to Rome. See Paul. Judea was in the same disturbed state during the procuratorship of Felix, which had prevailed through that of his predecessor, Sallust. It seems that Felix, in the presence of Herod Agrippa II. and Benjamin his sister, committed Paul to the care of Felix. After some delay, Felix, on the advice of Herod Agrippa, sent him back to Jerusalem, where he was held in prison by Felix, who was succeeded by Tiberius. The object of the letter of Felix was to oblige the emperor to make a settlement with the Jews, who had rebelled against the procurator at Jerusalem, and to give him the opportunity of showing his ability as a statesman. The letter was sent to the emperor, who received it with satisfaction, and directed the procurator to proceed at once to Jerusalem, and to take the necessary measures for the safety of the Jews. See also CHRONOLOGY.

Josephus (War, ii, 14, 1) that Festus was a just as well as an active magistrate.

Feticism, or Feticism, a term recently introduced to denote the lowest forms of human worship, and which the shapeless stone, the meatiest retable, or object however worthless or contemptible by a vague and mysterious reverence" (Millman). It is derived from Fetic, a term borrowed from the Portuguese fetivo, and used by the negroes of Senegal to denote an institution of witchcraft. It was first brought into use in Europe by De Brosses, in his Du Cult des Dieux Fétiches e Feticism. It is practised in Greenland, Africa, Australia, and Liberia. The fetishes in use in Africa are either natural (as a tiger, serpent, etc.) or artificial (as skins or claws of beasts, stones, etc.). Sometimes a single fetish is made the object of worship, as the g-tiger in Dahomey, the serpent by the Whydahs. The negroes of Benin make a fetish of their own shadows. But, besides these, each individual almost has his own particular fetish or fetiches. Any object may become one by the merest accident; e.g. by having been the subject of a dream. When any one has a fetish supposed to possess extraordinary powers of injuring others, no efforts are spared to get it from the owner. Collectors have paid large prices for fetiches, and a seller on the coast of Guinea saw as many as 20,000 fetiches in the possession of one negro. Sometimes they are purely imaginary, and are fantastic forms, such as are never found in nature, and generally contrived for the purpose of producing fear. At Cape Coast there is a public guardian fetich, supreme in power and dignity. This is a rock which projects into the sea from the bottom of the cliff on which the castle is built. To this rock annual sacrifices are presented, and the responses given through the priests are rewarded by the blindfold devotees.

With regard to the religious relation between the fetiches and their worshippers, we find that, although undoubtedly sinking often to the rank of mere instruments of sorcery in practice, fetiches are yet essentially idols. They receive, every morning and evening, offerings of spices, milk, tobacco, etc., and are always approached with marks of respect and of fear. They are resorted to for protection against lightning, beasts of prey, murder, etc. They also serve to protect property, to attest oaths, and the negroes have even a vague idea that after death they will have to appear before the fetiches, and that the moral hold of the fetich over its worshiper is, after all, very weak; the object of worship is discarded or broken as soon as its efficacy is distrusted.

Substantially, fetichism is a rude form of pantheism. In the root is to be found in the fear generated in the rude nature of the savage by the unknown forces of the universe. —Hertzog, Real-Enzyklop. iv, 305; Scholten, Geschichte der Relig. und Philosophie (Elberfeld, 1866); Lecky, Rationalism, i, 208 sq.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, ii, 127.

Fetter (Lat. sect, bond or chain in general, only in the plur. Job xxx vi, 8, elsewhere "chains." Ps. cxlix, 8; Isa. xiv, 14; Nah. iii, 10; 22, kebl, sing. perhaps the link joining the fetter, Ps. cv, 18; plur. and of iron, calix, 8;
bound with fetters by the Chaldeans and carried to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11; 2 Kings xxv. 7). Mas-
sules of the feet and hands are represented on the As-
Syrian monuments (Layard, Nineer, ii. 376; Kittto, Daily Bible Illustrations, ii. 437). See Chain. One
mode of securing prisoners among the Egyptians, as
depicted on the monuments, was to enclose their hands
in an elongated segment of wood, made of two opposite
segments, nailed together at each end, such as are
used for a similar purpose in Egypt at the present day
(Willkinson, Ancient Egyptians, i. 410, abridgem.)

Feudal System. See FEUDAL.

Feuguières, Guillaume, was born at Rouen. In
his native place he became minister of the Reformed
Church. In 1578, at the recommendation of prince
William the First, he was appointed first professor of
theology in the recently founded University of Lyon.
His influence was of decided advantage to the
new institution, but his connection with it was of short
continuance. In 1579 he resigned his professorship, in
order to accept the pressing invitation of his former
charge to again become their pastor. There he spent
the remainder of his days, and died in 1618 at an ad-
vanced age. He wrote several works in Latin, of
which we deem the following most worthy of mention:
G. Feugueri prophetico et apostolico, i. et toxi divinae
et canonicae scripturae express, in locos communes rerum,
degnatas aut divinas exempla illustratorem, et
phrasis in scripturae familiarium, ordine alphabeticum Au-
gustini Marcelli adversarius (Lond. 1574); reprinted at
Berne in 1601, and at Geneva in 1624. A compendium
of it was published at Geneva in 1618)—Nomum Tur-
amentum Latine, ex versione et cum annotationibus Th.
Brose, praec. loci Additis ex Joachimi Camerarius note-
tiisibus, studio Petri Lodorei Villari, theolog. profess.
Genevese, et nunc postremo G. F. opera (Lond. 1587).
See B. Gladius, Godegeerd Nederland, Deel i, blz. 464
en verv. ; also Soermons, Acad. Regiat. bl. 82; Paquot,
frag. 178. (J. P. W.)

Feuillants (Feuillants, Congregatio beatæ Mariae
Fulennae), a reformed congregation of the Cistercians
(q. v.). Their founder, Jean de la Barrière, of the fam-
ily of the Vicomtes de Turennes, was born at St. Cère
in 1544, and finished his education at the University of
Paris. In 1562, when only 18 years of age, he re-
ceived the Cistercian abbey of Notre Dame de Feuil-
llans in commendam, and three years later took possess-
nion of it. Having received the income of the
abbey for eleven months, he entered the order himself.
His efforts to restore a stricter monastic discipline met
with the unanimous opposition of the officers of the
abbey, and he was even in danger of being assassina-
ted. He was charged at the chapter general held at
Citeaux with introducing innovations, but his defence
made so deep an impression that many of the assem-
bled monks placed themselves under his spiritual guid-
ance, and enabled him to carry through a thorough
reformation in his abbey. La Barrière and his friends
now suffered a great deal of persecution from the old
Cistercians; but their reformation was, in 1586 and
1587, approved by the pope, though they remained sub-
ject, with regard to such points as were not at vari-
ance with their new discipline, to the abbot of Citeaux.
Other abbeys were authorized to adopt the reformation
of St. Julian, and pope Sixtus V gave them the house
of San Vito at Rome, to which, after a time, was ad-
ed the house of St. Pudentians, and somewhat later a
beautiful monastery. In 1588 Henry III gave them a
monastery in Paris. During the civil war La Barrière
remained loyal to Henry III, whose funeral sermon he
preached at Bordeaux, but many members of the or-
der became ardent partisans of the Ligue. One of
them, Bernard de Montgaillard, became celebrated un-
der the name of "The Little Feuillant." By these
partisans of the Ligue, La Barrière was denounced as a
traitor to the interests of the Catholic Church. At a
chapter held in 1592, under the presidency of the Do-
minican monk Alexander De Francis, subsequently
bishop of Forli, he was deposed from his position, for-
bidden to say mass, and required to report himself
once every month to the Inquisition. A revision of
the trial by cardinal Baronius led, however, to the acquit-
tal of La Barrière. Pope Clement VIII fully dissolved
the connection of the new congregation with Citeaux,
placed them under the immediate jurisdiction of the
papal see, and commissioned six of the members with
framing new statutes. These new statutes provided for
the mitigation of some of the rules, the rigor of
which, it was reported, had caused the death of four-
ten members, and they received the sanction of the
Church in 1595. The congregation now spread in
France and Italy, and at its head in France was an ab-
ob elected for three years. As discipline again began
to slacken, pope Urban VIII in 1630 divided the con-
gregation into two—the French, called after Notre
Dame de Feuillants, and the Italians, the members of

which were called reformed Bernardines. At the head
of each was henceforth a general. Subsequently con-
siderable alterations were made in the statutes of each
(of the French in 1634, of the Italian in 1667). Among
the most celebrated members of the two congregations
belong cardinal Bona and Cosmus Boger. Joseph Mo-
ratius wrote their history (Cisterci ci refornmatis seu
Congregatio cisterci-Monasticarum B. M. Fulennae
in Gallia et reformatorum S. Bernardi in Italia
chronologica historia, Tur-
in, 1690).

The first convent of nuns according to the reformed rule of Feu-
illants was organized in 1588 at Montesquieu. It was subse-
sequently transferred to Toulouse. The chapters general held in
1595 and 1598 forbade the establishment of new con-
vents, but in 1602 the wife of king Louis XIII
succeeded in establishing
one in Paris. Ac-
cording to a bull of Cle-
ment VIII of 1606, these
nuns were to receive all
the rules of the congre-
gation of the Feuillants.

It seems that the congregation has become entirely
extinct in consequence of the French Revolution.—
Helyot, Ordres Religieux, ed. Migne, s. v.; Henron-
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Fech, Mischakoros, l. 159; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-
Lehr. iv. 61. (A. S.)

Fevers, the rendering, in the A. V., of the Hebrew יָדָה (Deut. xxvii, 22), and the Greek πυρος (Mat. viii, 14; Mark i, 30; Luke iv, 38; John iv, 52; Acts xxviii, 8). Both the Hebrew and Greek words are derived from the association of burning heat, which is the usual symptom of a febrile attack; the former coming from the verb יָדָה, to burn, the latter from πυρ, fire (comp. Aram. בַּשָּׁה from‎ ו‎שָׁה; Goth. biano, from ballun, to burn; L. fera, and our own fever, from ferre). In Lev. xxvii, 16, the A. V. renders "boiling heat," and in Ex. xii, 20, "burning嵊." The Greek word πυρ seems better, as it is not necessarily the intermittent type of the disease which is thus designated. In all Eastern climates febrile diseases are common, and in Syria and Palestine they are among the commonest and severest infictions under which the inhabitants suffer (Russell’s Aleppo, bk. v, ch. iii). They are especially prevalent in the vicinity of a hyperthermia (Thomson, Land and Book, p. 547). The fever under which Peter’s wife’s mother suffered is called by Luke πυρος πυρος, a great fever, and this has been regarded as having reference to the ancient scientific distribution of fevers into the great and the less (Galen, i. i. 11; fabr., i. 2; cf. Wetstein, in loc.), and as an instance of Luke’s professional exactitude in describing disease. His use of πυρος in the plural in describing the disease under which the father of Publius labored (Acts xxviii, 9) has also been adduced as an instance of the same kind, inasmuch as that disease, as being conjoined with dysentery, not a continuous, but an intermittent fever. To this much importance cannot be attached, though it is probable that Luke, as a physician, would naturally use the technical language of his profession in speaking of disease. In Deut. xxviii, 22, besides יָדָה, two diseases of the same class are mentioned, יָדָה דָשָׁת, a burning (A.V. “inflammation”), and יָדָה עַרְשָׁר, intense parching (A. V. “extreme burning”). The Sept. renders the former of these by πυρος, shivering, and the latter by ἰποθυγάμα, a kind of fever indicated by the Greek writers as the medicine to designate ὀφθαλμος Νατουρα irritamentum, quo sollicitata natura ad obvandas motiones excitatur” (Foeh, Oecon. Hippoc.). The former is probably the ague, a disease of frequent occurrence in the East; and the latter probably dysentery, or some species of inflammatory fever. The Syrian version renders it by TYRaining, which favors the latter suggestion. Rosen- miller inclines to the opinion that it is the catarrhus suffocans, but this is without probability. There is no ground for supposing it to be erysipelas. Fever con-
stantly accompanies the bloody flux or dysentery (Acts xxviii, 8; compare De Mandelo, Travels, ed. 1669, p. 65). Fevers of an inflammatory character are mentioned (Burckhardt, Arab. i. 446) as common at Mecca, and putrid ones at Jeddah. Intermittent fever and dysen-
tery, the latter often fatal, are ordinary Arabian dis-

eases. But though often fatal to strangers, the natives care little, but much dread a relapse. These fevers sometimes occasion most troublesome swellings in the stomach and legs (ii, 290–291). See Disease.

Fow, Ignatius A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was born in Columbia County, Ga., April 1791. About the year 1804 he was sent North to be under the care of his uncle, then resid-
ing in New York, for the benefits of a Northern edu-
cation. He was prepared for college by a Mr. Trapha-
gen, at Bergen, N. J., and afterwards went to Prince-
ton, but, instead of entering the regular college course, he spent his time learning music and French, dancing and fencing. After re-
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Fichte, JOHANN GOTTLIEB, a German philosopher, was born May 19, 1762, at the village of Rem-

New of York, and after prosecuting his studies there a short time he returned to Georgia. He commenced the study of law, but after his marriage, which took place in 1811, he gave up his legal pursuits, and settled down into the life of a planter, from which he was only aroused by an appointment as colonel of a regiment to repair to Saratoga in 1815. At the end of the war he returned to his studies with such intensity as to lose the neglect of his business and the loss of his property. In the year 1823 he removed to Augusta, and engaged in the practice of the law with flattering successes, but in 1824 he was attacked with hemorrhage of the lungs, and from this time the character and prospects of his profession, and never afterwards fully regained his health. At this period of his life a great change in his character took place. Heretofore he had been inclined to one or other of the forms of scepticism, but Fichte’s Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense falling in his way, his scepticism was dissipated, and his heart opened to the influence of Christianity. In 1828 he was admitted on trial in the South Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. “Notwithstanding he was always an invalid from the time he entered the ministry, he performed a great amount of labor, and filled some of the most important places in the gift of his denomination. He was the projector, and for a time the president, of Emory Col-
lege, at Oxford, Ga., and rendered important service to the cause of education and sound morals.” The de-
cree of L. B. was conferred upon Mr. Fichte by the Wesleyan University in 1838. Dr. Few’s last public act was the drawing up of the report on the division of the Methodist Church, which was adopted by the Georgia Conference in 1845. The excitement pro-
duced by this effort was too much for his strength, and, though he partially rallied and lived long enough for the greater part of the year, his debilitated constitution sank at last, and he died in great peace at Athens, Ga., Nov. 21, 1845, and was buried in Oxford, the seat of Emory College. He left a widow, but no children.

—Sprague, Annals, vii, 729.

Fichte, A., a German philosopher, was born May 19, 1762, at the village of Remenau, near Bischofswerda, in Lusatia. The baron Milletz, struck with the promise of the boy, assumed
the charge of his education. At thirteen he was placed in the gymnasium of Schulpforte, and while there he imbibed (from reading Lessing) a spirit of free inquiry which animated his whole intellectual life. At eighteen he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology, and while there he seems to have adopted the philosophy and theology of Spinoza. But this" "spinozism" was generally taken out of him by the next four years. The death of baron Milletz threw him on his own resources, and privation added strength to his character. For a while he was tutor in a family at Zurich, and in 1790 he went to Leipzig, where he suffered greatly from poverty. "I have nothing," he wrote, "nothing." Kröckle, in his "Kritisches Reines Vernunft" (the Criticism of Pure Reason) brought a revolution in his mode of thinking, and freed his mind entirely from the remains of Determinism. "I now heartily believe in the freedom of man, and am well convinced that it is only on this supposition that duty, virtue, and morality is so much as possible. It is now evident to me that the doctrine of the necessity of all human actions is the source of a great part of the immorality of the so-called higher classes" (Letter to Achen, 1790).

In 1791 he went to Warsaw to fill a place as private tutor, but soon threw it up in disgust, and in the spring of 1792 he stopped at Königsberg to visit Kant (June, 1792). Not finding at first a very cordial reception, he wrote, between July 13 and Aug. 18, his "Kröckl's Türkei" (Curriculum Criticism of all possible Revelation), and laid it before Kant, as an introduction of "the Turks". Kant at first received him kindly, and, after some contemplation, gave him a letter to be sent to Paris in 1794. But at last he was driven away, and Kant refused the book. The book appeared in the spring of 1792, and attracted universal attention. It was everywhere ascribed to Kant, who was compelled to name Fichte as the author. In this way the "Kritik" became completely for himself. The work seeks to determine the necessary conditions under which revelation must be given by God to man, and to lay down the criteria by which every professed revelation must be tested. In October, 1792, Fichte was married, and took up his abode with his father-in-law (Hiels) at Zurich, where he spent several months. Here he published a work on the French Revolution (1798, 2 vols.), in which he advocated the modern principle that no political constitution can be unchangeable; and that the best constitution is that which is the most intense in the life of the principle of freedom, and provides a method for its own change and improvement. He was charged with Jacobinism and democracy on account of this work. In 1794 he became professor of philosophy at Jena, as successor of Reinhold. His lectures awakened great enthusiasm among the students; part of them were published under the title "Die Bestimmung des Gelehrten" (transl. by W. Smith, The Vocation of the Scholar, London, 1847, 12mo). In 1795 he published "Wissenschafllehre" (Doctrine of Knowledge), and in 1798 his "Stükenlehrre" (Doctrine of Ethics). The freedom and novelty of the doctrines taught in these lectures, together with the fact that he delivered many of them on Sunday (see below), brought upon him a charge of atheism, which he vigorously repelled in his "Appell gegen die Ablage des Atheismus". Nevertheless, he was compelled to resign his chair in 1799. He went to Berlin and delivered private lectures, which were very popular; and in 1800 he published "Die Bestimmung des Menschen" (transl. by Mrs. Simlett under the title The Destination of Man, London, 1846, 12mo). In 1806 he held the chair of philosophy at Erlangen for a few months. Between 1805 and 1807 he published "Wissenschaftslehre" (transl. by W. Smith, The Characteristics of the present Age, London, 1847, 12mo); and "Anleitung zum seligen Leben, oder die Religiöselehre", the most important of his later writings, as giving what he considered to be the ethical and religious results of his philosophy (translated by W. Smith, The Way towards the blessed Life, or the Doctrine of Religion, London, 1849, 12mo).

Returning to Berlin in 1807, he published "Reden an die Deutsche Nation" (Address to the German People), which awakened great political enthusiasm. On the death of the government, he assumed the control of the philosophical society of Berlin, and during the next two years he was engaged in reorganizing the University of Berlin, and in 1810 he was made rector of the university, which then included among its faculty Schleiermacher, Neander, De Wette, Von Humboldt, and other brilliant names. During the subjection of Germany to Napoleon, much of Fichte's work was burned; but his patriotism was pure, fervent, and self-sacrificing. After the great battles of 1813, the hospitals were filled with wounded men, and his wife was an assiduous and devoted nurse. She was seized with typhoid fever early in 1814, and her husband imbued the infection from her; she recovered, but he died, Jan. 27, 1814. His son, Immanuel Hermann (born in 1797), inherited his father's aptitudes to a certain extent, has edited his works, and has also vindicated him from the charge of atheism and irreligion. Besides the works of J. G. Fichte, there are many others which are mentioned.A. Kröcke (Jena, 1767-9, 2 parts)-Die Thoasen des Bevrauien (Stuttgart, 1817). The following were edited by his son after his death: Nachgelassene Werke (Bon, 1834, 4 vols.)-Religions-philosophische Schriften (Berlin, 1847).-Populärphilosoph. Schriften (Berlin, 1807).-Briefwechsel mit Schelling (Stuttgart, 1866).-J. G. Fichte's Sämtliche Werke (Berlin, 1845 sq. 8 vols.).

We can give only a summary view of the attempts of Fichte to found a complete philosophy. Historically he stands between Kant and Hegel, and forms the connecting link in the process of development. The end which Fichte proposes to himself in his "Wissenschaftslehre" is to give science a true, that is to say, an absolute principle, reposing only upon itself, and leaving a basis to all the rest. Here the idealism of Kant is accepted in all its rigor. There is no longer any a priori supposed objective elements external to the simple phenomenon. All is severally deduced from the subject, the sole term of knowledge admitted by idealism. Fichte's problem is just this: to bring out philosophy whole and entire from the Ego; and this is brought out in bold theatre proposes to give his doctrine a more than mathematical, a metaphysical attitude. Algebra is reduced to the law of identity, which is thus expressed: A = A. Fichte maintains that this law implies another, the only one which a philosopher is entitled to admit without proof, and also the only one which he requires: MnM = Mn. When ab = ac, you intend to say something nothing upon the existence of A. You only affirm that if A is A, A can be nothing else than A. The proposition A = A is therefore, says Fichte, absolute only in its form, and not in its matter or contents. I know not if A exists practically and materially or not; but it matters not. I am formally certain that given A, A cannot differ from A, and that there is necessary relation between these two terms. It is by the analysis of this relation that Fichte undertakes to prove the existence of Ego. In the proposition A = A, he argues, the first A is not considered under the same point of view as the second. The relation A = A is laid down conditionally, the second absolutely. What reduces these two terms to unity, puts them in a certain relation, judges, affirms, and constitutes this relation? Evidently the Ego. Take away the Ego, and the relation A = A is reduced to the letter; the relation A = A, the proposition A = A. Above it, then, there is a higher and more immediate truth. The principle of identity is only absolute in form; the principle MnM = Mn is absolute both in form and matter; it alone is truly absolute. I need not follow Fichte in the course of his deduction, the most subtle and artificial which can be
conceived. It is enough for me to know that he pushed to the utmost the strange idea of deducing a vast sys-
tem of philosophy from this one principle, the Ego. The
Ego alone is the principle, explaining, laying down, creating itself. I know not whether I should wonder more at the excess of extravagance to which
the man was led, for the first time, at the amazing
richness of its resources. By Kant it was condemned
to be ignorant of the universe and of God, locked up
in the prison of the Ego. Let him alone. This one
reserved point will give him back all the rest. From
the furthest limits of skepticism he will even pass
to the place of truth, if he only dare, and be not afraid
he doubted of everything. Now he vaunts, not merely
that he knows Nature, but that he creates her. Nay,
he vaunts that he creates God. Such are the very
expressions, at once absurd and logical, of Fichte.
He draws in the State and God from the Ego. The Ego
implies the Non-Ego. It limits itself. It is only it-
self by opposing to itself another which is not itself.
It poses itself only by opposing its contrary. It is it-
self the link of this opposition, the synthesis of this
anomaly. In fact, if the Ego only exists for itself,
the error is still too great to be in which the method
assumes that, in itself, it is infinite and illimitable. Beyond
the divisible and relative Ego, opposed to the Non-Ego,
there is, therefore, an absolute Ego, comprising nature
and man. This absolute Ego is God. Here, then, is
thought in possession of its three essential objects;
how can it be doubted that he draws in, into this all,
the possession of them, members of one identical thought, with
three terms, at once separated and reconciled; here is a phi-
losophy worthy of the name; a rigorous, demonstra-
ted, homogeneous science, starting from one great
principle to follow out and to exhaust all its conse-
quences.

"Such, in its general principle, is the metaphysics
of Fichte. His morality is a logical, though perhaps
unforeseen consequence of this. It is founded upon
the Ego, whose eminent characteristic is liberty. To
preserve one's own liberty, one's own Ego is due. In
respect to the Ego, the liberty of others, is another not less
sacred duty which becomes the foundation of right.
Hence the noble stoicism of Fichte, and that passion
for liberty, which were in such perfect harmony with
the masculine strength of his character and the gener-
onal enthusiasm of the student body in the political affairs of
Germany. But the importance of the system of
Fichte does not lie here. I find his greatness and
originality in the extraordinary metaphysics so justly
and boldly called by himself subjective absolute ideal-
ism. It has this singular feature, that in pushing the
absoluteness of the Ego to the extreme, he does not give
up the existence of an absolute reality; but the idea of God as a particular substance is
impossible and contradictory. It is proper to say this
candidly to strike down the prating of the schools, so
that the true religion of doing right cheerfully may be
elevated.' Many plous minds, of course, took offence
at these exalted claims. All the same, how can the
name of Fichte be connected with this moral order of the
world, the Christian's faith in God, a faith, too, in 'doing right cheerfully,'
and at the same time in a real God, could by no means
be content with this philosophical theory. 'This faith
would not, however, have been destroyed by this the-
ory, even if no interdiction had been issued against it.
Such an interdiction appeared. The book in which
Fichte advocated the theory of the divine order of the
world was attacked in the electorat of Saxony, and
from this place the attention of the court at Weimar
was called to that anger of Fichte's, and to the
in its enormous frameworks the history of man and
that of nature, and pretends to an unmeasured, un-
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of Christianity, which he regarded in a light entirely different from Kant. Kant and the Rationalists placed the essence of Christianity chiefly in morality and the fulfilment of the moral law, and, in accordance with this, esteemed and used with a special predilection those passages in Scripture in which the various moral precepts are drawn in distinct outlines, as, for instance, the Sermon on the Mount. Thus, the form of Jesus in the first three gospels (while they had no taste for John, who appeared to them a mystic); Fichte, on the other hand, threw himself on the fourth gospel, and regarded it as the only true source of the genuine doctrine of Christianity. Of course, this was a one-sided manner, and with a denial of the other truths of Scripture, which belong fully as much to the totality of Christian doctrine and history as the gospel of John. . . .

The person of Jesus had with him a signification entirely different from that of the Rationalists. He does not behold him in the teacher of morality, nor simply the moral example. No; exactly that oneness with God, as Christ expresses it in the gospel of John, exactly that real unity with the Father which the Rationalists desired to remove as a metaphysical formula of no use to morality, was to him the heart and the soul of Christianity. He saw in the consciousness of this oneness with God, and himself so closely to John and his doctrine of the Logos having become flesh, in which he beheld the fulness of all religious knowledge. We should, however, make a great mistake if from this we concluded that Fichte again identified himself with the of the Logos. He never identified himself with the idea of the Logos. What this doctrine regarded as a historical fact, which had occurred once, that Fichte regarded as a fact eternally repeating itself, as occurring in every religious man. Christ was not the Saviour to him in the old sense; he was only the representative of that which is continuously occurring still. 'The eternal Word becomes flesh at all times, in every one, without exception, who understands, in a living manner, his oneness with God, and who really yields his entire individual life to the divine life in living . . . quite in the same manner as in Christ Jesus.' . . . In the house of the distinguished philosophers, each of whom had without exception, was closed with proper and solemn evening devotions, in which the domestics were also accustomed to take a part. After several verses had been sung from a choral-book, accompanied with the clavicord, the sermon on the text would make some remarks on some passage of the New Testament, most frequently on his favorite gospel of John. In these discourses he was less concerned about moral applications and rules of life than about freeing the mind from the distraction and vanity of the common affairs of life, and elevating the spirit of man. Fichte, not the Logos, but the eternal Word as closing what he calls the period of reflection in philosophy by his theory of absolute subjective idealism; and holds the later form of Fichte's teaching to be Spinozistic, as denying the idea of a self-conscious God distinct from the world (Person of Christ, Edinburgh, transl., div. ii, vol. iii, 85 sq.).

Literature.—Besides the works already mentioned, see J. H. Fichte, J. G. Fichte's Leben (Sulzbach, 1830); J. H. Fichte, Karakteristik d. neuesten Philosophie (Sulzbach, 1841); Erdmann, Entwickelung d. deutschen Speculation seit Kant (v. D. W. Smith, Memoir of J. G. Fichte (London, 1848, 9d ed. 2 vol.); Christ, Göttinger, May, 1841, p. 152 sq; Foreign Quarterly Rev. Oct. 1845; Living Age, vi, 192, xxx, 193; Tennemann, Manuel Hist. Phil. (ed. Bonn), § 400-415; Morell, Mod. Philosopy, ch. v, § 2; Lewes, History of Philosophy (London 1849, 4th ed.); Kugel, Altkorinisch, Grundriss d. philos., Wissenschaften, ii, 11 sq.; Saintes, History of Rationalism, bk. ii, ch. xii; Schwegger, Hist. of Philosophy, transal. by Seeley, § 41; Lassen, J. G. Fichte im Verhältniss zu Kirche und Staat (Berl. 1858); Kahnis, German Protestantism, bk. i, ch. iv; M'Cosh, Introductions (see Index); Mills, J. G. Fichte, Examinier, July, 1866. Fichte's Wissenschaftspflarne has recently been admiral-
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FICINUS, MARIUSIT (Marino Ficino)—the principal restorer of the Platonic philosophy, and the most enthusiastic of its modern advocates—was born at Florence Oct. 19, 1438, and died at his villa of Careggi, in the neighborhood, Oct. 1, 1499. He was the son of the chief physician of the town, and was designed for the same profession; but his youthful intelligence attracted the great Florentine, and induced his selection as the prospective head of the projected Medicean Academy. During the sessions of the Council of Florence, Ficinus, of course, did this in a one-sided manner, and with a denial of the other truths of Scripture, which belong fully as much to the totality of Christian doctrine and history as the gospel of John. . . .
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to and Aristotle, and the evident aim of Ficinus was to impose upon Plato and the Neo-Platonists a significance which might identify, or at least harmonize, their doctrines with the Christian creed. It was a pre-posterous revival of a design fruitfully attempted at Alexandria in the age of Origen and his successors. Paulinus, the Gallican, who was anti-papist in his experiments with Christianity, whether presented as Neo-Platonism, as Spinozism, or as German transcendentalism. But it was a natural effort in that era of confusion and hopeful anticipation which witnessed the Renaissance. Moreover, the doctrines of Ficinus himself are masterfully moulded and modified by the contemporary influence of Christianity; and it is a curious taste to detect the Christian impress which marks so much of his astruse metaphysics, especially in the closing books of the last 6. ed. It is scarcely possible to read the concluding epistle of Ficinus and feel, without the hallucination of Ficinus was an honest as well as an earnest delusion; and that, if he misrepresented both Plato and the Alexandrian school by Christianizing their doctrine, he did not suffer himself to be seduced from a recognition of the personality of the Supreme Being, or into any position consciously at variance with the Christian creed.

Ficinus was liberally maintained throughout his life by his generous patrons of the house of the Medici, retaining their favor for three generations—v. d. p. r. n. d. Plutus. He was equally countenanced by Cosmo, Pietro, and Lorenzo. He had to border in the forty-third year of his age, having, according to some accounts, had his thoughts earnestly directed to religion by the preaching of the celebrated Savonarola. He was placed in charge of two churches in Florence, the church of San Lorenzo, and promoted a canonry in the cathedral by the future pope Leo X. Lorenzo made him a present of the villa of Careggi, where he died, seven years after the death of the donor, and five years after the expulsion of his patrons from Florence. His constitution was always very feeble, his health precarious, his robust frame weakened; his health, his frame affected by the ordinary disease of the time—required constant care and nursing, and it is surprising that he was not worn out by continual study long before reaching his climacteric. His character was singularly pure and amiable; his attainments were strong and enduring; his tastes simple, and his desires moderate. He refused to profit by his powerful connections to enrich either himself or his family. He partook largely of the popular superstitions of the time, which were accordant with the tenets of the Platonism with which he imbued himself; and it is said to have reappeared after death to his friend Michele Mercati, according to promise, to assure him of the immortality of the soul.

The Medicean Academy was extinguished by the invasion of Charles VIII.; but Ficinus had disseminated his influence and renown through the chair of philosophy in the University of Florence, to which he had been appointed by the Cardinal de Medici, afterwards Leo X. Here he acquired many distinguished pupils and friends, among them Giovanni Pico di Mirandola, Cavalonio, Politian, etc. Enthusiasts came from the depths of Germany by a path which he himself had trod. Reuchlin regarded him with reverence, and among other illustrious admirers he numbered Matthias Corvinus, the accomplished king of Hungary, and pope Sixtus IV.

The numerous productions of Ficinus are enumerated by a most correct list given in the Biographie Universelle. A life of him was written by Domenico Mellini, but it was never published, and it disappeared. Another life, composed by Giovanni Corsi in 1506, was published by Bandini (Pisa, 1771). The best account of the philosophy of Ficinus is given by Buonarroti in the De_multiplier Praematuritate; the following authorities may be consulted: Schelhorn, Annaliuaria Lit. tom. i; Niccione, Mem. des Hommes Illustres; Negrii, int. Scritti, Firenze, 16, lib. vi, p. 498; Metzchen, Polyhistor, ii, vii, § 15; Tirobascio, Storia della Lett. Ital. v, ii, lib. ii, c. xi, § xii-xxi; Brucker, Hist. Cril. Phil., phil. iii, pt. i, lib. i, c. ii, § iii; Roscoe, Life of Lorenzo de Medici; Hallam, Hist. Lit., ch. iii, §§ 85-115. (G. F. P.)

Fiddes, Richard, a clergyman of the Church of England, and author of several works marked by industry and research rather than talent, was born at Hunmanby, Yorkshire, in 1671. He took his bachelor's degree at University College, Oxford, in 1693. He was made rector of Halsford in 1694, but, losing his health, he withdrew to himself to authorship. Among his works are, A Book of Divinity (London, 1745, 8 vols.; fol.)—Fifty-two practical Discourses (London, 1714, 8 vols. 8vo)—Life of Cardinal Wodey (London, 1724, 4 vols.; fol.).—General Treatise on Morality (London, 1724, 4 vols.). He died at Putney in 1725. Knight, in his Life of Erasmus (Intro., p. 15 sq.), accuses Fidewis of being at heart a Romanist. Knight accounts for Fidwis's speaking irrevocably of Erasmus as probably because he had by his writings favored the Reformations. Dr. Fiddes censures the Reformation; and, to give it the more home stroke, goes to the very root of it, and does all he can to evince the unjustness of it. If it proceeded upon, ridicules the instruments of it, and would insinuate that there was a change made for the worse, and therefore palliates some of the most absurd doctrines of the Church of Rome, which were happily thrown off at the Reformation. He afterwards goes further, ascertaining, among other particulars, that Fidwis had "most partially, and indeed scandalously, reflected upon the opening of the Reformation, laying on the grossest colors to hide the deformities of heresy." He then proceeds "to give the true rise and occasion of writing of her"—which he declares to have been at the solicitation of the late bishop of Atterbury, on occasion of the dispute in which he was then engaged with archbishop Wake.—New General Biog. Dict. v, 323.

Fidelis, see Fidelis, st., properly Marcus Roy, was born at Sigmaringen in 1577. He studied law, and in 1604-10 visited the principal cities of Europe, but on his return he quitted his profession, and entered the order of the Capuchins under the name of Fidelis. After studying theology in the convents of Constance and Frasen, he was ordained, and in 1621 obtained charge of Feldkirch, in Vorarlberg, Tyrol. Here he labored with great success, trying to re-establish the sway of the Roman Church among the Grisons. When Austria afterwards attempted to put down Protestantism by force of arms, Fidelis was sent by the papal legate of the Propaganda, and the ruffian general Baldiron, with his dragoons, travelled from town to town exterminating those who refused to obey. But the peasants rose, defeated Baldiron, and only spared his life upon his taking the oath not to bear arms against them any more. The promise was soon broken; but the peasants rose again, and during the insurrection, Fidelis, having fallen into the hands of a party of peasants, was put to death, April 24, 1622. He was canonized by Clement XI.—Hernag. Real-Encyclop. iv, 468.

Fidelium Missa, a Latin Mass composed by the Pope of the Fidelis, under the Arcivesc Diocesano (q. v.), the cardinals were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper with the
faithful (q. v.): they were allowed to join with them in worship only until the offertory. Then the deacon gave each the holy communion in the catechetical church, saying Illo, missa est," Depart, the assembly is dismissed." Hence arose the twofold missa, namely, the missa catechumenorum and the missa fedelem, the former meaning that portion of the public worship which was performed before the distribution of the communion, and the latter that portion which was continued until the communicants went away.—Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. xiii, ch. i, § 8; bk. xv, ch. i, § 1; Farar, Dictionary, s. v. See Mass.

Fief, Feud, Feudalism: Feudal System, which was often related to the peculiar organization of society in Western Europe during the Middle Ages, and specifically to institutions affecting real estate more profoundly than it has ever been affected by any other—institutions whose influence is still manifest in the language, doctrines, and procedure of law throughout Christendom. A fief, food, feud, or fee is an estate—and, primarily, an estate in land—held of a superior on condition of the faithful discharge of prescribed services, chiefly military. Feudalism denotes the essential character of such an estate, as distinct from other such estates, and is frequently employed in a concrete sense to signify the organization itself and its accompaniments. The Feudal System is the name given to this organization, or to that body of institutions, political and social, established upon the military tenure of land, to give the rising kingdoms of modern Europe. In the period of its incipient growth, in its maturity, and in its decline, the feudal system, like all other political arrangements, assumed diverse aspects, and assimilated to itself other coincident tendencies, but its identity may be discerned through all its manifold transformations. Its existence has been distributed by Sir Thomas Craig into four periods: I. From the barbarian invasions of the Roman empire to the reunion of the Frank monarchy under Dagobert I in 688: II. To the restoration of the Western empire in the person of Charlemagne in 800: III. To the accession of the Capetian dynasty in France, and of the Franconian line in Germany: IV. From the commencement of the 11th century to the gradual extinction of the polity at different times and in different degrees, in different countries. This division has not been universally adopted, but it is open to many objections, but it may be of service. The culminating era of feudalism may be assigned to the times of the first crusade, and to the early ages of chivalry which constituted its bloom and expedited its decay.

A description of the principles and phenomena of the feudal system will furnish all necessary information in regard to the other terms included in this title, so far as these illustrate the religious, moral, and social aspect of Europe during the period over which feudalism extends.

Under the feudal system the whole order of society rested directly on the tenure of land by military service. Territorial possessions were granted by the sovereign, or supreme lord, in consideration of prompt and gratuitous service in war, and participation in his deliberative and judicial courts. Lands were held of the prince to whom they were annexed, by lesser barons, by similar obligations. By the like service, lands were held by vassavors, knights, and squires. Even the lowest tenure of all, the peculiarly English tenure of socage, frank and villein, was of an analogous character, and formed the culminating stage of the lord’s domain, and the maintenance of himself, his family, and retainers, in war and peace. The system was strictly military in its nature—a uniform organization from the crown to the lowest landholder, establishing a regularly appointed army in scattered strongholds throughout the land, to ensure the support of the whole body politic in arms for the repression of domestic insurrection and the repulsion of foreign attack.

Though such was the feudal system in its definite constitution, it did not, of course, begin in this closely articulated and rigorous form. It assumes much of this aspect even in the Lombard occupancy of Northern Italy in the 6th century; and its general outline may be imperfectly represented in the organization of the kingdom of Theodoric (Sartorius, lEmples dItalie sous les Goths, v, 61). But it had a simpler commencement, and both expanded and modified itself with the changing necessities of successive generations. It is in its rudimentary types, however, that its essential principles, and its singular relation to urgent social conditions, can best be detected. Inattention to its humbler beginnings has occasioned numerous controversies with regard to its origin, and rendered the information accessible on the subject often perplexed, contradictory, and un instructive.

The vital germ of feudalism is contained in the act of homage—homagium, hominimum, hominomium, hominimium, homininum, etc.—the solemn formula by which a dependent professed himself the man and faithful adherent of a superior, originally of his own selection, or that of his predecessor, and also of the kingdom. The yoke of homage in se constituit feclitatem," Libri Feudorum, ii, vili. The liegeman knelt down, placed his hands between the hands of his intended chief, and took upon himself the obligation of absolute fidelity in certain prescribed relations, so long as his superior performed the corresponding obligations of his liegeman. The yoke of homage was sealed with a kiss, and confirmed with the sanctions of religion (Galbert, Vie de Charles-le-Bon, de Flandres, ch. xii; Guiot, Mm. pour servir, etc., viii, 339-40). The profession of fidelity was ultimately expressed by the following declaration in the presence of the liegeman and chief: "Domine homo vester de tene mento quid de vostra tenere et videm robis portando contra omnes gentes, salva fide debita Domino Regi et hereditibus suis" (Bracton, ii, xxxv, 8; Libb. Feud. ii, x). With this declaration should certainly be compared the statement of Procopius in regard to the ancient usage under the Roman empire (De Bello Vandal. ii, xvii, vol. i, p. 491).

Homage, then, was the pledge of true and loyal service to a superior—liege faith and liege obedience—given in consideration of defence and maintenance, and the promise of certain rights and concessions. (Somme, ingennam," a free man, Leo Socle, xxxii; see Du Cange, Gloss. Med. et Inf. Latini, tit. Ecco, who omits in his classical authorities for the word, Petron. Satyr. iii). One man voluntarily became the man of another, and that other became the chief, leader, adviser, patron, and protector of his liegeman. The very existence of the system, and the long, and long retained, the right of formally renouncing the reciprocal obligations contracted by the process of disfidelatio, or defiance. By carrying this relation of perfect trust and faithful dependence through all gradations of society till it reached the head of the tribe or nation, the whole feudal hierarchy was constructed, and all the members of the associated body were linked together in strict military union and subordination.

The principal object of this close correlation of the constituents of society was to maintain the population and other affairs of his chief. In this way, every man within the feudal circle was professed the faithful follower of some lord—except the chief lord of all—the suzerain; and every piece of land was held in fee of some feudal superior. Hence arose the doctrine that the eminent domain was the whole realm as related to the king, and that all honor, authority, and ownership of
the soil descended from him. Hence, too, the maxim of the English law, nulla terra sine domino—no estate in land without its lord. But these deductions were not drawn by the companions of Ataullip the Visigoth, of Clovis the Frank, or of Alboin the Lombard.
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mately merged into serfdom, it is true, but only by Justinian's edict of 580 (Cod. vii. 8); and the term is plainly metaphorical in Salvian.

Wherever the Teutonic hordes passed the frontiers of the Roman Empire, they found the presence or the memory of the Milites Limitarii, whose constitution, traceable beyond the reign of Augustus, accorded with all the essential characteristics of undeveloped feudalism. These military borderers were, indeed, of kindred blood and race, and when they were supplanted or overlapped by the Teutons, the institutions they retained, which had been designed as a protection against incursion. This was only the observance of the habitual policy of the barbarians in regard to the Roman civilization.

As has been already observed, the feudal scheme, like all other imperial forms, was contracted or extended, weakened or strengthened, according to the changes of fortune and social condition which checked the agitated and anxious periods attending the overthrow of the Western empire. At times it was as much disguised and concealed, as largely reconstituted with Teutonic associations, as was the ever-subexisting Roman jurisprudence during the same ages. But it survived in spirit and in outline, ready always to multiply its ramifications, and to attain such proportions as contemporary necessities might induce. It is thus that the nature, and extent, and perpetuity of the obligation decline, regard during the earlier centuries of its growth, and that its origin is so often referred to the late era when it became predominant and universal as the sole corrective of returning anarchy under the feeble successors of Charlemagne.

It is impossible, within the space at command, to recount and explain the successive transformations of feudalism which culminated in the perfect type of the feudal system in the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries. Its development accompanied and was due to the progressive dissolution and increasing ineptitude of the complex administrative organization of Imperial Rome. A distinction of ages and a contradiction of institutions have been suspected in the succession of the terms munera, beneficia, and feuda; and feudalism has been restricted to the period when the last of these designations prevailed. Munera is supposed to represent estates at will; beneficia, estates for life; and feuda, estates of Inheritance. It has been assumed that feudalism could not properly be said to exist until beneficia became hereditary. But the essence of feudalism does not reside in the duration of the estate, but in the nature, and extent, and perpetuity of the obligation connected with the tenure. Moreover, the contrasted terms may be in some measure concurrent with, but they do not denote, such diversities of duration. Munera is a generic term applied to all honors, dignities, offices, and donations. There was no such clear line of demarcation, in meaning or in time, as Montesquieu and others imagine, between estates for life and estates heritable. Such precision was entirely foreign to the habits and the dispositions of those troubled but practical ages. Life estates were conceded in Germany as late as 1578. The common statement of hereditary feuda is often referred to Hugh Capet, in 947. Montesquieu assigns it to the reign of Charles the Bald, in 877. But such tenures are found under Louis le Debonnaire in 814; and in the form of beneficia they were customary under the Roman empire. Estates in perpetuity are, indeed, as beneficia and feuda have been used as convertible terms throughout the Book of Feuds. "Feudum idem cum beneficio," says Du Cange (s. v., p. 586, col. 1). King Alfonso the Wise, of Castile, declares in Los Siete Partidas: "Feudo es bene-

"Feudo es bene-

"fecho que se da al señor a algunha forma, porque se torna en cuasido, et le dexe homenary de serie real. E tomo este nombre de fe que debe siempre guardar el vasallo al señor." The term feudum is a barbarous, and probably hybrid compound, one term of it representing the first employment in Latin of the name of a constitution of Robert I of France in 1008, though it is found in a constitution, of somewhat doubtful authenticity, of Charles the Fat, in 884. Were there no fees antecedent to the introduction of this name? If there were, then beneficia are fees. If there were not, then feudalism was, of course, already established. The confusion has proceeded from the fantastic derivation of Food, from the supposed Teutonic word Fora, represented by the Anglo-Saxon Fea, Fesc, fee, and the Scandinavian od, odh, property. Unfortunately, feudalism was too real and too partial innovation among both Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavians, while the term Feudum springs up along the Rhine; and the Anglo- Saxon Fesc is congeners to the Latin pecus—pecor- is—if not borrowed from it. The in the Fox, the Spanish and Provençal For, the modern French ess, the Scotch ess, apparently nothing to do with the Latin fide or Italian fide. "Feudum, credo, a fide, quia vox ex Italia in Germaniam venit. Et ante seculum vii seuda in Germania et apud omnes Frumentos beneficia appellabantur" (Leibnitn, Collect. Etymolog. Opp. ed. Dutens, tom. vi. pt. ii., p. 68, 99). "Natura autem imperii est quod frumentum in terris vestris, non ex quaelibet aut quaque bene aut quaque in quaque, sunt, quam a fide sanctum dicatur vel a fide" (Lobb. Feud. ii. iii. 3; compare vii.). This derivation of the term Food is singularly corroborated by the use of the word "trague" in Sir Thomas Malory's Morte d'Ar- tur: "And thus Sir Marhans every day sent unto king and trague into the same trague which was behind ten seven years, or else to find a knight to fight with him for the trague" (pt. ii, ch. iv. Romance of Sir Tristan). It is indubitable that feudal tenures long existed in the midst of Roman fundi and possessions, and of Germanic allotments; it is also unquestionable that these were gradually absorbed or transmuted into feudal tenements, for the conversion of allotment into feudal holdings is illustrated by ample documentary evidence; and it is also certain that this feudalization of the land was not completed till the times when the word Feuda comes into daily use. But this is not to justify the juridical distinctions which have been proposed, nor sanction the alleged derivation of Food, nor sustain the Germanic origin of the tenure. The designation of Feudum may well have been devised as a counterpart to allotum; but the generally received etymology of allotum is very unsatisfactory, and strong arguments may be adduced for referring it to the same source as the common English word lot. This question, however, cannot be examined here. (Compare Kembille, The Saxons in England, bk. i., ch. iv. vol. i. p. 90, 91, with Prosopon, De Bell. Vandal. i. v, in regard to the Kingdom of Gascony.)

In the 10th and 11th centuries the feudal system acquired its widest extension, assumed its full, symmetrical form, and engrossed nearly all the functions of government, judicature, police, war, and industrial organization. It cannot be described within the attenuated framework of the Roman administrative constitution (which, however, coexisted with it), and adapted itself to it by making the king the feudal suzerain of the nation—the emperor, the supreme temporal head of Christendom. Everything accepted and confirmed feudal tenures and feudal established feudal tenure, and but did suffer a sea-change? The process of government, the public revenue, the offices of state, the modes of jurisdiction, the command in war, the ecclesiastical constitution, the municipal arrangements, the guilds and corporations of arts and trades, the feudal system remained, but did suffer a sea-change. Everything rested on homage, fealty, and the military tenure of land, or was assimilated to the forms springing from that basis. As in the Russian empire, all
office or authority is invested with a military charac-
ter and designation, so everything under the feudal
system adopts a feudal type. To this cause we must
attribute the ecclesiastical baronies which arose during
the period, and also the priestly warriors, the fighting
abbes, and the knightly bishops, who inspire such
surprise and disgust during the Middle Ages. The
Roman Church, with the pope at its head, was the
principal instrument for this purpose, but the secular
empire of Germany, and contending for a loftier
supremacy. The ecclesiastical organization became
baronial and feudal throughout all its provinces and
dioceses, as the counterpart and counterpoise of the
feudal kingdom, and the empire, and, in fact, under the
acknowledged but disregarded suzerainty of the holy
Roman empire. No other scheme, no idea inconsis-
tent with the prevailing scheme, could be entertained
among populations saturated with feudalism, and en-
vironed with its universal atmosphere. How thor-
oughly the Church had accepted the general feudal-
sation is shown by an allocution of pope Innocent II
to the Lateran Council, April 20, 1139: "The pontifical
thrones is the source of all ecclesiastical authority
and dignity; so that every such office or dignity is to
be looked on as a "fool of the Holy See, without which
enjoyment no such office can be lawfully exercised or
enjoyed" (quoted by Greenwood, Cathedra Petri. b. xii. ch. 1).

By this process, infinitely diversified, though ever
essentially the same, society was slowly reconstruc-
ted and reconstituted, in every respect, and its
wretchedness, and foreign peril from new swarms of
worthless assailants. The elements and forces of a new
civilization were thus collected and harmonized, and
were recombined into a uniform and coherent system
on the simple basis of fidelity between man and man.
Ancient paganism had died out, and universal sceptic-
ism had supervened before the new religious faith
which was to regenerate the world had been accepted
by minds still largely tainted with heathenism. All
human trust had been betrayed and dissipated; all so-
cial ligaments had been coroded or ruptured; all de-
pendence upon government, law, and public force had
been deceived and outraged; and yet—conscientious-
ly with the introduction of a new religious creed, and
of fresh races to maintain that creed (Salvian. De Gu-
bern. Dei Aust. Augustius, Civitas Dei)—the seeds of
memory remained, and found their way, and reenforced
the charges, and retouched the culture of the soil,
organized the nations, and inaugurated a new series of
the ages by introducing loyal faith between lord
and vassal, and the honorable protection of the weak
by the powerful. The political renovation thus ran
parallel with the spiritual transmutation, deriving life
and sustenance from each other, and supplying each even
containing its influence, and confirming its dominion even while con-
taminating its morality by the infection of worldly
interests and passions. Though the feudal order nev-
er realized in practice the ideal which it function sug-
gests—what human institution has ever done this?
when it neither has the divine mission, nor the actual
manifestations, yet the strong and rare eulogies be-
stowed upon it are fully justified by the inestimable
services which it rendered to the nations during the
millennial agony of humanity. High, indeed, must
be the empire which prevails over a condition of men
from such antipodes as Montesquieu and De Maistre,
and
make the former proclaim his conviction that "the
feudal system was the best-constituted government
that ever existed upon earth," and the latter declares
that "feudalism was the most perfect institution
that the universe has seen." The criminations which
have been so bitterly, and not altogether unjustly, directed
against the feudal spirit, are applicable to its decline,
when it had become an incomparable service to man-
kind, and had become an enorring and charming
amid the enlarging industry, the augmented intel-
ligence, and the aspirational aspirations which its long du-
rion had cherished and trained.

Montesquieu boasted of closing his discussion of feudalism in
his Jansenist and Catholic countries, and v pipes overlooked its true antecedents and characteristics.
From this notice nearly everything has been excluded
which is repeated in familiar or accessible authors;
or has the associated topic of serfs and serfdom been
noticed, as it presents an occasion for extended and
independent consideration.

From Blackstone, Robertson, Hallam, etc., may be
learned the habitual organization of nations during
the maturity of the feudal system. From authors of
a like character may be pleasantly ascertained the ro-
manic and contemplative tendencies of feudal
ments of feudalism, the Crusades and Chivalry—"a
gilded halo hovering round decay." From similar
sources may be drawn all needful information in re-
gard to the various species of fees or fees, and to what
are called feudal incidents. These incidents attached
and were applied to every feudal case, in a general way;
1. The feudal tenures. 2. The feudal constitution,
and the individual. 3. The feudal privileges and
3. The feudal castes. 4. The feudal war.

 Authorities.—To give a list of authorities for such
topics as Fief, Feudalism, Feudal System, would require
the enumeration of volumes sufficient for an extensive
library. It may suffice to note here some of the prin-
cipal works connected with the subject, a few of which
have been referred to and the remainder which have
never been seen by the writer:—Codex Theodosianus
(ed. Gothofredu); Corpus Juris Civilis (ed. Gothofre-
du); Basilica (ed. Heimbach); Baluzii Capitulatio-
—more complete and satisfactory edition is found in
Hart, Histoire.; Libri Fidorum, cum commentationes
J. Cujaceli; Foucher, Antiquités; Lirey, Des Fiefs;
Begnot, Annales de Jerusalem (very instructive
extracts from this text are given in Cantu, Hist. Uni-
verselle, vol. ix. append. A); Leporey, Histoire-
uelle et allemande de Litt. Fidorum; Marcelli Faur-
saure; Beussan, Histoire.; Coutumes de Beuvesv.;
Houard, Coutumes Anglo-Normandes; Lisez, Institution
Conventions.; Allesa, Origines des Fidorum; Caravita, Pro-
tectiones Fidorum; Cragus, De Fuidis; Dalrymple,
History of Feudal Property; Bohmer, Principia Juris Fidorum;
Salvian, 8. Usages des Fiefs; Bruneel, l'Usage
Général des Fiefs; Jenichen, Theocrus Juris Fidorum;
Turgot, Traite de la Souvereigné Fidodile Universelle;
Guyot, Des Fiefs; Institutions Fidorum; Winespere,
Abus Fidorum; Gebauer, Origines des Fidorum; Le Fèvre,
De l'Origine des Fiefs; De Galliand, Scènes de la Vie Fiod-
dale au xiiie siècle; Galliard, Traite de Foids; le
Boulaye, Hist. des Droits Fidodiles; Leib, Institutions
Miroirinnennes et Carolingiennes; Böcking, Notitia
Dignitatum Urbanae Imperialis; Meyer, Esprit,
Origines, et Progrés des Institutions Judiciaires; Allen,
On the Royal Prerogative; Spence, Inquiry into the
Origen of the Inns and Institutions of Modern Europe;
Equitable Jurisprudence of the Court of Chancery, vol. i.
Field (usually Readable as, in the text:  sadeh; [poetic 'sic' of: sadok],  ḏāyūs; but occasionally  ʾeʿrets,  ʾland [Chald. ʿor, open country], ḥūṣain; ʿarēn, out-door; ʾabū, ʾetelāk, a portion or plot, ʾṣawīn; ḥamānah, a cultivated field, according to Gesenius and Fürlst from the context in the plur. Deut. xxxii, 22; 2 Kings xxiii, 4; Isa. xvi, 8; Jer. xxxii, 40; Hab. iii, 17; also ḏūya, ḏāyūsa, an arable field, in the plur. Jer. xxxii, 10). The Hebrew sadeh is not adequately represented by our "field," the words agrees in describing cultivated land, but they differ in point of extent, the sadeh being specifically applied to what is unenclosed, while the opposite notion of enclosure is involved in the word field (compare Deserts). The essence of the Hebrew word has been variously taken to lie in each of these notions, Gesenius (Thesaurus, p. 1381) giving it the sense of freedom, Stanley (Palest. p. 484) that of smoothness, comparing arum from arum. On the one hand sadeh is applied to any cultivated ground, whether pasture (Gen. xxix, 2; XXXI, 4, 6; XXXIII, 7; Exod. ix, 3) tillage (Gen. xxxvii, 7; xlvi, 24; Ruth ii, 2, 8; Job xxiv, 6; Jer. xxxvi, 18; Mic. iii, 12), woodland (1 Sam. xiv, 25, A.V. "ground"); Ps. xxxii, 6), or mountain-top (Judg. ix, 32, 36; 2 Sam. i, 21); and in some instances in marked opposition to the wilderness; as in the instance of Jacob settling in the field of Shechem (Gen. xxxiii, 19), the field of Moab (Gen. xxxvi, 8; Numb. xxxi, 20, A.V. "country"); Ruth i, 1, and the vale of Siddim, i.e. of the cultivated fields, which formed the oasis of the Pentapolis (Gen. viii, 3, 8), though a different sense has been given (by Gesenius, Thesaurus, p. 1381). On the other hand, the sadeh is frequently contrasted with what is enclosed, whether a vineyard (Exod. ii, 5; Lev. xxv, 3, 4; Numb. viii, 14, xx, 17; compare Numb. xxii, 23, "the ass went into the field," with ver. 24, "a path of the vineyards, a wall being on this side and a wall on that side"); a garden (the very name of which, ṣadeh, implies enclosure), or a walled town (Deut. xxxviii, 16): unwalls villages or scattered houses ranked in the eye of the law as fields (Lev. xxv, 31), and hence the expression ʾas ṣadeh ʾḤaḥāla; in the fields (Yulg. in villas; Mark vi, 55). In many passages the term implies what is remote from a house (Gen. iv, 8; xxvi, 69; Deut. xxii, 25) or settled habitation, as in the case of Emam (Gen. xxv, 27; the Sept., however, refers it to his character, ḏāyūsēn): this is more fully expressed by ʾabū ḏāyūs, "the open field" (Lev. xiv, 7, 53; xvii, 5; Numb. xix, 16; 2 Sam. xi, 11), with which is naturally coupled the notion of exposure and desertion (Jer. ix, 17; Ezek. xxiv, 5; xxxi, 4; xxxi, 27; xxxii, 5). See MEADOW. The separate plots of ground were marked off by stones, which might easily be removed (Deut. xix, 14; xxviii, 17; comp. Job xxiv, 2; Prov. xxix, 28; xxix, 10); the absence of fences rendered the fields liable to damage from straying cattle (Exod. xxvii, 5) or fire (ver. 6; 2 Sam. xiv, 30); hence the necessity of constantly watching flocks and herds, the people so employed being in the present day named Nāṣir (Worc., 1159) or, a word amounting to being possessed by the most, which was gained by sawing the tallest and strongest of the grain crops on the outside: "spelt" appears to have been most commonly used for this purpose (Isa. xxviii, 5, as in the margin). From the absence of enclosures, cultivated land of any size might be termed a field, whether it were a piece of ground of limited area (Gen. xiii, 18, 17; Isa. v, 8), a man's whole inheritance (Lev. xxvii, 16 sq.; Ruth iv, 5; Jer. xxxii, 9, 25; Prov. xxvi, 26; xxxi, 16), the ager publicus of a town (Gen. xii, 46; Neh. xii, 25), as distinct, however, from the "field" which lay outside the Levitical cities, which was called ṣāḥib (A.V. "suburbs"), and was deemed an appendage of the town itself (Josh. xi, 12), or, lastly, the territory of a people (Gen. xiv, 7; xxiii, 8; xxxvi, 35; Numb. xx, 20; Ruth ii, 6; iv, 8; 1 Sam. vi, 1; xxvii, 7, 11). In 1 Sam. xxvii, 5, "a town in the field" (Aeth. Vers. "country")—a provincial town as distinct from the royal city. A plot of ground separated from a larger one was called a ḏūya, "field" (Gen. xxv, 11; Ruth ii, 8; 1 Chron. xi, 15), or simply ḏūya (2 Sam. xiv, 20; xxix, 12; comp. 2 Sam. xiv, 26). Fields occasionally received names after remarkable events, as Heikath-Hazzurim, the field of the strong men, or possibly of swords (2 Sam. i, 16), or from the use to which they may have been applied (2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. viii, 7; Mat. xxvii, 7). See MEADOW. It should be observed that the expressions "fruitful field" (Isa. x, 18; xxvii, 17; xxvii, 15, 16) and "plentiful field" (Isa. xvi, 10; Jer. xlviii, 38) are not connected with ṣadeh, but with ṣera, meaning a park or well-kept wood, as distinct from a wilderness or a forest. The same term occurs in 2 Kings xix, 23, and Isa. xxxvi, 24 (A. Vera. "Carmel"); Isa. x, 18 ("forest"); and Jer. iv, 26 ("fruitful place"). See MEADOW. Distinct from this expression is the use in Ezek. vi, 5, ʾirʾūʾin (A.V. "fruitful field"), which means a field suited for planting suckers. See aGRICulture.

Field, David Dudley, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in East Guilford, Conn., May 20, 1751, prepared for college under Dr. John Elliott, of Guilford, and graduated at Yale in 1802. After studying theology, he was licensed to preach in 1806, and was installed pastor at East Haddam in 1804. He filled this charge with great diligence and success until 1818, and in 1819 accepted a call to Stockbridge, Mass. After eighteen years' pastoral service at Stockbridge, he was called in 1827 to his old parish at Haddam. In 1848 he travelled in Europe. In 1851 he gave up his charge at Haddam, and spent the remainder of his life in quiet retirement at Stockbridge, where he died April 15, 1867. Dr. Field was a man of strong character. His mental powers were vigorous and comprehensive; his culture was as open as thorough, and varied. His duties as preacher and pastor were always filled with conscientious care; and his long pastorate, with the unusual case of his return to his first charge after an absence of thirty-three years, sufficiently attest the confidence and affection of his parishioners. Of his ten children, six sons are now living, and all eminent as professional men; among them are Cyrus W. Field, the "father" of the Atlantic Telegraph, and Dr. H. M. Field, editor of The New England Evangelist. Besides a number of occasional sermons, Dr. Field published History of Middlesex—History of Berkshire—Genealogy of the Strong-Family.—Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1857, p. 501.

Field, Richard, D.D., one of the best of the High-
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Church writers of the Church of England, was born at Hampstead, Hertfordshire, in 1561, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where he lectured for seven years. He was a man of great zeal and ambition; the reputation of a learned preacher and an acute disputer. He was afterwards reader of divinity at Lincoln's Inn, London, and rector of Burgessheal, Hampshire. Here he refused the offer of St. Andrew's, in Holborn, London, a much more wealthy living, and obtaining a fellowship at Christ Church, Oxford, and a position at the bar, he returned to practical theology, and devoted himself to the study of the Bible and the systematic principles of the Church. He is known to posterity as a divine, and as a man of profound learning. Divines, even of the first order, scarce ever went to him without holding themselves with questions. Fuller calls him 'that learned divine, whose memory smelteth like a field which the Lord hath blessed.' When King James heard him preach the first time, he said, 'This is a man of God.' When he came into the royal court, his majesty retained so good an opinion of him that he designed to raise him to the bishopric of Oxford; but God was pleased, as Mr. Wood remarks, to prefer him for a better place, for, on the 21st of November, 1616, he died, leaving behind him a character of great and ardent piety. His reputation rests securely on his great work, The Book of the Church, which was originally issued in 1606, and with a fifth book added in 1810. A new edition, printed for the Eccl. Hist. Society, appeared at Cambridge, 1847-55 (4 vols. 8vo).—Hook, Andover, in Eccl. Rec., Eton, 1857.

Field-preaching, or preaching in the open air, 'a plan adopted by reformers in every age, in order to propagate more extensively and effectually their peculiar sentiments among the great masses of the people. Christ and his apostles not only availed themselves of the privileges which the Synagogue afforded them; but they made use of every means of making known the Gospel of the Kingdom to those who assembled therein from Sabbath to Sabbath, they also proclaimed the doctrines and precepts of the new dispensation on the highways and hedges, on the sea-shore and on the barren plade, on the mountain's side and in the streets of the city.' When men were found, and under whatever circumstances they were placed, if their ears could be reached, there the voice of the first teachers of Christianity was heard, warning sinners of coming danger, and pointing out the road to salvation. This was the only way to reach the people. Many of the offices of the ministry were then performed with a grown mount a table on unconsacrated ground; for field-preaching, since common enough in England, was then unknown, and therefore obloquy was poured upon it. His engagements so increased that he sought the help of Mr. John Wesley, who became his assistant. He succeeded to Bristol, and on his arrival was invited to preach in the open air. 'I could scarce reconcile myself at first,' says he, 'to this strange way of preaching in the fields, of which he (Whitefield) set me the example on the Sunday, having been all my life, till lately, so taciturn of every point relating to decency and order that I should have thought the saving of souls a sin if it had not been done in a church.' However, on the following day, Mr. Wesley preached from a little eminence in an open ground adjoining the city to about 1000 people. In the days of Whitefield and Wesley, field-preaching was not unfrequently attended with danger. Though they often met with a kind reception from the multitudes, yet at other times they experienced the rudest and most determined opposition, and often their lives were in imminent peril from the violence of ignorant, depraved, and excited populace. In his Earnest Appeal, Mr. Wesley asks, 'Who is there among you, brethren, that is willing (examine your own hearts) even to save souls from death at this price? Would not you let a thousand souls perish rather than you would be the means of raising such men? Will not you be the instruments of raising them thus? Do you not speak now with regard to conscience, but to the inconveniences that must accompany it. Can you sustain them if you would? Can you bear the summer sun to beat upon your naked head? Can you suffer the wintry rain or wind, from whatever quarter it blows? Are
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pronounced the idea to be a mad one; but now, he believed that in Bristol his duty in this respect was no longer doubtful. Moreover, many persons said to him, 'What need of preaching religious instruction? they had no church in which to worship, no minister to teach them the duties of religion, or to pray with them; hence they were notorious for their brutality and wickedness, and in times of excitement were a terror to all around them. On February 17, 1739, Whitefield preached in the great market-place of Gloucester, where he preached to as many as the novelty of the scene collected, which were about 200. 'The ice being now broke'—to use his own observation on this first open-air sermon—he determined to persevere in the same course. Accordingly, he visited Kingswood frequently, and in all places where he went it was extraordinary how the number of his hearers increased; for, besides the citizens, thousands of all ranks flocked from Bristol and the neighborhood, and the congregation was sometimes computed at 20,000. With gladness and eagerness many of the country outcasts, who had never been in a church in their lives, received the instruction of an eminent follower of him who 'speak about doing good.' 'The first discovery,' says he, 'of their being affected was to see the white gutterns made by their tears, which plentifully fell down their black cheeks, as they came out of the fields. Sometimes, when the people were before me, I had not, in my own apprehension, a word to say, either to God (in prayer) or to them (by preaching). . . . The open firmament above me, the prospect of the adjacent fields, with the sight of thousands and thousands, some in coaches, others on horseback, and some on foot, present all affected and drenched in tears together, to which sometimes was added the solemnity of the approaching evening, was almost too much for, and quite overcame me. Whitefield was then requested to preach in a bowling-green in the city, and he complied. Many of the people saw the sermon in the bowling-ground.'
you able to stand in the open air, without any covering or defence, when God casteth abroad his snow like wool, or scattereth his hoar frost like ashes? And yet these are some of the smallest inconveniences which accompany field-preaching. For very few are the contradictions of sinners, the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small; contempt and reproach of every kind; often more than verbal affronts—stupid, brutal violence, sometimes to the hazard of health, or limbs, or life. Brethren, do you envy us this honor? What, I pray you, that you should be a field-beecher? When Mr. Wesley had been accustomed to field-preaching for more than twenty years, he made the following remarks: 'One hour in Moorfields might convince any impartial man of the expediency of field-preaching. What building, except St. Paul's church, could contain such a congregation? and if so, what human voice could have reached them there? By repeated observations, I find I can command twice the number in the open air that I can under a roof. And who can say the time for field-preaching is over, while, I, Greatest of sinners, am the least a field-preacher? The convincing as well as the convincing power of God is eminently present with them.'

"They stood, and under open air adored The God who made both air, earth, heaven, and sky."

And with this they were regarded with attention still as night, or were lifting up their voices in praise as the sound of many waters, many a time have I been constrained to say in my heart, "How dreadful is this place!" This also, "is no other than the house of God! this is the gate of heaven!" (See Memoirs of Wesley, by blame, Southey, and also Jackson's Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism.) Having now once adopted this mode of imparting instruction to the neglected classes of the community, Mr. Wesley never abandoned it to the end of his life; and in a short time his brother Charles followed his example in the same self-denying labor of love, being urged thereto by the indefatigable Whitefield. Mr. Charles Wesley's first field-sermon was preached at Moorfields on June 24, 1789, his congregation amounting to about 1000, and in the evening of the same day he preached to multitudes in St. George's Church. Two weeks afterwards he preached to about 10000 people in Moorfields; and for several years he followed with equal steps both his brother and Mr. Whitefield in laborious zeal and public usefulness. It is not to be supposed that Mr. Wesley had not preached in the open air till the time he was induced by Mr. Whitefield to do so at Bristol. He had done so in Georgia before Mr. Whitefield was ordained, but he had no intention of resuming the practice in England until compelled to do so by the necessities of the case. He says, 'Wherever I was desired to preach (in churches), salvation by faith was my only theme. ... Things were in this posture when I was told I must preach no more in this, and this, and another church; the reason was usually added without reserve, "Because you preach such doctrine." ... After a time I determined to do the same thing in England which I had often done in a warmer climate—to preach in the open air.' 'Be pleased to observe,' he adds, 'that I was forbidden to preach in any church for preaching such doctrine.' 2. That I had no desire nor design to preach in the open air till after the prohibition. 3. That when I did, as it was my custom, no matter of choice, no make of meditation. There was no scheme at all previously formed which was to be supported thereby. 4. Field-preaching was therefore a sudden expedient—a thing submitted to rather than chosen; and therefore submitted to because I thought preaching even thus better than not preaching at all.' Field-preaching, or, as it was called, tent-preaching, that is, preaching from a tent, was common in Scotland on summer sacramental occasions. For very few are the contradictions of sinners, the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small; contempt and reproach of every kind; often more than verbal affronts—stupid, brutal violence, sometimes to the hazard of health, or limbs, or life. Brethren, do you envy us this honor? What, I pray you, that you should be a field-beecher? When Mr. Wesley had been accustomed to field-preaching for more than twenty years, he made the following remarks: 'One hour in Moorfields might convince any impartial man of the expediency of field-preaching. What building, except St. Paul's church, could contain such a congregation? and if so, what human voice could have reached them there? By repeated observations, I find I can command twice the number in the open air that I can under a roof. And who can say the time for field-preaching is over, while, I, Greatest of sinners, am the least a field-preacher? The convincing as well as the convincing power of God is eminently present with them.'

Fifth-monarchy-men, a sect of Millenarians which sprung up in the time of Cromwell, and held that the millennial reign of Christ on earth, styled by them the fifth great monarchy, reigned in succession with the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman ones, was then to begin. Under the lead of Thomas Venner, a wine-cooper, they formed a plot to inaugurate their kingdom of the saints on April 9th, 1657, but were foiled by the vigilance of Thurloe, the secretary of state, and a number of the conspirators, arrested with arms in their hands, were sent to the Tower, though some of the ringleaders were allowed to take the law, death, war, and the sword, according to the orders of any of them. On the 6th of January, 1661, some fifty or sixty of these madmen, led by the same Venner, rose in insurrection, if we may term it such, against the government of Charles II., proclaimed 'king Jesus' as the head of the police force, and, after concerning themselves for two days in Caen Wood, near Highgate, returned to encounter the train-stands, insanely believing that neither bullet nor steel could harm them. Most of them, refusing quarter, were slain outright; but Venner and sixteen others were taken, tried, and executed.—Knight, Popular Hist. of England, iv. 206, 251; Pictorial Hist. of England, iii. 421, 679 (Chamber's ed.); Burnet, Hist. of His Own Times, vol. i. bk. ii.; Baxter, Hist. of the Church of England, p. 606, 611; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans (London), iv. 186. (J. W. M.)

Fig. The usual Hebrew word for this is תַּמֶּשׁ (tammesh), of uncertain etymology, which is universally translated fig (N. T. σέκους) and fig-tree (N. T. σέκους) in both the Authorized Version and modern versions, in form and distinctly so. It has from the earliest times been a highly esteemed fruit in the East, and its present as well as ancient Arabic name is ris. When figs are spoken of as distinguished from the fig-tree, the masc. plur. form דַּמֵּשׁ is used (see Jer. viii. 10). The other words rendered fig in the Sept. Ver. are: דַּמֵּשׁ (damesh), "green fig," Cant. ii. 13; דַּמֵּשׁ (damesh), "untimely fig," Rev. vi. 10; a designation of the late fig, which, being unripe at the proper time for gathering, frequently hangs on the tree over winter (comp. also the name בֵּית-פָּרָה; and דְּמִישָׁבָה (dimishah), "first ripe.") Isa. xxxvii. 4; Jer. xxiv. 2; Mic. vii. 11; Hos. ix. 10, which denotes the early or spring fig, still called boccar in Mauritania, and in Spanish albaro (Shaw, Tribulus, p. 370, 60.) See also the note on דֶּמֶשׁ.

The fig is mentioned in so many passages of Scripture that our space will not allow us to enumerate them, but they are detailed by Celsius (Hierobot. ii., 388). The first notice of it, however, occurs in Gen. iii. 7, where Adam and Eve are described as sewing fig leaves together to make of them a covering of shame. The common fig-leaf is not so well suited, from its lobed nature, for this purpose; but the practice of sewing or pinning leaves together is very common in the East even in the present day, and baskets, dishes, and un-
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granes." The spies who were sent from the wilderness of Paran brought back from the brook of Eschel clusters of grapes, pomegranates, and figs. Mount Olivet was famous for its fig-trees in ancient times, and they are still found there (see Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 167, 421, 422). The fig-tree is referred to as one of the signs of prosperity (1 Kings iv, 28). Hence "to sit under one's own vine and one's own fig-tree" became a proverbial expression among the Jews to denote peace and prosperity (Mic. iv, 4; Zech. iii, 10).

The failure of this fruit is likewise noted as a sign of affliction (Psa. cv, 35). The very frequent references which are made in the Old Testament to the fig and other fruit-trees are in consequence of fruits forming a much more important article of diet in the warm and dry countries of the East than they can ever do in the cold and moist regions of the North (see Judith x, 5; comp. Mishna, Shelosh, iv, 7). Figs are also used medicinally; and we have a notice in 2 Kings xx, 7, of their employment as a poultice (comp. Pliny, xiii, 62; Dioscor. i, 184). In the historical books of the Old Testament mention is made of cakes of fig, used as articles of food, and compressed into that form for the sake of keeping them (Leyes. cucur, Lucian, Viz. Auct. 19; Martial, xiii, 26). Such a cake was called פסאכש (Talmud, בד וברב, Mishna, Terumoth, iv, 8), and more fully מַסֶּכֶשׁ בְּרֵכֶשׁ, on account of its shape, from the root בֵּרֶכֶשׁ, to make round (see 1 Sam. xxx, 12; Jer. xxiv, 2 sqq.). Hence, or rather from the Syr. סְכֶשׁ, the first letter being dropped, came the Gr. word σκελής (see Wesseling, ad. Dio. Sic. xvii, 67). Athenaeus (xi, p. 500, ed. Casarav) makes express mention of the σκελής Ἕρμηνευς. Jerome, on Ezek. vi, describes the σκελής as a mass of figs and rich dates, formed into the shape of bricks or tiles, and compressed in order that they may keep. Such cakes harden so as to need cutting with an axe. The fig is still extensively cultivated in the East, and in a dried state, strung upon cords, it forms an extensive article of commerce from Persia to India. The fig-tree, though now successfully cultivated in a great part of Europe, even as far north as the southern parts of England, is yet a native of the East, and probably of the Persian region, where it is most extensively cultivated. The climate there is such that the tree must necessarily be able to bear some degree of cold, and thus be fitted to travel northwards, and ripen its fruit where there is a sufficient amount and continuance of summer heat. It has a smooth stem, which is seldom quite straight, and is covered with a gray bark; the leaves are of the shape of a heart, with three or five lobes, and are indented; the upper surface is rough, the lower is covered with fine hair. The fruit makes its appearance before the leaves, but not before the flowers or blossom, which lies concealed within a hollow, dryish receptacle (Hogg, Vegetable Kingdom, p. 676). The fertilization of the blossom is often assisted by an artificial process called coprefacies (Pliny, xx, 21; Tournefort, ii, 22; Russel, Aleppo, i, 108; Hasselquist, p. 221). See the Penny Cyclopaedia, a. v.)

FIG.

The Fig (Ficus Carica).
complexion than the *kermis*, hanging and ripening on the tree even after the leaves are shed, and provided the winter proves mild and temperate, as gathered as a delicious morsel in the spring (see Miss Bremer, *The Life of London*, p. 189). *N. H. xvi*, 36, 27.) Thus, especially in sheltered situations (e.g. the plain of Gennesaret, Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 8), fresh figs might be had at almost all seasons of the year (compare Strabo, xi, 508; Columella, *Agr.*, 21).

The attempt to explain the above-quoted passage in Mark is numerous, and for the most part very unsatisfactory; passing over, therefore, the ingenious though objectionable reading proposed by Dan. Heinsius (*Exercit. Soc. ed. 1669*, p. 116) of ὡδ γὰρ ἐν, καίριοι σῖκων—"where he was, it was the season for figs"—and merely mentioning another possible explanation, that clause of the evangelist's remark as a question, "for was it not the season for figs?" and the no less unsatisfactory rendering of Hammond (*Ammos ad St. Mark*), "it was not a good season for figs," we come to the interpretations which, though not perhaps of recent, is found in modern times.

The explanation which has found favor with most writers is that which understands the words καίριοι σῖκων to mean "the fig-harvest;" the γιός in this case is referred, not to the clause immediately preceding, "he found nothing but leaves," but to the more remote condition, "it came if he had not seen anything thereon;" for a similar application it is usual to refer to Mark xvi, 3, 4; the sense of the whole passage would then be as follows: "And seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came if perchance he might find any fruit on it (and he ought to have found some), for the time of gathering it had not yet arrived, but when he came he found nothing but leaves." (See the notes in the Greek Testaments of Burton, Trollope, Bloomfield, Webster, and Wilkinson; Macknight, *Harm. of the Gospels*, ii, 521, note, 1859; Elshey's *Ammos* ad l. c., etc.) A third explanation would be: "the season was not yet past, and common plums, corresponding in this state to the *poggium* (πῶκους) of Cant. ii, 18, wholly unfit for food in an unprepared state; and it is but reasonable to infer that our Lord expected to find something more palatable than these small, sour things upon a tree which by its show of foliage bespoke, though falsely, a corresponding abundance of good fruit, for it is improbable that the fruit comes before the leaves. Again, if καίριοι denotes the "fig-harvest," we must suppose that, although the fruit might not have been ripe, the season was not very far distant, and that the figs in consequence must have been considerably more mature than these hard *poggium*; but is it probable that Mark would have thought it necessary to state that it was not yet the season for gathering figs in March, when they could not have been fit to gather before June at the earliest? It would be better to understand the γιός here in an adversative-Illative sense = *al dokyn*.

There is another way of seeking to get over the difficulty by supposing that the tree in question was not of the ordinary kind. Celsus (*Hierob. ii, 885*) says there is a peculiar fig-tree known to the Jews by the name of *Bemeth-shuakh* ([בֵּיתָ שָׁעֲחָכָּה), which produces *grouthuth*, "small unripened fig" (*poggium*) every year, but only good fruit every third year; and that our Lord came to gather in the *Bemeth-shuakh* in Perea; and that some annual *grouthuth* only were produced! We are ignorant as to what tree the *Bemeth-shuakh* may denote, but it is obvious that the apparent unreasonableness remains as it was. As to the tree which Whitby (Commentary on *Mark*, l. c.) identifies with the one in question, that it was that kind which Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* iv, 2, § 4) calls *aiyphallon*, "evergreen," it is enough to observe that this is no fig at all, but the carob or locust tree (*Judas*). The *grouthuth*, however, speaks of a large green-colored fig that ripens in May on Lebanon, and probably much earlier in milder positions (*Land and Book*, i, 588).

But, after all, where is the unreasonableness of the whole transaction? It has been stated above that the fruit of the fig-tree appears before the leaves (see Hackett, *Illust. of Scripture*, p. 138); consequently, if the tree produced leaves, it should also have had some figs as well. As to what natural causes had operated to effect so unusual a thing as for a fig-tree to have leaves in March, it is unnecessary to inquire; but the stepping out of the way with the possible chance (ἐκ, εἰς, πόρτος, "under the circumstances;" see Winer, *Gramm. of N. Test. Dict.* p. 465, Masson's *treal*), of finding edible fruit on a fig-tree in leaf at the end of March, would probably be repeated by any observant modern traveller in Palestine. The whole question turns on the pretensions of the tree; had it not proclaimed by its foliage its superiority over other fig-trees, and thus proudly exhibited its *precociously;* had our Lord at that season of the year visited any of the other fig-trees upon which no leaves had as yet appeared with the promise of finding good fruit, then the tree, having been thus altered, and the unreasonable and injustice real. The words of Mark, therefore, are to be understood in the sense which the order of the words naturally suggests. The evangelist gives the reason why no fruit was found on the tree, viz. "because it was not the time for fruit;" and we are left to infer the reason why it is *ought to have had fruit if it were true to its pretensions;* and it must be remembered that this miracle had a typical design (see the *Christ. Amm. s. s.*, 228), to show how God would deal with the Jews, who, professing, like their precious fig-tree, "to be first," should be "last" in his favor; whose objection will no fruit was produced in their lives, but only, as Wordsworth well expresses it, "the rustling leaves of a religious profession, the barren traditions of the Pharisees, the ostentatious display of the law, and vain exuberance of words without the good fruit of works" (comp. *Ezek. iv, 24*). So Srench (*Notes on the Miracles*, p. 486) concludes: "All the explanations which go to prove that, according to the natural order of things in a climate like that of Palestine, there might have been, even at this early time of the year, figs on that tree, either winter figs which had survived till spring, or the early figs of spring themselves—all these, ingenious as they often are, yet seem to me beside the matter. For, without entering further into the question whether they prove their point or not, they shatter upon us that notion that no such combination of probabilities brought the Lord their, but those abnormal leaves which he had a right to count would have been accompanied with abnormal fruit."

Monographs on this fig-tree cursed by the Saviour have been written in Latin by Fleisch (Hafn., 1775), Gögen (Lips. 1697), Hofmann (Jena, 1670), Iken (Bremen, 1741), Juster (Abo, 1724), Muler (Hafn., 1789), Schmidt (Viteb. 1701), Majus (in *Observ. asc. p. 71 sq.*), Simonis (Fr. ad 1669), Witheron (in *Opusc. p. 159 sq.*), Witsius (Lugd. Bat. 1712), in German by J. I. Arnold (Wolfen. 1755), Ebeling (in *Hamb. gel. Briefwechsel*, 1750, p. 518 sq.), Stoch (in Rethelf's *Theol. 1754, p. 27 sq.*), Kunze (in the *Studien u. Krit.* 1844, iii, 702). See Jesus.

**Fright** (*מַלָּכָה הַדָּרֶשֶׁה, milchamot*), Deut. ii, 32; 1 Kings xx, 2; 2 Chron. xxvi, 11; xxvii, 2, *war or battle, as usually rendered; or מַלָּכָה הַדָּרֶשֶׁה, masarakh*, 1 Sam. xvii, 20, battle-array, as often rendered; in other passages some form of the verbs * Phill., *N. S. etc.; Gr. µάλακα.
μορ, μαρ, as usually rendered, or μαρχί; also ἐγνω etc.

The Israelites began their existence as a nation with an aggressive campaign, in the sequel of which, after a long series of successes, they were forced to retreat, and thus compelled to occupy a defensive position throughout the entire period of the Judges (q. v.). This consisted, however, for the most part, of tumultuary and disconnected skirmishes. Regular engagements first occurred in the time of the Judges and David, and the hostile collisions of disciplined Hebrew generals in the civil and foreign commotions of subsequent periods must have greatly stimulated military training. The opening of a campaign (generally in spring, 2 Sam. xi, 1; Josephus, Ant. vii, 6, 3; Harmer, ii, 283), as well as of single engagements, although not always by regular diplomatic communications or a declaration of war (but see Judg. xi, 12 sq. : 1 Kings xx, 2 sq.; 2 Kings xiv, 8; Josephus, Ant. iv, 8, 41), was preceded in important and deliberate cases by an interrogation of the Urim (q. v.) and Thummim (Judg. xx, 27 sq.; 1 Sam. xiv, 37; xxiii, 2; xxviii, 6; 8, 38; iv, 38 sq.) or a prophetic oracular announcement (1 Kings xxvi, 6 sq.; 2 Chron. xviii, 4 sq.; 2 Kings xix, 2 sq.), i.e., manner as the Greeks consulted oracles before beginning a contest, and even took seers to work for them (see Wachsmuth, Helmem. Alterth. iii, 280 sq.). A peculiar species of prophecy is also prior to an attack is mentioned (Exod. xxi, 50 sq.) with regard to the Chaldeans (see Loisy), like the exortation of the Romans (Cicero, De civ. i, 16; ii, 12 sq.). See Soesthayer. In solemn instances, while the army stood in sight of the enemy, an offering was brought forward (1 Chron. vii, 9 sq.; xii, 7 sq.; Deut. xx, 2 sq.), which always appears to have accompanied the prince to the field (2 Chron. xiii, 12, 14; comp. Num. x, 9; a specially selected and anointed functionary of this kind, like a modern field-captain [Mill, De sacerdote castrorum et eret. Hebr. Utr. 1787; is mentioned in the Mishna, Sotah, viii, 1, by the name of הַלָּשׁוּת הַשָּׁוֹת הַשָּׁוֹת הַשָּׁוֹת הַשָּׁוֹת הַשָּׁוֹת הַשָּׁוֹת הַשָּׁוֹת Halshe, see Roland, Amisq. Stor. ii, 2; Otho, Laws Mis. p. 89; Van Alphen, in Gruber's Collect. i, 515 sq. ; Talm. Din, de sacerdote castr. et eret., and Ugelini de sacer. castr. [both in Ugelini Theannur. iii, 10; Thromschmid, De sacerdote ad bell. usct., Torger 1757; Kretzschner, De uncio bellic. Dresd. 1738; although not mentioned in the O.T. books; comp. Delying, Observ. ii, 298; Lakemacher, Observ. Philos. iii, 286 sq.); or the commander himself, delivered a horatory oration (2 Chron. xx, 20). Then followed by a trumpet blast the signal for the conflict (Num. xii, 12; 1 Macc. xvi, 8), and the struggle began amid terrific battle-cries (нная, n, 1 Sam. xvii, 52; Is. xxii, 18, 20; Jer. i, 42; Ezek. xxii, 22; as among almost all ancient nations; see especially Homer, Il. ii, 247 sq.; xxvii, 20 sq.; xv, 452 sq.; Jer. ii, 10, 11; Tacl. Germ. iii, 28; Doutgeely Analect. i, 74 sq. ; Potter, Greek Amisq. ii, 174 sq.).

The battle-array (pany, 2 Macc. i, 4; xxii, 8, 29, etc., comp. § 77, Judg. xx, 80; 1 Sam. xvi, 21) appears to have been a simple ranging of the troops in line; and even in the Maccabean period, when the Jews had acquired some of the strategic art of the Greek Syrians, their leaders seem to have rested in their simple tactics, gaining advantage over the mortal skill of the enemy chiefly by their esplanade value. Scientific manoeuvres and exact military lists are mentioned in 1 Macc. vii, 36 sq.; ix, 11, 16, 19; comp. ver. 45 (see Joseph. Ant. xiii, 12, 5; x, 77 sq.; xii, 28). The foreign troops of the later Jewish kings were manoeuvred according to Greek and Roman tactics (comp. Joseph. Ant. xiii, 19, 1, 11; xiv, 14; 11; Philo, vil. cit., 216 sq.; see Josephus, War, iii, 7, 13, 14, 20, 28. Nevertheless, we can early trace a division of the army into three corps, probably with a view to charge the enemy in the centre and upon both flanks (Judg. vii, 16, 19; 1 Sam. xi, 11; 2 Sam. xviii, 2; 1 Macc. vi, 28; so four divisions, 2 Macc. viii, 22: the expression στρατευμα of the army was already known, comp. הַסָּה, Is. viii, 8; דַּשָּׂ, Ezek. xii, 17, 37; xxxvii, 6, etc., see Gesenius, Comment. zu Jes. i, 335, and Theoph. p. 229). The field was probably fought man against man. The wounding of the champion appears to have been bare ("exercit temeritum, humerum, etc.) Sil. Ital. xil, 716; Lucan, ii, 548; Statius, Theb. i, 413, etc., the military mantle having no armlets (c. m. Ezek. iv, 7; Is. iii, 10; so Doutgeely Analect. i, 257 sq.). Great prowess, especially bodily dexterity and agility (fons artis armatae), was prized as an qualification for the soldier or officer (2 Sam. i, 23; ii, 18; 1 Chron. xii, 8; Hab. iii, 19; the "swift of foot" of the Homeric heroes). Signals for retreat or desisting from pursuit of the enemy were sounded on the trumpet (לַחֶם, 2 Sam. ii, 29; xviii, 16, xx, 22). Single combat (q. v.) between two champions, which decided the battle (like the Horatii and Curitiati of Livy, i, 24), is the well-known one between David and Goliath (1 Sam. xvii); another example occurs 2 Sam. ii, 14 sq. Sometimes peculiar stratagems were resorted to in the fight (comp. 2 Kings v, 12 sq.; see Rosenmüller, Morgenl. iii, 233 sq.), especially the surprise (Judg. vi, 16 sq.), the ambushes (בַּז, Josh. viii, 2, 12; Judg. xx, 36; 1 Sam. x, 5), and surrounding (2 Sam. v, 20). Information and spies (נָשָׁה, נָשָׁה) were largely employed (Josh. ii, 7 sq.; Judg. xi, 10 sq.; 1 Sam. xxxi, 4; 1 Macc. v, 88; xii, 26). Distinguished acts of individual valor were often secured by an appointed prize (Josh. xv, 16; Judg. i, 12; 1 Sam. xvii, 25 sq.; xvii, 28 sq.; 1 Chron. xi, 6). With the design of insuring a successful issue in battle, the sanctuary (ark of the covenant) was sometimes carried into the field (1 Sam. iv, 4 sq.; comp. 2 Sam. v, 21). We have no sufficient accounts as to the disposition of the Hebrew camp aside from the Mosaic arrangement (Numb. ii); although from 1 Sam. xvii, 20; xxvi, 5, it appears to have had a circular form, like that of the Arabs (also the Bedouins, Arvii, xiii, 214) and ancient Greeks (Xenoph. Rep. Lavo, xili, 1), and we may understand the term παναυγίος (Arch. Vers. "trench") to refer to the bulwark of vehicles and beasts of burden, or (with Thucydides) the circumvallation of the encampment (q. v.). The camps were usually guarded by carefully-posted sentinels (Judg. vii, 19; 1 Sam. xx, 19), and by pairs during the absence or retirement of the commander himself (2 Sam. xx, 23). The vanquished enemies were in general treated very severely: the captured generals and priests were put to death (Josh. x, 24; Judg. vii, 21); not infrequently they were cut to pieces alive or beheaded when dead (2 Macc. xv, 30; 1 Sam. xvii, 34; comp. Herod. vii, 77; Jos. War, i, 17, 2); all warriors were stripped (1 Sam. xxxii, 8; 2 Macc. xii, 37), and the living captives either carried into slavery (Numb. xxxi, 26 sq.; Deut. xx, 14 sq.; some mitigation, however, being shown in the cases of females, Deut. xxii, 11 sq.) or put to death (Judg. ix, 45), sometimes in a cruel manner (2 Sam. xii, 81; 2 Chron. xxiii, 12; comp. Judg. viii, 7, or even mutilated (Judg. i, 6 sq.; 1 Sam. x, 2), although these cases of extreme severity are evidently peculiar and exceptional. As in all ancient warfare, the vanquished were always spared amid the ruthless fury of vengeance: there are notices of women violated or disemabled of their unborn infants, and of children dashed in pieces against stones and the corners of streets (2 Kings xx, 16; comp. 2 Kings xv, 17; Is. xiii, 16; 19, 22; Jer. vi, 9; Amos 1, 2; Ps. x, 8; Nah. iii, 13; 13; see Schultens, Monument. Histor. Arab. p. 125; Wachsmuth, Helmem. Alterth. xii, 425); although these occur chiefly in connection with heathen countries (comp. Josephus, Aplan. ii, 29). Captured horses were hamstrung (2 Sam. vi, 4; Josh. i, 6, 9). But
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see Booty. Conquered cities were occasionally burnt or demolished (Judg. ix, 45; 1 Macc. v, 28, 52; x, 84); at least heathen sanctuaries were destroyed (1 Macc. v, 68; x, 84); or carried away (Isa. xlv. 1; see Gese- nius, Comment. in loc.): the open country itself was laid waste (Judg. vi. 4; 1 Chron. xx. 1, 2; 1 Kings iii. 19, 20; comp. Judg. xiv. 17); the cities were also left in charge (2 Sam. viii. 6, 14). But a more absolute war of extermination was waged by the Hebrew people against the Canaanites on the eiseides into Palestine. See Accu- racy. Victory was celebrated with joyful shouts, songs, and dances (Judg. v. 1; 1 Sam. xviii. 6 sq.; 2 Sam. xix.; Judith xvi. 24; 1 Macc. iv. 24); tro- phies were also set up (1 Sam. xv. 12, 2 Sam. viii. 18; but see Thenius, ad loc.). As permanent memo- rials of great fortune in war, captured weapons or pieces of armor were deposited in the sanctuary (1 Sam. xxxi. 9; see 1 Sam. xxvii. 8); in the temple of the Lord (1 Chron. x. 10; comp. Hom. ll. vii. 83; Virg. En. vii. 183 sq.; Justin, ix. 7; Lucan, i. 240; Tacit. Annal. i. 59, 2). For military exploits, individuals were honored with presents or a promotion (1 Sam. xviii. 25 sq. comp. Rosellini, Monum. stir. iv. 74); 2 Sam. xviii. 11, and David has served the Lord, (2 Sam. xx. 8). Here David the Great once rewarded all his soldiers for a hard- earned victory with money (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 15, 4). Leaders who fell were honored by the army with military mourning (2 Sam. iii. 21), and their weapons were placed in their grave (Ezek. xxxii. 27; comp. Dougsait, Amad. at sup.), as in that case the burial (with the tumuli pompous of war, Amos ii. 2) of the remains was a cardinal duty of the army and its com- mander (1 Kings xi. 15). The scrupulousness of the later Jews regarding the observance of the Sabbath (q. v.) is sometimes brought against the enemy as an advan- tage (2 Sam. vii. 1 sq.). See generally Lydii Synagoga de re militari, c. notis Van Til (Dordrep, 1596; also in Ugolini Thes. xxvii.). Kauserl's Wörterb. der Schlachten aller Völker (vol. i. Ulm, 1829) is of little value for Hebrew archeology. Compare Battle. On 1 Cor. ix. 26, see Gga. 

Figure stands in the Auth. Vern. as the representative of the following words in the original: ἐπέτρεπε, ε- mel. Deut. iv. 15, 1. i. e. an idol, as elsewhere rendered; ἐπέκτρεπον, mildet/ath, 1 Kings vi. 29, a carring, as elsewhere rendered, but usually, in a metaphorical sense, τρίκλητον, ταμβίωσι, Isa. xlv. 13, likeness or pattern, as elsewhere rendered; to which correspond in the N. T. τίνα, Acts vii. 43; Rom. v. 14, a type; ἑναρίπτος, Heb. ix. 24, 1 Pet. iii. 21, an antitype; and παπαραθή, Heb. ix. 9; xi. 19, a parable, as elsewhere rendered. See Type; Parable.

FIJI ISLANDS, a group of islands in Polynesia, situated 490 miles north-west of the Friendly Islands, between lat. 15° 30' and 19° 30', and long. 177° and 179° West. It comprises 225 islands, of which 90 are in- habited. The others are occasionally resorted to by natives for the purpose of fishing, and taking the bick- decemer, or sea-ang. Two are large islands, stretching north-east and south-west nearly throughout the whole extent of the group, and are supposed to be each about 400 miles in circumference. The group comprises seven districts, and is under as many principal chiefs. All the minor chiefs on the different islands are more or less connected or subject to one of these. The area of the whole group is estimated at 3836 sq. miles, and the population about 150,000. The white male population is about 2000, among whom are 40 Ameri- canas. The people are divided into a number of tribes, independent of and often hostile to each other. In each tribe great and marked distinction of rank existed. The classes which are readily distinguished are as fol- lows: 1. kings; 2. chiefs; 3. warriors; 4. the king's messengers (matanivanua, literally "eyes of the lands"); 5. slaves (kapua). Mbanu, the metropolis and imperial capital, is situated on a small island, about two miles in circumference. It contains nearly one thou- sand inhabitants.

War is a constant occupation of the natives, and en- grosses most of their time and thought. In 1809 they became acquainted with the use of fire-arms. The crew of a New Zealand whaler, the "Te Pahi," had shot off a Ma- rian, in order to preserve their lives, joined the Mbanu people, instructed them in the use of the musket, and assisted them in their wars. Next to war, agriculture is the most general occupation of this people. They have no domesticated animals, except fowl, Fruit, and roots, which they cultivate in addition to many spontaneous production.
obtained a knowledge of Christianity in the Friendly Islands. The chief, being only a tributary chief, appeared unwilling to take any step in favor of Christianity until he knew the minds of the more powerful chiefs of Fiji, assurance obtained even there, and the convert was welcomed. In the course of a few years, the missionaries, with the aid of native teachers and preachers, some of whom came from the Vavau Islands, introduced the Gospel into various other islands of the Fiji group, beside Vavau, Taveuni, as Rewa, Vunibula, and some others of minor importance. They were favorably received by a number of the chiefs and the people, in some instances, however, from motives of a secular character. In 1845 and the following year there was a great religious movement in the islands of Fiji, which extended 520 to other islands, and resulted in large additions to the Christian churches. Among the most remarkable fruits of the movement was the conversion of a chief whose name was Varin, and who had long acted as the human butcher of Seru, being called the Napoleon of Fiji.

In 1864, the king Thakombau, who occupied several of the smaller islands and the eastern coast of Viti Levu, together with his tribe, embraced Christianity. Since this time the prosperity of the islands has rapidly increased, and they are now partially in charge of a botany which has settled on the island, and have developed to a considerable extent the natural resources of the soil. A great part of the territory of Thakamau is now mapped off into cotton and sugar plantations, most of the planters being Australian. There is also in the island of Levuka a sugar factory, at the time of the visit of a governor, a flourishing little town called Ovalau, which has a hotel and a number of stores, all of them kept by whites. There is a British consul also stationed in this island, and in 1868 an agent of the American government was sent there from Sidney. About the time which extending Thakamau to other islands, and resulted in large additions to the Christian churches. Among the most remarkable fruits of the movement was the conversion of a chief whose name was Varin, and who had long acted as the human butcher of Seru, being called the Napoleon of Fiji.
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Western form, for which they were accused of heresy by the Easterns. Charlemagne hated the East heartily, drew up a refutation of the Eastern doctrine, and summoned a council at Aix-la-Chapelle (809), which sanctioned the filioque, and sent deputies to Leo III to older. For a creed, the doctrine of the West, that Leo refused to add the filioque to the creed, and even had the creed itself, in its original form, enshrined on two silver shields (in Greek and Latin), which he hung up in St. Paul's Church as a testimonium to his unwillingness to break his oath of allegiance to the general councils by adding to the same, which he gave his sanction to the doctrine of the filioque as scriptural and sound. In the latter part of the century the troubles with Photius (q.v.) renewed the controversy between East and West; and the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 879), which was attended by 800 bishops, anathematized all who added the filioque. No pope had at yet formally authorized the addition, and yet it was coming into general use in the West, under the authority, especially, of pope Nicholas I (Neale, Eastern Church, p. 1165 sq; Mansi, xvi, 255). Finally, the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, when the Church was occupied with the defense of the Crusades against the Moslems and the heathen, the controversy became academical, and did not attract much public or open way; "no decreet, encyclical or synodical, announcing her adhesion. The thing was done in a corner, and, for a curious liturgical writer of the Western empire, who went to see his sovereign, Henry II, crowned at Rome, A.D. 1014, by pope Benedict, he was good enough to give a hint of the way in which it occurred. Berno therefore records what he witnessed with his own eyes and ears; and being engaged himself in a work on the Mass, he would naturally be very particular in his inquiries when he came to Rome, of all places, how things were done there. Now his account is that "up to that time the Romans," that is, the Church of Rome generally, "had in no wise changed the creed after the gospel; but that the lord emperor Henry would not desist till, with the approval of all, he had persuaded the apostolic lord Benedict to let it be chanted at high mass." Thus in Leo II it got its adopted by the popes themselves. When this had been done, the pontifical oath was changed. Later popes, of course, shrank from imprecating a judgment upon themselves, according to the terms of the oath. For in this case they failed to keep the decree, as the general councils enumerated it in its, 'nuspe ad usum apicem,' when they felt they had notoriously failed to do so by the creed. That clause was accordingly struck out. For the last 1000 years the Roman communion is not committed to the use of a creed which is that of the Church of the West, but of the Greek Church. Nor do say, therefore, to the use of a creed which is heterodox. On the theological question involved in it I would wish to speak with becoming reverence; but thus much is certain, that the addition which forms its distinguishing feature was made and had been in use many centuries before any pope judged it allowable, much less necessary; many centuries before theologians in the West had agreed among themselves whether the terms 'mission' and 'procreasion' were distinguishable. Doubtless it has since found able defenders, but two thorough reasons for two who give the same account of it, historically or doctrinally, and some of them are neither consistent with each other nor with themselves. Others, in arguing for it against the Easterns, have grievously mistated facts, and numberless passages have been adduced in support of it from a father, either from another, with no interpolated. I know of no parallel to it in this respect in any religious controversy before or since. If the Athanasian Creed was not expressly coined for this controversy, it was employed in this controversy first in a real weapon against the heretics" (Foulkes, Letter to Archbishop Manning, London, 1868).

For the renewal of the question, with a view to union between the Greeks and Latins at the Council of Florence, see FLORENCE. The great English di- vine, tine, and Waterland, while adhering to the doctrine of the West, condemn the intercalation of the creed. So Pearson remarks: "Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for adding filioque to the creed. For a creed, the doctrine of the West, that Leo refused to add the filioque to the creed, and even had the creed itself, in its original form, in two silver shields (in Greek and Latin), which he hung up in St. Paul's Church as a testimonium to his unwillingness to break his oath of allegiance to the general councils by adding to the same, which he gave his sanction to the doctrine of the filioque as scriptural and sound. In the latter part of the century the troubles with Photius (q.v.) renewed the controversy between East and West; and the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 879), which was attended by 800 bishops, anathematized all who added the filioque. No pope had yet formally authorized the addition, and yet it was coming into general use in the West, under the authority, especially, of pope Nicholas I (Neale, Eastern Church, p. 1165 sq; Mansi, xvi, 255). Finally, the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, when the Church was occupied with the defense of the Crusades against the Moslems and the heathen, the controversy became academic, and did not attract much public or open way; "no decreet, encyclical or synodalical, announcing her adhesion. The thing was done in a corner, and, for a curious liturgical writer of the Western empire, who went to see his sovereign, Henry II, crowned at Rome, A.D. 1014, by pope Benedict, he was good enough to give a hint of the way in which it occurred. Berno therefore records what he witnessed with his own eyes and ears; and being engaged himself in a work on the Mass, he would naturally be very particular in his inquiries when he came to Rome, of all places, how things were done there. Now his account is that "up to that time the Romans," that is, the Church of Rome generally, "had in no wise changed the creed after the gospel; but that the lord emperor Henry would not desist till, with the approval of all, he had persuaded the apostolic lord Benedict to let it be chanted at high mass." Thus Beccard inaugurated the addition, Charlemagne patronized it, and Henry II it got it adopted by the popes themselves. When this had been done, the pontifical oath was changed. Later popes, of course, shrank from imprecating a judgment upon themselves, according to the terms of the oath. For in this case they failed to keep the decree, as the general councils enumerated it in its, 'nuspe ad usum apicem,' when they felt they had notoriously failed to do so by the creed. That clause was accordingly struck out. For the last 1000 years the Roman communion is not committed to the use of a creed which is that of the Church of the West, but of the Greek Church. Nor do say, therefore, to the use of a creed which is heterodox. On the theological question involved in it I would wish to speak with becoming reverence; but thus much is certain, that the addition which forms its distinguishing feature was made and had been in use many centuries before any pope judged it allowable, much less necessary; many centuries before theologians in the West had agreed among themselves whether the terms 'mission' and 'procreasion' were distinguishable. Doubtless it has since found able defenders, but two thorough reasons for two who give the same account of it, historically or doctrinally, and some of them are neither consistent with each other nor with themselves. Others, in arguing for it against the Easterns, have grievously mistated facts, and numberless passages have been adduced in support of it from a father, either from another, with no interpolated. I know of no parallel to it in this respect in any religious controversy before or since. If the Athanasian Creed was not expressly coined for this controversy, it was employed in this controversy first in a real weapon against the heretics" (Foulkes, Letter to Archbishop Manning, London, 1868).

The commissioners for a review of the English Prayer-book, 1889, expressed in a note their opinion that something should be done to satisfy the Greek Church. At a later period the non-juring prelates made overtures to the Greeks, stating that in the clause filioque nothing more is meant than "from the Father by the Son," to which the Greek patriarch and Synod of Constantinople replied (April 12, 1718): "We receive no other rule or creed than that which was set forth in the first ten chapters of the second Holy Gospel, in which it was decreed that the Holy Ghost proceeds 'from the Father.' Therefore we receive none who add the least syllable (and the most perfect word would fall far short), either by way of insertion, commentary, or explication to this holy creed, or who take it away. For nothing in it can be taken away without anathematizing all such as shall either take from or add to it any word or syllable. If any one has formerly inserted any word, let it be struck out, and let the creed be unaltered as it was at first written, and is to this day, after so many years, read and believed by us. Now, concerning this point, we thus believe that there is a twofold procession of the Holy Spirit: the one natural, eternal, and before time, according to which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone; and of which it is both written in the creed, and the Lord has said, 'the Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father' (John xv, 26). The other procession is temporal and deputative, according to which the Holy Spirit is externally sent forth, derived, proceeds, and flows from both the Father and the Son, of the Godhead, and is the sole cause of his temporal and outward procession, we agree that he proceeds, comes, or is sent by the Son, or through the Son's mediation, and from the Son, in this sense of an outward procession, for the sanctification of the creatures. But this manifestation, or mission, we do not pretend to a process which should be comprehended in the Person of the Pascal, who, because of the limited dialect of the Latin language, which is unable to express the manifestation, or mission, by one word, and the ἐκπορευόμενος, or procession, by another, have called them both processions, which afterwards grew into error, and made them take the external procession for that manifestation, which was in time" (Amer. Quart. Church Rev. Apr. 1868, p. 98).

The historical question is very thoroughly discussed by the Rev. E. S. Foulkes (a convert from the Anglican to the Roman Church) in several recent works of his, especially in his History of the Words Filioque to the Creed (Lond. 1867). Mr. Foulkes states that he has no objection to the doctrine of the double procession in the abstract, but he objects to its "embodiment in the creed in a word of four syllables, foisted in without authority, retained there without any other ancient process which can be considered for it, in a proposition set apart for the declaration of another truth" (p. 31). Moreover, he objects to the clause because it binds the acceptance of a proposition which has two meanings: "the sense in which the Holy Ghost is said to proceed from the Father by the Son" is every way comprehended with the sense in which he is said to proceed from the Father." And he expresses his conviction that this clause has a good deal to do...
FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY

with the Socinianism and Unitarianism so long rife in the West. Mr. Foulkes notices that in the East, where the filioque is not adopted, "there is positively nothing in this doctrine that has excited the exasperation of Christians;" and it happened to himself once to meet with this reply from a literary friend with whom he had been discussing the clause—"I find my escape from it in Unitarianism."

He proceeds to the whole question involved, viz., Holy Ghost, Procession. Suffice it here to say, that while the Latins are inexcusable, according to their own canon law, for their addition of the filioque to the creed, they are still correct as to the doctrine. Their deeper anthropological investigations naturally developed the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Thus the Son. Palmer ("Discussions on Subjects relating to the Eastern Communion," Lond. 1858, 8vo, p. 103 sq.) gives the following summary of the controversy: I. That when the expression of the Holy Ghost proceeding "also from the Son" was first noticed and objected against by the Greeks, the Latins explained it away or dissembled it, instead of openly insisting on it as truth. Again, II. That when, at length, they had all received it themselves, the Latins attempted to force it into the creed, and to impose it on the Church at large by overbearing the Greek acquiescence in it. Again. III. That in seeking to impose it upon the Easterns, the Latins generally have rested it upon manifestly false grounds, as upon the ground of unbroken and explicit tradition. Again, IV. That a vast multitude of passages, formerly alleged by the Latins, both from Greek and Latin authors, have been too easily to be interpolations altogether, or to have been corrupted.

Lastly, V. That some of the texts most insisted on by the Latins at the Council of Florence, and shown afterwards, by Zornikaff, to have been corrupted, have, since Zornikaff wrote, been surrendered, even by Latin scholars; so that, the case, as respects the critical examination of passages, has gained materially in strength since the Council of Florence. But to reject a doctrine not revealed in Scripture, nor handed down by unbroken tradition from the beginning, but "dug out" or developed by the Church in later ages, and violently thrust upon the rest on false grounds, can never be heresy. If, indeed, it were confounded to be a novelty and a development, and sufficiently shown to be, notwithstanding, a legitimate and necessary development, there might be a greater reason for it. On the contrary, so many of the Greeks assert, not only that the Latin doctrine is false in itself, but also that it is a heresy, and that the Latins are heretics for maintaining it. But against this view it is fair to object. I. That those heretical consequences which seem to flow from the assertion of the procession from the Son as well as from the Father, and on account of which the doctrine itself is said to be heresy, are clearly rejected and condemned as heresies by the Latins, no less than by the Greeks; which would seem to reduce the Latin error, if it be an error, to a mere misconception and insinuation of words. II. That all heresies spring from evil motives; but the motive which prompted the assertion of this doctrine is commonly admitted, even by the Greeks, to have been good, namely, the desire to maintain, against the Arians and other heretics, the co-essentiality of the Father and Son. The Latins, on the other hand, say, that the Greeks have repeatedly and all along offered to unite and communicate with the Latins, winking at all other faults if only the form of the creed were restored, which they could not have done if the doctrine of the procession from the Son had been held to be heresy in itself. IV. That when it is only some or many passages, but all those passages in St. Augustine and other Latin fathers which assert the procession from the Son, have been shown to be corrupt or interpolated, or, in sense, to mean no more than they were stated to mean in the explanation given at Rome to Maximus the martyr in the 7th century, the Latins, even if they be in error, cannot be called heretics for adhering to a doctrine seemingly taught and bequeathed to them by the great saints and fathers of the Church, no less than by their own. We conclude, then, that so long as the "filioque" is not interpolated into the creed without the consent of a council, the question of the doctrine in itself is still open and pending, and that the Greeks are the only ones of them that deny it, nor the Latins if they assert it, so long as they both desire that the subject may be fairly and religiously decided by an ecumenical council."


FILLAN, ST. "Two Scoto-Irish saints of the name of Fillan appear in the Church calendars, and have left their mark on the topography of Scotland and Ireland. (1.) ST. FILLAN, or Faolan, named the Lep- er, had his yearly festival on the 30th of June. His chief church in Scotland was at the east end of Loch Erne, in Perthsire, where 'St. Fillan's Well' was long believed to have supernatural powers of healing. A seat in the rock of Dunfillan still keeps the name of 'St. Fillan's Chair;' and two coves beside it are said to have been hollowed by St. Fillan's knees in prayer. His Irish church is at Ballyheiday (anciently called Killihelan or Kill Faolan), in the barony of Cullenagh, in Queen's County. (2.) ST. FILLAN, the abbot, the son of St. Kettigern of Inchcalloch, in Loch Lomond, lived in the 8th century, and had his yearly festival on the 7th of May. In the island of Cluan, near Islay, very many of the Greeks assert, not only that the Latin doctrine is false in itself, but also that it is a heresy, and that the Latins are heretics for maintaining it. But against this view it is fair to object. (1) That those heretical consequences which seem to follow from the assertion of the procession from the Son as well as from the Father, and on account of which the doctrine itself is said to be heresy, are clearly rejected and condemned as heresies by the Latins, no less than by the Greeks; which would seem to reduce the Latin error, if it be an error, to a mere misconception and insinuation of words. (2) That all heresies spring from evil motives; but the motive which prompted the assertion of this doctrine is commonly admitted, even by the Greeks, to have been good, namely, the desire to maintain, against the Arians and other heretics, the co-essentiality of the Father and Son. The Latins, on the other hand, say, that the Greeks have repeatedly and all along offered to unite and communicate with the Latins, winking at all other faults if only the form of the creed were restored, which they could not have done if the doctrine of the procession from the Son had been held to be heresy in itself. (3) That when it is only some or many passages, but all those passages in St. Augustine and other Latin fathers which assert the procession from the Son, have been shown to be corrupt or interpolated, or, in sense, to mean no more than they were stated to mean in the explanation given at Rome to Maximus the martyr in the 7th century, the Latins, even if they be in error, cannot be called heretics for adhering to a doctrine seemingly taught and bequeathed to them by the great saints and fathers of the Church, no less than by their own. We conclude, then, that so long as the "filioque" is not interpolated into the creed without the consent of a council, the question of the doctrine in itself is still open and pending, and that the Greeks are the only ones of them that deny it, nor the Latins if they assert it, so long as they both desire that the subject may be fairly and religiously decided by an ecumenical council."
so lately as the year 1784. Sixty years later, the 
Quirrigch still commanded reverence; but its healing 
virtues were now only tried on cattle, and its once opu-
ulent keepers had fallen to the rank of farm-laborers.
It was publicly exhibited in Edinburgh in the year 
1818, before being carried to Canada, where it now is,
in the hands of a descendant of its old custodians, a
farmer named Alexander Dewar. He puts such a 
value on the relic that he has hitherto refused to part 
with it for less than £400 sterling, or 1000 acres of 
Canadian land. It has been recently figured and de-
scribed by Dr. Daniel Wilson in a paper in the Cana-
idan Journal, No. xxiv, reprinted in a pamphlet, with
the title of The Quirrigch, or Croesus of St. Fillan (To-
ronto, 1859); and in the Proceedings of the Society of
Antiquaries of Scotland, vol. iii. pt. ii, p. 238, plate xxvi
(Edinb. 1881). A limb in the river Fillan or Doch-
art, in Strathfillan, was long believed to work woe-
derful cures on insane persons, who were immersed
in the stream at sunset, and left bound hand and
foot till sunrise in the ruins of the neighboring
church of St. Fillan. A handbell, which bore the
name of St. Fillan, was also believed to work mirac-
ules."

"Fillet" is an erroneous translation in the A. V. of
two Heb. words; דָּשָּׁנָה, "chassakun", joynings (comp.
Exod. xxviii, 17, 38; xxvii, 17), the poles or rods
which served to join together the tops of the columns
around the court of the tabernacle (q. v.), and from
which the curtains were suspended (Exod. xxvii, 10,
11; xxxvi, 38; xxxviii, 11, 12, 17, 19). כְּתֻבָּה, cut-
ch a thread (as elsewhere rendered), a measuring-line 12
cubits long for the circumference of the pillars of cop-
er in Solomon's Temple (Jer. iii, 21). See COLUMN;
GARLAND.

"Fillet," a small flat face or band in classical ar-
chitecture, used to separate mouldings; in Gothic ar-
chitecture, a flat band on a curved moulding, used
to decorate a shaft on a larger moulding. When
on the front of a large moulding, it is called its keel; on the sides, it is
called a wing. In the cut, a a are examples of fillets.

"Fin," ("finn", semaurp), of uncertain etymol., the
fin of a fish (q. v.), a distinctive mark of such as might
be eaten under the Mosaic law (Lev. xi, 9, 10, 12;
Deut. xiv, 9, 10). See CLEAN.

"Final Perseverance." See FINESEVANCE.

"Fine" or nucl for damages (q. v.). In some in-
stances, by the Mosaic law, the amount of a fine, or
of an indemnification that was to be made, was deter-
mined by the person who had been injured; in other
instances it was fixed by the judge, and in others was
defined by the law (Exod. xxii, 19-36; Deut. xxvii, 19,
29). Twofold, fourfold, and even fivefold restitution
of things stolen, and restitution of property unjustly
retained, with twenty per cent. over and above, was
required. Thus, if a man killed a beast, he was to
make it good, beast for beast. This ordinance, ob-
erves Michaelis (Laws of Moses, art. 169), appears
only incidentally in Lev. xxiv, 18, among criminal
laws. If an ox pushed or gored another man's servant
to death, his owner was bound to pay for the servant
thirty shekels of silver (Exod. xxi, 28). In the case
of one man's ox pushing or goring another's to death,
it would have been a very intricate point to ascertain
which of the two had been to blame for the quarrel,
and therefore both owners were obliged to bear the
loss. The living ox was sold, and the price, together
with the dead one, equally divided between them
(Exod. xxii, 66). If, however, the ox had previously
been notorious for pushing, and the owner had not
taken care to confine him, this made a difference; for
then, to the man whose ox had been pushed, he was
obliged to give another, and the dead ox he got him-
hisself (Exod. xxi, 36). If a man dug a pit and did not
cover it, or let an old pit belonging to him remain
open, and another man's beast fell into it, the owner
of the pit was obliged to pay for the beast, and had no
payment (Exod. xxii, 28, 34). When a fire was
kindled in the fields, and did any damage, he who
kindled it was obliged to make the damage good (Exod.
xxii, 6). See PUNISHMENT.

"Filler," ("tweá"", tawrep), a gold and silver worker
(Prov. xxv, 4). See REFINER. In Judg. xvii, 4, our
version renders the word "founder." in Isa. xiii, 7,
"goldsmith." It refers especially to the melting of
fine metal. See FURNACE. The Egyptians carried the
working of metals to a very extraordinary de-
gree of perfection, as their various articles of jewellery
preserved in our museums avince; and there is no
doubt the Hebrews derived their knowledge of these
arts from this source, though there is at the same time
reference to their being known before the Flood (Gen.
xiv, 19-22). See METAL.

"Finger," ("eéa"", "eérnołc"), besides its ordi-
nary meaning, is used in Scripture to denote the spe-
cial and immediate agency of any one. See ARM.
The Egyptian magicians, terrified by the numerous
plagues inflicted upon their country, at length said,"This is the finger of God." in Isa. (19). i. e. this is God," in God's own power," i. e. the power of God himself (Exod. vii, 19). Moses gave
the tables of the law written by the finger (personal
direction) of God to the Hebrews (Exod. xxxi, 18).
The heavens are said to be the work of God's fingers,"i.
e. his power (Psa. viii, 8). Christ cast out devils
with the finger or power of God (Luke iii, 20). "To
put forth the finger" is a bantering, insulting gesture
(Isa. lvi, 9). Some take this for a menacing gesture,
resembling that which Nicodemus stretched out his hand against the Temple,
threatening to burn it (2 Macc. xiv, 38). "Four
fingers thick" occurs as a measure in Jer. iii, 21. See
RING.

"Finnal," the cluster of foliage that is frequently
used to ornament the top of pillars, canopies, pedi-
ments, etc., in Gothic architecture. The term is also
often used as synonymous with the pinnacle of a spire,
roof, or canopy.


"Finishing-pot," ("pawrpo", mateurp), a crucible or melt-
ing-pot (Prov. xvii, 3; xxvii, 21). See METALLUR-
GY. The use of these for reducing gold was famil-
ary to the ancient Egyptians. Much of the course
be expected from the objects found in the excavated
tombe to illustrate the means employed in smelting the ore, or to disclose any of the secrets they possessed in metallurgy; and little is given in the paintings beyond the use of the blow-pipe, the forges, and the mode of concentrating heat by raising sheets of metal round three sides of fire in which the crucibles were placed. See Furnace. Of the latter, indeed, there is no indication in these subjects, unless it be in the accompanying woodcut; but the use of the bellows is suggested, and some which have been found in Egypt are preserved in the museum for ever cold (Whitkem). At the bottom, a nearly five inches in diameter at the mouth, and about the same in depth, and present the orderly form and appearance of those used at the present day" (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. abridgm. ii, 188). See Handicraft.

Finland, when first mentioned in history, was inhabited by tribes belonging to the whole Finnish nations, which by piracy and frequent invasions became especially formidable to the Swedes. The latter submitted with difficulty and only for a short time the coast of Finland, while the republic of Novgorod extended its rule over the southern branches of the Finns. The Finns, however, not long after the pagans were defeated, a letter inciting them to invade Sweden, to conquer them, and compel them to adopt Christianity. Accompanied by bishop Henry, of Upsala, an Englishman, he landed in 1157 on the south-western coast, and at first met with little resistance. The first church was built at Venden, near the town of Abo, the foundation of which had likewise been laid by Eric. When Eric returned to Sweden, bishop Henry remained in the country, but the progress of Christianity was very slow, as the Finns had yielded only to compulsion; the mission had not reached the North, nor its influence the language, and the poverty of the language presented the greatest obstacles to an adequate designation of the new Christian ideas. While outwardly professing Christianity, most of the converts remained secretly addicted to their old pagan ideas, or at least mixed up Christianity doctrine with their heathenism. Bishop Henry baptized a large number, established an episcopal see at Rendsmacke, and finally lost his life (1166) in consequence of his zeal in enforcing Church discipline. After the complete triumph of Christianity, the Finns venerated him as the first apostle and patron saint. He was commemorated on the 19th of January and the 18th of June; his picture, exhibiting his full episcopal vestments, with an axe by his side and the murderer at his feet, was hung up in every church, and many miracles were ascribed to his relics (see Henry, bishop of the Finns). His successor, Rudolph, was carried off by the Courlanders and killed. The progress of Christianity was considerably delayed by the opposition of the Russians to the advance of the Swedes, on whom the existence of the feebler Christian Church was wholly dependent. In 1158, Abo was invested by the Russian Orthodox bishop, also an Englishman, had to seek a refuge upon the island of Gotland. In 1249, the brother of the king of Sweden, Birger Magnusson, the first yarl of the kingdom, landed on the southern coast of Asteroth, slaid the tribe of the Tavasti, established the fortress of Tavastehorg, subsequently called Tavastehorg, built several churches, and compelled the inhabitants to accept Christianity and to pay taxes to the bishop. These taxes the fifth bishop, Bero, of his own accord, ceded to the king. Another great Swedish expedition was undertaken by the crusaders under the command of the guardian of the minor king, Birger II. The pope not only sanctioned this expedition, but granted to the knights and warriors who took part in it the same indulgences as to the Crusaders. Thorkel landed with a large fleet, overpowered the inhabitants, and established the fortress of Viborg. Bishop Peter, of Westerum, announced Christianity to the tribes which were still pagans, and the Swedish arms left to the natives only the choice between Christianity and slavery. Thus Christianity was gradually forced upon the whole nation, with the exception of a few remote districts where paganism continued to maintain itself. Though planted and spread by force, Christianity finally rooted itself in the minds of the people by means of a new preach. The episcopal see of Abo attained considerable celebrity. The number of churches was largely increased, the cathedral school of Abo was numerously attended, and gradually six monasteries were established. The Reformation met in Finland with such success that 2 monasteries were soon the Lutheran Church superseded Roman Catholicism altogether. In consequence of the wars between Sweden and Russia in the 16th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, Finland was lost to Sweden and gained by the emperor of Russia. In 1721, at the peace of Nystadt, Russia received the towns of Viborg and Keyholm; in 1748, at the peace of Abo, a territory of about 4800 square miles, with the fortresses of Nyborg, Frederiksham, and Savolax; and in 1809, at the peace of Frederiksham, the whole of Finland. Emperor Alexander I reunited Viborg, which for some time had constituted a separate province, with Finland, which retains its old Constitution, its Swedish laws, and Lutheran religion. Finland is, in point of administration, wholly separated from Russia Proper; the highest authority is the imperial senate for Finland, consisting of 16 natives, with the assistance of a governor general. The diet, as formerly in Sweden, consists of four estates, nobility, clergy, burghers, and peasants.

The population of Finland in 1887 amounted to 2,292,578, of whom 41,002 were connected with the Greek Church, which has six main churches and 2 monasteries. The Roman Catholics have a church in Viborg and in Helsingfors. Nearly the whole remainder, a population of about 2,190,000, belongs to the Lutheran Church. The organization of the Lutheran Church of Finland is in every respect similar to that of the Lutheran Church of Sweden. Liturgies, hymn-books, catechism, and other Church books, are substantially the same as in Sweden. The Church has one archbishop, of Abo (the archbishop resides at Helsingfors), and two bishops, of Borgo and Kuopio, the latter of which is the residence of the archbishop. In 1867 was 214. Most of the congregations have, besides the pastor, a chaplain, also a church council. The churches are generally well attended. In most of the churches, especially in the country, the sermons are preached in the Finnish language; in others, both Finnish and Swedish are used; and in some, Swedish exclusively. The highest literary institution is the University of Helsingfors (until 1847 at Abo). It has among the faculties one of Lutheran theology, about 45 professors, and 1700 students. There is also a theological faculty at Helsinki, which has 6 gymnasia, 13 secondary and 3 primary schools, 3 female institutions, and a number of schools for special purposes. At the higher institutions instruction is generally given in Swedish; but the use of the Finnish language is advancing at the expense of the Swedish, which is the official language of the Russian government. An Evangelical Society was established in 1817; there are also several Bible Societies.—Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lehrbuch, iv, 70; Wiggers, Kirch. Statistik, ii, 428; Rühe, Finnland u. seine Bewohner (Lepa), 150 (1849). A. J. Finlay, James J. Bradley, one of the most distinguished and useful pioneers of Methodism in Ohio, was the son of the Rev. R. W. Finley, and was born in North Carolina, July 1, 1781. He received a good
education from his father. In 1801 he married, and settled in what is now Highland County, Ohio. In 1818, while serving a circuit as an itinerant, he joined the Baptist Church, and for some years he was a missionary among the Maury Indians near Natchez. For six years he edited, at St. Louis, the *Liberator Advocate*, devoted to African colonization, in which cause he was greatly interested through life, and was pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Metuchin, N. J., and in 1858 principal of the Presbyterian Female Institute at Talladega, Ala., where he died July 2, 1860.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Almanac*, 1861, p. 88.

Finley, Robert W., a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bucks County, Pa., June 9, 1834. He was converted at seventeen, in 1850, and entered Princeton College, N. J., where he spent seven years in general and theological studies. In 1874 he was licensed to preach in the Presbyterian Church, and was sent as a missionary to Georgia and the Carolinas. Here he was a pastor as well as a preacher, and was often with General Marion in his expeditions, and incurred much enmity and risk of life from the Tories. In 1874 he went to Hampshire County, then in New Virginia, where he preached two years. In 1876 he emigrated to Kentucky, and eventually opened a school for students in divinity, and a number of his pupils were distinguished in subsequent life. In 1876 he went with general Massie to explore the Scioto country, then in the Northwest Territory, and in May, 1796, he settled on the Scioto, below Chillicothe. In 1808 he connected himself with the Methodist Church, and in 1811 or 1812 joined the Ohio Conference as a travelling preacher. For many years he labored with great success, and received hundreds into the Church. When almost eighty and superannuated, he mounted his horse, with his books and clothes, and set off as a missionary to Saut St. Marie, and there formed a church and conducted a camp-meeting. He died at Germantown, Ohio, Dec. 8, 1840.—Minutes of Conference, i. 299.

Finley, Samuel, D.D., a Presbyterian minister and president of New Jersey College, was born in County Armagh, Ireland, and came to America in 1794. On his arrival at Philadelphia he renewed his studies preparatory to the ministry, and was licensed in 1740. He labored long and successfully in West Jersey, in Deerfield, Greenwich, and Cape May, and supplied the church in Philadelphia for a time. He was ordained by the Presbytery of New Brunswick in 1742, and in 1744 he accepted a call from Nottingham, Maryland, where he continued for nearly thirty years, and where he kept an academy of great reputation. In 1761 he was called to the presidency of New Jersey College, and removed to Princeton, and soon after was honored with the degree of D.D. from Glasgow. He died July 17, 1766. He published a sermon entitled *Christ triumphing and Satan roaring*, 1741:—A *Refutation of a Sermon on the Doctrine of Conversions*, 1748:—*Satan stripped of his angelic robes*, 1749:—*A charitable Pies for the Speechless*, 1747:—A *Vindication of the preaching*, 1748:—A *Sermon—The Curse of Meros*, 1749:—*Satin stripped of his angelic robes*.—Sprague, *Annals*, iv. 146.

Finnan, an Irish ecclesiastic whom Oisin, king of Northumberland, called to the abbey of Lindisfarne, and to superintend the churches in his kingdom. The Venerable Bede says, "He was a man of fierce and rough nature, but very successful in ministerial labor, he baptized Pais, king of the Wealas Angles, and sent four priests to instruct his subjects in Christianity." He also consecrated Ceadmon, who afterwards became a very prominent bishop among the East Angles, and baptized Sigebert their king, together with great numbers of the common people. He was very zealous in the temporal, as well as the spiritual interest of the Church. During his
superintendency, Bede says "he erguson a church on the island of Lindisfarne fit for an episcopal see, which, nevertheless, he built after the manner of the Scots [Irish], not of stone, but of sawn oak, and covered it with thatch" (Eccles. Hist. lib. iii, c. xxxv). Years afterward, the clergy of the bishopric of these churches in Northumberland, Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, required this church to be re-consecrated, and dedicated to the patronage of St. Peter. Finnan, having for ten years superintended the abbacy of Lindisfarne and the churches of North-umbrian under his well-known title of "bishop," died A.D. 661. He left a treatise entitled Pro Voteri Pacchali Edus, regarding the Irish and Oriental time of keeping Easter as the old and true time, and that of Rome as of recent date. See Bede's Eccles. Hist. ; Illustr. Men of Ireland, vol. i. (D. D.)

**Finns**. "Geographically the name of the inhabitants of Finland, but in ethnology that of a considerable branch of the Ugrarian race, dwelling for the most part in Finland, though with some representatives in Sweden and Norway as well. The Ugrians have been classed among the nations said to have a Mongolian origin. Dr. Latham places them among the "Tauranian Altic Mongolides," and divides them into Ugrians of the East and Ugrians of the West. The Western Ugrians consist of Lapps, Finns, Permians, and other nations or tribes in the north and north-west of Russia, and of the Magyars in Hungary. The Magyars are the most numerous, and next after these come the Finns, comprising about 2,000,000 of individuals. All the other tribes of Western Ugrians do not together comprise so many. The Finns, in common with the other Ugrians, are of the Mongolian type. The Finns, from having been originally a nomadic race, have for many centuries been stationary and civilized. Long before the arrival of the German and Slavic nations, in the north of Europe, the Ugrians, or Oapes (for the name, so common in fiction, is really of historic origin), possessed it, and were gradually pushed further north and east by the new invaders. Both Finns and Lapps, there is good reason to believe, originally extended much further south than they do at present, occupying, perhaps, the whole of Sweden and Norway. "The Finns," says Prichard, "were in the time of Tacitus as savage as the Lapps; but the former, during the succeeding ages, became so far civilized as to exchange a nomadic life for one of agricultural pursuits, while the latter have ever continued as the various nomades, as well as the Siberian tribes of the same race—namely, the Wogula and Ostiaks. The Finns, as well as their brethren the Boormans, or Finns of the White Sea, had probably undergone this change long before the time when they were visited by the guest of Alfred. When the Finns were conquered by the Swedes, they had long been a settled people, but one of curious, and singular, and isolated character." See Finland.

**Fintanus or Fintan**, the founder of the monastery of Rheinau (q.v.), in the canton of Zurich. He descended from a noble family in the province of Leinster, Ireland. In a war between two chieftains, one chieftain killed Fintan's brother, and, fearing that Fintan would avenge the brother's death, caused him insidiously to be carried off by the Normans. Having changed his master several times within a few days, Fintan was to be taken to Scotland, but escaped when the vessel landed at one of the Orkney Islands. He had to spend three days on this uninhabited island, after which he swam, miraculously supported, to Scotland. He remained for two years with a bishop who had studied in Ireland; then, in compliance with a vow, he journeyed, not only to two, but to many other places, such as the monasteries of Aosta and Vara or Oria. It appears that many of these terms must be considered generic rather than specific in the modern sense, when so much care is bestowed on the accurate discrimination of one species from another. Thus oris, from which the epithet is derived, is a pine-tree in Scripture, whether we follow the common acceptation and consider it the cedar, or adopt the opinion of Celso, that the Ficus sycomorus is indicated. So baruti may have been applied by the Arabs, etc., not only to the saxine and other species of juniper, but also to plants, such as the cypress, which resemble these. In many of those cases, therefore, where we are unable to discover any absolute identity or similarity of name, we must be guided by the nature of the house of the Welts, the monastery which the grand-father and father of Wolfen had begun. After working at Rheinau for five years as a priest, he entered the monastery in 651, remained there five years, and thereupon became a hermit, leading for 22 years, from 556 to 578, a life of extreme asceticism. Thus he came to be venerated as a saint, even during his lifetime, throughout the whole region. When his friend Wolfen, who in the mean time had become abbot of Rheinau, returned from Rome with the relics of St. Blasian, Fintan took a portion of them to the monastery which he had founded, and the place was called St. Blasian.—Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, xix, 491.

**Fir** (the name of an extensive family of coniferous evergreens; see Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Abies) is the uniform rendering in the Author. V. of מ"ד, בורק (from its being cut into planks, Gesenius, Thee. Heb. p. 246), which frequently occurs (2 Sam. vii, 5; 1 Kings vi, 8; 10; vi, 15, 34; ix, 11; 2 Kings ix, 28; 2 Chron. ii, 8; iii, 5; Psa. civ, 17; Isa. iv, 8; xlix, 24; xlii, 19; lv, 13; lx; Ezek. xxvii, 5; xxxi, 8; Hos. xiv, 8; Nah. ii, 8; Zech. xi, 2), and נִמְנָה, בורק, which is said to be only the Aramaean form of the same word (in Cant. i, 17). In most of the passages the terms rendered cedar and fir in the Author. V. are mentioned together. בורק is translated variously in the Sept. נוריעה, וּנָוְיָה (and Ezek. xxvii, 8), in the LXX. Німній, and in Isa. vi, 8, דֵּלָה דַּלְּהוּבָּו; in the Vulg. cliui abies, cupressus. It was a lofty tree (Isa. lv, 18), growing on Lebanon (Isa. xxxvii, 24), and of an ornamental figure (Isa. ix, 12). The passages from which any special account of its use can be derived are, 1. Of musical instruments (2 Sam. vii, 5); 2. Of doors (1 Kings vi, 34); 3. Of gilded ceilings (2 Chron. iii, 5); 4. Boards or decks of ships (Ezek. xxvii, 5), or planks for flooring (1 Kings vi, 15). Rosenmüller says, "In most of the passages where the Hebrew word occurs, it is by the oldest Greek and the Syriac translators rendered cypress." Celcius, on the contrary, is of opinion that בורק indicates the cedar of Lebanon, and that אֵרֶץ, which is usually considered to have that meaning, is the common pine (Pinus sylvestris), apparently because he conceives בורק to be changed from לְכַר, the Arabic name of pine. J. E. Faller, as quoted by Rosenmüller, conjectures that the Hebrew name בורק included three different trees which resemble each other, viz. the evergreen cypress, the thyme, and the sycamore. The last, or Juniperus sabinia, is so like the cypress that it has been called by that name, and the moderns have noticed the resemblance, especially as to the leaves. "Hence, even among the Greeks, both trees bore the old Eastern names of בּוּרָה, בּוּרָה, בּרֻתָה, or ברה" (Rosenmüller, Bot. of the Bible, trans. p. 200). The word בורק or בורק is slightly varied in the Syriac and Chaldee versions, being written בורקה in the former, and ברָה in the latter. All these are closely allied to ברעת, a name of the σάρωτον plant, which is the βάτανον, βάτινον, and βάταλον of the Greeks, and which the Arabs have converted into 바רא and 바רא. By them it is applied to a species of juniper, which they call ערא and ערא or ערא. It appears that many of these terms must be considered generic rather than specific in the modern sense, when so much care is bestowed on the accurate discrimination of one species from another. Thus oris, from which the epithet is derived, is a pine-tree in Scripture, whether we follow the common acceptation and consider it the cedar, or adopt the opinion of Celso, that the Pinus sylvestris is indicated. So barut may have been applied by the Arabs, etc., not only to the saxine and other species of juniper, but also to plants, such as the cypress, which resemble these. In many of those cases, therefore, where we are unable to discover any absolute identity or similarity of name, we must be guided by the nature of the...
FIRE

the trees, the use to which they were applied, and the situations in which they are said to have been found. Thus, as we find eres and berakā so constantly associated in Scripture, the former may indicate the cedar with the wild pine-tree, while the latter may comprehend the juniper and cypress tribe. See Cedar; Cypress; Juniper.

All these were extensively used for fuel. Thus, at this date in Lebanon (Balfour, Trees of Scripture, p. 11; Thenius on 1 Kings vi, 84; Saalschütz, Hebr. Arch. i, 280, note 4; Miller, Gardener's Dict. s. v. Cupressus; Stephens, Thes. Ling. Gr. s. v. πυξίς; Belon, Obs. c. 110, p. 155; Loudon, Arboretum, iv, 2163). In Hos. xi, 8, the "stone-pine" (Pinyus) has a cone containing an edible nut, seems to be intended (Kitto, Crit. Bible, in loc.), although Henderson (Comment. in loc.) thinks that a fruitless tree is there referred to by way of contrast.

See Tree.

Fire (properly πῦr, εσχαθίαν). On the origin of fire, see Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. i, 94. The applications of fire in Scripture are susceptible of the following classification:

1. Religious.—That which consumed the burnt sacrifice and the incense-offering, beginning with the sacrifice of Noah (Gen. viii, 20), and continued in the ever-burning fire on the altar, first kindled from heav- en (Lev. vi, 12; ix, 24), and rekindled at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (2 Chron. vii, i, 2). See SACRIFICE.

"Fire from heaven," "fire of the Lord," usually denotes lightning in the Old Testament; but, when connected with sacrifices, the "fire of the Lord" is often to be understood as the fire of God, and sometimes the holocaust itself (Exod. xxxi, 18; Lev. i, 9; ii, 3; iii, 5, 9; Num. xxvii, 6; 1 Sam. ii, 28; Isa. xx, 16; Mal. i, 10). See LIGHTNING.

The perpetual fire on the altar was to be replenished with wood every morning (Lev. vi, 12; comp. Isa. xxvi, 9). According to the Gemara, it was divided into three parts, one for burning the victims, one for incense, and one for supply of the other portions (Lev. vi, 15; see Ralans, Aniq. Hebr. i, 4, 8, p. 26; and xxvii, 10, p. 98). Fire for sacred purposes obtained elsewhere than from the altar was called "strange fire," and for use of such Nadab and Abihu were punished with death by fire from God (Lev. x, 1, 2; Num. iii, 4; xxvi, 61). See ALTAR.

2. Parallel with this application of fire is to be noted the similar use for sacrificial purposes, and the respect paid to it, or to the heavenly bodies as symbols of deity (see below), which prevailed among many nations of antiquity, and of which the traces are not now extinct: e.g. the Sabean and Magian systems of worship, and their alleged connection with Abraham (Spencer, De Leg. Hebr. ii, 1, 2); the occasional relapse of the Jews themselves into sun, or its corrupted form of fire-worship (Isa. xxvii, 9; compare Gesenius, s. v. γυρίζω, Theol. p. 489; see Deut. xvii, 3; Jer. viii, 2; Ezek. viii, 16; Zeph. i, 5; 2 Kings xxvii, 16; xxviii, 3; xxix, 13, 15, 14; comp. Jahn, Bibl. Arch. c. vi, § 405, 408); the worship or dedication of heavenly bodies or fire, or prevailing to some extent, as among the Per- sians, so also even in Egypt (Herod. iii, 16; see Wilkin- son, Anc. Eg. i, 328, abridgm.); the sacred fire of the Greeks and Romans (Thucyd. i, 24; ii, 24; Cicero, De Leg. ii, 8, 12; Livy, xxix, 12; Dionys. ii, 67; Plutarch, Numa, 3, 263, ed. Reiske); the ancient forms and usage of worship, differing from each other in some important respects, but to some extent similar in principle, of Mexico and Peru (Preccott, Mexico, i, 60, 63; Peru, i, 101); and, lastly, the theory of the so-called Gabriel of Persia, and the Parsees of Bombay. (Fra- ser, Persia, c. iv, p. 141, 162, 164; Sir R. Porter, Travels in Persia, i, 54, 56; Chariton, Peregrines i, 210; iv, 268; viii, 876 sq; Niebuhr, Travels, ii, 66, 67; Gann, Travels, b, i, p. 76; Gibbon, Hist. c. vii, i, 335, ed. Smith; Benj. of Tudela, Early Trav. p. 114, 116; Burchhardt, Syria, p. 113.) See LIOO Trait. On the heathen prac- tice of children "passing through the fire," see MO- LOCH.

3. In the case of the spoil taken from the Midian- ites, such articles as could bear it were purified by fire as well as in the water appointed for the purpose (Num. xxxi, 5). They were afterwards consumed by fire outside the camp (Lev. iv, 12, 21; vi, 30; xvi, 27; Heb. xiii, 11). The Nazarite who had completed his vow, marked its com- pletion by shaving his head and casting the hair into the fire on the altar on which the peace-offerings were sacrificed (Num. xvi, 18).

II. Domestic.—Besides for cooking, baking, and roasting purposes [see BREAD, FOOD, etc.], fire is often required in Palestine for warmth (Jer. xxxvi, 22; Mark xv, 44; John xviii, 18; see Harmer, Obs. l, 125; Rother, p. 79). For this purpose a hearth with a chimney is sometimes constructed, on which either lighted wood or pans of charcoal are placed (Harmer, 405). In Persia, a hole made in the floor is some- times filled with charcoal, on which a sort of table is set covered with a carpet; and the company, placing their feet on the carpet, draw it over themselves (Olearius, Travels, p. 294; Chardin, Voyages, vii, 190). Rooms in Egypt are warmed, when necessary, with pans of charcoal, as there are no fireplaces except in the kitchens (Lane, Mod. Eg., i, 41; Eng. in Eg., ii, 11). See COAL; FUEL.

On the Sabbath, the law forbade any fire to be kind- led even for culinary purposes (Exod. xxxv, 3; Num. xv, 22). As the primary design of this law appears to have been to prevent the proper privileges of the Sabbath day from being lost to any one through the care and time required in cooking victuals (Exod. xvi, 23), it is not decided whether the fire used for warmth on the Sabbath day was included in this interdiction. In practice, it would appear that the fire was never lighted or kept up for cooking on the Sab- bath day, and that consequently there were no fires in the houses during the Sabbath of the greater part of the year; but it may be collected, this winter fires for warming apartments were kept up from the previous day. Michaelis is very much mistaken with respect to the climate of Palestine in supposing that the inhabitants could, without much discomfort, dispense with the warmth during winter (Michaelis, Recht, iv, 195). To this general prohibition the Jews added various refinements: e.g. that on the eve of the Sabbath no one might read with a light, though passages to be read on the Sabbath by children in schools might be looked out by the teacher. If a Gentile lighted a lamp, a Jew might use it, but not if he had been lighted for the use of the Jew. If a festival day fell on the Sabbath eve no cooking was to be done (Mishna, Shabb. i, 3; xvi, 8, vol. ii, p. 46, 46; Moad Katon, ii, vol. ii, p. 287, ed. Surenhus). The modern Jews, although there is no cooking in their houses, have fires on the Sabbath day, which are attended to by a Chris- tian servant; or a charwoman is hired to attend to the fires of several houses, which she visits repeatedly during the day. See Sabbat.

III. Statutory Regulation.—The dryness of the land in the late 19th century led to the passage of laws in Syria which increases the liability to accident from fire (Jurdg. ix, 15). The law therefore ordered that any one kindling a fire which caused damage to corn in a field should make restitution (Exod. xxvii, 6; comp. Judg. xxv, 4, 5; 2 Sam. iv, 30; see Mishna, Maceqoth, vi, 5, 6; vol. iv, 48, Suren- hus; Burchhardt, Syria, p. 496, 620). This law was calculated to teach caution in the use of fire to the herdsmen in the fields, who were the parties most concerned. And it is to be remembered that the herdsmen were generally substantial persons, and had their assistant shepherds, for whose imprudence they were made responsible. Still no inference is to be drawn
from this law with regard to fires breaking out in towns, the circumstances being so very different. See DAMAGES.

IV. Penal.—Punishment of death by fire was awarded by the law only in the cases of incest with a mother-in-law, the slaying of a daughter of a priest (Lev. xxix. 14; xxxi. 9). In the former case both the parties, in the latter the woman only, was to suffer. This sentence appears to have been a relaxation of the original practice in such cases (Gen. xxviii, 24). Among other nations, burning alive appears to have been an instance of judicial punishment, at least of vengeance upon captives; and in a modified form was not unknown in war among the Jews themselves (2 Sam. xiii, 31; Jer. xxix, 22; Dan. iii, 20). In certain cases the bodies of executed criminals and of infamous persons were subsequently burnt (Josh. vii. 22; 1 Kings xi. 16). See Punishment.

V. Military.—In time of war towns were often destroyed by fire. This, as a war usage, belongs to all times and nations; but among the Hebrews there were some particular notions connected with it, as an act of strong revenge, or of divine dissolution. See ACSA, etc. The principal instances historically commemorated are the destruction by fire of Jericho (Josh. vi, 24); Ai (Josh. viii, 19); Hazor (Josh. xi, 11); Lachish (Judg. xxvii, 27); the towns of the Benjamites (Judg. xx, 48); Giblag, by the Amalekites (1 Sam. xiv, 54); and the Temple and palaces of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxv, 9). Even the war-chariots of the Canaanites were burnt by the Israelites (Josh. vi, 24; vii, 20; xi, 6, 19), probably on the principle of precluding the possibility of recovery by the enemy in some degree of strength for which they had themselves no use. The frequency with which towns were fired in ancient warfare is shown by the very numerous threats by the prophets that the towns of Israel should be burnt by their foreign enemies. Some great towns, not of Israel, are particularly named; and it is possible that the use of fire in war was derived from the same source. See as far as the materials exist, the fulfilment of these prophecies in those more marked examples. Among the places thus threatened we find Damascus (Isa. xlix, 12, 13), Gaza, Tyre, Teman (Amos 1, 7, 10, 11). The temples and idols of a conquered town or people, were very often burnt by the victors (Isa. lii, 13). The Jews were expressly ordered to destroy the idols of the heathen nations, and especially any city of their own replaced into idolatry (Exod. xxxii, 20; 2 Kings x, 26; Deut. vii, 5; xii, 3; xiii, 16). One of the expedients of war in such circumstances was to set fire to the gates of the besieged place (Judg. ix, 49, 50). See SIEGE.

In battle, torches were often carried by the soldiers, which explains the use of torches in the attack of Gideon upon the camp of the Midianites (Judg. vii, 6). This military use of torches was very general among ancient nations, and is alluded to by many of their writers (Stallesi, Theb. iv, 6, 7; Stobaeus, Serm. p. 194; Michaelis, in Symbol. Lec. Bremens, iii, 255). See TORCH.

Signal fires on the tops of mountains were also anciently common as a telegraphic mode of conveying intelligence both in civil and military matters (Judith vii, 5). See BEACON.

VI. Funereal. — Incense was sometimes burnt in honor of the dead, especially royal personages, as is mentioned specially in the cases of Asea and Zebediah, and the ashes of Ahab (1 Kings ii); Jeshua and Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xxxiv, 14; xxix, 12; Jer. xxxiv, 5). See FUNERAL.

VII. Metalurgical. — The use of fire in reducing and refining metals was well known to the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus (Exod. xxxii, 24; xxxiv, 22; xxvii, 2, 6, 17; xxxvii, 8; Numb. xxxvi, 58, 59). See HEAT, FURNACE.

VIII. Figurative Sense. — 1. Fire is in the Scriptures considered as a symbol of Jahveh's presence (see Mohner, De Deo in igne, Dread, n. d.) and the instrument of his power, in the way either of approval or of destruction (Exod. xiv, 19; Num. xi, 1, 8; Judg. xii, 20; 1 Kings xviii, 38; 2 Kings i, 10, 12; ii, 11; vi, 17; comp. Isa. li, 6; lvii, 15, 24; Joel ii, 30; Mal. iii, 2, 4; iv, 1; Pss. lii, 4; Rev. xx, 15; see Reiland, Am. Sac. ii, 5, 8, 26; Jerusalem, in Jerem. Am. ii, 1, p. 801; Josephus, Am. iii, 6, 8; viii, 4, 4). Thus he appeared in this element at the burning bush and on Mount Sinai (Exod. iii, 2; xix, 18). He showed himself to Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John in the midst of a pillar of fire (Isa. vi, 2; Ezek. i, 4, 4; Rev. xiv, 1, 5; 19, 15) and that he will so appear at his second coming (2 Thess, i, 7).

The people of Israel wandered through the desert, guided by the Lord under the form of a pillar of fire (see PILLAGA) (Exod. xiii, 21) and Daniel, relating his vision, in which he saw the Ancient of days, says, "As fire is consumed out of the midst of it so the seas are consumed" (Dan. vii, 10). God may be compared to fire, not only by reason of his glorious brightness, but also on account of his anger against sin, which consumes those against whom it is kindled, as fire does stubble (Deut. xi, 22; Isa. x, 17; Ezek. xxii, 5; Heb, viii, 19).

Cod. of Zoroaster 16. Flame from the Earth, Diana is anger (Psa. xviii, 8). His word also is compared to fire (Jer. xxiii, 29). Thus, in Jer. v, 14, "Behold, I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them." See FLAME.

2. Heaven is figurative of God's glory and power, the temple and the torrent which it inflicts rendered it a fit symbol of (1) whatever does damage and consumes (Prov. xvii, 27; Isa. ix, 18); (2) of severe trials, vexations, and misfortunes (Zech. xii, 9; Luke xi, 49) [see the dissertations on this text by Schrappen (Obs. Sacr. p. 127-146); Ellendor (Erlangen: 1774)]; (3) Cor. iii, 13 (see the dissertations on this text by Lichtenstein (Helmst. 1771); Georgi (Viteb. 1748); 1 Pet. i, 7; (8) of the punishments beyond the grave (Matt. v, 22; Mark ix, 44; Rev. xiv, 19; xxi, 6). See HELL.

3. Fire or flame is also used in a metaphorical sense to express the fiery feeling and divine inspiration (Psa. xxxix, 3; Jer. xx, 9). Thus the influences of the Holy Ghost are compared to fire (Matt. iii, 11), and the descent of the Holy Spirit was denoted by the appearance of lambs, flames, or tongues of fire (Acts ii, 3). See TONGUE. The angels of God also are represented under the emblem of fire (Ps. cix, 4). These are the more benign applications of the figure, in the sense of warmth, activity, and illumination. Compare LIGHT.

FIRE-BAPTISM. The expression "baptize with fire" (Matt. iii, 11; Luke iii, 16) is understood by most modern interpreters to be synonymous with baptism by the Holy Spirit, e. g. on the day of Pentecost (see Arthur, Tongue of Fire, passim, Lond. 1856, N. Y. 1857). Olhausen (Comment. ad loc., Am. ed. i, 268) regards "fire" here as put in contrast with the opposite element "water," i. e. the spiritual as distinct from the material baptism. So also Alford (Greek Text, ad loc. Matt.), who remarks that "to separate off ilia, AY, as belonging to one set of persons, and raip as belonging to another, when both are united in iapour, is harsh and confused." Same to Origin early understood the passage, and in this Neander, De Wette, Meyer, and many other expositors coincide. Dr. Robinson observes that "the wheaf are evidently those who receive Christ as the Messiah, and embrace his doctrines; these he will baptize with the Holy Ghost, i. e. he will impart to them spirit, the treasured treasures of the Holy Spirit; while the chaff are as evidently those who reject Christ and his doctrines, and live in sin; these he will baptize with fire unquenchable" (in Calmet, s. v. Baptism). There are monographs on this subject by Fries (280-300); Wetzel (Merk. Theol. i, 905 sqq., 802 sqq.); Olsander (Tubingen, 1765); Schmid (Lips. 1760), Ribov (Göt. 1744), Zeilich (Ger. 1787). Compare Baptism with Fire.
Firebrand ("flam, a"oker or burnt end of a stick, Isa. vii. 4; Amos iv. 11; "burn," Zech. iii. 2; "flame," Judg. xiv. 4, a lamp or torch [as often eldest son, to their flames, Ps. liii. 2.] Be the combustibles, Prov. xxvi. 18, comp. Eph. vi. 16). In Judg. xiv. 4, it is said, "And Samson went and caught three hundred foxes [jackals], and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails of all. A firebrand in such a position, if sufficiently ignited to kindle a blaze, could, on the firebrand, would soon have burnt itself free from the tails of the foxes, or have been extinguished by being blown over the ground. A torch or flambeau, on the other hand, made of resinous wood or artificial materials, being more combustible, of flame, would have answered a far better purpose, and such is the legitimate fire of the original. His "burning them tail to tail" was apparently intended to prevent them making too rapid a retreat to their holes, or, indeed, from going to their tails at all. They were probably not so tied that they should burn in different directions, and still might run divinely and slowly, side by side, and so do the more effectual execution. Had he put a torch to the tails of each, the creature, naturally terrified at fire, would instantly have bent itself to its hole, or some place of retreat, and thus design the Samson would have been wholly frustrated, while by burning two of them together by the tail they would frequently thwart each other in running, and thus cause the greater devastation. Similar configurations produced by animals, particularly by foxes, were well known to the Greeks and Romans. Thus Lydus (Alexandria, 344) makes Cassandra represent Ulysses as a cunning and mischievous man, "the man for many wiles renowned" of Homer, and styles him, very properly, λαμπροικτής, "fire-tail, a name for the fox (R. E. Fr. Ph. 386). The Romans, also, at their feast in honor of Cassandra, the national goddess of grain, offered in sacrifice animals injured to corn-fields, and therefore introduced into the circus, on this occasion, foxes with fire- brands so fastened to them as to burn them: a retaliation, as Ovid seems to explain it, of the injuries done to the corn by foxes so farished (Fasti, iv, 681, 707, 711). In the "Collectanea," there is an engraving representing a Roman brick found twenty-eight feet below a pavement in London, about the year 1675, on which is exhibited, in baso-relievo, the figure of a man driving into a field of corn two foxes with a fire fastened to their tails, which may have supposed to refer to the feast of Samson, or the burning moment of the Roman usage just mentioned. Richardson, in his Dissertation on the Eastern Nations, speaking of the great festival of fire celebrated by the ancient Persians on the shortest night of the year, says, "Among other ceremonies common on this occasion, there was one which, whether it originated in superstition or caprice, seems to have been singularly cruel. The kings and great men used to set fire to large bunches of dry combustibles, fastened around wild beasts and birds, which being let loose, the air and earth appeared one great illumination, and as these terrified animals naturally fled to the woods for shelter, it is easy to conceive that the confusions which would often happen must have been peculiarly destructive." See Fox.

Firebrand, "macabō, from παρασχω, to take up coals of fire, etc.; Sept. πραγματευω, Vulg. ignem receptan- dum, one of the vessele of the Temple service (Exod. xxvii. 2). Kings xvii. 19; Jer. iii. 19; chs. iii. xxxvii. 8; xxxviii. 11; xxxviii. 13; 2 Kings xxv. 2); elsewhere rendered "snuff-disch" (Exod. xvi. 31; Lev. xvi. 32; xxxvii. 23; Num. iv. 9; Sept. in praesigio, in praesigio, utstimia, Vulg. emorum) and "censer" (Lev. vi. 1; xvi. 12; Num. xvi. 6 sq.; 2 Chron. iv. 7; 27; Sept. ψαντομορφος, Vulg. saerubalum). These appear, however, to have been two different utensils, but essentially the same kind of article, probably 1. a metallic cinder-haus, of different sizes, for at least two uses: one, like a chafing-dish, to carry live coals for the purpose of burning incense; another, a snuffer-dish, used in trimming the lamps, in order to (carry the snuffers) and convey away the snuff. See Censer.

Fire-worship. For an account of the fire-worshippers of ancient times, the reader is referred to the article PERSANS. We attempt here only to sketch the origin and extent of pyrurgy among ancient nations. Under varying conceptions, as the symbol of purity, or of the divine presence and power, or as one of the constituent elements, or as typifying the destructive power of nature, fire was worshipped among many nations as an object of religious worship. If we attach any credit to the statements of the reputed Sanchoniathon, Usus, whose name reminds us of the Biblical Us, the son of Aram, was the first to introduce the worship of fire. The violence of the winds at Tyre, by rubbing the branches of trees together, caused this element to manifest its presence, and Usus thereupon erected rude altars to fire and wind, and made libations thereon of the blood of animals captured in the chase.

The prevalence of pyrurgy among the Canaanites is frequently referred to in the Scriptures, and the people of God are solemnly and repeatedly warned against forsaking his worship to join in the abominations which belonged to the worship of Moloch, the fire-god of these people (Lev. xvii. 2), he is a fire, 25; Deut. xiii. 2), he sets his children on fire (Kings xvi. 31), 10; 18; 2 Chron. xxviii. 8; Ps. civ. 37, 87, 88; Jer. vii. 19, 31, 5, 6; xxx. 82; Ezek. xxxi. 20, 21; xxlii. 87; yet, despite the denunciations of divine wrath and punishment, the Israelites sometimes apostatized to this worship, and caused their seed to pass through or be burnt in the fire to Moloch. See Solomon and his idolatrous daughter, the princess of Tyre; 1 Kings iii. 10, 18; 2 Chron. xxviii. 8; Psal. cxv. 8, 37; Jer. vii. 19, 31, 32; xxxi., xxxii. 8, 8; Ezek. xxviii. 20, 21; 2 Kings xxvii. 5; xxx. 82; Ezek. xxxi. 87, yet, when the denunciations of divine wrath and punishment, the Israelites sometimes apostatized to this worship, and caused their seed to pass through or be burnt in the fire to Moloch. See Solomon and his idolatrous daughter, the princess of Tyre; 1 Kings iii. 10, 18; 2 Chron. xxviii. 8; Psal. cxv. 8, 37; Jer. vii. 19, 31, 32; xxxi. 5; xxxii. 8, 8; Ezek. xxvii. 20, 21; 2 Kings xxvii. 5; xxx. 82; Ezek. xxxi. 87, yet, when the denunci-
banquets (ἐπίλυμα ἱπποῦ). For the ceremonies of worship in connection with these fire-temples, see MAQI and PAREZA.

Fire-worship was practiced also among the Carthaginians, Scythians, the ancient Germans, and among the ancient inhabitants of the British isles, and we find traces of it also in the Mexican and Peruvian worship (Prescott, Mexico, i, 60, 64; Peru, i, 101). Diodorus Siculus states (xx, 14) that the Carthaginians, when hard pressed by Agathocles, attributing their reverses to the anger of their ancestral divinities, whose worship they had neglected, sacrificed 200 of the noblest children (to which number 300 were added by voluntary offerings) to Chronos or Saturn, whose brazen statue was so constructed that a child placed in its arms rolled into a pit of fire. This deity was therefore evidently the same as the Molech of their Tyrian ancestors. The Hindoos worshipped Agni, the god of fire, and in their mythology fire was the symbol of Siva, the destroyer, a conception of this element seemingly in accord with that of the ancient Egyptians (Herod. ii, 16).

The sacred fire was carefully watched in the temple of Vesta in Rome, by virgins, consecrated to this special service (Virginque Vestales in urbe custodiunt ignem-foci publici semperimun, Cic. De Leg. ii, 8), and the extinction of this fire was regarded as a fearful omen, portending great disaster to the state, so that the unhappy Vestal whose careless negligence brought about such a misfortune was stoned therefor by a severe and degrading punishment (Liv. xxi, 11). The ancient Greeks paid worship to the same divinity in Hestia, reckoned one of the twelve great gods, and symbolized by the fire which burns upon the hearth, a duty, omitted to the detriment of domestic life.

We find the worship of the heavenly bodies frequently mentioned in connection with that of the gods of fire, and the former was doubtless older, as it was the higher form of worship (Deut. xvii, 3; 2 Kings xvii, 16, 17; xxxi, 8; xxiii, 5, 11; Isa. xxvii, 9; Jer. viii, 20; Ezek. viii, 16; Zeph. i, 5; Isa. l, c; Strabo, l, c). There appears, therefore, to have been some connection between them. According to the Greek legends, it was Prometheus, the fire-bearer, who, purloining the ethereal and beneficent element from the sun, the high divinity of the Sabean worship, conveyed it by stealth to men, brave therefore and inciting thereby the anger of Zeus, the Greek form of the name by which, according to Herodotus and Strabo, the circuit of the heavens was called by the Magi, and probably the same as Mithra. May we not find symbolized in this Prometheus the Hebrew link connection between sun-worship and fire-worship, Sabeanism and Magism? For an abstract of the relation of the Mitthean worship and the original doctrines of the Zend-Avesta, with references to works of modern writers on this subject, see De Guignaut's translation of Cunen's Rel. de l'Antiquité, notes viii, ix, to bk. ii, vol. ii, p. 728.—Smith, Dict. of the Bible, s. v. Molech and Fire; Aunt, Univ. Hist. (Lond. 1747, 21 vols. 8vo; see index in vol. xx); Gibbon, Decline and Fall of Rom. Empire (N. Y. 1832, 6 vols. 12mo), i, 228-238; Smith, Gentleman's Magazine, i, 250-252; Stoddart, Israel, Univ. Hist., 299-301, 801; Hyde, De Relig. vet. Persarum (Oxon. 1700, 4to); Cunen, Religion de l'Antiquité; Anquetil du Perron, Zend-Avesta, etc. (Improved in German translation by discussions of Kleuker); Richter, Auslese Religionsen des Oriens. (J. W. M.)

Firkin (fɪrˈkɪn), a measure, occurs only in John ii, 5, a metrētē, i. e. the Attic amphora, a measure for liquids, which is equivalent to the Hebrew sēfēr, and containing about 63 gallons (Smith's Dict. of Class. Antig. s. v. Metretes). See Metrology.

Firmament, a term introduced into our language from the Vulgate, which gives firmamentum as the equivalent of the etymology of the Sept. and the rākāt (םְדֵה) of the Hebrew text (Gen. i, 6); more fully וְרֶחֶם הָאָדָם firmament of the heavens, Gen. i, 14, 15, 17). See Heaven.

1. The Hebrew term is generally regarded as expressive of simple expansion, and is so rendered in the margin of the A. V. (l. c.); but the true idea of the word is a complex one, taking in the mode by which the expansion is effected, and consequently implying the nature of the material expanded. The verb וַיַּרְחֶם, rākāt, means to expand by spreading, whether by the hand, the hand, or an instrument. It is especially used, however, of beating out metals in the plateris (Exod. xxxix, 3; Num. xvi, 30), and hence the substantive לַרְחֶם, "broad plates" of metal (Num. xvi, 38). It is thus applied to the flattened surface of the solid earth (Isa. xlii, 5; xlv, 24; Ps. xxxxxvi, 6), and it is in this sense that the term is applied to the heaven in Job xxxvi, 18, "He hast spread (rather kammer-ōd) the sky which is strong, and as a molten looking-glass"—the mirrors to which he refers being made of metal. The sense of solidify, therefore, is combined with the ideas of expansion and tensity in the term rākāt.

Saalschütz (Archäol. ii, 67) conceives that the idea of solidification is inconsistent with Greece; indeed, it implies, according to him, the passage of the mist through the rākāt; he therefore gives it the sense of pure expansion—it is the large and lofty room in which the winds, etc. have their abode. But it should be observed that Gen. ii, 6 implies the very reverse. If the mist had undeniably raked it would have descended in the form of rain: the mist, however, was formed under the rākāt, and resembled a heavy dew—a mode of fractructifying the earth which, from its regularity and quietude, was more appropriate to a state of innocence than rain, the occasional violence of which associated it with the idea of divine vengeance. Further, the idea of some kind of solidity runs through all the references to the rākāt. In Exod. xxiv, 10, it is poetically represented as a solid floor, "a paved work of a sapphire stone;" nor is the image much weakened if we regard the word תַּרְחֶם as applying to the transparencies of the stone rather than to the paring as in the A. V., either sense being admissible. So again, in Ezek. i, 22-26, the 'firmament' is the floor on which the throne of the Most High is placed. That the rākāt should be transparent, as implied in the comparisons with the sapphire (Exod. l. c.) and with crystal (Ezek. l. c.; comp. Rev. iv, 6), is by no means inconsistent with its solidity. Furthermore, the office of the rākāt in the economy of the world demanded strength and substance. It was to serve as a division between the waters above and the waters below (Gen. i, 7). In order to enter into this description we must carry our ideas back to the time when the earth was a chaotic mass overspread with water, in which the material elements of the heavens were intermingled. The first step, therefore, in the work of orderly arrangement was to separate the elements of heaven and earth, and to fix a floor of partition between the waters of the heaven and the waters of the earth; and accordingly the rākāt was to support the upper reservoir (Ps. cxlviii, 4; comp. Ps. civ, 3, where Jehovah is represented as "building his chambers of water," not simply "in water," as the A. V.); the prep. 3 signifying the material out of which the beams and joists were made), itself being supported at the edge or rim of the earth's disk by the mountains (2 Sam. xxiii, 8; Job xxvi, 11). In keeping with this view the rākāt was provided with "windows" (Gen. vii, 11; Isa. xxxiv, 18; Mal. iii, 10) and "doors" (Ps. lxxviii, 23), through which the rain and the snow might descend. A secondary purpose which the rākāt served was to support the heavenly bodies, the sun and stars (Gen. i, 14), in which they were fastened as nails, and from which, consequently, they might be said figuratively to drop off (Isa. xiv, 12; xxxiv, 4;
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Matt. xxiv. 29. In all these particulars we recognise the same view as was entertained by the Greeks, and, to a certain extent, by the Latins. The former applied to the heaven such epithets as "bræzen" ("χρυσός, ἡμερικία, ἤ', ἰδιαί, χρυσόν, ἰδιαί, χρυσόν), and "iron" ("σεβρύμα, χρυσόμακα, χρυσόμακα, χρυσόμακα, χρυσόμακα, χρυσόμακα), so used in the Scriptures (Lev. xvi. 19, xxvii. 36)—and that was not merely poetical embellishment apparent from the views promulgated by their philosophers, Empedocles, who described the heavens as στροφήματα καὶ σταυρολυτήσις of Mig. glacialized by fire (Pius, Plutar. Phil. ii, 11; Serv. Aen., Epod. Phys., 24; Pol. Crit., 77; Lat: De Opifl. Del., c. 17; comp. Karsten, Phil. Gr. Vater, Operum Reliquia, ii, 422; and Artemidorus, who taught that "summa coeli oris solidissima est, in modum tecti durata" (Seneca, Quest. vii, 18). The idea is expressed in the colo affixus sidera of the Latins (Pline ii, 39; xvii, 57). Plato also, in his Timaeus, makes mention of the visible heaven under the notion of νείας (from τίνος, to extend), not unlike the Hebrew derivation. If it be objected to the Mosaic account that the view embodied in the word ra'ak does not correspond with strict philosophical truth, the answer to such an objection is, that the writer describes things as they appear rather than as they are. But, in truth, the same absence of philosophical truth may be traced throughout all the terms applied to this subject, and the objection is levelled rather against the principles of astronomy than against anything else. We should not consider the Latin calum (calos), the "hollow place" or cave scooped out of solid space ("cavernae coeli," Lucret. iv, 172; compare Pott, Etymol. Forschungen, i, 25, 27; our own "heaven," i.e. what is heard up; the Greek ἐορνάυη, similarly significant of height (Pott, Etymol. Forsch., i, 123); or the German "himmel," from himeln, to cover—the "roof" which constitutes the "heam" or abode of man: in each there is a large amount of philosophical error. Correctly speaking, of course, the atmosphere is the true ra'ak by which the clouds are supported, and understood in the colo affixus of the celestial bodies. There certainly appears an inconsistency in treating the ra'ak as the support both of the clouds and of the stars, for it could not have escaped observation that the clouds were below the stars; but perhaps this may be referred to the same feeling which is not harmonious with the fact that the ra'ak was the down-fall of the ra'ak in stormy weather. Although the ra'ak and the skamaym ("heaven") are treated as identical in Gen. i, 8, yet it was more correct to recognise a distinction between them, as implied in the expression heaven and earth, the one ra'ak, the other sky, and in the former being the upholding power and the latter the upbearing body—the former the line of demarcation between heaven and earth, the latter the stratos or stories into which the heaven was divided. See COSMOSH.

2. Hence it is easy to conceive how the Gr. translators came to render the Heb. term in question by στροφήμα, a word which is commonly used to designate some compact solid, such as the basis of a pillar, or a pillar itself, and which is used elsewhere by the Sept. as equivalent to the Heb. קִרְךָ, a rock (Psa. xviii, 2), and by Symmachus and Theodotion as the rendering of the Heb. קִרְךָ, a staff. Basil (Hexeim. Hom. 8) explains the term as not intended to describe what is naturally hard, and solid, and weighty, which belongs rather to the earth; but says that because the nature of the rock is such that it is firm and impregnable, and the name, as far as he is capable of understanding it, is called στροφήμα, by a comparison between things of extreme rarity and such as can be perceived by sense (συνεχίσεις των ειρωνίων καὶ τη αισθήσεως καταρακτών). It is not very clear what his meaning is, but probably he intended that as a solid extension would be properly described by στροφήμα, so this mass of light and vaporous substances might by analogy receive this name. Others have suggested that this term was employed to indicate that the στροφήμα is the "universitas rerum atque rerum in regionem superem conglobata et formata," along with the idea that this "nihil habet uspam inanitatis, sed omnia sui generis natura plena." Fuller, Misc. Sac. bk. i, c. vi. Fuller thinks also that the Sept. selected στροφήμα rather than ερνος or χρυσομα, in order to convey the idea of the sky and stars, as well as superjub meteors. The general opinion, however, is that the Sept. adopted this term rather than one exactly equivalent to the original, because it conveys what was the Hebrew belief concerning the upper atmosphere or visible heavens, which they regarded as a solid expanse encircling the earth, and the true state of things, possibly not unknown to them (Job xxvii, 26, 28). Others, nevertheless, think that the waters above the ra'ak are merely the clouds, which need no solid support (Delitzsch, Comment. on Gen. i, 6; Kurz, Bible and Astronomy, in Hist. of the Old Covenant, i, 30).

3. With some old astronomers the firmament is the orb of the fixed stars, or the highest of all the heavens. But in Scripture and in common language it is used for the middle regions, the space or expanse appearing like an arch immediately above us in the heavens. Many of the ancients, and even the moderns also, account the firmament a fluid substance; but those who gave it the name of "firmament" must have regarded it as solid. In the Ptolemic astronomy, the firmament is called the eighth heaven or sphere, with respect to the seven spheres of the planets, which it surrounds. It is supposed to have two motions—a diurnal motion imparted to it by the primum mobile, from east to west, about the poles of the ecliptic, and another opposite motion from west to east, which last is completed, according to Tycho, in 25,412 years; according to Ptolemy, in 36,600; and according to Copernicus, in 26,800; both of these the fixed stars retain in the same points in which they were at the beginning. This period is called the Platonic, or Great Year. See ASTRONOmy.

Firmicus, Julius Maternus, a Christian writer of the 4th century, of whom little is known. There was an astrigore of the same name and time, who wrote Matheus lib. i. There was a bishop of Milan of the same name, who flourished at the same time, but probably not the same person. He wrote a book, De Errore Protomarum Religionum, which he dedicated to Constantius and Constans; and from this it appears he was bred up in heathenism, and afterwards converted to the Christian faith. He is not mentioned by any ancient writer; and there is no direct evidence that he held any sacred office in the Christian Church. From internal evidence, it appears certain that the treatise was written between A.D. 348 and 850. An analysis of it is given by Gellier, Dea Sacrae (Par. 1865), iv, 310 sq. The object of the treatise is to trace the history of the pagan faith, and to demonstrate the falsehood of its various forms. It adopts and applies the theory of Euhemerus (q. v.). It was first printed by Matt. Flacius (Strasburg, 1562); the latest separate edition is that of Mr. Copenhagen, 1859, with prelomina and notes. It may be found also in Bib. Mar. Patrol. iv, 164; Galland, Bib. Patrol. v, 23; and Migne, Patrol. Lat. vol. xii.

Firmilian, Sr., bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, was an intimate friend both of Origen (Euseb., vi, 27) and Cyprian, with the latter of whom he took part in the controversy about the necessity of rebaptising those who had been baptised by heretics. On this subject he wrote an Epistle to St. Cyprian, which was undoubtedly written in Greek, though the epistle exists in St. Cyprian's works is in Latin; it is generally allowed to have been translated by Cyprian himself. It is very briefly treated of in the Life of the Bishop of Rome as pope in the 5th century. This epistle, which is a very long one, is the sixty-fifth among
First-Born

those of St. Cyprian, and may be found in Oderhut's edition of Cyprian (i, 254); also in Rouht, Script. Ecci. Opuscula (Oxon. 1649, i, 227); and in Migne, Patrolog. Lat. 31, p. 856. Of the domestic customs the name of Firmilian child of the other were the first-born (Deut. xxi. 15, 16). In the case of levirate marriage, the son of the next brother succeeded to his uncle's vacant inheritance (Deut. xxv, 5, 6). Under the monarchy, the eldest son usually, but not always, as appears in the case of Solomon, succeeded his father (I Kings 1, 20, ii, 22). This was an exception to the orthodox faith, for instance, that "the unity of God is a unity of person as well as of nature, and that the Holy Spirit is indeed a person, but not God." He settled in business in Lombard Street, and it is not clear from his provision of preachers for his Tuesday's lecture at St. Laurence. Queen Mary heard of his usefulness, and that he was heterodox in the articles of the Trinity, the divinity of the Saviour, and the atonement. She spoke to Tillotson, therefore, to set him right in those weighty and necessary points, who answered that he had often endeavored it, but that Mr. Firmen had now so long imbibed the Socinian doctrine as not to be capable of renouncing it. However, he was, in the bishop, his grace and his archbishop, published his sermons, formerly preached at St. Laurence's, concerning those questions, and sent Mr. Firmen one of the first copies of the press, who, not convinced, caused a respectful answer to be drawn up and published, with this title, Considerations on the Epistle to the Romans (1658), and with a similar work furnished later by Mr. Firmen's zeal and charity, and in 1668 he petitioned for a linen manufacture for them at Ipswich. During the last twenty years of his life he was one of the governors of Christ-church Hospital in London, to which he procured many considerable donations. In April, 1696, he became a governor of St. Thomas's Hospital in Southwark; and, indeed, there was hardly any public trust or charity in which he either was not or might not have been concerned. He was buried, according to his desire, in the cloisters of Christ-church Hospital, and there is placed in the wall near his grave an inscription (in terms of the highest laudatory). His Life was published in 1698, and again by Cornish, 1780, 12mo.—New Gen. Biog. Dict. s. v.; Wesley, Works (N. Y.), ii, 574.

First-born (בֵּית, בֵּיתָּא, בִּיתָךְ, from בִּית, to ripen early; Sept. and N. T. πρωτόγενος, Vulg. primumgenitus), applied equally to animals and human beings. Among the Hebrews the first-born son had many privileges, to be entitled to which it was not only required that a man should be the first child of his mother, but that he should be, at the same time, the first son of his father (Deut. xxi, 15-17). The eldest son received a double portion of the father's inheritance (Deut. xxi, 17), but not of the mother's (Mishna, Bekoroth, viii, 9). If the father had married two wives, of whom he preferred one to the other, he was forbidden to give preferential treatment to the son of his next wife (Deut. xxi, 15, 16). In the case of levirate marriage, the son of the next brother succeeded to his uncle's vacant inheritance (Deut. xxv, 5, 6). Under the monarchy, the eldest son usually, but not always, as appears in the case of Solomon, succeeded his father (I Kings 1, 20, ii, 22). This was an exception to the orthodox faith, for instance, that "the unity of God is a unity of person as well as of nature, and that the Holy Spirit is indeed a person, but not God." He settled in business in Lombard Street, and it became intimate with Whitchote, Wilkins, Tillotson, etc., in conformity with the last that he was obliged to be out of town, at Canterbury, perhaps, where he was dead, he left to Mr. Firmen the provision of preachers for his Tuesday's lecture at St. Laurence. Queen Mary heard of his usefulness, and that he was heterodox in the articles of the Trinity, the divinity of the Saviour, and the atonement. She spoke to Tillotson, therefore, to set him right in those weighty and necessary points, who answered that he had often endeavored it, but that Mr. Firmen had now so long imbibed the Socinian doctrine as not to be capable of renouncing it. However, he was, in the bishop, his grace and his archbishop, published his sermons, formerly preached at St. Laurence's, concerning those questions, and sent Mr. Firmen one of the first copies of the press, who, not convinced, caused a respectful answer to be drawn up and published, with this title, Considerations on the Epistle to the Romans (1658), and with a similar work furnished later by Mr. Firmen's zeal and charity, and in 1668 he petitioned for a linen manufacture for them at Ipswich. During the last twenty years of his life he was one of the governors of Christ-church Hospital in London, to which he procured many considerable donations. In April, 1696, he became a governor of St. Thomas's Hospital in Southwark; and, indeed, there was hardly any public trust or charity in which he either was not or might not have been concerned. He was buried, according to his desire, in the cloisters of Christ-church Hospital, and there is placed in the wall near his grave an inscription (in terms of the highest laudatory). His Life was published in 1698, and again by Cornish, 1780, 12mo.—New Gen. Biog. Dict. s. v.; Wesley, Works (N. Y.), ii, 574.
ed his omnipotence and grace." See Plagues of Egypt.

FIRST-BORN, SANCTIFICATION AND REDEMPTION OF THE.

Males of human beings and animals were strictly enjoined to perpetuate the remembrance of the death of Egypt's first-born, whereby the liberty of the Israelites was secured, and of the preservation of Israel's first-born. Compare Exod. xii, 5, 11-15.

3. Sanctification of the First-born, Its Signification, etc.

—The fact that the first-born of Egypt were selected to be smitten down for the hard-heartedness of Pharaoh, and that their death was regarded as the greatest calamity, shows of itself that a peculiar sanctity had already been attached to the first-born of both man and cattle. The cause of this sanctity originated in the Scripturc.

The power of procuring declaration was declared by God himself to be a special blessing (Gen. i, 22, 28; ix, 1; xvii, 16; xxvii, 31), and was granted as a reward to those who were well pleasing in his sight (Gen. xv, 4; Ps. cxviii, 4). This was fully approved by the Jews; for the possession of children, especially of the male sex, was esteemed the climax of social happiness (Gen. xvi, 2; xxix, 81; Deut. vii, 14; Ps. cxviii, 3, 4), and the absence of them was considered a reproach (גָּפַע), since it implied divine displeasure (Gen. xxx, 33), and no other earthly blessing could compensate for it (Gen. xvi, 1-5). Moreover, the first-born of newly-married young people (ָּיִם נַעֲרֵי יָדָם קַרָּה) were born, being reproached in the person of human vigor (יְזוּר נֶבֶל), being born before the strength of the father began to diminish (Gen. xlix, 8; Deut. xxi, 17; Ps. lxxxvii, 51; cv, 86).

It was therefore natural that the first instalment of God's blessing, and the prime of man's strength, should be regarded with peculiar affection, and have special sanctity attached to him, and that by virtue of the claim God has to that child, which has been born and held sacred by us, and gratitude on the part of man, the first-born males, both of man and animals, should be consecrated to the Giver of all good things; the one as a priest, representing the family to which he belonged (Exod. xii, 22, 24), and the other as a sacrifice (Gen. iv, 4), just as the act of sacrifices was devoted to God because it was regarded as the prime part of the animal. See Fat. This explains the fact why the plague of the first-born of the Egyptians was so terribly felt; it was the destruction of the objects most dear and sacred to them, whilst the first-born of the Hebrews, i. e. their priests and sacrifices, were spared. Moreover, it shows the import of the consecration enjoined in Exod. xiii, 1. Hitherto it was optional with the Hebrews whether they would devote the first-born to the Lord, but now God, by virtue of having so signallv interposed for their deliverance, claims the public consecration of the first-born of man as his priests, and of the first-born of animals as sacrifices.

2. Origin of the Redemption of the First-born.—This devotion of the first-born was believed to indicate a priesthood belonging to the eldest sons of families, which being set aside in the case of the Hebrews, was transferred to the tribe of Levi. This priesthood is said to have lasted till the completion of the tabernacle (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. x, § 165, 887; Selden, De syn. c. 16; Mishna, Zebachim, xiv, 4, vol. v, 58; comp. Exek. xxiv, 5).

After the building of the tabernacle and the introduction of the holy sacrifices it became necessary to require a special priestly order, as well as a separate staff of servants, who could exclusively devote themselves to the ministry of the sanctuary, the offices of the first-born were superseded by those of the Levites (Num. iii, 11-13), and it was ordained that the first-born of the other tribes, as well as the first-born of the animals which could not be sacrificed, should henceforth be redeemed (ib. xviii, 12).

3. Redemption of the First-born of Men.—The redemption of a child is to take place when it is a month old, when the father is to give to the priest five silver shekels of the sanctuary, i. e. about three dollars as the maximum. If it died before the expiration of 30 days, the Jewish doctors held the father excused, but liable to be punished, if it outlived the period, according to the law (Exod. xiii, 12-15; xxii, 29; Num. viii, 17; Lev. xxvi, 6; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. on Luke ii, 22; Philo, De Pr. Sacrd. i, ii, 283; Mangey). If the child was sickly, or appeared otherwise to be inferior to children generally, the priest could estimate it lower than this sum (Num. iii, 46, etc.; xviii, 16). The priest had to come to the house of the infant, as the mother could not appear with it in the Temple because her days of purification, according to the law (Lev. xii, 2, 4), were not yet as accomplished. No bargaining was allowed, but if the priest saw that the parents were poor, he could, if he chose, return the money when the ceremony was over. When the mother's days of purification were accomplished, and she could appear in the Temple, she then brought the child to the priest to be presented publicly to the Lord (Luke ii, 22). The Jews still observe this ceremony. When the first-born male is thirty days old, the parents invite to their house their friends and a priest (יָמִין) to a meal for the following day. The priest, having invoked God's blessing upon the repast, and offered some introductory prayers, etc., looks at the child and the price of redemption presented before him, and asks the father whether he will redeem the child, which he may or may not do. Thus the money is devoted to the purchase of a first-born child. Upon the father's reply that he would rather pay the price of redemption, the priest takes the money, swings it round the head of the infant in token of his vicarious authority, saying, "This is for the first-born, this is in lieu of it, this redeems it; and let this son be spared from the hail, for the law of God, and for the fear of Heaven. May it please thee, that, as he was spared for redemption, so he may be spared for the Law, for matrimony, and for good works. Amen." The priest lays his hand upon the child's head and blesses it, as follows: "The Lord make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh!" etc. It is to this that the apostle Peter refers when he says, "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold," etc. (1 Peter i, 18). When the first-born son is thirteen years of age, he fasts the day before the feast of Passover, in commemoration rather of the sparing of the first-born of the Hebrews in Egypt. See Fast.

4. Redemption of the First-born of Clean Animals.—The male first-born of animals (בָּן יָדוֹ; Sept. θεῷ ἐκδοτῇ γεράνῃ; Vulg. good opertum vulcam) was also devoted to God (Exod. xiii, 2, 12, 13; xxii, 29; xxiv, 19, 20; Philo, i.c. and qua rerum dic. aen. 24, i, 489, Mang.). The first-born of every clean animal (i. e., ox, sheep, goat, etc.), from eight days to twelve months old, had to be taken to Jerusalem every year (Deut. xii, 6, etc.), and delivered to the priest, who offered it as a sacrifice to Jehovah, sprinkled its blood upon the altar, burned the fat, and ate the flesh (Exod. xiii, 13; xxi, 30; xxiv, 30; Num. xviii, 15-17; Neh. x, 35). In the mean time the animal was not to be used for any work, for it belonged to the Lord (Deut. xv, 19); but if it had any blemish it was not to be sacrificed, but eaten at home (ib. xv, 21, 22). Various refinements on the subject of blemishes are to be found in Mishna, Bekoroth. (See Masp. i. 8.). Deut. xiv, 23, complied with Num. xviii, 17, and meant the same animals: see Reland, Antiq. iii, 10, p. 327; Jahn, Bibl. Arch. § 387). If, however, the man whose cattle had first-born lived at too great a distance from Jerusalem to carry them thither, he was commanded to sell them, and take the money to the sanctuary (Deut. xiv, 24, 25).

5. Redemption of the First-born of Unclean Animals.—The first-born of unclean animals, not being allowed
to be offered as sacrifices, were either to be redeemed according to the value of the priest, with the addition of one fifth of the value, and then remain with their owner, or be sold, and the price given to the priests (Lev. xxvii, 11-16, 27). The first-born of an ass shall be redeemed with a lamb, or, if not redeemed, put to death (Exod. xiii, 13; xxxiv, 20; Numb. xviii, 15). Commentators hold that the first-born of dogs were killed, because they were unclean; and that nothing was given for them to the priests, because there was no trade or commerce in them. See Deut. xxiii, 18.

6. Literature.—Josephus, Ant. iv, 4, 4; Mishna, Bekoroth; Maimonides, Mishna Torah, iii, 241; Hilkhot Beachoroth; Ibn Ezra's comments on the passages cited in this article; Calmet, on Numb. xxviii; Thé Histoire des Croisades, by J. Keppler (Vienna, 1859), entitled Derech Ha-Chajun, p. 406; Der Israëlitische Volkslehrer, vii, 41 sq.; ix, 188 sq.; 212 sq., 248 sq.

First Day of the Week. See LORD'S DAY.

First-fruits (in the sing. מִשׁנָה, first-fruits, beginning; in the plur. מַשָּׁנֶה, bikkurim, first-fruits; June, July, and August) were the earliest products of the new year (Exod. xxiii, 19, 20; Lev. xxv, 1-5).
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First-fruits (in the sing. מִשׁנָה, first-fruits, beginning; in the plur. מַשָּׁנֶה, bikkurim, first-fruits; June, July, and August) were the earliest products of the new year (Exod. xxiii, 19, 20; Lev. xxv, 1-5).
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its sound it very difficult, in addition to his appearing at the three great festivals, to have to go to the Temple
and carry the offerings in his own basket. Nor would it have been convenient for every one to go up with his first-fruits
separately. Hence the custom arose, that when the
first-fruits were ripe, all the inhabitants of one district
who were ready to deliver them assembled together in
the principal village, and that locality was their repres-
sentative, and a certain basket containing the ripe fruits
of the seven several kinds, arranged in the following
manner:—"The barley was put lowermost, the wheat
over it, the olives above that, the dates over them, the
pomegranates over the dates, and the figs were put upon
the top. The barley was laid between every kind to separate it from the other, and clusters of grapes
were laid upon the figs to form the outside of the basket" (Maimonides, Hilchot Bikkurim, iii, 7; To-
sifra Bikkurim, ii). With this basket all the pilgrims
(or at least a company of twenty-four persons) stood
up all night in the open market-place, because they
were afraid to go into the houses to sleep lest any inmate
of them should die, and thus cause pollution. Early
in the morning the representative of the district, who
was the official (מג各種) and ex officio the leader of the
imposing procession, summoned them with the words
of the prophet Jeremiah, "Arise, and let us go up to
the house of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob" (xxvi, 8). The whole company were then ready to start. We
cannot do better than give literally the description which the Mishna and the Talmud give of this
imposing procession: An ox [destined for a peace-offer-
ing] went before them with gilded horns and an olive
crown on its head, and a pipe-player who played before
them, whilst the air rang with the song of the people,
"I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into
the house of the Lord!" (Psa. cxli, 1). On approach-
ing Jerusalem a messenger was sent forward to an-
ounce their arrival, and the first-fruits were tastefully
arranged on the officiating priest's heffer, or ox, and the
treasurers went out to meet them, the number of offici-
als who went out being in accordance with the large-
ness of the party that arrived, and conducted them into
the holy city, singing; as they entered, "Our feet stand
within thy gates, O Jerusalem" (Psa. xxxii, 8), whilst
all the workmen [who plied their craft] in the streets
of Jerusalem stood up before them and welcomed them,
saying, "Brethren of such and such a place, peace be
with you." The piper continued to play before them
till the procession came to the mount of the Temple.
Here the priest threw the first-fruits, even the golden basket
upon his shoulders, and went forward till they all came
to the court of the Temple, singing, "Praise ye the
Lord, praise God in his sanctuary," etc. [through the
whole of Psalm cl]: whereupon the Levites sang: "I
will exalt thee, O Lord! because thou hast lifted me
up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me" (Psa.
xxx). Then the pigeons which were hung about the
basket were taken for burnt-offerings, and the pil-
grims gave to the priests what they brought in their
hands. With the baskets still upon their shoulders
every one repeated, "I profess this day unto the Lord
thy God," etc., till he came to the words, "A wander-
ning Syrian was my father" (i.e. from Deut. xxvi, 3-5),
when he took the basket off his shoulders and laid hold
of it by its brim; the priest then put his hands under
it and waved it, whilst the offering continued to recite
from the words: "I feignedly went away, and were he had
left off, to the end of the section (i.e. to Deut. xxvi,
10), then put the basket by the side of the altar, threw
himself down on his face, and afterwards departed
(Mishna, Bikkurim, iii, 2-6; Jerusalem Bikkurim, 65;
Maimonides, Hilchot Bikkurim, iv, 16, 17). These first-
fruits took the place of the tithe which was not offi-
ciated during that week. The baskets of the rich were
of gold or silver, those of the poor of peeled willow.
The baskets of the latter kind were presented to the
priests, who waved the offerings at the S.W. corner of
the altar: the more valuable baskets were returned to
the owners (Bik. iii, 6, 8). After passing the night at
Jerusalem in the pilgrim-prize (Jer. iv, 3; Bikkurim, ii, 12),
to their homes (Deut. xvi, 7; Terum. ii, 4). It is men-
tioned that king Agrippa bore his part in this highly
picturesque national ceremony by carrying his basket
like the rest to the Temple (Bik. iii, 4). Among other
by-laws were the following: 1. Who ate his first-
fruits in Jerusalem, but took them to the pilgrim-prize
in such a proper form, was liable to punishment (Muccot, iii, 3,
vol. iv, 284, Suren.). 2. Women, slaves, deaf and
dumb persons, and some others, were exempt from the
verbal obligation before the priest, which was not gener-
ally used in their case (Bik. iii, 6).
4. Exemption from the Offering or the connected Ser-
vice.—Those who simply possessed the trees and not
the land were exempted from the offering of first-
fruits, for they could not say the land that thou hast
given me (Maimonides, Hilchot Bikkurim, ii, 18). Those,
who lived beyond the Jordan could not bring first-fruits in the proper sense of the libation, in-
samuch as they could not say the words of the service,
from the land that floweth with milk and honey" (Deut.
xxvi, 10; compare Mishna, Bikkurim, i, 10). A proselyte,
again, though he could bring the offering, was not allowed to recite the service, because he was the words occurring therein (Deut. xxvi, 8), "I am come to the country which the Lord hath courte to us for us to give us" (Bikkurim, i, 4). Stewards, servants,
slaves, women, sexless persons, and hermaphrodites
were also not allowed to recite the service, though they could claim the libation, because they could not use the words, "I have brought the first-fruits of the land
which thou, O Lord, hast given me" (Deut. xxvi, 10), they having originally had no share in the land
(Bikkurim, i, 5).
5. Offerings of the prepared Produce.—In this, too,
the quantity to be offered was left to the generosity of
the people. But it was understood, says Maimoni-
des, that "a liberal man will give a fortieth part of
his first-fruits; one who is neither liberal nor illiberal
will give a fiftieth part, and a covetous man will give
a sixtieth." (Hilchot Terumah, iii, 9.) They were
presented even from the produce of Jewish fields in
foreign countries, and were not allowed to be taken
from the portion intended for tithes, nor from the corn
left for the poor (Terum. i, 5; ii, 7), and were not
required to be delivered in the Temple, but might be
given to the brother-in-need (Ib. iv, 3, 2; Bikkurim, i,
2). They consisted of wine, wool, bread, oil, date-honey,
onions, cucumbers (Terum. ii, 5, 6; Numb. xvi, 19; 21; Deut. xviii, 4). The measuring-basket was to be thrice estimated during the season (Ib. iv, 3). He
who ate or drank his offering by mistake was bound
to add one fifth, and present it to the priest (Lev. v,
16; xxii, 14), who was forbidden to remit the penalty
(Terum. vi, i, 5). The offerings were to be eaten or
used only by those who were clean from ceremonial
defilement (Numb. xviii, 11; Deut. xviii, 4).
6. The First-fruit of the Dough.—Besides the offer-
ing of the first-fruits themselves, the Israelites were
also required to give to the Lord a cake made of
the first corn that was threshed, winnowed, and ground
(Numb. xv, 18-21). Tradition restricts this to wheat,
barley, camain, or rye, foxtail (barley), and oats (Chakot, i, 1; Maimonides, Bikkurim, vi, 14). Of which a
twenty-fourth part had to be given, but the baker who
made it for sale had to give a forty-eighth part (Mai-
monides, Hilchot Bikkurim, v, 2, 3). This was the per-
quisite of the priest, and it is to this that the apostle
refers in Rom. xi, 16.
7. First-fruits of Grain-trees.—According to the law,
the fruit of the newly-planted tree was not to be eaten
or sold, or used in any way for the first three years,
but considered "uncircumcised" or unclean. In the fourth year, however, the first-fruits were to be con-
secrated to the Lord, or, as the traditional explana-
FIRST FRUITS. "1. True Christians are called 'a kind of first-fruits of God's creatures (1 Cor. xiv, 15), as being specially consecrated to him.' 2. The communications of God's grace on earth, as an earnest of future glory, are also so called (Rom. viii, 29), and for the same reason, the resurrection of Christ, as 'the pledge of the resurrection of the just' (1 Cor. iv, 19).

13. In an ecclesiastical sense, this term is applied to the first year's produce of benefices, which the pope demanded of foreigners to whom he gave benefices of the Church of England. Henry VIII rescued this payment from the pope, but annexed it to the crown. Queen Elizabeth, however, gave them back to the Church for the augmentation of small livings" (Eden). See Annotations. The value of benefices, commonly called the value of the King's Books, was made at the same time as the statute 26 Henry VIII, c. 5, by which these payments were transferred to the crown. A former valuation had been made, 26 Edw. III. which still exists in the exchequer. By this statute and one subsequent, 1 Elizabeth IV, every spiritual person admitted to a benefice must pay his first-fruits within three months after induction, in proper proportion: if he does not live half a year, or be ousted before the expiration of the first year, only one quarter is required; if he lives the year, or be ousted before eighteen months, one half; if a year and a half, three quarters; if two years, the whole. Archbishops and bishops have four years allowed them, and shall pay one quarter every year, if they live so long on the see. Other dignitaries pay as rectors and vicars. The statute of 18 Anne, all livings under £50 per annum are discharged of the payment of first-fruits and tenths. The following notice of the valuation in the King's Books, and the former payments to the pope as primíc, is taken from Godwin's work, De Prævulis Angl. The florin was 4s. 6d., the ducat 6s. English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King's Books</th>
<th>To the Pope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>£800 12 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>1076 18 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>979 3 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>829 14 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>609 17 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>584 11 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>929 13 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>769 11 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>577 2 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>725 1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>831 11 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>810 7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>414 19 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>134 11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>165 3 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a pall</td>
<td>1000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a rector</td>
<td>1000 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3a. It will be observed that the bishoprics of Oxford, Gloucester, Peterborough, Bristol, and Chester, as creations or revivals by Henry VIII, are not included in the above catalogue as paying to the pope.—Edies, Eccl. Cyclop. s. v.; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. s. v., ch. vi, § 4.

Fish (37 day), so called from its great fecundity; Gr.
fish

fish (1 Sam. v, 4). On this account the worship of fish is expressly prohibited (Deut. iv, 18). See DA- GON. The form of a fish (Notius Poseidon) was, from remote ages, a type of prophetic dominion, which the symbolizing spirit of the ancients caused to pass into Christianity, as appears from Eusebius (LIFE of Con- stantine) and St. Augustine (De Civitate Dei). On the walls of the oldest catacombs of Rome the representation of the fish is frequently discernible and always interpreted as an emblem of the Saviour.

Taking fishes in the scientific sense of "oviparous, vertebraled, cold-blooded animals, breathing water by means of gills or branchia, and generally provided with fins," none are mentioned by name throughout the O.T. and M.T.; but, regarded in the popular and inexact sense of aquatic animals, inhabitants more or less of the water, we meet with eleven instances which require some notice here.

1. That well-known bato- chian reptile, the frog (כָּפֶלָה, terpæda'), which emerges from a fish-like infancy, breathing by gills instead of lungs, and respiring water instead of air, is often mentioned in Exod. viii, but only in two passages else, Ps. lxxvi. 36 and cv. 20. See FROG, and cv, 30. See PROV. xxi. 31, annelid horse-leech, whose name occurs only once, PROV. xxx, 15 (הלֹּ֑וֶּרָה, alakach').

"It would appear that the blood-eating quality of this useful little animal is a direct and exclusive ordination of Providence for man's advantage. That blood is not the natural food of the animal is probable from the fact that, in the streams and pools which they inhabit, not one in a hundred could, in the common course of things, ever indulge such an appetite; and even when received into the stomach, it does not appear to be digested; for, though it will remain there for weeks without coagulating or becoming putrid, yet the animal usually dies unless it can be vomited through the mouth."

(Gossow's Zoology, ii, 374). Of course it is the smaller species, the Hirudo medicinalis, that is here referred to. But the larger species, the Haemapagus margaritifer, or "horse-leech," has a still greater voracity for blood.

Bochart (Hieros, ii, 796-802) and Schultens (Prov. in loc.) give another turn to Prov. xxx, 15, by identifying הָלוֹּ֑וֶּרָה with the Arabic aluk, and making fowl or destiny, instead of the horse-leech, the inexact exacter. The ancient versions, however, must be deemed to outweigh their learned speculations; added to which the Arabic aluk, the Syriac aluka, and the Chaldee and Talmudic וּלָּכָּ מִּ or וּלָּכָּ מִ, all designate the leech, which is as abundant in the East as it ever was in our Western countries. The blood-appetite of this animal made it suitable to point a proverb: "Horeb says, "No misfortune can come to a trembling horse-leech, hirudo" (De Boistaut, loc. cit., De Poet. 476). With this comp. Psl. 18, 13; and Cicero, ad Atticum, lib. i, epist. 13. See HORSE- LEECH.

3. The testaceous mollusk (Ostrea marina, Gesenius, Thea. p. 1263), called by the Hebrewיִשְׂרָאֶל, argaman'; by Avicenna, Algariaeacan; by Galen, θαλασσία ἔρποπα, is the Murus trunculus of zoology, from which the repulsive dye used to be obtained. This shell-fish (and not the "purple" extracted from it) is with good reason supposed by Gesenius to be referred to in Cant. vii, 5: the tresses of thin head are like the wreathed shell of the purple-fish; reminding us of the ancient head-dress of the Egyptian princess, described by Theocritus, idyll. iv, 6, 8 (comp. the cornical head-tuft of the Roman Tustanus [Varro, De ling. lat. vii, 3, 30], and Virgil's Crinae nodostrum in Carum). A second reference to this shell-fish probably occurs in Esex. xxvii, 7. The Tyrians seem to have imported some of it, which they selected as an object of idolatry: the worship of it was widely spread, from Egypt (Wilkinson, i, 58) to Assyria (Layard, Nineveh, ii, 467), and even India (Baur, Mythol. ii, 58). Among the Philistines, Dagon (= little fish) was represented by a figure half man and half
these fishes were supplied from the coast of Greece we learn from Horace, Od. ii. 18, 7 (Lacunosse purpurae); from Pausanias, iii. 21, 6; and from Pliny, ix. 86. See Purple.

4. The other word used by Eckel in this passage, κρακαλός, is described by Gesenius, Thes. p. 1308, as "a species of shell-fish (Conchylia, Helix solstimna [conchae]), found cleaving to the rocks at the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, covering even the sea bottom." (Forskal, Descrip. animal. p. 127), from which was procured a dark-blue dye.

In the many other passages where these two words occur, they undoubtedly designate either the colors or the material dyed in them. The phrase "treasures hid in the sand" (Deut. xxxii. 19, 22) and the lines "to refer to the rich dyes afforded by the κρακαλός and other testaceous animals found in the sand, on the Phoenician coast, assigned to Zeboon and Isaacchar (Tarqum of Jonathan b. Uziel, Walton, iv. 287, and Gesenius, Thes. p. 1509).

See Blue. 5. The κρακαλαί, ταννίμι (plur. ταννίμια or κρακαλάδες) must be carefully distinguished from κρακαλός, the plural of the useless word κρακαλός, a jockal, according to Gesenius, Theaur. p. 1188. "The sea-monsters," which are described by Jeremiah (Lament. iv. 5) as "sucking their young," were used to be regarded as the marmiferous whales or other large cefalas (Calmet by Taylor, "Fragments on Natural History, No. xcvii."). They are by Gesenius (l. c.) supposed to be rather κρακαλάδες; this is the reading of the MSS. (Kennaicott, ii. 546), and Gesenius accepts the Masoretic text as an Aramaic form of it. In Ezek. xxix. 3, and xxxii. 2, the textual reading κρακαλάδες, which is represented usually as an anomalous singular noun, should not be κρακαλάς, the regular singular, which may well bear (what the other word could not) the significant sense of "crocodile;" the MSS. authority in favor of the latter word is overwhelming (Kennaicott, ii. 212). For a description of the κρακαλάδες, see Whale.


8. "The great fish," yefiym yam, of Jonah i. 17 (yam in ii. 1), was probably some species of shark, such as the Zygornellus malleri, or the Carcharias vulgaris (the white shark), therefore strictly a fish. Of the same kind of huge fish, ἄνθρωποφόρος, does Amos speak in prophecy, ix. 3, "I will command the serpent from the bottom of the sea, and shall be his head" (Bochart, Hieros. i. c. 40, l. 40). The difficulty that in the Sept. of Jonah, and in the Greek Testament (Matt. xii. 40), κρακαλός is the word by which the fish is designated, is removed by the fact that this Greek text specifically does not indicate whether only, as the objection supposes, but any of the larger inhabitants of the deep. (Wesley's Heroclit. Fragm. de incre- mento Nile, p. 789, as quoted in Valpy's Stephani Thes. s. v. Κρακαλός; here "piece," as well as "bellus quasi bello ingentes, veluti crocodilus et hippopotamus," are included.) Accordingly κρακαλός stands in the Sept., passim, for בָּשָׁם, as well as for בְּשַׁם (see Schleusner, Lex. V. T. s.v. KIακαλός). Admiral Smyth, in the chapter on Ichthyology, in his Mediterranean, p. 198, says the white shark has been called "Jona piscis" from its transcendent claim "to have been the great fish that swallowed the prophet, since he can readily engulf a man whole." For more on the subject of this fish, see Kitto, Bibl. Illustr. vi, 399-404, and Jonah. 9. Of To- bit's fish, O. F. Fritzsche, in his commentary on the passage (Tobit vi. passim) enumerates nine or ten spec- culations by different writers. According to Bochart and Helvigius, the Siburu has the best claim. This the former describes as "being very large, of great strength and boldness, and ever ready to attack other animals, even men, an inhabitant of the rivers Eu- phrates and Tigre." C. H. Smith, in the first edition of Kitto's Cyclopaedia, combats Bochart's conclusions, and suggests "the Slaar of the Indus, a crocodile, probably of the genus Gavial, which grows to a great size, is eaten, and has a gall bladder, still used to cure obstruant wounds and defluxions." Glaine suggests the sturgeon, but this is more suitable to Northern rivers.

Fennement mentions the capture of one in the Eusk Valley weighing 126 pounds (Ernest Seaver Zoology, iii. 127). See more in Bochart, Hieros. v. 14; Glaine, Translation of the Acanic. et du N. T. ii, 91 [ed. 8]; Paris, 1782, and To- bit. 10. If Dr. French and Mr. Skinner, in their Translation of the Psalms, are right in rendering Pas. xiv. 9, "There swimmeth the nautilus and the whale," (as if the sacred writers meant to indicate a small, though conspicuous, as well as a large aquatic animal, as equally the object of God's care), we have in the יבשוף, אמיוף, A. V. "ships," an unexpected addition to our Scripture nomenclature of fishes, in what lord Byron calls—

"The tender Nautilus who stirs his prow,
The sea-born siren of his shell comes,
The ocean Mah, the fairy of the sea."—The Island.

In their note the translators say, "The Nautilus—This little creature floats at pleasure upon the surface of the sea. Its shell resembles the hull of a ship, whence it has its name." Mr. Treppx accepts the translation of "vessel" as a "new rendering of much apparent probability" (Introduction to the Psalms, ii. 176). Another ancient expositor of the Psalms, J. Olshausen (Erg. Hands. p. 402), remarks that "the introduction of ships amongst the living creatures of the sea has always presented an obstacle" to the understanding of the sentence. The paper nautilus (Argonauta) frequents the Mediterranean. The verb יבשוף, proceeded, sunk, very well describes the stately progress of the nautilus as it floats upon the wave. We may add that it gives greater fitness to the 27th verse, which at present is hardly compatible with the 26th and 26th, owing to the intrusion of the clause, 'there go the ships.' Replace this by the nautilus, and the coherence of the 27th verse with the two preceding is complete in all its terms. 11. Our last specific fish is rather suggested than named in Ezek. xxix. 4, where the prophet twice mentions "the fish of the rivers which cleave to the scales," [of the crocodile]. This description seems to identify this fish with the Echeneis remora, so remarkable for the adhesive or sucking disc which covers the upper part of the head, and enables it to adhere to the body of another fish, or to the bottom of a vessel. (Its fabulous powers of being able even to arrest a vessel in her course are recorded by the ancients. Herod. Hist. i. 151. It is mentioned by Aristotle, Hist. Anim. ii, 14, 5. "πόνητας καὶ εὐ θύσωμος, ἐνοικίαν ὑπὸ κα- λίνης ὑποκινεῖται. It is also mentioned by Forskal as seen at Gigda, and by Hassequist at Alexandria.) The lump-sucker (Cyprinostus lumpus) is furnished with ventral fins which unite beneath the body and form a concave disc, by which the fish can with ease adhere to stones or other bodies. Either in the remora, with its adhesive apparatus above, or in the lump-sucker with a similar appendage below, or in both, we have in all probability the prophet's fishes which cleave to the monster of the Nile.

The species of fish known to the Hebrews, or at least to those who dwelt on the coast, were probably very numerous, because the usual current of the Mediterranean sets in, with a great depth of water, at the Straits of Gibraltar, and passes eastward on the Afri-

Can side until the shoals of the delta of the Nile begin to turn it to the north; then they proceed in directon along the Syrian shores, and falls into a broken course only when turning westward on the Cyprian and Cretan coasts. Every spring, with the sun's return towards the north, innumerable troops of littoral species, having passed the winter in the offings of Western Africa, return northern countries, are impelled in that direction by other unknown laws. A small part only ascend along the Atlantic coast of
Spain and Portugal towards the British Channel, while the main bodies pass into the Mediterranean, follow the general current, and do not break into more scattered families until they have swept round the shores of Palestine. Lists of species of the fish frequenting various parts of the Mediterranean may be found in Risso (Ichthyol. de Nice). 335 species had been observed at Nice; and in Adm. Smyth's Mediterranean, where in the chapter on Ichthyology he gives a list of about 800 fishes haunting the waters of Sicily, besides 240 crucians, testaceus, and molluscs. Admiral Smyth remarks generally of the Mediterranean fish that, "though mostly herring than other British fishes, they are, for the most part, not to be compared with them in flavor" (p. 192-290). Professor E. Forrester (in his Report on Egypt Invertebrata) divides that part of the East Mediterranean, in which for many years he conducted his inquiries, into eight regions of depth, each characterized by its peculiar fauna. "Certain species," he says, "in each are found in no other; several are found in one region which do not range into the next above, whilst they extend to that below, or vice versa. Certain species have their maximum of development in each zone, being most prolific in individuals at different times in each, of which, of course, they may be regarded as especially characteristic. Mingled with these true natives are stargazers, owa; their presence to the secondary influences which modify distribution." The Syrian waters are probably not less rich in marine life than Tyre, and could produce, at least as great a number. The name of the last place, indeed, is derived from the Phoenician word fish (see Gesenius, s. v. ἱχθυς). Sidon: the modern name has the same meaning, Saida; Abulfar. Syria, p. 93. See Sidon), and it is the oldest fishing establishment for commercial purposes known in history. The Hebrews had a less perfect acquaintance with the species found in the Red Sea, whether on account of the extent, the majority of fishes found in the Indian Ocean. Besides these, in Egypt they had anciently eaten those of the Nile (for the fish of the Nile, see Rawlinson's Herodotus, ii, 119-121, and, more fully, Wilkins's Ancient Egyptians, ii, 58; v. 248-255); subsequently, those of the lake of Tiberias and of the rivers falling into the Jordan (von Ramuer, Palästina, p. 106, after Hasselquist, mentions the Sparus Gilius, a sort of bromus, the silurus and mura; and Reulin, in Her. aegyptiarchaeology, after Dr. Barth, adds the Labrus N. boeotia as inhabitant of the Red Sea, which Stanger, in Ichthyology, p. 575, represents as abounding in fish of all kinds (comp. John xxi, 11, with Matt. xiv, 17 and xv, 34). From the earliest times—so said the Rabbinical legends—this lake had been so renowned in this respect (see Reland, p. 260, who quotes the Baba Bathra of the Babylonian Gemara), that one of the ten fundamental laws laid down by Joshua was, that any one might fish with a hook in the Sea of Galilee [see Lightfoot, Talm. Exerc. in Matt. iv, 8]. Two of the villages on the banks derived their name from their fisheries, the west and the east side, "house of fish" [compare the modern name of Sidon just mentioned]. The numerous streams which flow into the Jordan are also described by Stanley as full of fish, especially the Jabok, p. 323); and they may have been acquainted with species of other lakes, of the Oronas, and even of the En Dor, although, however, of this article of food, which the Jewish people appear to have consumed largely, came chiefly from the Mediterranean. From Neh. xiii, 16, we learn that the Phoenicians of Tyre actually resided in Jerusalem as dealers in fish, which must have led to an exchange of that commodity for corn, and that they must have had at least called it (in which form it is termed τῆς ἐν Τιμωλόν). Lightfoot on Matt. xiv, 17): the existence of a regular fish-market is implied in the notice of the fish-gate, which was probably contiguous to it (2 Chron. xxvii, 11). —19; Neh. iii, 9; xii, 28; Zeph. i, 10). In addition to these sources, the reservoirs formed in the neighborhood of towns may have been stocked with fish (2 Sam. ii, 13; iv, 12; Isa. vii, 8; xxiii, 9, 11; Cant. vii, 4, where, however, "fish" is interpolated in the A. V.). See Zoon. The most nutritious and common of the fishes was almost always filled the Jewish markets were genera of Perca (European perch tribe); some in the Red.
with which we close our general review of the class, although many interesting remarks might be subjoined, all tending to clear up existing misconceptions respecting fishes in general—such as catadromous, or the whale tribe, belong to them; and the misapplica-
tion of the term when tortoises and oysters are denomi-
nated fish; for the error is general, and the Arabs
ven include lizards in the appellation. See ZOOLOGY.

Ancient Egyptians cutting fish. Fig. 1, splits them open, ω, and removes the entrails, as at b, & c, takes out the back-
bone, ρ, and malls them from the pot, ρ, ω and 4, bring them in whole, ρ, ρ, ω.

The extreme value of fish as an article of food [when cooked, or otherwise prepared as a relish, ὀφθαλ-
μῶς, lit. source] (our Lord seems to recognise this as
shaping his mission to them to be a prime necessity of life, see Matt. vii, 9, 10) imparted to the destruction of fish the character of a divine judg-
ment (see Isa. 1, 2; Hosea iv, 5; Zeph. 1, 3; compare with Exod. vii, 18, 21; Ps. cxxv, 29; and Isa. xix, 4).
This would especially be the case in Egypt, where the
abundance of fish in the Nile, and the lakes and can-
nals (Strabo, xvii, p. 828; Diod. i, 86, 48, 52; Herod.
i, 53, 149), rendered it one of the staple commodities of food (Numb. xii, 5; comp. Wilkinson, iii, 62). How
fish is destroyed, largely in the way of God's judg-
ment, is stated by Dr. E. Pococke on Hosea iv, 5, where he
collects many conjectures of the learned, to
which may be added the more obvious cause of death
by disease, such as the case mentioned by Welsted
(Traels in Arabia, i, 810) of the destruction of vast
quantities of the fish of Oman by an epidemic, which
recurred nearly every five years. St. John (Traels in
Valley of the Nile, ii, 246) describes a vast destruction
of fish from cold. Aristotle (Hist. Anim. viii, 19) men-
tions certain symptoms of disease among fish as known
to skilful fishermen; but he denies that epidemics such
as affect men and cattle fall upon them. In the next
section we meet with another plant parasite, æs-
μος) as poisonous to fresh-water and other fish. Cer-
tain waters are well known to be fatal to life. The
instance of the Dead Sea, the very contrast of the
other Jordan lakes so full of life, is well described by
Schwarz (Descriptive Geography of Palestine, p. 41-45),
and by Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, p. 290-294), and
more fully by De Saulcy (Dead Sea, passim). Con-
trast the present condition of this Sea of Death with the
vitality which is predicted of it in the vision of
Essekil (xlvii, 9, 10). Its healed waters and renova-
ted fish "exceeding many," and "the fishers which
shall stand on it from Engedi even unto Enonaim," and
"the places on its coast to spread forth necta"—all these
features are in vivid opposition to the present condi-
tion of "the Asphaltic lake." Of like remark-
able import is 2 Esd. v, 7, where the writers, among the
fish of which the text claims possession, name as called
a fishy sea shall cast out fish." For ancient testimoni-
ances of the deaths which reign over this lake, see
St. Jerome on Essekil, lib. xiv., Tacitus, Hist. vi, 6;
Div. Sic. ii, 46, and xix, 58; and the Nubian Geog-
rapher, iii, 5, as quoted by Bochart, Hieros. i, 40.
But there are other waters equally fatal to life, but
less known, such as the lake called Cumudam
(Avicenna, i. q. ἀγγων, without life), in Armenia,
and that which Aluan (Hist. Anim. iii, 38) mentions
and was graven or painted as a secret sign upon mon-
uments of all kinds. We do not speak, of course, of
the fish introduced into arabesque ornamentation, or
the religious significance of the Hebrew names drawn from the Second Testament, nor of
those cases where it was used upon tombs to indicate
the calling of the deceased, but of those cases where it was used independently, and manifestly in a purely
symbolical sense. Numberless examples are extant
of its being thus used on tombstones, rings, seals, and
amulets. It manifestly had two significations, some-
times referring to Christ, and sometimes to the
Christian Church.

I. Referring to Christ, it was in familiar use as early
as the 2d century. Its significance was drawn from
the fact that the letters of ἰχθύς, the Greek word for
fish, form the initials of the acrostic Ἰχθύς, Χριστός,
Θεοί, Ιεωνίας (Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour).
The complete acrostic is found upon but one monu-
ment, a tombstone. It is explained in the writings of
St. Augustine. Sometimes the entire word was used;
in other cases there were but parts of it. The figure
of a fish was very frequently cut or painted to repre-
sent the Saviour. Fishes of glass or of bronze were
often hung upon the necks of believers as amulets.
Seals and rings often had other symbols also, as the
anchor, the cross, and the A Γ. The fish was spe-
cially used on representations of fish, and on the walls of bap-
tisteries. A ship resting on a fish was used to indicate
that Christ supports the Church.

II. The fish represents the Christian in all artistic
presentations of those parables where the apothecaries
are spoken of as fishers of men. The fish, attached to a
book and line, with or without a fisherman, always re-
fers to the Christian, as do those representations of a
number of fishes on pavements of churches, and on
tombstones where funeral inscriptions, as in paces,
are added. Often two fishes are given, one on each
side of an anchor or a cross. Many interpretations are
given of this, the best established being the one that
considers them as referring to the Jews and Gentiles,
though much weight is attached to the interpretation
which considers the two fishes to allude to the two
ravenants, the Jewish and the Christian. The baptis-
teries were therefore sometimes called piscaria. The
territorial speech of Christians as accustomed to please
themselves with the name piaciuli, "fishes," to denote
that they were born again into Christ's religion by
water. He says, Nos pisciarii secundum ἰχθύν, nostrum Jesum Christum, in aqua docvitum (De Esp. ch. i).

The use of the fish as a symbol ceased almost en-
tirely with the death of Constantine the Great, though
examples are found of it as late as the 5th or 6th cen-
tury.—Rossi, De Christianis Monumentis IX,91N ex-

See FISH.
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kreatoth (Par. 1855); Martigny, Dictionnaire des Anciennes Christiennes (Paris, 1865); Piper, Die christliche Kunst; Becker, Die Darstellung Jesu Christi unter dem Bilde des Fishes (Brunelles, 1868, 8vo); Diderot, Christian Iconography, i, 344; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. i. ch. i. § 2.

FISHING (ζίγα, dig; ἀλιών). The copious supply of fish in the waters of Palestine encouraged the art or avocation of fishery, to which frequent allusions are made in the Bible: in the O. T. these allusions are of a metaphorical character, descriptive either of the conversion (Jer. xvi. 18; Ezek. xlvii. 10) or of the destruction (Ezek. xxvii. 8 sq.; Eccl. xiii. 8); Amos iv. 2; Hab. i. 14) of the enemies of God. In the N. T. the allusions are of a historical character for the most part (see Thompson, Land and Book, ii, 79), though the metaphorical application is still maintained in Matt. xiii. 47 sq.

It was from the fishing-nets that Jesus called his earliest disciples to become "fishers of men" (Mark i, 16-20): it was from a fishing-boat that he rebuked the winds and the waves (Matt. vii. 28); it was from a fishing-boat that he delivered his wondrous series of prophetic parables of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii. 27-32); it was to a fishing-boat that he walked on the sea, and from it that Peter walked to him (Matt. xxiv. 22-82); it was with fish (doubtless dried) as well as with bread that he twice miraculously fed the multitude (Matt. xiv. 19; xvi. 30), it was from the mouth of a fish, taken with a hook, that the tribute-stater was paid (Matt. xvii. 27); it was a "plentifully fished fish" that he ate before his disciples on the day that he rose from the dead (Luke xxiv. 42, 48); and yet again, before he ascended, he filled their net with "great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three," while he himself prepared a "fire of coals," and laid fish thereon, on which then he and they dined (John xxi. 1-14).

The most prevalent method of catching fish in use among the Hebrews was by nets of various kinds and sizes. Four of these are mentioned: two in Hab. i, 15, 16, χεὶς (che'sem, Sept. ἄμβρασαν) v. no doubt in v. 16 this word and ἀμβρασία have been by some men transposed; verse 17 compared with verse 16 makes this evident), the casting-net, Matt. iv. 18 (ξενοῦ), and Mark i. 16; and ὑπεροχά (ὑπεροχά, Sept. ἀμφασάρας), the drag-net, a larger kind (see Matt. xiii. 48), requiring the use of a boat: the latter was probably most used on the sea of Galilee, as the number of boats kept on it was very considerable (Josephus, War, iii, 10, 9). The third occurs Eccl. iv. 12, ἡ ἠμβρασία (ἰμπρασία, Sept. ἀμβρασάρας), a casting-net. The fourth, ἄμφασις (αμβαστή, Sept. ἀμφασάρας), a fouler's net as well as a fisher's. In Psa. xxxv, 7, 8, the ἄμφασις, net, is used with ἄμφασις, a "fisher" (they have hid for me their net in a pit"); the allusion would seem to be to that mode of winter-fishing which Aristoteles describes as practised by the Phenicians (Hist. Animal, vii, 20). Net-fishing is still used on the lake of Tiberias (Dr. Pococke, Description of the East, ii, 69). See NET. This mode of fishing prevailed in Palestine, and is a prominent feature in the places associated with the Gospel history to the very last (see John xxi, 8, 11). It is certainly less characteristic of Egyptian fishing, of which we have frequent mention in the O. T. See ANGLING. The instruments therein employed were the ἀμβρασία (ἀμβρασία, Sept. ἄμβρασαν, comp. Matt. xvii, 27), angling-hook, for smaller fish; Isa. xix, 8; Hab. i. 16. They were (for distinction to resemble thornes (on the principle of the fly-fishing instruments, though not in the same manner; for the Egyptians, neither anciently nor now, seem to have put winged insects on their hooks to attract their prey: Wilkinson, iii, 54), and were then called ἄμβρασαν, sirodt, Amos iv. 2 ('from their resemblance to thornes,' Gesenius, Lxx. s. v.); and (in the case of the larger sort) ἵνκλαβα, A. V. "barbed irons;" Job xii, 7 [xli, 81]. Another name for these thorn-like instruments was ἰερσάνθος, tillirth, Amos iv. 2 (a generic word, judging from the Sept., ἄμβρασαν), was either a hook or a ring put through the nostrils of fish to let them down again alive into the water (Gesenii), or (it may be) a crook by which fishes were suspended to long poles, and carried home after being caught (such as is shown in plate 344 [from a tomb near the Pyramids] in Wilkinson, iii. 56). The word is used in Job xii, 2 [xli, 28] with ἄμβρασαν, agmon' a cord of rushes (πτενοσ). Rosenmuller, ad loc., applies these two words to the binding of larger fish to the bank of the river until wanted, after they are captured, and quotes Bruce for instances of such a practice in modern Egyptian fishing. The rod was occasionally dispensed with (Wilkinson, iii, 55), and is not mentioned in the Bible: ground-bait alone was used, fly-fishing being unknown. Though we have so many terms for the hook, it is doubtful whether any have come down to us denoting the line; ἵνκλαβα and ἵνκλαβα, though the most nearly connected with piscatorial employment, hardly express our notion of a line for angling (see Gesenius, s. v.); while ἄμβρασαν and ἄμβρασαν (bread, twine) are never used in Scripture for fishing purposes. See Hook. The large fish-spear or karpov used for destroying the crocodile and hippopotamus was called ἄμφασις (Job xii, 7 [xli, 81]; comp. with Wilkinson, iii, 72, 75). ἄμφασις means a symbol or any clange-

Ancient Egyptian spearing Fish.

Ancient Egyptian spearing Fish.

[Description of fishing methods and instruments used in ancient Egypt, with references to specific biblical passages and historical sources.]

The descriptions and illustrations provided offer a vivid insight into the fishing practices and equipment used in ancient Egypt. These methods, while effective for their time, were surpassed by modern techniques and technologies, leaving a rich legacy of cultural and artistic expression in the form of historical records and artifacts. The passage integrates historical context with specific biblical references, creating a comprehensive overview of the subject matter. The text includes detailed descriptions of various types of fishing nets, hooks, and equipment, highlighting the ingenuity and practicality of ancient Egyptian fisheries. The mention of specific biblical verses and historical sources lends credibility to the text, ensuring that the information is both accurate and authoritative. The descriptions are written in a clear and concise manner, making them accessible to both specialists and general readers. Overall, the passage provides an insightful look into the world of ancient Egyptian fishing, emphasizing the historical and cultural importance of the practice.
Ancient Egyptians fishing with the Net and drying Fish in the rigging of the Boat. A kite sits upon the mast waiting for the entrails of the fish.

ets (Isa. xix, 8-10). Fishing pavilions, apparently built on the margin of artificial lakes, also appear in the Assyrian sculptures (Layard's Nineveh, 1, 55). Ac-

Ancient Assyrian Fishing in a Lake with a Line, without a Rod, and carrying a Rush Basket on his Shoulders.

conting to Aristotle (Hist. Animul. vii, 19), compared with Luke v, 5, the night was the best time for fishing operations: "before sunrise and after sun-

Fisher (277, dorojus, Jer. xvi, 16 [marg.]); Ezek. xliii, 10; or 33°, dorojus, Isa. xix, 8; Jer. xvi, 16 [text]; Gr. ὄλος, seamon or sailor, hence fisherman, as rendered Luke v, 2), a term used, besides its literal import [see Fishing, above], in the phrase "fishers of men" (Matt. xii, 17, Mark i, 17), as applied by our Saviour to the apostles (q. v.) in calling them to their office; and in a like typical manner, but in an unfavorable sense, the word occurs Jer. xvi, 16. The application of the figure is obvious [see Wemys, Symbolical Dict. s. v.]. On the "fisher's coat" (ἐφεδρόγης, Jer. xxi, 7), see COAT.

Fisher, Edward, an English Protestant theologian, was born in 1557, and was educated at Oxford, where he became a gentleman commoner in 1577. He taught a school at Caernarvon, in Wales, and died in Ireland. He was a strong Calvinist. His Marrow of Modern Divinity, published in 1644, excited a vigorous controversy when republished in Scotland by Hogg (1718, 8vo). It went through numerous editions (12th ed. Lond. 1726, with notes by Thomas Boston, 2 vols. 8vo). Fisher also wrote Appeal to the Conscience (Ox-

ford, 1644, 8vo) — Feast of Aneas (1644, 4to) — Crest to the Subtactarians (1650, 4to) — Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, s. v. — Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, ed. Smith, ii. 481. See MARROW CONTROVERSY.

Fisher, John, bishop of Rochester, was born at Beverly, in Yorkshire, in 1458. He was educated at Michael House, Cambridge, of which house he became master in 1495; and being appointed confessor to Margaret, countess of Richmond, mother of Henry VII, he induced her to found St. John's and Christ's colleges. He was made divinity-professor in Cambridge, 1502, and bishop of Rochester, 1504. He was a great ben-

Fisher, Jonathan, a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 7, 1768, at New Brintree, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College, 1792, entered the min-

istry Oct. 1798, and was installed pastor at Blue Hill,
FISHER

FISK

Me., July 13, 1796, where he labored until Oct. 24, 1857, and died Sept. 22, 1847. He published a volume of Miscellaneous Poems; Scripture Animals; and a sermon.—Sprague, Amlbs., ii, 544.

Fisher, Richard Adams, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Berks Co., Pa., Oct. 25, 1800. Having finished his preparatory studies under his own pastor, Rev. F. Herman, Jr., he began the study of theology with Rev. Dr. Herman; was licensed and ordained in 1826. He took charge of the German Reformed congregation in Sunbury, Pa., together with several other churches, in 1827, and continued in this field of labor until 1854, when failing health compelled him to resign. Recovering somewhat, he labored a short time in Lyken's Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa., where he died Jan. 27, 1857. Mr. Fisher had a good mind, was a logical and instructive preacher, a genial and kind friend, and was greatly beloved throughout the church in which he labored. He preached well in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

Fisher-Ring or Fisherman's Ring. See ANGULUS.

Fish-Gate ( UIGUM, soko'ar had-dawim, gate of the fishes; Sept. ἡ πόλη ἢ η ἀκονία, in Neh., ἡ πόλις ἢ η ἀκονία, in Zeph. πόλις ἢ ἀκονία, αἰώνιον, Vulg. porta piscium name of one of the gates of Jerusalem. (2 Chron. xxiv, 14; Neh. iii, 3; xil, 39; Zeph. i, 10), probably on the east side, just north of the Temple enclosure (Strong's HARM, and EXPOS. of the Gospel, APP., p. 18), although Barta fs (City of Great King, p. 158) locates it on the west side of the Temple, supported by the name of the medieval piscina. (p. 801); a very unsuitable position, as it doubtless derived its name from the fact that fish (q. v.) from the lake of Tiberias (or perhaps from the Mediterranean) were brought to the city by that route, or that they were sold there (Genesius, Zexa, p. 1694, who identifies it with the present gate of St. Stephen). See JERUSALEM.

Fish-hook (in the plur. 646, 646, thorns [as often rendered] of fishing; Sept. at random λιθοπαρα yumpos, Vulg. equally so olia fermenta, both taking the term in the sense of pots, contrary to the synonymous γιτάκα, "hooks," of the other hebrewism), used figuratively of an instrument of control (Amos iv, 3), after the name which was taken by putting hooks and rings in their noses (comp. Isa. xxxvii, 29; Ezsk. xxxix, 4; Job xl, 26; see also Oedmann, Somal. v, 5). Others, as the letter in (loc.), prefer to retain the simple meaning of thorns, as referring to pastoral customs. See FISHING.

Fish-poole (έραβα, a pool, as often elsewhere), a pond or reservoir in general; presumed by our translators at Cant. vii, 4 to be intended for fish (q. v.), such as we know were anciently constructed for the purpose of pleasure angling. See FISHING (above).

Fish-spear (γορον, a prowg of fishes; Sept. and Vulgate vaguely ἀκονία φυσιών, γαργανία piscium), a harpoon or trident for spearing fish (Job xii, 3 [in the Heb. x, 31]), See FISHING.

Fisk, Ebenezer, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Shellburne, Mass., Jan. 10, 1795, graduated at Williams College in 1809, and was licensed in 1810. After preaching for some months, he was ordained as an evangelist, and labored chiefly among destitute congregations of Georgia; after which he engaged as missionary in the city of Philadelphia. In 1826 he was chosen pastor of the Presbyterian church in Goshen, N. Y., where he continued for upwards of twenty years. He became a trustee of Williams College in 1823, and a director of the Theological Seminary at Princeton in 1825. He retired to Georgia in 1832 for his health, and was appointed the following year professor of ecclesiastical history and Church government in the Western Theological Seminary, and moderator of the General Assembly. He removed to Philadelphia, and died Dec. 5, 1841. He published An Oration before the Society of Alumni of Williams College (1825): —A Lecture on the Inability of Sinners (Phila. 1822) —A Farewell Sermon (1833) —Articles on Mental Science, in Church Advocate (1822).—Sprague, Amlbs., iv, 457.

Fisk, Pilny, a Congregational minister and missionary, was born at Shelburne, Mass., June 24, 1792. He graduated at Williams College in 1817, studied divinity and theology at Andover, entered the ministry in January, 1814, and preached for a time in Wilmington, Vt. Having determined to be a missionary, he was, with Mr. Levi Parsons, appointed by the American Board of Missions to the Palestine mission in September, 1818, and spent the winter travelling through the South, raising money for the missionary cause. With his colleague, he sailed from Boston for Smyrna, Nov. 8, 1819, and arrived at their port Jan. 15, 1820. The two missionaries spent some time in Scio to study modern Greek, then visited the "seven churches" in Asia Minor, and finally settled in Smyrna. Early in 1822 Mr. Fisk accompanied Mr. Parsons to Egypt, where the latter died, Feb. 10. His successor, the Rev. J. King, met Mr. Fisk at Malta, and in April, 1823, they went, together with Mr. Wolf, by way of Egypt and Syria to Jerusalem. After two months in Jerusalem and Beyroot, they visited the principal cities in Northern Syria to "spy out the land," and spent some part of 1824 at Damascus and Aleppo studying Arabic. In May, 1825, he joined the mission already established at Beyroot, and died there on the 28th of October following. See Bond, Life of Pilny Fisk (Boston, 1829, 12mo).—American Mission, p. 264; Sprague, Amlbs., ii, 622.

Fisk, Samuel. See FISIK, SAMUEL.

Fisk, Willburn, first president of the Wesleyan University, was born in Brattleboro, Vt., August 8, 1792. His parents were of the old Puritan stock, and he was trained in habits of virtue and religion, especially by his mother. In 1809 he went to the Grammar School at Peacham, and in 1812 to the University of Vermont, where he passed A.B. in 1815. In 1818 he entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon became remarkable for piety and success in his ministry. His talents as a preacher were of the greatest, and he became a man of great power, surpassed in this respect in the American pulpit. His health was feeble, however, from the beginning, and his unsalaried labors in the itinerant ministry were too great for him. In 1823 he was made presiding elder of the Vermont district, and in 1824 was chosen delegate to the Vermont Conference, a rare distinction for so young a man. From this time onward his life was devoted to the cause of Christian education in the Methodist Episcopal Church. When he entered the ministry in 1818 "there was not a single literary institution of any note under the patronage of the Church. A few years later, in 1824, he was appointed agent to collect funds for one which had been established in Newmarket, N. H.; but he declined the service because, as he said, it was not established on a permanent basis. Still he was anxious that one should be established, and after long effort, with the aid of the academy at Wilbraham, was commenced, and he was appointed its principal in 1826. The spirit which was thus aroused soon demanded an institution of a higher grade. The Northern and Eastern Conferences united to found the Wesleyan University at Middletown, and Dr. Fisk naturally, and without a rival, was chosen its president in 1830. The part he had already taken in awaking the people to the subject, his devotion to it, and his abilities, made him more than ever a leader in the cause of education in the Church. Sub-
dants gathered to the institution from every part of the nation, and many soon went forth from it, who, by his grace of manhood, became presidents, professors, and teachers in the rapidly multiplying colleges and seminaries under the patronage of the Church throughout the United States. His heart was in this work. He believed, too, that he was where Providence designed him to be. And when he was elected bishop, he declined the office, for he said, 'if my health would allow me to perform the work of the episcopacy I dare not accept it, for I believe I can do more for the cause of Christ where I am than I could do as a bishop. Who shall say that his decision was not only honest and good in itself, but of the highest duty as a father of the church young, and the part he took in awakening the people to the value of general education, were more important than the work of any bishop?" (Centenary Memoirs, In The Methodist, N. Y.) In 1825 he was elected bishop of the Canada Conference, but declined the office. In 1829 he received the degree of D.D. from Brown University, and in the same year was elected president of Lagrange College, Alabama, and also professor in the University of Alabama, both which offices he declined. For many years his life was an incessant battle with pulmonary disease. In 1835-6 he travelled in Europe for the benefit of his health. He died at Middletown, Feb. 22, 1838. Among his writings are, The Culminating Controversy (N. Y. 1830); Travels in Europe (N. Y. 1838, 8vo); -Sermons and Lectures on Universalism; -Reply to Pierpont on the Atonement and other tracts and sermons.

Dr. Fisk was a saintly man, of the type of Feneon, and endowed with some of Feneon's best moral and mental traits—clearness and logical force; flexibility and adroitness in controversy; with earnest love of truth and goodness for the animating spirit of all his life and thought. As a preacher, few surpassed him in eloquence, none in fervor. As a teacher, he had that highest of all qualities, the power to kindle the enthusiasm of his pupils. Take him for all in all, he was a man of rare symmetry of character, moral and intellectual, of whom all whom he knew would be more willing to say, "Mark the perfect man, and be hold the upright," than of any man of his time who held so high a place. Dr. Stevens describes him as follows: "Wilbur Fisk's person bespeaks his character. It was of good size, and remarkable for its symmetry. His face was oval, very beautifully harmoniously composed, strongly resembling the better Roman outline, though lacking its most peculiar distinction, the sanae aquatic. His eye was nicely defined, and, when excited, beamed with a peculiar benignity and conciliatory expression. His complexion was silvery, and added to the decided simplicity of his surroundings the needed features. His head was a model, not of great, but of well-proportioned development. It had the height of the Roman brow, though none of the breadth of the Greek. There is a bust of him extant, but it is not to be looked at by any who would not mar in their memories the beautiful and benign image of his earlier manhood by the disfigurations of disease and suffering. His voice was peculiarly flexible and sonorous: a catarrhal disease affected it, but just enough, during most of his life, to improve its tone to a soft orottund, without a trace of huskiness, and to indicate the moral emotions more effectually by mere tones. It was especially expressive in pathetic passages. His pulpit manner was marked in the introduction of the sermon by dignity, but dignity without ceremony or pomposity. As he advanced into the exposition and argument of his discourse, and then again, in most of his sermons, he became more emphatic, especially as brilliant though brief illustrations ever and anon gleamed upon his logic. By the time he had reached the peroration his utterance became rapid, his thoughts were indistinct, the music of his voice rang out in thrilling tones, and sometimes even quivered with trills of pathos. No imaginative excitement prevailed in the audience as under Maffitt's eloquence, no tumultuous works. To Bacon's, none of Cookman's impetuous passion, or Oliphant's overwhelming sense of a subdued, almost tranquil spell of genial feeling, expressed often by tears or half-suppressed ejaculations; something of the kindly effect of Summerfield combined with a higher intellectual impression. Fisk professed living for the faith and exemplification of Paul's sublime doctrine of Christian perfection. He prized that gate of trust as one of the most important distinctions of Christianity. His own experience respecting it was marked by signal circumstances, and that the day he practically adopted it till he triumphed over death, its impress was radiant on his daily life. With John Wesley, he deplored this important truth—promulgated, in any very express form, almost solely by Methodism in these days—to be one of the most solemn responsibilities of his Church, the most potent element in the experimental divinity of the Scriptures" (Methodist Quarterly Review, July, 1852, p. 485). See Holdich, Life of J Wilbur Fisk (N. Y. 1840, 8vo); Methodist Quarterly, 1842, p. 579; Sherman, New-England Divines, p. 288; M'Clintock, Lives of Methodist Ministers (N. Y. 8vo); sketch of Fisk by the Rev. O. H. Tiffin, D.D., in Magazine of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Cheever's Review, July 9, 1868; Zion's Herald, vii, 400. See also New England Theology.

Flase, John D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 26, 1770, in Warwick, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College, 1791; entered the ministry May 6, 1794; and was ordained pastor in New Braintree Oct. 26, 1796, where he remained not long after his death, Mar. 15, 1855. Dr. Fiske assisted largely in the founding of Amherst College. He published a Spelling-book (1807), and two sermons. -Sprague, Annals, ii, 867.

Flase, Nathan Welby, an eminent Congregational minister, was born April 17, 1796, at Weston, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College 1817; was chosen tutor 1818, in which position he remained two years, and then entered the Theological Seminary at Andover. In Nov. 1823, he went to Savannah, and preached among the seamen and others not belonging to any church. He was chosen professor of languages in Amherst Collegiate Institute (afterwards Amherst College), 1824. A few years after, he was transferred to the chair of intellectual and moral philosophy, which he held until his death. In 1846, on account of ill health, he sailed (Nov. 6) for Palestine, and died in Jerusalem Dec. 27, 1846. Dr. Fiske was the author of an English translation of Echegaray's Manual of Classical Literature (1836), which went through three editions, and was stereotyped for the fourth ed. (1848). A volume of his Sermons was published 1850, and also Memoirs of N. W. Fiske, with Selections from his Sermons and other Writings, by Heman Humphrey, D.D. (Amherst, 1850). The New Englander (Feb. 1850, p. 70) speaks of his sermons as follows: "They are eminently suggestive. Some of them, like that on 'the analysis of conscience,' are fine specimens of philosophical analysis. Some, like that on 'the wonder and truth of men's mental institution,' and that on 'the fearfulness of man's mental constitution,' lead the reader over a track almost untrodden by sermonizers, and yet presenting grounds for most powerful appeals. No thinking mind can fail to be enriched by the attentive reading of these discourses. They belong to no man's mental class of bishop Butler's sermons; yet with the bishop's strong reasoning and clear analysis of principles, they have much more of the direct and powerful application of the truth to the conscience, and are more imbued with the very essence of the doctrine of the cross."
cated at Amherst College, where he graduated in 1849. After two years spent in teaching, he studied theology at Andover until 1852, when he became tutor at Amherst, where he remained until 1855, when he sailed for Europe and the East. His letters describing this journey appeared under the title of Mr. Dunn Brown's Experiences in foreign Parts (Boston, 1857, 12mo), and abound with wit, humor, and graphic power.

In 1857 he was ordained pastor of the Congregational church at Madison, Conn., where he was remarkably useful and successful. During the Civil War his patriotism led him to join the army, and failing to secure a chaplaincy, he entered the service as private, but soon rose to be captain. While in service he wrote Mr. Dunn Brown's Experiences in the Army (Boston, 1866, 12mo). Made prisoner at Chancellorsville, he spent some time in Libby prison, Richmond. He fell in the first battle of the Wilderness, May 6, 1864. His Christian life in the army was kept up as at home, and he was more than a chaplain could be to his men.

"He was a Christian officer, illustrating in camp, and on the march, and in battle the noblest Christian character. He decidedly rebuked all the vices of the army; he gently soothed the sick and wounded, prayed with the dying and over the dead. Touching memories of him have been recalled in our hospitals at the mention of his name. 'Oh,' said one in Washington, 'he is the man who put his arm around me so kindly, and begged me to promise him that I would do another oath, and I never have.' Said another: 'Captain Fiske—oh yes; he helped me off the field after that dreadful battle, gave me his blanket, and spoke kind words of cheer that helped to keep me alive. Multipled could testify of his fidelity to them. It was his daily duty to care both for the bodies and the souls of all about him.'—New Englander, January, 1866, art. iv; Congregational Quarterly, 1866, art. 1.

Pistulce, pipes or reeds used in the administration of the wine in the Eucharist from the 8th century to the 12th. The deacon held the cup in his own hand, a small reed or pipe was introduced into the wine, and the communicant drew up the wine into his mouth through this pipe. The object was to prevent the possibility of spilling any of the wine.

Pitcho, Ewenzer, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, and president of Williams College, Mass., was born in Norwich Sept. 28, 1756, and graduated in Yale in 1777. After teaching for some time in Hanover, N. Y., he became tutor in Yale, and remained there till 1783, when he formed a mercantile connection, which proving disastrous, he returned to his former office, to which was added that of librarian. He was licensed to preach in 1787, and in 1791 became preceptor of the academy in Williamstown, Mass., of which, with the title of Williams College, he was appointed president in 1798. He resigned in 1816, and was installed pastor of the Presbyterian church, West Bloomfield, N. Y., which he resigned in 1826, after a zealous and efficient ministry. He died March 21, 1838. He published A Bacchus Discours, 1795. Syracuse, Ausick, lii, 811.

Pitches (i.e. Vetches or chic-k-poo), the incorrect rendering, in the Auth. Vera, of two Heb. words. See Botany.

1. נָצָא (b'toach, something stream), which occurs only in Isa. xxviii, 29, 27, where special reference is made to the mode of threshing it; not with "a threshing instrument," (גָּנֶס, גְּנֶשׁ), but "with a staff" (גָּחֹשׁ), because the heavy-army-armed of the former implement would have crushed it. Although b'toach, in Chaldee ננס (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 2101), is always acknowledged to denote some seed, yet it is impossible we had great difficulty in determining the particular kind intended, some translating it pea, others, as Luther and the English version, vesch, but without any proof. Melonious considers it to be the white poppy, and others a black seed. This last interpretation has the most numerous, as well as the oldest authorities in its support. Of these a few are in favor of the black poppy-seed, but the majority of a black seed common in Egypt, etc. (Celcus, Hieroclet. ii, 10). The Sept. translates it μαλουθων, the Vulg. gith (perhaps from the Heb. "ח, corridor; see Ptau-

The book is about the history and culture of the East, focusing on the experiences of a Christian officer during the Civil War and his service in the army. The author, Dunn Brown, describes his time as a pastor in Madison, Conn., and later as a captain in the army, where he was captured during the Wilderness battle. The text also includes a note on the use of "pistulce," pipes or reeds used in the Eucharist for centuries, a detail that highlights the religious practices of the time. The entry for Pitches (Vetches or Chic-k-poo) is a gloss on a Hebrew word, mentioning its context in Isaiah, and the challenges in determining its specific meaning. The text concludes with a discussion on the black seed, touching on its cultural and religious significance.
enous in Europe, others cultivated in most parts of Asia, with their leaves deeply cut and linear, their flowers terminal, most of them having under the calyx leaves, and others having none. 

The fruit is composed of five or six capsules, which are compressed, oblong, pointed, sometimes said to be hornlike, united below, and divided into several cells, and enclosing numerous angular, scabrous, black-colored seeds. From the nature of the capsules, it is evident that, when they are ripe, the seeds might easily be shaken out by moderate blows of a stick, as is related to have been the case with the keteacok of the text. See Threshing.

Besides the N. annua, there is another species, the N. arvensis, which may be included under the term keteacok; but the seeds of this last-named plant are less aromatic than the other. They are annual plants belonging to the natural order Ranunculaceae, and suborder Hellebores. The nigella forms a singular exception among the family to which it belongs, inasmuch as they are terrible poisons, while the nigella produces seeds that are not only wholesome and aromatic, but are in great reputation for their medicinal qualities. See Aromatic.

2. In Ezek. iv, 9, "scistes" are mentioned among the materials of the bread the prophet was bidden to make, and there it represents the Heb. word גְּנַּפָּה, קְטָאָךְ. This word is incorrectly translated in A. V. "yce" (q. v.) in Exod. i. 22, and Is. xxviii, 30, but the word does not occur in the English place, as in the margin, "spelt," which is the true rendering of the word. The root of גְּנַּפָּה is גְּנַפָּה, to shear, and the species of corn to which it gives a name is the Triticum spelta of Linnaeus—in Greek ζηοκα; in Latin far and odor. "Spelt has a four-leaved blunted calyx, small blossoms, with little awns, and a smooth, slender ear. It is grown in regions of which the grains of which sit so firmly in the husks that they must be freed from them by peculiar devices; it grows about as high as barley, and is extensively cultivated in the southern countries of Europe, in Egypt, Arabia, and Palestine, in more than one species. The Sept. translates it by δασα, in Pliny unseris, which corresponds with the French rizet; and Herodotus (ii, 30) observes that it was used by the Egyptians for baking bread" (Kaiach on Exod. 9, 22). See Cereals.

Five-mile Act, or Oxford Act, an act of the British Parliament, passed in 1665, which imposed an oath on all nonconformists, binding them at no time to endeavor any alteration of the government in either Church or State. In England, Church and ordering the ministers should neither live in, nor come within five miles (except in crossing the road) of any borough, city, or corporate town, or within five miles of any parish, town, or place in which they had been, since the Act of Obligation, parson, vicar, or lecturer, under a penalty of forty pounds, or six months' imprisonment, and being rendered incapable of teaching any school, or taking any boarders to be taught or instructed.—Baxter, Church History of England, ii, 692; Neal, History of the Puritans (Harper's ed.), ii, 255.

Five Points, the five doctrines controverted between the Calvinists and Arminians, viz. predestination, election of the outward, grace, free-will, and final perseverance. The quinquaginta controversy in England was a dispute which arose at Cambridge in 1594 respecting the above points. In 1626 two fruitless conferences were held on these points; and in 1630 bishop Davenant preached at court on these disputed matters, and thereby gave great surcease to Charles I. The next year the controversy was revived at Oxford and in Ireland, of which archbishop Usher was then primate. The king issued certain injunctions concerning the bounds within which these points might be discussed. See Arminianism; Calvinism; Dore.

Flaccus, Caius Norbanus (Grecized Γρατος Νορμα ός, Josephus, Ant. xvi, 6, 6), son of a somewhat notable consular Roman of the same name (see Smith's Dict. of Ant. s. v. Νορμα ός) and a cousin of Octavius in A.D. 51 (Tactius, Ann. i, 54; Suet. Vit. 8). While proconsul of Asia Minor, he promulgated the emperor's decrees to the provincial magistrates in favor of the Jews (Joseph. Ant. xvi, 6, 3-6); and when preces of Syria he befriended Herod Agrippa II till influenced by Aristobulus (6. xlvii, 6, 3-9).

Flaccius, a name given to those who adhered, in the controversy concerning the German reformers, to Matthias Flaccus (q. v.).

Flaccus (Flacch), Matthias, also called Illyricus from his native country, an eminent Lutheran reformer, was born at Albona, in Illyria, about 1520. At sixteen he proposed entering a convent, but Baldo Lupstino, the provincial of the Franciscans, who had imbued Protestant tendencies, advised him to study theology in the university of Germany. Accordingly he went to Basle in 1538, to Tübingen in 1540, and in 1541 to Wittenberg, where he gave private lessons in Greek and Hebrew. In his travels he became acquainted with Grynæus, Leonard Fuchs, Eber, and finally with Luther himself, whose zealous disciple he soon became, and who for a while was prior of a professor of O.T. literature at Wittenberg, but, driven away by the issue of the Smalcaldic War in 1547, he went to Brunswick. Recalled by prince Maurice, he came back, but, having opposed Melancthon's Liber Interim [see Interim], he left the city, and in 1551 went to Hamburg, and thence to Magdeburg, whence he published several writings against the Interim, though in other points, especially in the Oriental controversy, he sided with Melancthon. He was also for several years engaged in theological controversies with Major, Strigel, Grocholkof, etc. See Sächische Confessionalschrift, of which great work he was the life and soul. In 1557 he was made professor of the newly-organized University of Jena, which became the stronghold of strict Lutheranism, and where he was chiefly instrumental in the drafting of the Sächische Confessionalschrift, to enforce Lutheran views. It, however, proved injurious both to the university and to himself, as it led the judges to establish a censorship, to which Flaccus and his colleagues were unwilling to submit and were dismissed in 1559. He then made himself especially odious by the rash statement (in his discussion with Strigel at Weimar, 1600) that original sin is the very substance of man in his fallen state. He was accused, therefore, of Manichæism. After spending five years in Regensburg, he accepted a call to Antwerp, and from thence to Frankfort and Strassburg. Obliged to leave the latter city on account of his opinions, he returned to Frankfort, where he died in the hospital in 1575.

The career of Flaccus was, on the whole, a stormy and unhappy one. But, after all the abuse that has been heaped upon him, it cannot be denied that he was a consistent upholder of the doctrines which he learned originally from Luther. The writers in the Reformed interest have generally treated him too severely; an unfavorable view of him is given by Planck, Geschicche des Protestant. Luthegriff. The best account of him is to be found in Proper, Matthias Flaccus Ilyricus u. seine Zeit (Erlangen, 1879-81, 2 vols.), from a notice of which, in the Bibliotheca Sacra (1882, p. 226), we make the following extracts:

"If it was right for a sincere follower of Luther to oppose the causes of his deceased friend and teacher, and to show by the severest logic that the Lutheran Church was, under Melancthon's guidance, drifting away from its moorings, then Flaccus is to be exonerated from the charge of uncharitableness, and his plaus must be allowed, that the unhappy division was not chargeable
to him who defended the old Wittenberg theology, but rather to him who introduced innovations. We say nothing now about the truth of the one or the other view; we only remark that Flacius was the outstanding champion of the genuine theology of Saxonys, as taught by Luther. We cannot, therefore, uphold Luther and condemn Flacius, that is, the dogma which he taught as the doctrine of what Luther, as the first reformer, had a right to teach. Flacius, his inferior in authority, had not a right to maintain against such a great man as Melancthon; for the theological swear allegiance not to men, but to principles. Flacius could justly reply to all who thus resented the dogma, in his polemic, that that was what Luther, as the first reformer, had a right to teach. Melancthon saw that the Genevan and Lutheran theologians entertained clearer and more scriptural views of the subject than Luther and the party of Flacius. With him the authority of Luther was not final. According to Flacius, all questions of theology and church usages were to be decided by the authority of the Bible and the consistory. According to Melancthon, they were to be decided by the authority of the Bible and of reason. Both were sincere and deeply in earnest. Both make out their points by irresistible logic. Schmidt, in the new Life of Melancthon just published by him, vindicates Melancthon's character in this controversy treated in the most precise way. He has done this well for Flacius. Flacius shows more firmness and tenacity, Melancthon more conciliation and forbearance. The former had such a reverence for truth, or for what seemed to be truth, that he forgot the respect due to a great and good man. He was mercilessly but consistently contumacious. The latter was so amiable and fond of peace that he would for the sake of it yield what he might have maintained. He was never a polemic, except by necessity. It is a somewhat remarkable fact that Flacius was incessantly persecuted, and often driven from place to place for teaching exactly what Luther taught. He was evidently a tenacious man, and born to be a polemic; but, notwithstanding his bad name for disputatiousness, he was far less violent and abusive in his language than his opponents, and more measured and unimpassioned than Luther. It was not in his nature to be polemic, but arising severity with which he exposed to the light of day any deviation from Luther, that so galled his opponents. They charged him, and perhaps not unjustly, with asuming to be the guardian of the Church. He did, indeed, make his princes his magistrates to watch over the purity of Christian doctrine. He required that they should call every man to account, no matter what his rank or position was, either openly or secretly attempted to destroy what Luther had built up. At the same time, he affirmed that he did it as a faithful son of the Church, doing only what every one was bound to do, namely, to guard its purity with all the power and skill he possessed. He furthermore maintained that, as the pupil and friend of Luther, he owed it to his memory to defend him and his doctrines against all assaults, even though they were made at Wittenberg itself, and by no less a man than Melancthon. He was undoubtedly governed by conscientious motives, however he may have erred both in matters of doctrine and of expediency; but when he trusted in princes to preserve the orthodoxy of the Church, he found, to his grief, that he trusted to a broken reed. Though unfortunate in his life, and a wanderer and fugitive in his old age, and apparently unsuccessful in the chief aim of his life, still he ranks third among the men of his age in his influence upon the doctrines of the old Lutheran Church. He has, indeed, been long almost forgotten as an historical man, as a religious historian. The chief writings of Flacius are Omnium Scriptura Latina contra adiaphoristicas fraudes edita (Magdeburg, 1550, 8vo.); De Justificatione Buslatius (Francfort, 1552, 4to.); Catalogus Testamenti Veritatis, etc. (Bâle, 1556; Francfort, 1574, 4to.); Unum Prim. Ecclesie concursus de non scrutinando divinae generationis Filii Dei modo (Bâle, 1600, 8vo.); Historia cerimoniae de prim. nata Pope (Bâle, 1554, 8vo.); Clarissimæ Scripturæ Sacrae notulæ ad instantiam, lib. III. (Marburg, 1584); Studio u. Christiani, 1555, 468; Schmidt, in Zeitschrift f. d. histor. Theologie, 1849; Dorner, Geschichte d. prot. Theologien (Munich, 1886, 8vo), 861-374; Gieseler, Ch. History, ed. Smith, vol. iv, § 57; and the articles Anti-apostolic Controversy and Synergetic Controversy.

Flag (as the name of a plant) stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative in part of two Heb. words. See Botany.

1. Acha (1 Sam. 21, 9; 31, 5; Ps. 68, 21; 105, 17; 110, 2; Isa. 1, 26; 5, 1; Job 2, 21; Deut. 1, 29; 22, 10; 31, 16, 18; Job 7, 20; 29, 4; Prov. 21, 16; 28, 19; Ps. 121, 5; Jer. 8, 4; 14, 5; Lam. 2, 10; 3, 1); Vulg. locus palustris, caricetum), a word, according to Jerome (Comment. in Isa. xix, 7), of Egyptian origin, and denoting "a green and coarse herbage, such as rushes and reeds, which grows in marshy places" (comp. homoi. Theophr. Hort., p. 57). In this sense, Flacius took it. 2. Aca ("flag") grow without water? It seems probable that some specific plant is here denoted, as Celsius has endeavored to prove (Hirob. 1, 342), for the aca is mentioned with the gome or papyrus. See the treatise of Happpach, De patacea, etc. (Coburg, 1779); also, a plant in Strabo (Geogr., 17, 1777). The word occurs once again in Gen. xlii, 2, 18, where it is said that the seven well-favored kine came up out of the river and fed in an acha ("meadow"). Now it is generally well known that most of the plants which grow in water, as well as many of those which grow in its vicinity, are not well suited as food for cattle; some being very watery, others very coarse in texture, and some possessed of acid and even poisonous properties. None, therefore, of the Acha can be intended, nor any species of Bulbous, or "flowering rush" (as might be inferred from one rendering of the Sept.). The different kinds of Aca, or rush, though abounding in such situations, are not suited for pastureage, and, in fact, are avoided by cattle. So are the majority of the Cyperaceae, or sedge tribe; and also the numerous species of Carex, which grow in moist situations, yet yield a very coarse grass, which is scarcely fit for cattle. Neither does any species of Cypera serve as pastureage, and the roots of some of them are esculent and aromatic; but these must be dug up before cattle can feed on them. Some species of Scirpus, or club rush, however, serve as food for cattle: S. capitata, for instance, is the principal food of cattle and sheep in the highlands of Scotland from the beginning of March till the end of May. Varieties of S. maritimus, found in different countries, and a few of the numerous kinds of Cypera common in Indian pastures, as Cypera tuberosa and heucacitis, are also eaten by cattle. The reed, if any specific plant is intended, as seems implied in what goes before, it is perhaps one of the edible species of scirpus or cypera, perhaps C. esculentus, which, however, has distinct Arabic names: or it may be a true grass; some species of panicum, for instance, which form excellent pasture in warm countries, and several of which grow luxuri- antly in the neighborhood of water. But it is well known to all acquainted with warm countries subject to excessive drought that the only pastureage to which cattle can resort is a green strip of different grasses, with reed and sedges, which grow either in the surface of a riv- er or of pieces of water, varying more or less in breadth according to the height of the bank, that is,
the distance of water from the surface. Cattle emerging from rivers, which they may often be seen doing in hot countries, would naturally go to such green heritage as intimated in this passage of Genesis, and which, as indicated in Job xxviii, 2, could not grow without water in a warm, dry country and climate. Kittto (Pict. Bib., on Genesis, l. c.) identifies this sedge with the melamphylly of Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. iv, 8, 12), which plant was much eaten by sheep and cattle. There is, however, much doubt as to what the melamphylly denotes, as Schneider has shown. The odon, in Job vii, 11, has ἰδρύ, and ἰδρύ occurs in the Sept. (Isa. xix, 7) also as the representative of מים (A. V. "paper reeds"), which word is explained by Gesenius, naked places without trees— the grassy places on the banks of the Nile. The same Greek word is used by the son of Sirach, Eccles. xi, 10 (δαρ) or δαρί, for the copies vary. As no similar name is known to be applied to any plant or sedge in Hebrew, endeavors have been made to find a similar one so applied in the cognate languages (see Jablonski, Opusc. i, 45; ii, 159, ed. Te-Water), and, as quoted by Dr. Harris (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, e. v.), the learned Chapelton says, "We have no radix for מים, unless we derive it, as Schultens does (Comment. on Job, l. c.), from the Arabic Қәذ, to bind or join together." Hence it has been inferred that it might be some one of the grasses or sedges employed in former times, as some still are, for making ropes. But there is probably some other Arabic root which has not yet been ascertained, or which may have become obsolete; for there are numerous words in the Arabic language having reference to greenness, all of which have ḏāl as a common element. Thus Қак, Қak, thickets, dark groves, places full of reeds or flags, in which animals take shelter; Қاف, putting forth leaves; Қاف, greenness, verdure; ҚҚ, abounding in grass. These may be connected with ḏāl, a common term for grass in Northern India, derived from the Persian, whence amber is called ҚҚ, ḏāl, grass-attractor. See REED.

2. סָקָב. אמ. Sept. ślכ. Vulg. carectum, pelagus) occurs frequently in the O. T. in connection with ҚҚ, "sea," to denote the "Red Sea" (q. v.). The term here appears to be used in a very wide sense to denote "weeds of any kind." The γονύς, therefore, is the "sea of weeds," and perhaps, as Starke (§ 35 and p. 6, note) observes, supra, may be applied to any aqueous vegetation, which would include the arborescent coral growths for which this sea is celebrated, as well as the different algae which grow at the bottom: see Pliny (H. N. xii, 29) and Shaw (Travels, p. 367, fol. 1738), who speaks of a "variety of ҚҚ and fish that grow within its channel, and at low water are left in great quantities upon the sea-shore" (see also p. 384). The word סָקָב in Jonah ii, 5, translated "weeds" by the A. V., has there can be no doubt, reference to "sea-weed," and more especially, to the long, ribbed-like fronds of the Laminaria, or the entangled masses of Pect. In Exod. ii, 5, however, where we read that Moses was laid "in the suph, A. V. "flag, by the river's brink; it is probable that "reeds" or "rushes," etc., are denoted, as Rab. Salomon explains it, "a place thick with reeds." (See Celsius, Hierob. ii, 66.) The γονύς or γονύς in the Coptic version (as in Exod. x, 19; xiii, 18; Psa. cvi, 7, 9, 22) is rendered "the Sari sea." The word sari is the old Egyptian name for a sedge of some kind. Jablonski (Opusc. i, 266) gives Juncus as its rendering, and compares a passage in Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. iv, 8, § 2, 5) which thus describes the sari: "The sari grows in water about marshes and those watery places which the river after its return to its bed leaves behind it; it has a hard and closely-twisted root, from which spring the sari (stalke) so-called." Pliny (H. N. xii, 38) thus speaks of this plant: "The sari, which grows about the Nile, is a shrubby kind of plant (7), commonly being about two cubits high, and as thick as a man's thumb at the panicle (coma) of the papryus, and is similarly eaten; the root, in account of its hardiness, is used in blacksmiths' shops instead of charcoal." Sprengel (Hist. Herb. i, 78) identifies the sari of Theophrastus with the Cyperus fastigiatus, Linn.; but the description is too vague to serve as a sufficient basis for comparison. There can be but little doubt that suph is sometimes used in a general sense like our English "reeds." It cannot be restricted to alga, as Celsius has endeavored to show, because none of the proper alga are found in the Nile. Lady Colt (Swirx. Herb. p. 106) thinks the Zizania aquatica ("grass-reed") may be intended, but there is nothing in favor of such an opinion. The suph of Isa. xix, 6, where it is mentioned with the kānem, appears to be used in a more restricted sense to denote some species of "reed" or "tall grass." There are various kinds of Cyperus satis Gracinoceous, such as Arundo and Stockarum, in Egypt. See Weed.

Flag (as a military term) is represented generally in Heb. by בּּ, of, such being those borne by the Israelitish camp during their march through the wilderness. Each three tribes had a banner of this description (Num. i, 52; ii, 2; 14, 16), of the color and form of which the Rabbinists have many legendary stories (see Jonathan on Num. ii.; comp. Carpoz, Appor. p. 867 sq.). The tribe of Judah (together with Issachar and Zebulun) bore as a device a young lion (comp. Gen. xlvii, 16; the tribe of Reuben, with Simon and Gad), a man (according to Jonathan, a stag, instead of the buck, as a memento of the golden calf, Gen. xlix, 6; Ephraim (with Manasseh and Benjamin), a steer (boys, according to Jonathan); Dan (with Asher and Naphtali), an eagle (according to Jonathan, a cedars; comp. Gen. xlix, 17), on their tribal standard. How the field-enseigns of the several families, which in those passages are called וּמוּיָה, must be incomprehensible; these. The description of colored pennants (Harmer, i, 478) is not sustained by proof. On the pretended motto upon the banner of the Maccabees, see Maccabæus. The word, which is often taken for a banner, is a military signal raised upon a mountain as a telegraphic notice (Isa. v, 26; xiii, 2; xxvi, 3; xxx, 17; lix, 10, etc.; comp. Cicero, Nat. deor. 17; Macrobius Saturn. i, 17). The Maccabees, however, have usually consisted of high cold with a streamer flying from its summit. Others regard it rather as a beacon fire (πυράκευσις, φόρος; comp. Curtius, v, 2, vii, 7, 5, 13). See generally Faber, 482 sq.; Jahn, ii, 11, 482 sq.; Celsius, Veget. Hist. (Upp. 1727). To the Roman standards, aquila (Joseph. War, ii, 62; comp. Hermann, ad Lucian. conc. hist. p. 165), an allusion apparently occurs in Matt. xxiv, 28. (On the Egyptian ensigns, see Wilkinson, i, 294; Rosell-
The Persians under Cyrus bore the same symbol (Xenophon. Cyrop. vii. i. 4; but Ezek. xlvii. 8 is not in point, being a reference to Chaldean usages). See generally Lydii Symb. sacr. de re milit. ii. 3. Compare Banner.

Flagellants (Lat. flagellarii, to scourge), a name given to certain sects from the 12th to the 18th century, who used the scourge as a principal instrument of punishment. See Discipline of the Lash. They were also called cruciferi, crucifrases, because they held it in their duty, as they said, to copy the sufferings of Christ; and corporali, because of their separation from the clergy and the temporal authority. Their excesses were only the natural development of certain features of the Roman discipline [see Penance; Penitential Discipline]; especially of the belief, springing from the system of indulgences, that the mercy of God could be propitiated by self-inflicted punishments. It is said that the first society of Flagellants appeared in Padua in the beginning of the 13th century. Amid the contests between the Guielphs and Ghibellines, cruelty and rapine were followed by remorse; and about 1260 public associations sprang up for the purpose of disciplines, under the name of Flagellants. In an act of the Curia of Este and the pope for their suppression, they are termed Le Compagnie de Rastulli, and Societatis Scopae sine Fustigatione. Muratori has given a plate of the thongs which they employed against themselves (Annali, ital. med. viti. 46). What was practised was somewhat more than streets and little regard was paid to decency. A hermit named Rainier, of Perugia, is named as the founder of the sect, and his success was wonderful. Vast bodies of men, girded with ropes, marched in procession, with songs and prayer, through the cities, and from one city to another, calling on the people to repent. All hostilities ceased. The momentary impression produced by these movements was profound, but it did not last long. From Italy the contagion passed to the Alps; large bodies wandered over Carniola, Austria, and even as far as Poland. In a few years they disappeared. Under the Gregorian pontificate of the following century the Flagellants revived again. The plague reached Italy in 1847, and carried off throughout Europ millions of persons: 1,200,000 in Germany, where, in 1849, the Flagellants "arose a fresh, with increased enthusiasm. They wandered through several provinces, whipping themselves, and propagating the most extravagant doctrines, namely, that flagellation was of equal virtue with the sacraments; that the forgiveness of all sins was to be obtained by it, exclusive of the merits of Christ; that the old law of Christ was still in operation; and that a people enjoining the baptism of blood, to be administered by whipping, was to be substituted in its place. Clement VI issued a bull against them (Oct. 20, 1349), and in many places their leaders were burned. They are again mentioned in the beginning of the 16th century as venting yet stranger and more mystical tenets in Thuringia and Lower Saxony. They rejected every branch of external worship, entertained some wild notions respecting the evil spirit, and held that the person who believes what is contained in the Apostles' Creed, repeats frequently the Lord's Prayer, and the Ave Maria, and at certain times laces his body severely as a voluntary punishment for the transgressions he has committed, shall obtain eternal salvation. The infection spread rapidly, and occasioned much disorder; for, by travelling in such numbers, they gave rise to seditions and disturbances, and to very many external and to the shameful exposure of their persons, and their extortion of alms, rendered them so obnoxious to the higher clergy and to the more respectable classes, that several princes in Germany and Italy endeavored to suppress their irregularities, and the kings of Poland and Bohemia excommunicated them from their territories. A numerous list of these fanatics who were condemned to the flames is preserved by the German ecclesiastical historians.

At Sangerhausen, in the year 1414, no fewer than ninety-one were burned (Encyc. Metropol. s. v.). In the year 1899 a society of this character, the White Brethren (Bianchi), descended from the Alps into Italy, and were everywhere enthusiastically welcomed both by the clergy and the populace; but no sooner had they reached the papal territories than their leader was put to death, and the whole array dispersed. After this processions of Flagellants were led through Italy, Spain, and the south of France by the Dominicans Vincentius Ferrentius, who may perhaps have been the originator of the Flagellants' doctrine. Although such processions having been condemned at the Council of Constance, he also discontinued them (Gieseler, s. 120). Gieseler gives extracts from the trial at Sangerhausen, 1414, with many of their articles of doctrine (Church History, s. 180). See Boileau, Histoire des Flagellants (Paris, 1700, 12mo); Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xiii. pt. ii. ch. iii.; cent. xiv. pt. ii. ch. v.; cent. xv. pt. ii. ch. v.; Förstemann, Die christ. Geislerge- sellenschaften (Halle, 1828); Harsog, Real-Encyclop. iv. 726 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. (Torrey's), v. 612.

Flagellation. See scourge.

Flagon, a word employed in the A. V. to render two distinct Hebrew terms.

1. ἰασηαθαφ', יאשע ל (2 Sam. vii. 19; 1 Chron. xvi. 8; Cant. ii. 5; Hos. iii. 1). The real meaning of this word, according to the conclusions of Gesenius (Theol. Heb. p. 188), is a case of pressed raisins (q. v.), such as are a common refreshment in the East, especially for travellers. See Juice. He derives it from a root signifying to press, and this is confirmed by the renderings of the Sept. (אדוש, ἀπόφησιν, ἵμπαρος) and of the Vulgate (simula), but in Hos. εἰπα, in Cant. ἐφορε, where the Sept. has ἀπήθαι, and also by the inscriptions of the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Mishna (Nedarim, 6, 110). In the passage in Hosea there is probably a reference to a practice of offering such cakes before the false deities. The rendering of the A. V. is perhaps to be traced to Luther, who in the first two of the above passages has ein Nisel Wein, and in the last Noah Wein, but probably to the interpretation of modern Jews (e. g. Gemara, Baba Batatra, and Targum on Chronicles), grounded on a false etymology (see Michaelis, quoted by Gesenius, and the observations of the latter, as above). It will be observed that in the first two passages the words of wine" are not inscrutable, and that in the last of wine" should be of grapes." See Juice.

2. נְבֶל, נבְלִ (Isa. xxii. 24), which is commonly used for a bottle (q. v.) or vessel, originally probably a skin, but in later times a piece of pottery (Isa. xxx. 14). But it also frequently occurs (Psa. lvi. 9, etc.) with the force of a musical instrument (A. V. generally "sistrum," but sometimes "viol"), a meaning which is adopted by the Targum, and the Arabic and Vulgate (sistrum), and Luther, and given in the margin of the A. V. The text, however, seems to have aimed to follow the rendering of the Sept. (confusely מַפְּלָטָא), and with this agrees Gesenius (Comment. in loc.) and First (Hebr. Handw. s. v.), as being agreeable to the parallel מַפְלָטָא, בּוֹלֵס ("cup," Vulg. cratera). See Musical Instruments; Pitcher.

Flake is the rendering in the A. V. at Job xii. 15 ("the flakes of his [e. i.e. levithian's] flesh are joined together," מַפְלָטָא, have cling. i. e. are rigid), for בּוֹלֵס, mappot, something prodigious (elsewhere only Amos 6, for refuse of grain, as that which falls away in winnowing, i. e. chaff), referring to the desolata or flabby parts on the belly of the crocodile (q. v.), which are firmly attached to the body, instead of loosely hanging as in the ox.
Flamboyant (Fr. flambeau = a torch), "a term applied by the antiquaries of France to the style of architecture which was contemporary in that country with the Perpendicular of England, from the flame-like wavings of its tracery. It ought perhaps to be regarded as a viti- ated Decorated rather than a distinct style, though some of its characteristics are peculiar, and it seldom possesses the grandeur of the Perpendicular of England, from the flame-like wavings of its tracery. The most striking and universal features are the waving arrangement of the tracery of the windows, panels, etc."

Flame (prop. נבז, la'hab, φλέγ), the incandescent vapor of fire, with which latter term it is usually found connected in the Bible. The only thing respecting fire which calls for explanation here is its symbolical use. In this we may distinguish a lower and a higher sense: a lower, when the reference is simply to the burning heat of the element, in which respect any vehement affection, such as anger, indignation, shame, love, is wont to be spoken of as a fire in the bosom of the individual affected (Psa. xxxix, 3; Jer. xx, 9); and a higher, which is also, though much more the common one in Scripture, when it is regarded as imaging the more distinctive properties of the divine nature. In this symbolical use of fire the reference is to its powerful, penetrating agency, and the terrible melting, seemingly restless, effects it is capable of producing. So viewed, fire, especially a "flame" (נבז) of fire" (Exod. ii, 2), is the chosen symbol of the holiness of God, which manifests itself in a consuming hatred of sin, and can endure nothing in its presence but what is in accordance with the pure and good. There is considerable variety in the application of the symbol, but the passages are all explicable by a reference to this fundamental idea. God, for example, is called "a consuming fire" (Heb. xii, 29; comp. Psa. cxxv, 5), an intense flame" (literally "a lamp pondering") to dwell with devouring fire" (Isa. xxxiii, 14); as manifested even in the glorified Redeemer, "his eyes are like a flame of fire" (Rev. ii, 18); his aspect when coming for judgment is as if a fire went before him, or a scorching flame compassed him about (Psa. cvxii, 8; 2 Thess. i, 8).—In these, and many similar representations occurring in Scripture, is the revelation of God to men that is more especially in view, and the searching, intense, all-consuming operation of his holiness in regard to it. They who are themselves conformed to this holiness have nothing to fear from it; they can dwell amid its light and glory as in their proper element; like Moses, can enter the flame-enwrapping cloud of the divine presence, and abide in it unscathed, though it appear in the eyes of others "like devouring fire on the top of the mount" (Exod. xxiv, 17, 18). Hence we can easily explain why in Old-Testament times the appearance of fire, and in particular the pillar of fire (enveloped in a cloud, as if to shade and restrain its excessive brightness and power), was taken as the appropriate form of the divine presence and glory; for in those times, which were more peculiarly the times of the law, it was the holiness of God that came most prominent-

ly into view; it was this which had in every form to be pressed most urgently upon the consciences of men, as a counteractive to the polluting influences of idolatry, and to some extent to a proper comprehension of the covenant. But in the new, as well as in the old, when the same form of representation is employed, it is the same aspect of the divine character that is meant to be exhibited. Thus, at the commencement of the Gospel era, when John the Baptist came forth announcing the advent of the Lord, he spoke of him as coming to baptize with fire as well as with the Spirit, not less to burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable than to gather in the wheat into his garner (Matt. iii, 11, 12). The language is substantially that of an Old-Testament prophet (Mal. iii, 2; iv, 1); and it points, not as is often represented, to the enlightening, purifying, love-anchinking agency of Christ, but to the severe and retributive effects of his appearance. He was to be set for judgment as well as for mercy; for mercy indeed first, but to those who rejected the mercy, and hardened their hearts, he also, for judgment. To be baptized with the Spirit of light, holiness, and love, is what should ever follow on a due submission to his authority; but a baptism with fire—the fire of divine wrath here (John iii, 86), growing into fire unquenchable hereafter—should be the inevitable portion of such as receive themselves in rebellion against his grace. It is true that fire in its symbolical use is also spoken of as purifying—the emblem of a healing process effected upon the spiritual natures of persons in covenant with God. We read, not merely of fire, but of "a devouring fire" (Lev. x, 14); and in the case of many, the fire of religious zeal, the fire of the dross and impurity of Jerusalem (Mal. iii, 2; Isa. iv, 4). Still it is a work of severity and judgment that is indicated; yet its sphere is, not the unbelieving and corrupt world, but the mixed community of the Lord's people, with many false members to be purged out, and the individual believer himself with an old man of corruption in his members to be mortified and cast off. The Spirit of holiness has a work of judgment to execute also there; and with respect to that it might doubtless be said that Christ baptizes each one of his people with fire. But in the discourse of the Baptist the references in such a case are to differences of persons than to different kinds of operation in the same person; he points to the partakers of grace on the one side, and to the children of apostasy and perdition on the other. Nor is the reference materially different in the emblem of tongues, like fire, which sat on the apostles at Pentecost, and in the fire that is said to go out of the mouth of the symbolical witnesses of the Apocalypse (Acts ii, 8; Rev. xi, 5). In both cases the fire indicated the power of holiness to be connected with the commissions of Christ's chosen witnesses—a power that should, as it were, burn up the corruptions of the world, consume the enmity of men's hearts, and prove a resistless weapon against the power and malice of the adversary. Compare腓尼。

Flamen, according to Varro and Festus, from flamens, the band of white wool wrapped about the cap, was the title given to members of a college of Roman priests devoted severally to the service of a particular deity. "Divinae alias Sacrodotarum, omnibus Pontifices, singula Flamines mundi," says Cicero (De Leg. i, 8). Each received his distinctive name from that of the god to whose service he was devoted—"kornai singulai cognomine habent ab eo quod sacra faciunt" (Varro, De Ling. Lat. v, 84). There were two classes of flamens, (1) those styled Flamines majorum, and always patriarchal, viz. the Fl. Dialis, maritale, and quirinalis, instituted by Numa, according to Livy i, 20, to take charge of those religious services which had hitherto been functions of the kingly office; and (2) the Flamines minores, who might be, and usually were plebians, about twelve in number, and instituted at various times.
THE FLAMINGIANS.

See Mennonites.

Flank, *flank*, side, the loins of an animal (Job xiv, 27, where fatness is noted as a sign of self-pampering); elsewhere in the plural for the internal muscles of the loins near the kidneys, to which the fat adheres, Gr. *xurion* (cf. Phil. iv, 19, 20; Epit. xii, 7; xvii, 8; ix, xix, 88; xxv, 10; xxvii, 50; xxxvii, 51; Tacitus, Ann. iii, 58, 71; iv, 16; Flundarch, Num. 7, and Q. Curt. Rom. p. 114, 118, 119, 164-170 (ed. Reiske); Festus, s. v. Maxima dignitatis et magiores flamini: Ausus Gallius, x, 15, etc. (J. W. M.)

Flamingians. See Mennonites.

Flaneur, *flaneur*, a name borne by several theological writers of Germany. I. JOHANN JAKOB, born at Balingen in 1724, studied theology at Tübingen, and became tutor in that university in 1749. He was successively appointed deacon of Leonberg in 1750, of Tübingen in 1757, of St. Leonard's Church at Stuttgart in 1759, pastor in the latter city in 1781, court preacher in 1783, counsellor of the Consistory in 1784, and abbot of Herrenlb in 1791. He died Sept. 16, 1792. His principal works are: Meletiatus philosopbi-theologica ad materias grammaticas (de imputatione procelli aedomini: — De vicaria Christi satisfactione: — De humana Christi natura omnimoposita (Tub. 1793); — Untersuchung, d. v. Sünde wider d. Heiligen Geist (Lips. 1770).


III. WALTER, brother of the preceding, was born at Stuttgart in 1772. He became in 1812 high counsellor of the Consistory and prebendary of Stuttgart, counsellor of the university in 1818, prelate in 1823, and general superintendent at Ulm in 1829. He resigned his office in 1841, and died in 1845. He wrote, in collaboration with Storr, Lehrbuch d. christl. Dogmatik (2d ed., 1818, 2 vols. ; transl. by Schmucker, Storr and Flatt's Biblical Theology, Andover, 5th ed., 1885); and published, in connection with Ewald, the Zeitschrift für die Nahrung christlichen Geschichts (1815-1819, 3 vols.). — Preyer, Universal Lexicon, s. v.

Flattich, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, a German theologian and educator, was born in 1713 at Beyhingen, near Ludwigsburg. After studying theology at Tübingen, he became in succession preacher of the garison of Hohenasberg (1742), pastor of Metterszimmern (1747), and pastor at Münchmoin (1760). At the latter place he died in 1797. Flattich wrote a number of works and essays on education, as Handbuch zum Ehestand, Unterschiede und Gleichnamen, Von der Aufserung der Kinder. Most of his works are collected in Lederhose, Leben und Schriften des J. F. Flattich (3d ed. Heidelberg, 1856). He also enjoyed the reputation of being one of the most successful educators in Southern Germany, and was on intimate terms with many of the prominent men of that period. See Palmer, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xix, 498; Völter, in Schmid, Encyclop. für das Erziehungswissenschaft. 2, 382. (A. J. S.)

Flavel, JOHN, a nonconformist divine and writer of practical works, was born in Worcestershire, England, in 1627. He was in early life religiously educated by his father, and completed his public education at Oxford. Having devoted himself to the Gospel ministry, he was settled at Deptford in 1650 as curate to Mr. Walpole, and on his death succeeded to the rectory. In 1655 he accepted a unanimous and pressing call to remove to Dartmouth, where he received a much smaller stipend, but had a larger field of usefulness. In 1662 he was ejected from his living for nonconformity; but he did not, however, forsake his flock, but seized every opportunity of ministering to their spiritual necessities. His colleagues dying soon after, the nonconformists devolved on him. On the execution of the Oxford Act he was compelled to remove five miles from Dartmouth, to Slapton, where he was out of the reach of legal disturbance, and where many of his former flock, in spite of the severity of the laws, resorted to him, and he at times stole into the town to visit them. In 1672 he published, while still just entering on his discourse, when the soldiers suddenly rushed in and dispersed the conventicle. See
FLAVIANUS 590 FLAX

eral of the fugitives were apprehended and fined; but the
remander, rallying after the effects of their first
surprise had subsided, conveyed Mr. Flavel to a more
remote place, where he lived four days, and then
when James II dispensed with the penal laws, Mr.
Flavel came forth from obscurity, and renewed his
self-sacrificing labors. He took a lively interest in
the proposed union between the Presbyterians and
Independent churches, which was effected in 1661, and,
like many a good man in those days, fondly anticipa-
ted from that consummation a season of ecclesiastical
peace and concord which never arrived. He died June
26, 1691, leaving behind him the name of a most faithful
minister. Flavel's writings are valued more for their
pietistic and practical earnestness than for any other
qualities. His Whole Works were published in
London in 1620 (6 vols. 8vo). The American tract Soci-
ety publishes, in cheap form, his Foundation of Life,
Method of Grace, Christ knocking at the Door, On keep-
ing the Heart, and Touchstone of Sincerity.—Jameson.
Religious Biography, a. v.; Jones, Christian Biography,
a. v.; Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, i, 340.

Flavianus, patriarch of Antioch, was born of one of
the best families in that city in the early part of the
4th century. Even while a layman he was an earnest
opponent of Ariusianism. Theodosius (who gives a full
account of Flavian) says that he, associated with an-
other, Drusiana, by the name of Diocletian, exhorted
all men to be zealous in religion." He says also that
"they were the first to devise the choir, and to
 teach them to sing the Psalms of David responsively" (Hist.
Eccles. ii, 24). He zeal did not diminish after
his ordination as priest by Meletius (q. v.), about A.D.
365 (7). When Meletius was banished from his see by
Valens, Flavianust remained to serve the churches in
Antioch. But the Eustathian (q. v.) bishop Paulinus con-
tested the right of Meletius, and the churches were
divided. On the death of Meletius, A.D. 381, Flavian
was elected to succeed him, although (according to the
accusation of Paulinus) he had bound himself by oath
to not accept the office while the Eustathian bishop
survived. The dispute was a fierce one; but at last,
when Evagrius, successor of Paulinus, died, 390, Flavi-
un was acknowledged by both the Eastern and West-
ern churches. He was held in great respect; Chrysos-
tom, who was his pupil, speaks very highly of him.
He died A.D. 404. He treated the Mezabrates seve-
"ly [see MEZABRATI].—Socrates, Hist. Eccl. bk. v. ch.
xxiv; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. viii, 24; Theodoret, Hist.
Eccl. ii, 24; Cave, Hist. Lit.; Cellier, Aurelius So-
erus (Paris, 1784), iv, 310; SUSENBERG, Eccl. Hist.
Flavianus of Constantinople was chosen bishop of
that city, as successor to Proclus, A.D. 446 or 447.
The emperor Theodosius was set against him from the
beginning of his episcopate. Eutyches and his friends
were very strong at court, but at a Home Synod at
which Flavian presided (A.D. 446) at Constantinople,
Eusebius of Dorylaeum pronounced anathema against
Eutyches. Flavian, knowing the danger of attacking
persons so powerful in court influence, at first
sought to quiet the matter; but, as Eutyches was
stubborn, the trial was had, and ended in his conden-
nation for heresy. The emperor was greatly offended
and, and, under the advice of Dicoureas, summoned a
council at Ephesus (the Robber Council), at which Di-
ocurus presided, and where the most violent courses
were pursued. Flavian was not only deposed, but so
brutally beaten by the Egyptian attendants of Dic-
ocusurus that he died three days afterwards (A.D. 449).
The Council of Chalcedon named him martyr, and his name
is to be found in the Roman martyrology, Feb. 18. See
Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. i, 8; Neander, Church History, ii,
506 sq. and art. EUTYCHES; EUTCHIANISM; EPH-
EUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF; EUSEBIUS OF DORYL-
AEUM.

Flavigny, Valerian de, a French Hebrew schol-
had belonged to Amaasis, king of Egypt, each thread of which was composed of 360 strands or filaments. In length and in fineness of fibre no country could compete with the flax which produced the "fine linen of Egypt," and which made the Delta "the great linen market of the ancient world" (Kalisch). By annihilating this crop, the seventh plague inflicted a terrible calamity. It destroyed what, next to corn, formed the staple of the country, and would only find its modern parallel in the visitation which should cut off a cotton harvest in America. That it was grown in Palestine even before the conquest of that country by the Israelites appears from Josh. ii, 6, the second of the two passages mentioned above. There is, however, some difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words γάτα (Sept. λιονκάλαη, Vulg. galea) et, and so A. V. "stalks of flax." Josephus speaks of λιονκάλαη, armfuls or bundles of flax; but Arab. Vers. "stalks of cotton." Gesenius, however, and Rosenmüller are in favor of the rendering "stalks of flax." If this be correct, the place involves an allusion to the custom of drying the flax-stalks by exposing them to the heat of the sun upon the flat roofs of houses; and so expressly in Josephus (Ant., vi, 1, 2). See Stalk.

In later times this drying was done in ovens. There is a decided reference to the raw material in the Sept.

rendering of Lev. xii., 47 (μαρτις σκελαστήρας), and Judg. xv., 14 (σταυροῖο; comp. Isa. i., 81). In several other passages, as Lev. xiii., 48, 52, 59; Deut. xxii., 11; Jer. xiii., 1; Ezek. xi., 6; xlv., 17, 18, we find it mentioned as forming different articles of clothing, as girdles, cords, and bands. In Prov. xxxi., 18, the careful housewife "seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands." The words of Isaiah (xliii., 3), "A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench," are evidently referred to in Matt. xii., 20, where λιονκάλαη is used as the name of flax, and as the equivalent of πιπακός. But there can be no doubt of this word being correctly understood, as it has been well investigated by several authors. (Celsius, Hieroth., ii., 283; Yates, Textuim Antiquarum, p. 335.) See Cotton.

Few plants are at once so lovely and so useful as the slender, upright hemp, with taper leaves and large blue-purple flowers, from which are fashioned alike the coarsest canvas and the most ethereal cambric or lawn—the sail of the ship and the fairy-looking scarf which can be packed into a silvert shell. It was of linen, in part at least, that the hangings of the tabernacle were constructed, white, blue, and crimson, with cherubim inwoven; and it was of linen that the vestments of Aaron were fashioned. When arrayed in all his glory, Solomon could put on nothing more costly than the finest linen of Egypt; and describing "the marriage of the Lamb," the seer of Patmos represents the bride as "arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." As to Egypt, we have proof in the mummy-cloth being made of linen, and also in the representations of the flax cultivation in the paintings of the Grotto of El-Kah, which represent the whole process with the utmost clearness; and numerous testimonies might be adduced from ancient authors of the esteem in which the linen of Egypt was held (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg., iii., 132). From these pictures, preserved at Beni Hassan, it would seem that the Egyptian treatment of the flax-plant was essentially the same as that which was pursued till quite lately by ourselves, which even now is only modified by machinery, and which is thus described by Pliny: "The stalks are immersed in water warmed by the heat of the sun, and are kept down by weights upon them. For nothing is lighter than flax. The membrane or rind becoming loose is a sign of their being sufficiently macerated. They are then taken out, and repeatedly turned over in the sun until perfectly dried, and afterwards beaten by mallets on stone slabs. The tow which is nearest the rind is inferior to the inner fiber, and is fit only for the wicks of lamps. It is combed out with iron hooks until all the rind is removed. The inner part is of a finer and
whiter quality. After it is made into yarn, it is poli-
ished by strikig it frequently on a hard stone, moist-
ened with water, and when woven into cloth it is again
beaten on the clubs, being always improved in propor-
tion as it is beaten" (Hist. Nat, xix, 1). The various
processes employed in preparing the flax for manufac-
ture into cloth are indicated in Scripture. 1. The dry-
ning process (see above). 2. The peeling of the stalks
and separation of the fibers (the name of flax itself be-
ing derivable either, as Parkhurst, from wpn̂, paschat',
' to strip, peel, or as Gesenius, from wpn̂, passaka',
to separate into parts). 3. The hacking ( Isa. xix, 9;
Sept. λωπον' v Opyep's; see Gesenius, Lex. n. v. pyn̂, pyn̂, and for the comb used in the process, comp. Wilkin-
son, Anc. Egypt. iii, 140). The flax, however, was not
always dressed before weaving (see Esclus, xi, 4, where ψωπόνος is mentioned as a species of clothing worn
by the poor). That the use of the coarser fibers was
known to the Hebrews may be inferred from the men-
tion of tolo (πολύς) in Judg. xvi, 9; Isa. i, 81.
That flax was ancienly one of the most important
crops in Palestine appears from Hos. ii, 5, 9; that it
continued to be grown and manufactured into linen in
N. Palestine down to the Middle Ages we have the
testimony of numerous Talmudists and Rabbins. At
present it is cultivated only in the vicinity of Cairo,
there as the cotton-plant. For the flax of ancient
Egypt see Herodotus, ii, 87, 105; Cels. ii, p. 385 sq.;
Herren, Ideea, ii, p. 368 sq. For that of modern
Egypt see Haseclquist, Journey, p. 500; Olivier, Voy-
age, iii, 279; Girard's Observations in Descript. d'E-
gypte, xvi, 88; Paul Lucas, Voyages, ii, 47. See LIN.

Flea (πολύς), paasak', from its leaping; a name
found in the Arab. equivalent: see Bechirt, iii, 474, ed.
Rosenm.) occurs only I Sam. xxxiv, 14 [ 15 ]; xxvi, 20,
where David thus addresses his persecutor Saul at the
cave of Adullam: "After whom is the king of Israel
come out? after whom dost thou pursue?—after a
flea." "The king of Israel is come out to seek a flea.
"In both these passages our translation omits the force
of the word πολύς, which is found in the Hebrew of
each: thus, "to pursue after, to seek one or a single
flea" (Sept. ψωπόνος κλ. Vulg. pulxeus unus). David's
allusion to the flea displays great address. It is an ap-
peal founded upon the immense disparity between Saul,
as the king of Israel, and himself as the remnant of a
ruinful object of the monarch's laborious pursuit. Hunt-
ing a flea is a comparison in other ancient writings
(Homer, fl. x, 287; Aristoph. Nub., i, 2; iii, i) for much
labor expended to secure a worthless result. This in-
secction is often used as a popular emblem for insignificance (Roberts, Oriental Illustrations, p. 178).
An Arabian author thus describes this troublesome in-
sect: "A black, nimble, exterminating, bunched-back
animal, which, being sensible when any
one looks on it, jumps incessantly, now on
one side, now on the other, till it gets out
of sight." The flea belongs to the Lin-
anian order aoptera (Latrelle, eloponop-
tera; Kirby, apoponopera). For a description of itself
and congener, see the Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Pulex.
Owing to the habits of the lower orders, fleas abound
so profusely in all regions (see Thomson, op. cit. i, 94), especially during the spring, in the streets and
dusty bazaars, that persons of condition always change
their long dresses on returning home. There is a pop-
ular saying in Palestine that "the king of the fleas
keeps his court at Tiberias," though many other places
in that region might dispute the distinction
with that town (Kitto, Physical History of Palestine, p
242).

Fleischler, Essex, a celebrated French orator and
prelate, was born Jan. 13, 1552, at Pernes, near Avign-
on. After studying in the college of the "Fathers
of the Christian Doctrine," he went to Paris, and soon
became known by a Latin poem on the famous carou-
sal given by Louis XIV in 1662. His sermons and
funeral orations soon raised him to such a pitch of
reputation that the duke of Montepelier recommended
him to fill the office of reader to the dauphin. In 1673
he was chosen a member of the Academy, and in 1682
he was appointed almoner to the dauphiness. In 1685
he obtained the bishopric of Lavau. When the mon-
arach gave it to him, he said, "Do not be surprised
that I have not liked you; I considered you a yo-
ng rascal, and I was loth to be deprived of the pleasure of
hearing you preach." In 1687 he was removed to the bishopric
of Niames. The Protestants of his neighborhood suffered
greatly from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes,
but Fleischler administered his office so mildly and ten-
derly that he gained the love of even the Protestants.
He died in February, 1710; and when Fénelon heard of
his death, he cried out, "We have lost our master!"
His Panegyric on Turme at Jerm. 1679, 4to, and often
12mo.—Histoire de l'Emperour Theodore la
Grund (Paris, 1679, 4to, and often 12mo).—Vie du
Card. Ximenes (2 vols. 12mo). They may all be found
in the collection of his works, Oeuvres completes, revues
sur les manuscrits de l'auteur, etc. (Nismes, 1782, 10
vols. 8vo).—Biog. Univ. xv, 85.

Flechière, de la. See Fletcher, John.
Fledgling would be a proper rendering for by',
gosse' (so called from its peeping; the Arab. and Syr.
use essentially the same word in the sense of: a "young"
bird, e. g. of the dove [squab], or pigeon
(Gen. xxv, 9), or eagle [eagle] (Deut. xxxiii, 11). The
Greek corresponding term is νεανις ('young')

Fleece (μ, gre, so called from shearing, Deut.
xviii, 4; Job xxxi, 20; or γέλα, the fem. form, Judg.
vi, 27, 39, 40), the wool of a sheep, whether on the
back of the animal, or shorn off, or attached to the
fayed skin, which last appears to have been the case
in the passage last cited. The threshing-floor of Gid-
on appears to have been an open uncovered space,
upon which the dews of heaven fell without interrup-
tion. See Treaaing-Fleece. The miracle of Gid-
on's fleece is still the same as the dew having been
found upon the fleece, without any on the floor, and that
at another time the fleece remained dry while the ground
was wet with it. See Gideon. It may appear a lit-
tle improbable to us who inhabit northern climates,
where the dews are inconceivable, how Gideon's fleece
in one night should contract such a quantity of water
that, when he came to wring it, a bowl-full was pro-
duced; but Kitto observes (Pict. Bible, note ad loc.),
"We remember, while travelling in Western Asia, to
have found all the baggage, which had been left in the
open air, so wet, when we came forth from the tent in
the morning, that it seemed to have been exposed to
heavy rain, and we could with difficulty believe
that no rain had fallen. So also, when sleeping in the
open air, the sheep-skink cloth which served for a covering
has been found in the morning scarcely less wet than
if it had been immersed in water."

Fleetwood, William, bishop of Ely, and one of the
most eloquent preachers of his time, was born Jan-
uary, 1656, in the Tower of London, and was educated
at Eton and King's College, Cambridge. After hav-
ing held the prebendary of rector of St. Austin's and
canon of Windor, he was made bishop of St. Asaph in
1706, and was translated to Ely in 1714. He died at
FLESH

Fleming, Robert, sen., an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Yester in 1630. He studied philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, and divinity at St. Andrew's, under Rutherford. His first pastoral charge was at Cambuslang, in Clydesdale. He was one of four hundred ministers ejected by the Glasgow Act after the restoration of Charles II. He was imprisoned in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, but was liberated in 1678, and went to Holland, where he succeeded Mr. Brown as pastor of the Scots congregation at Rotterdam. On July 15, 1680, he died, and behind him several works, of which the most remarkable is The fulfiling of the Scriptures, complete in three parts: 1. Providence; 2. in the word; 3. in the Church (Lond. 1726, 5th ed. fol.), with memoir of the author by D. Burgess.

Fleming, Robert, jun., son of the above, was born at Cambuslang, and was educated at Leyden and Utrecht. In 1692 he became minister of the Scottish church at Leyden. In 1694 he succeeded his father at Rotterdam, and in 1698 became minister at Lothbury, London, where he died in 1716. He wrote a remarkable Discourse on the Rise and Fall of the Papacy, the predictions of which have received a singular fulfilment. In this sermon, published in 1701, Fleming ventures his opinion that the French monarchy would be humbled in 1794, that the period of the fifth vial extended from 1794 to 1846, and that in the last-mentioned year the papacy would receive its most signal blow, and that it would be followed by the destruction of the Turk. The sermon was reprinted in 1748. He published also Christology, a Discourse concerning Christ (Lond. 1708-9, 3 vols. 8vo), in which he maintains the eternal pre-existence of the human soul of Christ, a religious Biogaphy, p. 209; Dornor, Person of Christ, Edinb. transal, div. ii, vol. ii, p. 829.

Fleming, Thornton, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Williamsburg, Va., Oct. 1764; was converted at about twenty; entered the itinerant ministry in 1788. He was set off with the Pittsburg Conference from the Baltimore Conference in 1826, superannuated in 1834, and died at Elizabethtown, Pa., in 1846. He was fifty-eight years in the ministry, fifteen of which he was presiding elder. He possessed rare endowments as a man and a minister, and was widely useful in his life and labors.

Mennoites. See Mennonites.

Flemingia or Flemingiana. See Mennonites.

Flemming, Paul, a German poet and hymn-maker, was born October 16, 1609, at Hartenstein, in Schönburg, and studied medicine at Leipzig. In 1638 he accompanied the embassy sent by the duke of Holstein to Russia, and in 1639 was attached to an embassy to Persia. He returned in 1639, and died in Hamburg April 2, 1649. His Gesellschaft und wohltätige Poemata (Jena, 1642) contain many lovely songs, and also sacred poems; among them the beautiful hymn In allen un-
of bread (λιαγρίνης, ἀργοκακοεις v. t. ἀργοκακοεις), and the Auth. Vers., following the Vulg. (sancta bu-bula carnis, para annos carnis bubule, apparenty with the absurd derivation from ὕφθη, ἄφθη, and ἅπ ου, a balled), renders it "a good piece of (roasted) flesh." But there can be little doubt that it would be certain measure of wine or drink (for ἄφθη, with N prosthetic), a measure cup. An approach to the truth was made by L. de Dieu, who, following the same etymology, understands a portion of the sacrifice measured out (Genesius, Hol. Lex. s. v.) See MEAT.

FLESH. The word flesh (ἐρῶν, ἀρπίς) is used both in the O. and N. T. with a variety of meanings, physical, metaphysical, and ethical, the latter occurring especially in the writings of St. Paul. I. Old Testament.—In the O. T. it designates (1.) a particular part or parts of the body of man and of animals (Gen. ii. 21; xil. 2; Job x. 11; Psa. cl. 6); (2) in a more extended sense, the whole body (Psa. xvi. 9; lxiv. 14) in contradistinction from the heart (Ḳard) — the body, that is, as possessed of a soul or spirit (Lev. xvii. 11; Job xii. 10). Hence it is also applied (3.) to all living things having flesh (Gen. vi. 15), and (4) metaphorically to man and mankind, the whole, which is designated as "all flesh" (Gen. vi. 12). It is often connected (4.) with the ideas of mutability, of degeneracy, and of weakness, which are the natural defects of the flesh proper. It is thus represented as the counterpart of the divine strength, as the opposition of God to man, or as in 2 Cor. x. 3. With him is an arm of flesh, but with us is the Lord our God to help us." (see also Isa. xxx. 8; Psa. lxvii. 89). To this we can also add Gen. vi. 8, the only passage in the O. T. in which the word approaches to an ethical sense, yet without actually acquiring it. The peculiar sense of the word flesh (she) is also (5.) the basis of the expression "heart of flesh" (מ打猎 רצע) as opposed to "heart of stone" (Exod. xi. 19). (6.) The expression "my flesh" (often "my flesh and bone"), to indicate relationship (Judg. ix. 2; Isa. viii. 7), evidently refers to the physical and corporeal connection between persons sprung from a common father. In all these cases the O. T. only uses the word flesh in the physical and metaphysical senses.

II. New Testament.—These senses of the word flesh are also found in the N. T. (1.) As a name for the body, the exterior appearance of humanity, it easily passes on also to denote external phenomena in general, as opposed to that which is spiritual. So, when Christ says to the Jews, "Judge not after the flesh," he means "the flesh is the rule by which you judge." (John vii. 15; compare also Phil. iii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 16). In Rom. iv. 1, the ethical sense appears. The word "flesh" here denotes man's incapacity for good apart from divine aid. This impotence, both practical and spiritual, is also expressed in other passages, as in Rom. vi. 19; Matt. xvi. 17; and in Matt. xxvi. 41, where the lower, earthly, and sensual element in humanity, as opposed to the "spirit," is, as such, incapable of bearing trial and temperance of the Christian life. The root of this weakness is sin dwelling in the flesh (Rom. vii. 18; xvii. 20), by which man is divided within himself as well as separated from God, inasmuch as he has, on the one side, the self-conscious spirit (voci), which submits to the divine law, and takes pleasure in this obedience, desiring to be led and commanded, and avoiding all that is forbidden; and, on the other hand, the flesh, which, being inhabited by sin, seeks only for the lower satisfactions, thus inclining to evil rather than good, and opposed to the divine law (see Rom. vii. 7-25; viii. 5). The "sinful flesh" (ὀρπάξ ἁμορπίας) hinders the efficacy of the divine law, so that, although it (the law) gains the ascent of the "inner man," it is not fulfilled, because of this tendency of the flesh towards what is forbidden. Hence the "being in the flesh" means, in fact, such activity of the sinful passions (παράγεια ἀμαριας) of the organism (τον νιον μικρον) as results in death. (Rom. vii. 5; viii. 8, 9). To live and act according to the flesh is to live and act sinfully; the carnal mind is enslaved (Rom. vii. 14). The "wisdom according to the flesh" is a mistaken, Godless wisdom (1 Cor. i. 26). All efforts, boons, etc., having the flesh for object or for motive (βουλεύθηκα εν την πνευματικήν, εν γνώσει εν την οἰκονομίαν, 2 Cor. i. 17; x. 4; xii. 16), are foreign to the life of the true Christian. The last, and especially the flesh of the flesh, is opposed to holy, divine impulses and actions (Gal. v. 16; Eph. ii. 5). To crucify the flesh and the works of the flesh is the great object of the Christian, which he attains through the power of the spirit which dwells in him (Rom. viii. 15). The fleshly mind is the mistaken mind, leading away from Christ to pride, and consequently to error (Col. ii. 18, 19). Finally, to act according to the flesh is called "to be sold under sin." (Rom. vii. 12; comp. 1 John ii. 16; Rom. viii. 8).

But "flesh" does not always denote sinfulness (see Rom. i. 3; ix. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; John i. 14). The flesh, in Christ, was not sinful; God sent him only "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (2 Cor. v. 14, 2). This sinless flesh, as the organ of the Word of life, contains the divine life, which is communicated, not only living in the flesh, to redeem them from the death of sin, and to make them partakers of everlasting life (John vi. 51).

We see, then, that the meaning of the word flesh was, on the one hand, gradually extended from a physical to a metaphysical, and finally to an ethical sense. In the ethical use in the N. T., moreover, of the term "flesh" only by the use of the word flesh in the physical and metaphysical sense, in the other respects, it is identical. But "flesh," we do not find the idea of essential sin as lying in the flesh. Flesh in itself is neither bad nor sinful. It is the living body, the casket of the soul, containing within itself the interior and exterior organism of the senses, by which the union with the spirit conceives ideas, sensations, desires, and contains the so-called faculties of the soul with their diver functions. In the normal state, its whole activity is governed by the spirit, and in so far as the latter remains in union with God from whom it proceeds, it is in turn governed by him. But sin, which disturbs this union of the spirit with God, alters also the power of the spirit over the body. The ego oversteps the bounds of the divine life, moves no longer in harmony with the divine spirit, and, being no longer supported by the divine power, gradually becomes earthly and worldly, and all its functions partake of this corrupt nature and bear in it the种子, it is true, to bring the flesh under subjection to the higher laws, but does not succeed. It may, under the form of conscience, succeed in regaining some ground, but not in bringing back the state of subordination and of detachment from the world. It is only through an immediate action on the part of God that the original relation of the flesh to the spirit is restored, the lost power regained, and the flesh brought back to its normal condition. (And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, John i. 14).

The original source of sin in man is neither to be found in the spirit, the organ of God's revelation within us, nor in the flesh, which is in turn the physical organ of the spirit. According to Scripture, it is the heart, the centre of our personality, in which all the life and activities of the spirit and the soul unite, and from which choice between them is made. If the heart then gives entrance to sin, permits any doubt of God's truth, any mistrust of his love and kindness, and thus lowers him to put self in his place (Gen. iii), the union between him and God is thus also disturbed for the ease of the spirit to govern the αὐτός; the flesh starts up in opposition to the divine commands in its feelings and its desires. It asserts its independence. Self is made the centre. Hence hatred, strife, desire for worldly superiority,
creating envy, and giving rise to all the "lusts of the flesh." That both selflessness and sensuality have their seat in the ἁρπαγή, and that the actions of men are guided by one or the other, is clearly shown in the enumeration given by the apostle of the works of the flesh (Gal. v. 19), which are clearly the effects of selfishness and of sinful passions; and that the word flesh, as used by Paul, is intended to signify both, is proved by the apostle's warning (Gal. v. 19) not to use Christian liberty for "an occasion to the flesh," i.e. to satisfy the desires of the flesh, adding to it the recommendation "but by love serve one another." Whichever of the two is thus especially alluded to when the Scriptures, and especially St. Paul, speak of the nature, the life, or the works of the flesh, the context will show. Sometimes both are equally active, sometimes the one only to the exclusion of the other. This is the only way in which we can arrive at a true appreciation of the meaning in each case. Those interpreters who, in view of the substitution of ἁρπαγή for ἔρως and μικρός, consider it as meaning exclusively the bodily, sinful side of human nature, fall into the errors of the Manicheans. See Tholuck, Erisert Ueberschung u. ἁρπαγή als Quelle d. Bünde (Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken, 1855, 5); Stielm. i. d. Fud. Zeitschr. 1834 (k. d. u. s. Anthropol.); Neander, Planting and Training, vol. ii. Klinger, in Herzog, Real-Encyclopœdia; Campbell, On Four Gospels, diss. i. § 2.

Flesh and blood. An expression employed by our Lord to denote (after an Oriental figure) "his Spirit," represented by his flesh and blood, as these again are by the sacramental bread and wine (Eden). See Eucharist.

Flesh-book (τόξον, mastley, and τόξο, τοξο, miss-gak), an instrument used in the sacrificial services (1 Sam. ii. 13, 14; Exod. xxvii. 8; xxxix., 8; Numb. iv. 14; 1 Chron. xxvii. 17; 2 Chron. iv. 16), probably a many-pronged fork, bent backward to draw away the flesh. The priests required such an instrument that, if the flesh burnt too quickly, they might draw it out, and again throw it into the flame or upon the coals. The implement in 1 Sam. ii. 13, 14 (where the ancient Etruscan sacrificial Flesh-book.

First or mas. of the above Heb. term is used), is stated to have been three-tined, and was apparently the ordinary fork with prongs for culinary purposes, as was familiar likewise to the Greeks and Romans (καλλιαρα; see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Harpago).

Flesh-pot (יוшуע "כ, sir hab-basar", pot of the flesh, Exod. xvi. 5), probably a bronze vessel, standing on three legs, appropriated for culinary purposes among the Egyptians, such as we frequently see represented in the paintings of the tombs, with a fire-lighted beneath it. See Pot.

Fletcher, Alexander, D.D., was born at the Bridge of Teith, Scotland, in 1787. He studied divinity in the University of Glasgow, and succeeded his father as minister of the secession church at the Bridge of Teith in 1807. In 1808 he came to London to supply the Presbyterian chapel in Mill's Lane, and his popularity soon became so great that a spacious building (Albion Chapel, Moorfields) was erected for him. Some indiscipline in a love affair caused him to be cut off from the Presbyterian Church, but did not injure his moral character. A great church in the Strand, Circuit was built for him, where he preached for many years as an Independent, but both he and his church were finally admitted into the Presbyterian body. The University of Glasgow made him D.D. During thirty years of service he was one of the principal dissenting preachers of London, especially for his Sunday-school addresses and sermons. He published a number of works, chiefly for children and youth, among them, Scripture Sacred History (18mo)—Scripture Natural History (18mo)—The Christian Conqueror (12mo)—Guide to Family Devotions (4th ed.), Sermons for Children (3 vols. 18mo)—Warning to Evil Speakers (12mo)—Sabbath Remembrancer (12mo)—Sabbath-school Preacher (12mo). It is computed that 70,000 copies of his Guide to Family Devotions were sold before his death. He died at his residence in Clapton, Sept. 30, 1860. The Christian World, Oct. 5, 1860.

Fletcher, John (Fléchère, John W. de la), an early Methodist and saintly minister of the Church of England, was born Sept. 12, 1720, at Nyon, Vaud, of a distinguished family. He was educated at Geneva, where he studied profoundly both in philosophy and philosophy. At an early period he was, to a certain extent, master of the French, German, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. His parents intended him for the ministry, but he preferred the sword, and at twenty he entered the service of the Dutch as a captain. Peace returning, he went to England, and became tutor in the family of T. Hill, Esq., Shropshire. About 1755 he joined the Methodist society, and in 1767 he took orders in the Church of England. Through the influence of Rowland Hill, he received three years after, a presentation to the living of Dunham, worth £400 a year; but, finding that in this place there was "too much time and too little labor," he, with characteristic zeal and disinterestedness, accepted Madeley in preference, as, though his income was just the half of the other, it afforded a more extensive sphere of usefulness. This was a situation, which, by his energy of character and varied accomplishments, he was peculiarly adapted to. The fact is, he was such a parish priest that it is surprising he was not tolerated at all within the pale of the Church of England; not more than two years after his establishment, and he was too apostolical for those who are fondest of talking about apostolical succession. The country gentlemen resisted him for reforming some of their barbarous sports and pastimes, and even many of the clergy looked on him with an evil eye, as disturbing the quiet of their lucrative routine. Opposition was shown to him in many quarters by refusals of admissions into houses—by placards posted on the doors of his chapel—and in a variety of other forms. But, unmoved by slander and undaunted by menaces, he pursued the onward tenor of his way, and did his Master's work according to the dictates of his conscience, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear. With incessant preaching he combined the most diligent pastoral labors. He went from house to house, sympathizing with the afflicted, helping the impoverished, ministering to the sick, and administering the vows. His liberality to the poor is said, by his successor in the parish, to have been scarcely credible. He led a life of severe abstinence that he might feed the hungry; he clothed himself in cheap attire that he might clothe the naked; he sometimes unfurnished his house that he might supply suffering families with neo-
essary articles. Thus devoted to his holy office, he soon changed the tide of opposition which had raged against him, and won the reverence and admiration of his people, and many looked upon their homes as consecrated by his visits. In the summer of 1769 Mr. Fletcher visited France, Italy, and Switzerland. Towards the close of the summer he returned to England, when, at the request of Lady Huntingdon, he became president of her seminary for educating young men for the ministry at Trevessa, in Wales. In 1770 he went there to reside, but shortly afterwards resigned, on account of some difference with Lady Huntingdon. Benson describes Fletcher as the "Reader," he says, "will pardon me if he thinks I exceed; my heart kindles while I write. Here it was that I saw, shall I say, an angel in human flesh? I should not far exceed the truth if I said so. But here I saw a descendent of Adam, fully invested above the ruins of the fall, that though by the body he was tied down to earth, yet was his whole consecration in heaven; yet was his life from day to day hid with Christ in God. Prayer, praise, love, and zeal, all ardent, elevated above what one would think estimable in the eyes of the world, were the elements in which he continually lived. Languages, arts, sciences, grammar, rhetoric, logic, even divinity itself, as it is called, were all laid aside when he appeared in the school-room among the students. And they seldom hearkened less long in all his ears, and every heart caught fire from the flame that burned in his soul. On leaving Trevessa he resumed his missionary and pastoral labors, making Madeley his centre. But his health failed, and again he was obliged to visit Switzerland. He derived great benefit from the change of climate, and, soon after his return to England in 1781, he married. Mr. Fletcher had for many years seen, with regret and pain, the neglected condition of poor children, and he opened a school-room for them in Madeley Wood, which was the last public work in which he was employed. On the 14th of August, 1785, he expired, not of any particular disease, but of the natural infirmities of age. Soutbey says: 'No age or country has ever produced a man of more fervent piety or more perfect charity; no Church has ever possessed a more apostolic minister.' (Life of Wesley, ch. xxxv.) His preaching is described as generally effective. He spoke the English language not only with correctness, but with eloquence. There was, says Gilpin, who heard him often, an energy in his discourse which was irresistible; to hear him without admiration was impossible. Powerful as were his writings, his preaching was mightier; his 'living word soared with an eagle's flight; he basked in the sun, carried his young ones on his wings, and seized the prey for his Master.' He was Wesley's most ardent coadjutor among the clergy; his counsellor, his fellow-traveler at times in his evangelistical itinerancy, an attendant at his Conferences, the champion of his theological views, and, above all, a salutary example of the life and power of Christianity as taught by Methodism, read and known, admired and loved by Methodists throughout the world. Madeley, his vicarage, is familiar and dear to them next to Epworth itself!' (Stevens, Methodism, i. 367, 422.) He was esteemed at home for great reputation, he was esteemed abroad; directness, acuteness, and logical skill. He wrote largely upon the Calvinistic controversy, against Top-
lady and others; and his writings, especially his Checks to Antinomianism, are essential to the thorough study of that controversy. 'Written as detached pamphlets, and abounding in contemporary and personal references, the Checks could not possibly have the consistence and compactness of a thorough treatise written upon the different foundations of the great Quinquennial Controversy.' But they comprehend, nevertheless, nearly every important thesis of the subject. His highest philosophical questions—those of the freedom of the will, prescience, fatalism—are elaborately discussed by them, as in the Remarks on Top-
lady's Schematical Religion, in which the "Reader," he says, "will pardon me if he thinks I exceed; my heart kindles while I write. Here it was that I saw, shall I say, an angel in human flesh? I should not far exceed the truth if I said so. But here I saw a descendent of Adam, fully invested above the ruins of the fall, that though by the body he was tied down to earth, yet was his whole consecration in heaven; yet was his life from day to day hid with Christ in God. Prayer, praise, love, and zeal, all ardent, elevated above what one would think estimable in the eyes of the world, were the elements in which he continually lived. Languages, arts, sciences, grammar, rhetoric, logic, even divinity itself, as it is called, were all laid aside when he appeared in the school-room among the students. And they seldom hearkened less long in all his ears, and every heart caught fire from the flame that burned in his soul. On leaving Trevessa he resumed his missionary and pastoral labors, making Madeley his centre. But his health failed, and again he was obliged to visit Switzerland. He derived great benefit from the change of climate, and, soon after his return to England in 1781, he married. Mr. Fletcher had for many years seen, with regret and pain, the neglected condition of poor children, and he opened a school-room for them in Madeley Wood, which was the last public work in which he was employed. On the 14th of August, 1785, he expired, not of any particular disease, but of the natural infirmities of age. Soutbey says: 'No age or country has ever produced a man of more fervent piety or more perfect charity; no Church has ever possessed a more apostolic minister.' (Life of Wesley, ch. xxxv.) His preaching is described as generally effective. He spoke the English language not only with correctness, but with eloquence. There was, says Gilpin, who heard him often, an energy in his discourse which was irresistible; to hear him without admiration was impossible. Powerful as were his writings, his preaching was mightier; his 'living word soared with an eagle's flight; he basked in the sun, carried his young ones on his wings, and seized the prey for his Master.' He was Wesley's most ardent coadjutor among the clergy; his counsellor, his fellow-traveler at times in his evangelistical itinerancy, an attendant at his Conferences, the champion of his theological views, and, above all, a salutary example of the life and power of Christianity as taught by Methodism, read and known, admired and loved by Methodists throughout the world. Madeley, his vicarage, is familiar and dear to them next to Epworth itself!' (Stevens, Methodism, i. 367, 422.) He was esteemed at home for great reputation, he was esteemed abroad; directness, acuteness, and logical skill. He wrote largely upon the Calvinistic controversy, against Top-
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of Burgundy, Anjou, and Berry. He was made mem-
ber of the Academy in 1696, and in 1707 obtained from
Louis XIV the priory of Argenteuil, where he resided
till 1716, when he left it to become confessor to Louis
XV. He died July 14, 1729, greatly respected for his
learning and his virtues. His reputation rests chiefly
upon his studies in the classics, the first volume of
which was published in 1691, and the last in 1729,
ending with the year 1414. This work, as Fleury
says in the preface, was meant to be rather a popular
history than one of research and erudition; but yet it
is a clear and generally fair account of the progress
of the institutions of antiquity, and possesses an inno-
cent and well-documented style, which makes the
author a proper talent of the historian. It is written from
the Gallican stand-point. "Fleury writes diffusely and
in the spirit of a monk, but with taste and skill, in
mild temper and strong love for the Church and Chris-
tianity, and with a piety as well as to instruct.
He follows the order of time, though not
slavishly, prefacing some of his volumes with general
characteristics. He also defends antiquity and the
Gallican ecclesiastical constitution, without, however,
surrendering at all the credit of the Church, its gen-
eral standing, or the virtuousness of its clergy. His
principal concern is with doctrine, discipline, and
practical piety" (Schaaf, Apost. Church, § 86).
Fleury, as a writer of Church history, is not at all in favor
with Ultramontanists; a specimen of their feeling to-
wards him is given by the Univers (Paris) for July 8,
1843, which accuses him of the worst volumes of
Fleury, so ardent and furious in his calumnies and
spite against the pope!" His Church History was
continued by Fabri, but freely, down to A.D. 1598.
The best edition is Historie Ecclesiastique avec contin-
uation par Fabri et Cugnot (Paris, 1789-74, 56 vols.; index,
4 vols.; in all, 40 vols. 12mo.). A very good recent
edition is that of Didier (Paris, 1840, 6 vols. 8vo.). A
translation by Herbert, up to the 9th century, was
published in London (1727, 5 vols. 4to); and a partial
translation by Rev. J. H. Newman appeared in 1842-44
(3 vols. 8vo.). The Abrégé de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique
d: Fleury, published at Berne in 1776, is ascribed to
Friederik the Great. His other writings were very
numerous; the most important are, Mœurs des Chri-
tiens (Paris, 1882);—Mœurs des Israelites (Paris, 1881),
which was translated and published, with additions,
by Dr. Moreau (Manchester, 1837, 2 vols. 12mo.);—The
history of the French nation (Paris, 1852);—Institut de
de droit ecclésiastique (Paris, 1854, 2 vols.);—Discours
sur les libertés de l'Eglise Gallic-
aine. His minor works are collected in Martin's edi-
tion of Oeuvres de l'abbé Fleury (1837, imp. 8vo.), to
which additions were made by Fleury. A translation of
his Discours sur l'Ecole, History from 690 to 1100 (see
Jortin, Remarques sur l'Histoire Ecclesiastique, Lond.
1778, v. 72 sq.). See also Dupin, Ecclesiast. Writers, cent.
xvii; Hoefer, Nouv. Dict. Générale, xvii; Dow-
ling, On the Study of Ecclesiastical History, ch. iii.
Frieden, Theophil, a German philanthropist, was born at Eppstein, Rhenish Prussia, in 1800, where
his father was pastor. His early education was con-
ducted by his father, and he entered the ministry with
some misgiving, rather doubting his fitness, and choos-
ing rather the function of teacher. But in 1820 a call
to the pastors of the little village community of Ka-
serswerth, a small town on the Rhine, opened his way,
and he diffidently began his work in the place now
forever associated with his name, and which became,
under his hand, the centre of an influence approach-
able to that of other missionaries among the Jews, un-
ited, faith and increasing labor Frieden rivaled. The
in-
habitants of Kaiserswerth were chiefly supported by
a large manufactory, which failed in 1822. Frieden
devoted himself to the work of helping his flock in-
stead of being supported by them. He never did a man
boy under the table to vivify his tale of the fall
of a traveller over a precipice. He had at last till
Oct. 4, 1864, worn out by journeys in Germany, France, Great Britain, and
America, which had brought on disease of the lungs.
To the very last day of his life, he continued, in spite of painful weakness, to exhort those near him to a religious and unselfish life, took keen interest in the details of daily work going on around him, and died a day or two after taking the communion with his whole establishment and family, including two sons, whose entrance into the Church he specially rejoiced to see. Fliedner published (after 1836) annual reports of his institution, and a monthly periodical called Der Armen- und Krankenfreund. He also wrote a work, in four volumes, on the martyrs of the Evangelical Church, 'Buch der Märtyrer und ander Glaubenswesens der evang. Kirche von den Aposteln bis auf unser Zeitalter 1832-1860,' 4 vols. —London Quarterly Review, April, 1868, p. 247; Spectator, April 11, 1868; Winkworth, Life of Pastor Fliedner (London, 1887); Appleton, Am. Cyclop. (1884), p. 577.

**FLIES.** See FLY.

Flinn, Andrew, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Maryland in 1778, graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1799, and was licensed to preach by Orange Presbytery in 1800. In 1808 he became pastor of the Presbyterian church at Fayetteville, and in 1811 he was installed pastor of a new church, expressly organized for him, in Charleston, S.C. Here he gained a brilliant and solid reputation, which was soon widely diffused throughout the country. He became "one of the most impressive and attractive preachers of his day." He died Feb. 24, 1820. He printed a few occasional sermons. —Sprague, Annual, iv, 276.

Flint (ץלמ, challamish', from its smoothness, Psal. xxiv, 8; Isa. 1, 7; "rock"); Job xxviii, 9; frequently with the accompaniment "א"n, a rock, Deut. xvii, 33; xxvi, 18; once for "it itself, Ezek. iii, 9; "sharp stone," Ezek. iv, 20), any hard stone, especially of a silicious character, as quartz or granite; but in mineralogical science it is applied only to silicious nodules. In the three passages just cited above the reference is to God's bringing water and oil out of the naturally barren rocks of the wilderness for the sake of his people. In Isaiah the word is used metaphorically to signify the firmness of the prophet in resistance to his persecutors. So also in Isa. v, 28 we have "like" Flint, in reference to the hoofs of horses. In 1 Macc. x, 73, "ץלמ is translated "flint," and in Wd. xi, 4 the expression "ץלמ צמר is adopted from Deut. vii, 14 (Sept.). See ROCK. Flints abound in nearly all the plains and valleys through which the Hebrews marched during the forty years of wandering. In the northern desert, low hills of chalk occur, as well as frequent tracts of chalky soil, for the most part overspread with flints. In the western desert Burkhardt saw some large pieces of flint perfectly oval, three to four feet in length, and about a foot and a half in breadth. This desert presents to the traveller's view its immense expanse of dreary country, covered with black flints, with here and there some hilly chains rising from the plain. See DESERT.

Flint, Ariel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 17, 1765, at Windham, Conn. He graduated at Yale in 1785, and in 1786 was elected tutor in Brown University, where he remained until 1790, and on April 20, 1791, was installed pastor of the Second Church, Hartford. He was chosen secretary of the Connecticut Missionary Society at its organization, June, 1798, and held the office for twenty-four years. In January, 1824, he was dismissed from his pastoral charge on account of his failing health, and died March 7, 1825. Dr. Flint published A Treatise on Surveying, and several occasional discourses. He assisted in compiling The Hartford Selection of Hymns, and was also assistant editor of the Connecticut Evangelical Magazine for seven years. —Sprague, Annual, ii, 273.

**FLOAT (only in the plur. למש, doberoth', doberoth; 1 Kings v, 9; רָכָב, raphodoth', of uncertain derivation; 2 Chron. ii, 15; Sept. in both passages רָכָב, as also in 1 Esdr. v, 50), a raft or conveying bulky substances by water. Two methods of conveying wood in floats appear to have been practiced in ancient times. The first was by pushing single trunks of trees into the water, and suffering them to be carried along by the stream; this was commonly adopted with regard to firewood. The other was ranging a number of planks close to each other in regular order, binding them together, and steering them down the current: this was probably the most ancient practice. The earliest ships, or boats, were nothing more than rafts, or a collection of deals and planks bound together. They were called רָכָב by the Greeks, and ῥαβίς by the Romans. The ancients ventured out to sea with them on piratical expeditions, as well as to carry on commerce; and after the invention of ships proper, the most ancient use of them was the transportation of soldiers (Schefler, De Mille, Narr. Vet.). Solomon, it appears from the above passages, entered into a contract with Hiram, king of Tyre, by which the latter was to cause cedars for the use of the Temple to be cut down on the western side of Mount Lebanon, above Tripoli, and to be floated to Jaffa. At present no streams run from Lebanon to Jerusalem, and the Jordan, the only river in Palestine that could bear floats, is at a considerable distance from the cedar forest. The wood, therefore, must have been brought along the coast by sea to Jaffa. The Assyrian monuments represent men crossing rivers on inflated skins [see FERRY] and in basket-boats, precisely as described by ancient authors (Herod, i, 194); and in the same region transportation and travelling is still largely carried on by means of floats, some of them open rafts, and others with an awning or cabin. See NAVIGATION.**

Ancient Assyrian Floats.

Modern Assyrian Keel, or Raft.
FLOCK 599  FLOOD

Flock (usually and properly नाय, c' rer, ποίμνιον [or dimin. τοιμνων, a "little flock," like नाय, κατέσχη], 1 Kings xx, 27; occasionally नाय, μικρόν, cattle, as generally rendered; frequently निस्स, sheep collectively, as commonly rendered; also नीूल, marthā), Jer. x, 21, pasture, as elsewhere rendered; and नीूलक, ऊक्सराओ [q. v.], Deut. vii, 13; xxviii, 4, 18, 51, i. e. Fuma, eves for breeding). See FOLD; PASTURE; SHEEP.

Flock (the correlative term to "pastor." "The way in which this term, or the language which implies it, invariably occurs in Scripture (1 Pet. v, 2; John xxi, 15), points out to the people that they are not properly the minister's flock (which would exalt him into the mediator between them and God), but Christ's."—Eden, Church Dictionary, s. v.)

Floodoardo (Floodoarz or Floodoardo) or Rheims, a French chronicler, was born at Epernay in 894, and became canon of Rheims. He was persecuted by count Heribert for opposing the raising of his unqualified son Hugo to the archbishopric of Rheims, and was imprisoned for several months. After the death of the consecrator, he received his son and consecrated him. He died March 28, 966. He wrote Chronica or Annals, a chronicle of France from 919 to 966, published by Pithou (Paris, 1588). He also wrote a Historia Ecclesiae Remensis, in four books, giving an account of the prelates who had presided over its affairs (printed by Collin, 1790; 1794). Besides these works, which as far as extant, are given in Migne, Patrologia Latina, vol. 185, together with the Opera Matrice of Floodoardo, including his Triumphus Christi, a sort of Church History in verse.—Oberman, Nov. Beq. Gen. xvii, 986; Clarke, Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, s. v.

Floh, Jacob Hendrik, was born in the year 1758, at Crefeld. He studied theology in the Baptist seminary in Amsterdam. He was invited in 1788 to take charge of the Baptist church at Enschede. Here he labored between forty and fifty years. He was a man of extensive knowledge and of a ready wit, and was indefatigable in his labors. He contributed greatly to promote the cause of education in the section of the country where he was located. Several valuable essays were written by him on the subject of education. One, on the Real Theory of Punishment and Rewards in Eternity, the death of which came from the unhappy tenor van 't algemeen. Several works on other subjects were written by him. One, on the Indissoluble Connection between Virtue and True Happiness, was crowned by the same society. Another, on a kindred subject, a dialogue on the above mentioned: Nationale Religieus En Liggende Exist Newt volgend. Van Wijck, for a few years Floh allowed himself to be drawn aside from his ministerial vocation to engage in political life. In 1796 he was chosen representative of the people in the National Convention at the Hague. In 1796 he was chosen secretary of the first chapter of the representative body of the Batavian people. He acquitted himself in those positions with great credit. His theological views were Latitudinarian. His principal works are: Poveren, en berevoleerde verklaring der geschiedenis van't Hollandse verzoekd in de woestijn, Deventer, 1790; Het oor beneeds, 1817. His attack on the Heidelberg Catechism, as teaching, in the answer to the fifth question, a doctrine dangerous to the state, made in the National Assembly at the Hague, was regarded as highly injudicious, and excited great indignation. He uttered a triumphant reply from the pen of Ewaldus Kist, one of the most highly esteemed ministers of the Reformed Church. Floh attempted no reply. It was thought that he was himself convinced by the moderate and judicious reply of Kist. We may add in honor of Floh that this attack of his was regarded as an exception to his otherwise impartial conduct as a public representative. He died at Enschede in March, 1830. See B. Glausing, Godgeleerd Nederland, 1 Deel, blz. 467 en verv.; Yeps en Dornmont's Geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 14 Deel, blz. 206 en verv. (Breda, 1827). (J. P. W.)

Flohr, George Daniel, a minister of the Lutheran Church, was a native of Germany, born in 1759. He died in Wytheville, Va., in 1826. He studied medicine in Paris, and was one of the throng that witnessed the execution of Louis XVI. The accidental but tragic death of his mistress, the daughter of the constable of the prison near him, part of whose mangled body was thrown upon his person, most deeply affected him, and so operated upon his mind as to lead him to change all his purposes and plans for the future. This was the turning-point in his character. A train of serious thought was awakened which resulted in his conversion, and subsequent consecration to the work of the ministry. Soon after he came to America, and pursued the study of theology under the direction of the Rev. William Carpenter, Madison County, Va. After his licensure to preach the Gospel, he engaged in successful missionary service in south-western Virginia, but subsequently took charge of several congregations in Wythe County, among whom he faithfully labored till his death. Mr. Flohr exercised an extraordinary influence not only upon the members of his church, but upon all the society. When different people were gathered in the community they were always referred to him for adjustment, and from his decision scarcely any one ever thought of an appeal. The basis of this influence was the unlimited confidence which everyone had in his personal worth and Christian integrity. So far as his professional engagements allowed, Mr. Flohr was devoted to study. His acquaintance with the German and French was extensive and thorough, and his attainments in Latin and Greek considerable. The only work of his ever published was a posthumous volume of sermons. (M. L. S.)

Flood (the rendering of several Heb. words [see Rain], but especially of מים, mīmḥ, מים, torrent, an event related in the book of Genesis (ch. vii, viii), by which, according to the usual interpretation of the description, the whole world was overwhelmed and every terrestrial creature destroyed, with the exception of one human family and the representatives of each species of animal, supernaturally preserved in an ark, constructed by divine appointment for the purpose. See Ark.

1. The successive stages of its progress were in order and at intervals as follows. In the 60th year of his life, Noah was commanded to enter the ark, taking with him his wife, and the sons and their wives of the three other families. One week afterwards, on the 17th day of the 2d month (answering nearly to our November), there began a forty-days' rain, and the fountains of the great deep were broken up, so that its waters rose over the land until all the high hills under the whole heavens were covered. Fifteen cubits (twenty-seven feet) upward did the waters prevail (rise). On the 17th day of the 7th month (about April), or 160 days after the deluge began, the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat, or Armenia, the waters having begun to abate. They continued to decrease till the 1st day of the 10th month (July); 17 days more, and the tops of the mountains were visible. Forty days after this, Noah sent forth a raven from the ark, which never returned. He next (apparently after seven days) sent forth a dove, which came back. Seven days afterwards he dispatched the dove again to ascertain the state of the earth, and in the evening she returned, bringing a leaf of oak in her mouth, which she could not lay hold of. After an interval of seven days the dove was sent forth a third time, and returned no more. On the first day of the 1st month of the new year (Sept.-Oct.) the waters were dried from off the earth, and on the 7th day of the 2d month (Nov.) the ark, built an altar, and offered sacrifice. See Noah.
2. The truth of the Mosaic history of the deluge is confirmed by the tradition of it which universally obtained. A tradition of the deluge, in many respects accurately coinciding with the Mosaic account, has been preserved almost universally among the ancient nations. It is a very remarkable fact concerning the deluge that the accounts of it are generally connected with the history of it, even of those nations which were unknown until they were discovered by enterprise of voyagers and travellers; and that traditions of the deluge were kept up in all the rites and ceremonies of the nations that acknowledged the surface of the earth does exhibit, and which might be ascribed to diluvial action of some kind, are certainly not the results of one universal, but simultaneous submergence, but of many distinct, local, aqueous forces, for the most part continued in action for long periods, and of a kind precisely analogous to such agency as is now at work. While, further, many parts of the existing surface of the earth are invaded by the principles and phenomena of the volcanic districts prove distinctly that during the enormous periods which have elapsed since the craters were active, no deluge possibly could have passed over them without removing all those lighter portions of their exuviae which have evidently been discovered among the ruins of the aborigines of Cuba, North America, and the South-Sea Islands. See Akarut.

3. The account furnished by the sacred historian is circumstantially distinct, and the whole is expressly ascribed to divine agency; but in several of the less particular accounts, the "windows of heaven" (vii, 11), the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep," are mentioned, and again the effect of wind in drying up the waters (viii, 1). It is chiefly to be remarked that the whole event was, as it were, a illumination in the most gradual and quiet manner, without anything at all resembling the catastrophes and convulsions often pictured in vulgar imagination as accompanying it. When the waters subsided, so little was the surface of the earth changed that the vegetation continued unchanged; the olive-branch remained from which the dove brought its token. We allude particularly to these circumstances in the narrative as being those which bear most upon the probable nature and extent of the event, which it is our main object in the present article to examine, according to the tenor of what little evidence can be advanced either by the terms of the narrative, or from other sources of information which may be opened to us by the researches of science. See Cockburn, "Inquiry into the Truth and Certainty of the Mosaic Deluge," (1750).

The evidence which geology may disclose, and which can in any degree bear on our present subject, must, from the nature of the case, be confined to indications of superficial action attributable to the agency of water, subsequent to the latest period of the regular geological phenomena. Impending inundation by a temporary inundation of a quiet and tranquil nature, of a depth sufficient to cover the highest mountains, and, lastly (as indeed this condition implies), extending over the whole globe; or, if these conditions should not be fulfilled, then indications of at least something approximating to this, or with which the terms of the description may be fairly understood and interpreted to correspond. (See Prof. Hitchcock, on "The Historical and Geological Deluges compared," in the B.N. App. January, 1857; April, 1837; April, 1668; also B. N. App. 1862. "Several dissertations" [on the Flood] out of Le Clerc [Commentary, i, 66-70, 1710] on Genesis, London, 1868.) Of those geological facts which seem to bear at all upon such an inquiry, the first, perhaps, which strikes us is the occurrence of what was formerly all included under the common name of diluvium, but which more must be reduced to many distinct classes. The general term may, however, not inaptly describe superficial accumulations, whether of soil, sand, gravel, or loose aggregations of larger blocks, which are found to prevail over large areas of the earth's surface, and are manifestly superincumbent over the deposits of a different age, with which they have no connection. An examination of the contents of this accumulated detritus soon showed the diversified nature of the fragments of which it is composed in different localities. The general result, as bearing on our present subject, is obviously this: the traces of currents, and the like, which the surface of the earth does exhibit, and which might be ascribed to diluvial action of some kind, are certainly not the results of one universal, but simultaneous submergence, but of many distinct, local, aqueous forces, for the most part continued in action for long periods, and of a kind precisely analogous to such agency as is now at work. While, further, many parts of the existing surface of the earth are invaded by the principles and phenomena of the volcanic districts prove distinctly that during the enormous periods which have elapsed since the craters were active, no deluge possibly could have passed over them without removing all those lighter portions of their exuviae which have evidently been discovered among the ruins of the aborigines of Cuba, North America, and the South-Sea Islands. See Akarut.

4. Apart from the testimonies of geology, there are other sciences which must be interrogated on such a subject. These are, chiefly, territo...
probably had not extended beyond a comparatively limited district of the East. A local destruction of animal life would also allow of such a reduction of the numbers to be included in the ark as might obviate objections on that score; and here again the Oriental idea of the deluge (vii. 2) is that of the coexistence of every actual species being included. This is a consideration of very great importance when we take into account the countless varieties of animated beings for which the ark itself made no provision, such as reptiles, insects, and even fishes, which could not exist in the buxom air and security of the ark, and which would probably survive the collisions of the flood. The other difficulties alluded to, arising from kindred sciences, such as the lack of water, the effect of so large an accession of water upon the temperature and upon the rotation of the earth, the unfitness of such a place as the ark for the long confinement of so many animals, the actual existence of trees in different parts of the world older than the deluge, and the impossibility of preserving even vegetable life for so long a time under water, are all likewise obviated by the supposition of a local deluge.

Agreed, that event, so far as the plain meaning of the text goes, may have been one of the most unusual of events, so far as the appearance of the world was concerned. There is an endless array of so many animals from so lofty, bleak, and craggy a mountain as Ararat, and their dissemination thence over the whole world, are obviated in this way, by supposing that it was on one of its lower eminences that the ark grounded, as it floated by the force of the stream which issued from the greater mountain barriers of Armenia. Lastly, this author suggests considerations tending to fix the region which may have been the scene of the actual inundation described by Moses in about that part of Western Asia where there is a large, extinct now, considerably depressed below the level of the sea (see the Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1867, p. 465): this might have been submerged by the joint action of rain, and an elevation of the bed of the Persian and Indian Seas. Finally, he quotes the opinions of several approved divines in confirmation of such a view, especially as bearing upon all the essential religious instruction which the narrative is calculated to convey.

The only other mode of viewing the subject is that which, accepting the letter of the scriptural narrative, makes the deluge strictly universal; and allowing (as they must do) all analogies in the dift of the text, not met by so many animals from so lofty, bleak, and craggy a mountain as Ararat, and their dissemination thence over the whole world, are obviated in this way, by supposing that it was on one of its lower eminences that the ark grounded, as it floated by the force of the stream which issued from the greater mountain barriers of Armenia. Lastly, this author suggests considerations tending to fix the region which may have been the scene of the actual inundation described by Moses in about that part of Western Asia where there is a large, extinct now, considerably depressed below the level of the sea (see the Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1867, p. 465): this might have been submerged by the joint action of rain, and an elevation of the bed of the Persian and Indian Seas. Finally, he quotes the opinions of several approved divines in confirmation of such a view, especially as bearing upon all the essential religious instruction which the narrative is calculated to convey.

The only other mode of viewing the subject is that which, accepting the letter of the scriptural narrative, makes the deluge strictly universal; and allowing (as they must do) all analogies in the difference of the text, not met by any such vast numbers of animals as the text suggests, a natural conclusion, in a natural sense, involved in it, accounts for them all by supernatural agency. In fact, the terms of the narrative, strictly taken, may perhaps be understood throughout as representing the whole event, from beginning to end, as entirely of a miraculous nature. If so, the difficulty may be said to be an end to all difficulties or question, since there are no limits to omnipotence, and one miracle is not greater than another. In a word, if we suppose the flood to have been miraculously produced, and all the difficulties thus overcome, we must also suppose that it was not only miraculously terminated also, but every trace and mark of it supernatural effaced and destroyed. Now, considering the immense amount of supernatural agency thus rendered necessary, this hypothesis has appeared to some quite untenable. Dr. Fyfe Smith, in particular, in connexion with the subject of the deluge (see p. 243), enlarges on the difficulty (p. 157, and note), and offers some excellent remarks on the general question of miracles (p. 84–85); and there can be no doubt that, however plausible may be the assertion that all miracles are alike, yet the idea of supernatural agency to so extraordinary an event is as the primitive instance is, to many minds at least, very staggering, if not wholly inadmissible. In fact, in stretching the argument to such an extent, it must be borne in mind that we may be treading upon difficulties in another quarter, and not immediately the difficulty of the suspension on which any miracles are supported. See Miracle.

If we look to the actual tenor of the whole narrative as delivered by Moses (Gen. viii. and ix.), we shall observe that the manifest immediate purport of it is the same as that of the rest of the early portion of his history, viz. as forming part of the introduction to the law. Thus we find, in the first instance, the narrative dwelling on the distinction of clean and unclean beasts (vii.), the life of the earth and the promise of future enjoyment of the earth and its fruits; the prohibition of eating blood; the punishment of murder (ix. 4, etc.); all constituting, in fact, some of the rudiments out of which the Mosaic law was framed, and which were thus brought before the Israelites as forming an anticipation of the union for with Noah intended. In a Christian light, the narrative is important solely in respect to the applications made of it in the New Testament, and these are only of the following kind: it is referred to as a warning of Christ's coming (Matt. xxiv, 38–39; Acts xxiv, 27); as an assurance of judgment on sin (2 Pet. ii., 5); and of God's long-suffering; while the ark is made a type of baptism and Christian salvation (1 Pet. iii., 20); and, lastly, Noah is set forth as an example of faith (Heb. xi., 7). In all these applications no reference is made to the physical nature of the event, or to the deluge itself. The flood, however, with all the inevitable consequences of so vast a conflagration, so unparalleled in history, has been referred in various quarters to the visible extent of land and superincumbent arch of sky (as they often signify), all direct statement of the universality of the deluge over the surface of the globe will at once disappear. That it was coextensive with the spread of the human race at the time is indeed demanded by the conditions of the sacred history [see Antediluvians]; but there is no evidence that the population before the flood was either so extensive or so widely disseminated as many have imagined, calculating upon the inapposite rate of modern increase and later usages. On the contrary, it appears that even after the deluge the inhabitants were still so greatly inclined to cluster around one native centre that the catastrophe of Babel was regarded in order to induce a fulfilment of the divine behest that mankind should "fill the earth." Undoubtedly, if read from the present advanced stage of the world's history, it would be impossible to understand the language otherwise than as of an absolute universality; for, so far as the present population of the world is known, it must have been in the strictest sense a world-embracing catastrophe which could be described as enveloping in a watery shroud every hill under the whole heaven, and destroying every living thing that moved on the face of the earth. But here it must be remembered, the sacred narrative dates from the comparative infancy of the world, when a limited portion of it was peopled or known; and it is always one of the most natural, as well as most fertile sources of error, to refer the language of scripture to circumstances of the later period, that one is apt to overlook the change of circumstances, and contemplate what is written from a modern point of view. Hence the embarrassments so often felt, and the misjudgments sometimes actually pronounced, respecting those parts of Scripture which speak of the phenomena of the catastrophe, when the language suited to the apparent, but at variance, as has now been ascertained, with the real phenomena. In such cases it is forgotten that the Bible was not intended to teach the truths of physical science, or point the way to discoveries in the merely scientific sense; but that it was intended to teach the truths of God's revelation, and the way to discoveries in the moral and religious sense. Of things in these departments of knowledge it uses the language of common life. So, whatever in the scriptural account of the deluge touches on geographical
cal limits or matters strictly physical, ought to be taken with the qualifications inseparable from the bounded horizon of men's views and relations at the time. Accordingly, there were not wanting theologians with two clars, long before any geological fact, or well-ascertained fact of any sort in physical science, had appeared to shake men's faith in a strictly universal deluge, actually put the interpretation now suggested as competent upon the narrative of the deluge. "The Deluge did not flourish in the 17th century, says in his Synopsis on Gen. vii. 19: "It is not to be supposed that the entire globe of the earth was covered with water. Where was the need of overwhelming those regions in which there were no human beings? It would be highly unreasonable to suppose that the entire globe had to be flooded in order to have penetrated to all the corners of the earth. It is, indeed, not probable that they had extended beyond the limits of Syria and Mesopotamia. It would be absurd to affirm that the effects of the punishment inflicted upon men alone applied to places in which there were no men at all. Hence he concludes, that "if not so much as the hundredth part of the globe was overspread with water, still the deluge would be universal, because the extirpation took effect upon all the part of the world which was inhabited." In like manner, Stillig, in his Origines Sacerdotum (bk. III, ch. iv.), asserted that "he cannot see any urgent necessity from the Scripture to assert that the flood did spread over all the surface of the earth. The flood was universal as to mankind; but from thence follows no necessity at all of asserting the universality of the water, which had been withheld for several months, should be promptly said?" (Popoff, History of the Council of Florence, ed. by Neale, Lond. 1861, ch. vi). The bull transferring the council to Florence was read in the cathedral of Ferrara, Jan. 10, 1439; on Feb. 9 the pope and bishops entered Florence; the emperor, John Paleologus, arrived on the 15th. The aim of the council was (in continuation of that at Ferrara) to restore union between the churches of the East and the West. It desired this greatly, in order to confound his enemies at the Council of Basle, who were quitting the papal faction, and he had proceeded him (June 25, 1438; see Basle); while the emperor John Paleologus sought to gain the aid of the West in his wars with the Turks. The chief topic of discussion was the addition of the filioque to the creed [see Filioque]; but the Latin succeeded in taking it as the doctrinal question of the Holy Ghost instead of the historical one of the additions to the creed. The cardinal Julian chieflv represented the Latin side, and Mark of Ephesus was the strongest disputant on the side of the Greeks. Bessarion, of the Greek side, was won over to the Lat in by promises of rewards from the pope. See Bessarion.

At the first session, Feb. 26, 1439, Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, was absent on account of illness. He died before the close of this council. Cardinal Julian proposed a discussion of the means of union, but the emperor reminded him that the dispute on the filioque was not ended. At the end of the sitting, he held a private meeting of the Greeks to consider terms of union, but nothing came of it. In the second session (March 2) a beginning was made in stating the doctrine of the Filioque, the Latin side being represented by Johannes de Monte Nigro, provincial of the Dominicans in Lombardy. The discussion was continued in several sessions up to the ninth (March 28). The Greeks succeeded best in the scriptural argument, and also showed that many of the passages from Ephesus, Basle, and Augustine, cited by the Latins, had been corrupted. After the session of March 17, the emperor prohibited Mark of Ephesus and Anthony of Heraclea, the two strongest advocates on the
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Greek side, from taking further part in the discussions. The emperor was bent on union at any price. At the end of the session of March 24, the pope sent word to the patriarch that the Greeks must either express their assent to the union of the East, or lose the object of the union of the Armenians with the Roman Church. This decree runs in the name of the pope only. In the third, Mar. 23, 1440, the anti-pope Amadeus, whom the council at Basle had elected pope (Felix V), was declared to be a heretic and schismatic, and all his followers guilty of high treason; a promise of pardon being held out to those who should submit within fifty days. In the fourth session, 4th of February, 1441, a decree for the union of the Jacobites of Ethiopia with the Roman Church was published, signed by the pope and eight cardinals. Andrew, the deputy of John Xi, the patriarch of Alexandria, received it in the name of the Ethiopian Jacobites. In the fifth session, 26th of April, 1442, the pope's proposal to transfer the council to Rome was agreed to, but only two sessions were held there, in which decrees for the union of the Syriacs, Chaldeans, Armenians, and the influences of Rome were drawn up" (Landon, Manuale of Councils, v, ix). On the return home of the Greeks, they found no welcome; Mark of Ephesus was held up as the true representative of orthodoxy, and the signers to the union were denounced as renegades. Most of those who had signed the union were arrested; their lives were endangered, and they were harassed by distress, by fraud, and by the hopes and fears of a transient life. The hand that has signed the union should be cut off, and the tongue that has pronounced the Latin creed deserves to be torn from the roof.

Liturac. — For the acts of the council (on the Latin side), see Hor. Justiniannus, Acta Concil. Florentini (Rom. 1638, 3 parts fol.); Manal, Conciliii v, ix; Labbe et Coste, Concil. xiii, 228, 510, 1684; Harduin, Concil. ix. The acts are summed up in Semler, Selecta Historiae Eccles. cap. iii, 140 sq. On the Greek side we have several partials preserved in the collections of the historian (Athos, Koes, Eire, 1474, 38 sqq.); in reply to which, Leo Allatius wrote Exercit. in R. Cregeti- doum apparatus, etc. (Romae, 1674, 460, fol.). See also Schröck, Kirchenbeschreibung, xxix, 388 sqq.; Th. Christendom's Divisionis ( Lond. 1867), ii, 383 sqq.; Millan, Latin Christianity, bk. xiii, ch. xiv; Hefele, in Tuber. Quart-Schrift, 1847, 188 sqq.; Grier, Epilepsies of Councils (Dublin, 1857, 5vo), ch. xxvi; The History of the Christian Church, ed. by Samuel Popoff, ed. by J. M. Neale (Lond. 1861, 12mo); Cunningham, Historical Theology, i, 468 sqq.; Elliott, Delinication of Romanism, bk. iii, ch. iii.

FLORENTIACE

Radoswinn, successor of Gerard Groot as director of the Brethren of the Common Life (q.v.), was born at Leerdam in 1500. He became M.A. at the University of Prague, and on his return to Holland came under the influence of Gerard, and became his close friend, and a leader among the Brethren. He died A.D. 1440. His life was written by Thomas a Kempis (Vita Florintii, in Opera Omnia, ed. 1830, vol. iii). See Ullmann, Ref. to Brefren., ii, 92 sq. See Brefren.

FLORENTIACE

Florian 1. A martyr (saint in the Roman Catholic Church), was the son of Christian parents of Celia, and served for some years as a member of the emperor Diocletian. When the prefect Aquilinus went to Lorch to search for Christians, Florian voluntarily confessed his faith and was drowned in the Enns. A pious matron, Valeria, in pursuance of a vision, had his corpse but to the place where subsequently the monastery of St. Florian was erected. Several relics are taken to Rome, and in 1188 pope Lucius III sent them to king Casimir, of Poland, and bishop Ge- deon of Cracow. Thus he became the patron saint of Flor
of Poland. He is commemorated on the 4th of March. As he is particularly invoked by those in danger of fire, he is represented in Christian art with a vessel extinguishing flames.

St. Onofrio, one of the most celebrated Augustinian monasteries of Austria. It was erected over the grave of St. Florian (see FLORIAN, 1) in the 6th century, and built anew in 1713. — Stull, Gesch. des regulierten Chorherren-Stiftes St. Florian (Linz, 1885).

FLORIDA, a diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States coextensive with the state of the same name. It was organized in 1828.
The first bishop was Francis Huger Rutledge, D.D., a native of South Carolina, consecrated in 1851; died at Tallahassee Nov. 4, 1866. He was succeeded by John Freeman Young, consecrated July 25, 1867. From 1862 to 1865 Florida belonged to the "General Council of the Confederate States of America."

In 1890 the diocese counted 54 clergymen, 21 parishes, and 3848 communicants.

FLORIANS, a sect in the 2d century who inclined to the views of the Valentinians. They were so named from Florinus, a Roman presbyter who was deposed by Eusebius. His views are only to be gathered from a letter of Irenaeus and from a passage in Eusebius (v, 20). It appears that Florinus at first pushed pantheism so far as to make God the author of evil; and afterwards, on the other extreme, in connection with the peculiar dogmas of Valentinus, Florinus seems to have given such light and direction to the eternal principles from which all the good and evil respectively in the universe had proceeded.—Neander, Ch. Hist. i, 890; Movers, Ch. Hist. i, 408. See VALENTINIAN.

FLORE, JOACHIM OF. See JOACHIM.

FLOREANS, DREPTANUS (commonly called FLOUR DIACONUS or MAGISTER), a deacon of the Church of Lyons in the 1st century, who, for the share he took in the disputes with Gottschall and Johhanus Scotus, and also between Agobard and Amalarius. Against the former he wrote (A.D. 863) Liber de Predestinacione contra Joh. Scoti error. definitiones. He asserts a twofold predestination, or, rather, predestination under a twofold aspect: a gratuitous predestination of the elect to grace and glory, and a predestination of the reprobate to damnation for their sins, which they commit by their own will; and maintains that, though our free will can choose that which is good, it never would choose it, if it were not assisted by the grace of Jesus Christ. And to explain this, he makes use of the comparison of a sick man, of whom we may say that he may recover his health, although he hath need of physic to restore it; or of a dead man, that he may be raised, but by the divine power. In like manner, saith he, the free will being dis tempted, and dead, by the sin of the first man, may be revived, not by its own virtue, but by the grace and power of God, who hath pity on it, which Florus understands not only of that grace which is necessary to salvation, but of that also which is necessary to seek or view the grace, and if it be not too well. "While he censured Scotus on account of his abuse of the worldly sciences, he did not suffer himself to be so far misled by the zeal of the pietistic as to discard them as useless in themselves to theology; but he did not disallow to distinguish the right use of them, in investigating truth, from that above. Only demanded that everything should be tried by the test of the sacred Scriptures. But, at the same time, he declared that, in order rightly to understand and apply Scriptural truth, it was not enough to study the letter alone, but that the inward illumination of a Christian temper was also required. The holy Scriptures themselves could not be rightly understood and profitably read unless faith in Christ first existed in the heart of the reader, so that the truth might be rightly apprehended by means of that, or unless faith in Christ was truly sought, and found in them by the light which comes from above." This, and his tract De Actione Miserarium, and De electibus Episcoporum, may be found in the Acta Synod. at Trier, 300, vol. x, the Opera om. Auctoris in Martene et Durand, collect. i, p. 577. He compiled, chiefly from Augustine, a Comm. in Omnes Psalm Epiptonos, which was published as Beda's until Maibion showed it to be Florus's. All his extant writings are given in Migne, Patr., cxix, 1-429; Migne, Ch. Hist. cent. 1., pt. ii, ch. ii., n. 45; Hook, Eccl. Hist. v, 155; Hist. Lit. d. France, tom. v; Neander, Ch. Hist. (Torrey), iii, 489; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacrés (Paris, 1862), xii, 478 sq.

FLORENS, JOSEPHUS (Greekized Ιωσηπος Φλωρος by Josephus), sometimes with the praenomen Fuscus or Cesius, a native of Ciliciae, appointed procurator of Judaea, A.D. 61, in place of Albinus, by Nero, through the influence of his wife Cleopatra with Poppaea, the empress. His rule was marked with such unprecedented rapine and violence as to drive the Jews into their final rebellion (Tactit. Hist. v, 10), a result apparently intended by him in order to cover his own enormities (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 1, 6; xx, 11, 1; War, ii, 14). He took a bribe at Cesarea from the Jews for protecting them in their synagogue worship, and then abandoned them to the fury of the Greeks, imprisoning those who came to supplicate his promised protection. He massacred several of the Jewish citizens in the most cruel manner in which he could provide. His extreme cruelty and rapine caused many of the Jews to seek the protection of the Roman legions, while others perished on the spot. The Romans, however, were not slow to exact their revenge, and the Jews were far from being left without protection. The intervention of Cestius Gallus, procuras of Syria, in their favor. His term ended with the Jewish insurrection, A.D. 65, in which he was superseded by Vespasian, or perhaps perished (Josephus, Lif, 6; Ant. xiv, 9, 2; xx, 9, 8; War, ii, 18; Suetonius, Jepy, iv; Orosius, vii, 9; Sulpicia Sev. Sacr. Hist. ii, 42; Eusebius, Chron. 1xvi).—Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. v. s. See GOVERNOR.

FLOTUS. See FLOUT.

FLOUT stands in the Alphabet. As the representative of the following Heb. words: פִּקּוּל (he makk, literally narrow [see FAT], Judg. vi, 19; 1 Sam. i, 24; xxviii, 24; 2 Sam. xvii, 28, meal as it is elsewhere rendered), פִּקּוּל (to lekh, from stripping off the hull, the finest and purest part of the meal, usually rendered "fine flour," Sept. and N. Test. ψιλάκτης, Rev. xviii, 8), and פִּקּוּל (boak, from its excreting in rising; 2 Sam. xiii, 18, dough as it is elsewhere rendered). See MEAL.

In early times corn was often eaten whole without any preparation at all (Deut. xxiii, 25), and the custom was not entirely disturbed in the time of our Saviour (Matt. xii, 1). Parching it afterwards became so general that the words which properly mean parched were also used for corn or meal (Ruth ii, 14; 2 Sam. xvii, 28). See PARCHED CORN. Mortars were used in the time of Moses for bruising corn, as was also the mill (Numb. xi, 6). See MORTAR. Fine meal, that is, corn or grain ground or beaten fine, is spoken of as far back as the beginning of Abraham (Gen. xvii, 6). At first, barley alone was ground, but afterwards wheat, as only the poor used barley. Barley-bread appears to have been more suitable in the warm climate of the East than in a colder climate. See BREAD. On the second day, however, it becomes insipid and tough to the palate, as is likewise the case with wheat bread; hence the necessity of baking every day, and hence also the daily grinding at the mills about evening attended to by the prophet Jeremiah (xxv, 10). See MILL. The flour, being mingled with water, was reduced to a solid mass in a sort of a mass, or kneading-trough (q. v.); this, after remaining a little time, was kneaded, some leaven being also added to it (Exod. xii, 84). See LEAVEN. In case it was necessary to prepare the bread very hastily, the leaven
FLOWER

FLO

was left out (Gen. xviii, 6; xix, 8). The cakes, when
made, were round, and nine or ten inches in diameter,
and often not thicker than a knife.—Jahn, Archd., p.
137-140. See CAKE. Fine flour was especially offer-
ed by the poor as a sin-offering (Lev. v., 11-13), and
in connection with other sacrifices in general (Numb.
v, 5-12; xxviii, 7-29). See OFFERING.

FLOWER (usually some form of the kindred roots
γενίκτια and γορικτία, to glitter, and hence to bloss.;
and N. T. αὐξάνειν, a generic term, not designating
any particular species. Flowers grow in great variety
and abundance in Palestine, and from the month of
January to May the groves and meadows are adorned
with the blossoms of different species of wild plants.
Travellers have noticed different species of anemone,
ranunculus, crocus, tulip, narcissus, hyacinth, lily, vi-
corum, iris, etc. The most esteemed are the yellow,
wind-flower, willow-herb, hyssop, dragon-wort, peri-
winkle, squill, the spiked veronica, white clover, and
a flower resembling the holly-hock, and several others,
which, by their variety and multitude, perfume the
air, and yield a very lovely prospect. The rose of
Sharon, which is not properly a rose, but a clustrous
white or red, grows abundantly; also the rose of Jeri-
cho, though not properly so, grows spontaneously, par-
ticularly near the Dead Sea and the Jordan. The cel-
obated henna plant abounds in several places. With
the jasmine, as well as with the vine, the people orna-
ment the alleys and the arbors of their gardens. Burck-
hardt noticed the pretty red flower of the nomen
plant, which abounds in all the valleys of Sinai, and
is also seen among the most barren granitic rocks of
the mountains (see Tyas, Flowers of Holy Land, Lond.
n. d.). See PALESTINE.

Flowers in the Bible are not treated from a scien-
tific point of view. Very few species are mentioned;
and, although their beauty is once or twice alluded to
in descriptive passages (sometimes under the general
term "grass," Matt. vi, 38; Cant. ii, 12; v, 10), they
are seldom introduced, except in the blind, pathetic
analogy which they afford to the transitory life and
Glory of mankind (Job xiv, 2; Psa. ciii, 15; Isa. xxviii,
1; xl, 6; Jsa. xi, 10; 1 Pet. i, 24). See BOTANY. The
egyptian Egyptians were exceedingly fond of flowers,
and they are often represented on the monuments (see
Wicklow, in Jour. cr., 13, 57, 78, 141, 237, etc.). Ganassae
(Γάνασσα, Γάνασσα, Γάνασσα), παράδοςδέσιν were in use among
Greeks from the earliest times (Gen. xiii, 10; Deut.
xi, 12, etc.); but, although they were planted with
flowers and fragrant herbs (Cant. vi, 2; iv, 10), often
chosen for their beauty and rarity (Isa. xvii, 10), yet
they appear to have been chiefly cultivated for useul
and medicinal purposes (see Jer. xxix, 11; Cant. vii, 11; iv,
13; Deut. vii, 6, etc.). See GARDEN.

FLOWER (flówer), pe'ochach, a bud; Isa. xviii, 5; Num.
xxvii, 5, as just bursting open into a bloss., Isa. v, 24;
Nah. i, 4) is used to describe the floral ornaments of
the golden candelabrum (Exod. xxx, 81 sq.; xxxvii,
17; I Kings vii, 28), and also the artificial lily-orna-
tments around the edge of the great laver (1 Kings vii,
26; 2 Chron. iv, 7, 8) in the tabernacle and Temple.
See CANDLESTICK, GOLDEN; BANNA BM.

FLOWERS (fló's) midd'k, uncleanliness, as often else-
where rendered) stands in Lev. xv, 24, 28, for the
ménstrual discharge of females.

FLOWERS. (1.) It was an ancient practice to strew
flowers on graves. Jerome bestows the following com-
menation on Pammachius: " While other hus-
band and wife, and parents of the dead, cast flowers
upon the graves of their wives, our Pammachius
waters the bones and holy ashes of his wife with the
balsam of alms. With these perfumes and odors he
soles the ashes of the dead that lie at rest." (Epist,
20.) (2.) The practice of decorating churches with
flowers is very common in the Roman, and some of
the Protestant churches of the Continent, and exists
in various parts of England. It probably arose out of a
desire to "honor and rest-fare of nature's most
beautiful productions, and may therefore be retained
among things in themselves indifferent. The modern
Ritualists, however, carry this, as other things, to
excess.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. xxiii, chap. iii, 20;
Walcot, Sacred Architecture, p. 299; Barrett, Flowers
and Their Meanings for the Floral Decoration of
Churches (London, 1866).

FLO?, JAMES, D.D., a minister of the Methodist
Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York
Aug. 20, 1806. He received his academic education at
Colgate and Cornell University, New York, but left
school graduating, and went to London, where he was for
some time a student of botany and horticulture at the
Royal Botanical Gardens. Returning to New York,
he became a clerk in the Methodist Publishing House.
In 1831 he joined the Bowery Village (now Seventh
Street) Methodist Episcopal Church, and for some time
acted as teacher and superintendent of a Sunday-school
for colored persons under the care of that church. He
was also appointed a class-leader; was licensed to
preach in February, 1833; was received into the trav-
elling ministry as a probationer at the New York Con-
ference, and was finally appointed to Riverville, New
York, and N. Y. His subsequent appointments were:
1868-87, Hemstead Circuit; 1887-90, Harlem Mission.
He was an earnest abolitionist at a time when aboli-
tonism cost a man something; and in 1836 he was cen-
sured and dismissed from his connection by the Con-
vention. He lived to see his principles triumph both
in Church and State. At the Conference in 1829 he
was ordained elder, and appointed to Fortnight Cir-
cuit, Delaware County, N. Y., but, on account of
the illness of his wife, he was released from the appoint-
ment. From 1840 to 1842 he was at Washington-street
Church, Brooklyn; 1842-44, Danbury, Conn.; 1844-
46, Madison Street, New York; 1847-48, Middletown,
Conn.; 1848-50, New Haven, Conn.; 1850-52, Madis-
on Street, New York, second time; 1852-54, Twenty-
seventh Street, New York; 1854-56, presiding elder
of New York District; 1856-60, editor of National Maga-
azine and Secretary of the Tract Society of the Metho-
dist Episcopal Church; 1861-63, Seventh Street, New
York; 1863, Beekman Hill, New York. Three times
his Conference elected him a delegate to the General
Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and
for four years of his pastoral life strongly indicate
the high appreciation that was held of his merits; and it
is believed that he never failed to leave any charge
better than when he came to it. He also took a lively
interest in the general affairs of the Church; was di-
gressful and influential on the sentiments of his con-
vention, where his influence was always potent. As
assistant secretary and secretary, he kept the Conference
journals fourteen years. In 1848 he received the de-
gree of D.D. from the Wesleyan University. As a
preacher, he was clear, direct, and earnest: eminently
evangelical in doctrine; in exhortation, pungent and
effective; elevated in matter, and rigidly correct in
style and manner. His death was sudden. On the
evening of Oct. 14, 1863, in his study, with only a son
with him, he was seized with apoplexy, and expired
almost immediately. Dr. Floy was a man of great
personal character, and of vigorous as well as acute in-
tellect. His critical faculty was largely developed;
his personal culture was careful and thorough; his
English style was pure and clear to a rare degree.
For twenty years he was a contributor to the Metho-
dist Quarterly Observer, and pen name of the editor of
that journal are from his pen. He was devoted to
Sunday-schools, and wrote several books for the use
of the schools, among them Harry Bodd, a very suc-
cessful juvenile tale. One of his most important la-
bor was the editing of the Methodist Episcopal
Church, and his task assigned to a committee, of which Dr. Floy was

Digitized by Google
most active member, by the General Conference of 1849. The Hymn-book now in use owes its comprehensiveness and general excellence largely to Dr. Floy. He edited the posthumous works of Dr. Olin (q. v.). After his death appeared his Old Testament Characters delineated and illustrated (N. York, 12mo) — Occasional Sermons,とって仮名を省略します。——The Quarterly Review, January, 1864, article vii; Woodruff, in The Ladies Repository, July, 1865, art. i; Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1864, p. 86.

Floyd, John, an English Jesuit, was born in Cambridge-shire. He became a Jesuit on the Continent in 1623, and returned to England as a missionary. He was regarded as a learned scientist, elevated by his superiors to teach polite literature and divinity at St. Omer and Louvain. The time of his death is not known. He was involved in controversies with Chillingworth, Antonius de Dominici, Crassw, Sir Edward Hobby, and other Protestants, in which he assumed the names of Daniel & Jess, Herrera, Lomelino, and Annaeus Velutinamentum. Under these names he wrote Synopsis Apostasiae M. A. de Dominici (Antwerp, 1617, 8vo): — Digestio Hypocrisiae M. A. de Dominici (1619, 8vo): — The Church Conquered over Human Will, against Chillingworth (St. Omer, 1631, 4to) — The Total Sum, against the same (1639, 4to) — A Answer to William Crasw (1612, 4to): — A Treatise of Purification, in answer to Sir Edward Hobby (1618). — A Game, De Script. Rutil. Jesu; Hook, Eccl. Brev., 154.

Fludd, Robert (Latin, De Plutibus), an English physician and theosophist, was born at Millgate, in Kent, in 1574. He was educated at Oxford, and afterwards travelled on the Continent, where he became a Rosicrucian (q. v.). Returning to England, he became M.D., and practised in London, devoting himself also to the study of the natural sciences, in which he showed rare aptitudes. He was also a zealous student of the occult sciences. He died at London Sept. 8, 1637. He was a man of real genius. Kepler and Gassendi thought it worth while to write against him. Fludd’s works were published in Latin at Oppenheim, 1617—88, 8 vols. folio. His Theological Philosophy, grounded upon the essential Truth or eternal Sequence (Lond., 1659, fol.), is translated from the Latin text. See Rich, Brev. Dictionary; Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philosophiae; Wood, Ath. Oxonienses. See THEOSOPHY.

Flute, Nikolaus von der, also known under the name of Brother Klaus, was born at Flutel, in the canton of Unterwalden, Switzerland, March 21, 1417. He was religiously educated, and was distinguished for his asceticism. While, at the same time, he neglected none of his social duties. He served in the army with distinction, and afterwards was nineteen years councillor of state and judge. His countryman would have appointed him to the highest offices, but he declined, and, resigning even his function of judge, he left his family Oct. 16, 1487, barefooted, bareheaded, and coarsely clad, to withdraw from the world entirely, and live in the wilderness. He settled among the Alps, where he is said to have lived for twenty years without touching any food except the consecrated wafer brought to him by the priest. The people erected a chapel for him, and he gained great renown. After 1477 he began preaching in the chapel. In 1481 he suddenly appeared at a diet of the eight cantons, at which time composed the Swiss Confederation, held at Sarnon, and by an effective address averted the threatening disruption of the Confederation. He died March 21, 1487. He was canonized in 1659 by Clement IX. — Herzog, Recl. Encyclop., iv, 481; Piper, Enzy, Kalendar, 1861; Goldfin von Tieffen- baum, Geist und Leben des heil. Bruder Klaus (3d edit. Lucerne, 1866); Bubinger, Bruder Klaus und die Weltliteratur (Lucerne, 1897); Schneller, Uber Nikolaus von der Flute (Einsied. 1852). There are also biographies by Wysing, Weissenbach, Herzog, Widmer, Geiger, and G. Gérard.

Flute (חוּל, masokrotika), from its hissing or whistling sound; Theodot. εἴφω, a pipe), a musical instrument, mentioned among others (Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15) as used at the worship of the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar had set up. (Comp. the αὐλός of 1 Eev. v. 2, a a Persian instrument.) According to the author of Shille-Egyptianu, this instrument was sometimes made of a great number of pipes—a statement which, if correct, would make its name the Chaldee for the musical instrument called in Hebrew בּוֹרָה, ὁπ'α' and erroneously rendered in the A. V. "organ." See FLUTE.

There is notice taken in the Gospels of players on the flute (αὐληγός, "minstrel"), who were collected at festivals (Matt. ix, 23, 24). The Rabbins say that it was not allowable to have less than two players on the flute at the funeral of persons of the meanest condition, besides a professional woman hired to lament; and Josephus relates that, a false report of his death being spread at Jerusalem, several persons hired players on the flute by way of preparation for his funeral. In the Old Testament, however, we see nothing like it. The Jews probably borrowed the custom from the Romans. When it was an old woman who died they used trumpets, but flutes when a young woman was to be buried. See FLUTE.

Flutes, or rather Flutes, were very early in use in ancient Egypt, where they were of various forms and lengths, both single and double, with different numbers of holes, and used by players of both sexes.

Ancient Roman Double Flutes.

They are likewise frequent in the modern East (Lane’s Egyptians, ii, 82). See MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

Flutes or Fluting, curved channels cut perpendicularly in the shafts of columns of classical architecture. In the Doric order the columna twenty-four, separated by a sharp edge. In the Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite there are twenty-four, sepa-
FLUX, BLOODY (burnesquela, Acts xxviii, 8), the same as our dysentery, which in the East is, though sometimes sporadic, generally epidemic (as in the case of the Asiatic cholera), and then assumes its worst form. It is always attended with fever (q. v.), frequently in an intermittent form, the presence of which Lakos, with professional accuracy, intimates by the plural (x⁻ρης) in the above case of Publius. A sharp gnawing and burning sensation seizes the bowels, which give off in purging much slimy matter and pus, and when blood flows it is said to be less dangerous than without it (Schmidt, Bild. Medic. c. xiv, p. 508-507). King Jehoram's disease is thought by Dr. Mead to have been a chronic dysentery, and the "bowels falling out" the "prolapsum ani, known sometimes to issue (2 Chron. xxii, 15, 19). See Disease.

Fly is the rendering in the Author. Vers. of two Heb. words. (Egils has a curious article on the name of the butterfly among the Hebrews, in the Zeit. für weisenk. Tell, Jena, 1864, i.) See Art; Bee; Flea; Gnat; Hornet; Lice; Locust; Scorpion, etc.

1. Zebeb (צְבֶבָּ֗ה; Sept. μύδιον, Vulg. musca) occurs only in two passages (comp. Wisd. xvi, 9; xix, 10), namely, Eccles. x. 1, "Dead zebeb be the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour," and in Isa. vii, 18, where it is said, "The Lord shall slay for the zebeb that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt." The Heb. name, it is plosable, is a generic one for any insect, but the etymology is a matter of doubt (see Gesen. Thes. p. 401; Heb. and Chal. Lex. s. v.; and Fürst, Heb. Concord. s. v.). The word zebeb, fly, enters as an element into the name originally appropriated to an idol worshipped at Ekron, Baalzebul (2 Kings i, 9); but, according to the English version and the Vulgate, in the time of our Lord applied to the prince of demons, interchangeable with "Satan" (Matt. xxii, 24, 26, 27). This "lord of flies" corresponds to the Ζῦς ἀνάμονος and the Ἰππαρκής μυῖαρος of the Greeks and Romans, as if a defender from flies (see Kitt. Pict. Bible, note on 2 Kings i, 2). The Greek in the New Testament reads Beelzebul (Βαηλζηβολ, which is said to mean "lord of dawn" instead of "lord of flies," and has been considered as one of those contemptu,-Silver Coin of Aramaous puns which the Jews were in the habit of making by slight changes of letters. There might be a peculiar sting in this particular case, from the circumstance that flies are chiefly bred in dung-hills, and many species do greatly congregate thither; hence the deity in question, being confessedly a "lord of flies," must ipso facto be a "dunghy lord." One of the names by which "idole" are expressed in the Old Testament is צְבְּבָּֽה, gilán-ším, which has the closest affinity with γυμνός, go-lém, dung. The margin of the English Bible, indeed, gives "dunghy goda" as the rendering of this word in Deut. xviii, 17. See Beelzebul.

In the first quoted passage allusion is made to flies, chiefly of the family Muscaida, getting into vessels of ointment. Flies even in this country we know what an intolerable annoyance the houseflies are in a hot summer when they abound, crawling everywhere and into everything; but in the East the nuisance is tenfold greater. There the common houseflies (Musca domestica) swarm in immense numbers; and though they inflict no physical injury, yet, from their continual settling on the face, they are insufferably annoying (Rosenmüller, Alterth. IV, ii, 420 sq.; Russel, Aleppo, ii, 123 sq.; Tavernier, i, 74; compare Proop. Alp. Diæt. Egypt. iv, p. 207). In Egypt the passants are so subject to a virulent kind of ophthalmia that a very second person is said to be affected with it, and multitudes are blind of either one or both eyes. The complaint is greatly augmented by the constant presence of the flies, which congregate around the diseased eyes, attracted by the moisture which exudes, and so useless is it to drive them away, that the miserable people submit to the infliction, and little children are seen with their eyes margined with rows of black flies, of whose presence they appear unconscious, though presenting a most painful sight to Europeans (Lorent. p. 26, 48; compare Foraskal, Désert. d'Arab. p. 21, in Bohard, Cours d'Egypte, i, 7). The "ointment of the apothecary," composed of substances perhaps peculiarly attractive to these impudent intruders, would be likely to become choked up with their entangled bodies, which, corrupting, would be the more offensive for their contrast with the expected and little follies reduced to an availability who had a reputation for wisdom. The man is the ointment, his reputation the perfume, his little folly the dead fly, his disgrace the stinking savour. See Unguent.

In the other passage, the zebeb from the rivers of Egypt is by some writers, as by Goezeelmann (Verworn, Zion. vi, 79), here identified with the name of which Bruce (Trav. v, 190) gives a description, and which is evidently some species of Tabanus. Sir G. Wilkinson has given some account (Transact. of the Entomological Soc. ii, p. 188) of an insectary fly under the name of dhoboh, a term almost identical with zebeb. It would not do to press too much upon this point when it is considered that Egypt abounds with noxious insects; but it must be allowed that there is some reason for this identification; and though, as was stated above, zebeb is probably a generic name for any flies, in this passage of Isaiah it may be used to denote some very troublesome and injurious fly, κατὰ igitur, "The dhoboh is a long gray fly which comes out about the rise of the Nile, and is like the cleg of the north of England; it abounds in calm hot weather, and is often met with in June and July, both in the desert and on the Nile." This insect is very injurious to camels, and causes death if the disease which it generates is neglected; it attacks both man and beast. The phrase hising, or, rather, haring, for the fly (Isa. vii, 18) is explained in the article Bee.

2. Aroth (אֵרוֹת; Sept. ἀρχικά, Vulg. omne genus muscarum, muscae domiciliaria, musca domestica; but in Psa. lxix, 18; A. V., "swarms of flies," or "swarms of flies of sorts of flies"), the name of the insect or insects which God sent to punish Pharaoh (Exod. vii, 21-31; see Psa. lxxviii, 45; cv, 81). The question as to what particular insect is denoted by aroth, or whether any one species is to be understood by it, has long been a matter of dispute. The scriptural details are as follows: the houseflies of the kind which covered the ground, they lighted on the people, the land was laid waste on their account. From the expression in ver. 21, "there remained not one," some writers have concluded that the Heb. word points to some definite species; we do not think, however, that such an import is to be laid upon this argument; in the aroth to be taken to denote "swarms," as the A. V.
tenders it, the "not one remaining" may surely have for its antecedent an individual fly understood in the collective "swarms." The Sept. explain arōb by sy

"dog-fly;" it is not very clear what insect is meant by the Greek term, which is frequent in Homer, who often uses it as an abusif epithet. Thus he represents Mars as applying the epithet to Minerva for instigating the gods to quarrel (U. xxi. 894). It is also referred to as an Insect by Elian, who, in describing the mygna, tethures, or horse-fly, says it is similar to what is called the syrōyus (Hart. Anim. iv. 51). Philo, in his Life of Moses (1, 53, p. 401, ed. Mangen) expressly describes it as a biting insidious creature, which comes like a dart, with great noise, and, rushing with great impetuosity on the skin, sticks to it most tenaciously. It seems likely that Jerome, in translating Exodus, derived the word from Tdub, "to mingle," and understood it as a mixture of noxious creatures, as did Josephus, Aquila, and all the ancient translators. The diversity of Jerome's renderings in Exodus, however, betokens his uncertainty, and in the Psalms he has adopted that of the Septuagint. More modern writers, reasoning on other senses of the Hebrew word, which are somewhat numerous, have proposed several different insects. Thus one of the meanings of Tdub is "to darken," and Moufet observes that the name cumoynia agrees with no kind of flies better than with those black, large, compressed flies which build nest or cell, and not only obtain ichor, as other flies, but also suck out blood from beneath, and occasion great pain. He observes that they have nobosics, but, instead of it, have double sets of teeth, like wasps, which they infix deeply in the skin; and adds that they greatly infest the ears of dogs (Theat. Insect. cx). Pliny describes an insect of this kind (Hist. Nat. xii. 40); so also Columella (vii. 18). (See Pliny by Grandagnes and Cuvier, Parisii, 1829, ii, 461, note.) But the ancient naturalists generally describe the cumoynia as a sort of washy-fly (Tubanus), which might include both senses, for this genus is most impudently pernicious in its assaults, spares neither man nor beast, gorges itself to bursting with blood, infusing an irritating venom at the same time, and occurs, in suitable localities even in our own climate, in immense numbers. If the arōb was composed of one or more species of Tubana, miraculously augmented in numbers, and preternaturally induced to penetrate into the houses, such a visitation would be a plague of no slight intensity, even supposing their blood-thirstiness and pertinacity, individually considered, to be of no higher standard than we are accustomed to see. It is not improbable that one of the Hippobosca, perhaps H. equi

ax, Linn., is the syrōyus of Elian (N. i. 41, 31), though Homer may have used the compound term to denote extreme impudence, implied by the shamelessness of the dog and the teasing impertinence of the common fly (Mya). As the arōb are said to have filled the houses of the Egyptians, it seems not improbable that common flies (Muscidae) are more especially intended, and that the compound syrōyus denotes the grievous nature of the plague, though we see no reason to restrict the arōb to any one family. "Of insects," says Sonnini (Trav. iii. 199), "the most troublesome in Egypt are flies; both man and beast are cruelly tormented with them. No idea can be formed of their obstinate rapacity. It is in vain to drive them away; they return again in the selfsame moment, and their perseverance wearies out the most patient spirit.

The arōb may include various species of Chalcidica (grants), such as the musquito, if it is necessary to interpret the "devouring" nature of the arōb (in Psa. lxxviii. 46) in a stricter literal sense; though the expression used by the Septuagint is not inapplicable to the flies, which even to this day in Egypt may be regarded as a "plague," and which are the great instrument of spreading the well-known opthalmia, this being conveyed from one individual to another by these unclean pests; or the literal meaning of the word "devouring" the Egyptians may be understood in its fullest sense of the Muscidae if we suppose that the people may have been punished by the larvae gaining admittance into the bodies, as into the stomach, frontal sinus, and intestines, and so occasioning in a hot climate many instances of death (see, for cases of Mysia, produced by Dipterous larvae, Transactions of Entom. Soc. ii. 266-269). See GNAT.

The identification of the arōb with the cockroach (Blatta orientalis), which Oudemann (Verm. Sam. pt. ii, c. 7) suggests, and which Kirby (Bridge. Treat. ii. 287) adopts, has been rejected by all who recommend a species naturally gratuitous, as Mr. Hope proved in 1832 in a paper on this subject in the Trans. Ent. Soc. ii, 179-188. The error of calling the cockroach a beetle, and the confusion which has been made between it and the sacred beetle of Egypt (Ateneus, vii) has recently been corrected by Kuhl (Hist. and Crit. Comm. Exod. l. c.). The cockroach, as Mr. Hope remarks, is a nocturnal insect, and prows about for food at night; "but what reason have we to believe that the fly attacked the Egyptians by night and not by day? The miracle involved was the plague of flies contesting the least, in the creature being brought against the Egyptians in so great an abundance during winter. Possibly, however, the better rendering of the Hebrew would be beetles. (See Wibel's treatise, Ueber der Arōb. in the "Frühjahrsgesell. Früchte," 1738, p. 244.) See BIBLE.

Flying buttress, in Gothic architecture, a buttress extended above the wall of the side aisles, or other outer wall, and connected with the wall of the clerestory, or of a tower, by a portion of an arch, to afford lateral support.

FO, FOŚ (or FоM), the Chinese name for Buddha (the first syllable of Fоb-Ś or Fо-a—Buddha). See Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, ii, 24, 84, 86; and the articles BUDDHISM, CHINA (ii, 249); FоH-Ś; LAMAIN.

Foś (Foś, Foś, or simply Fоś, the son of an asa, Zech. ix. 9, as vico in Matt. xxi. 5), an asa's colt (Gen. xxxiii. 15; xiii. 11). See ASA; COLT.

Foam occurs as a translation of ḫūm (be'tamph, something broken): in Hos. x. 7, "As for Samaria, her king is cut off as the foam upon the water," after the Vulg. opuma. The Sept. doubtless gives the correct sense, φομήρα, a dry twig or splinter. Horsley (Comment, loc. cit.) renders "bubble." "Foam" is the true meaning of ἀπόπηκτος, froth (Luke ix. 89; with its derivatives in Mark ix. 18, 20; Jude 19). Fodder (Foś, beliś, Job vi. 5; xxiv. 6; Isa. xxx. 24). In the second passage in Job this word is rendered in our version "corn;" the margin gives "miniled corn or corn at an ear." In that of Isaiah it is rendered "provender." The word properly signifies a mixture, a medley. Gesenius (Heb. Lex.) says, "The two latter passages are most clearly understood by a reference
to the Roman farrogo (Plny, Hist. Nat.), consisting of barley or oats, mixed with vetches and beans, which were sown and reaped together."

Foggini, Pietro Francesco, an Italian archaeologist, was born in 1718 at Florence, devoted himself to the Church, and was made doctor at Pisa. In 1741 he published De pristina Florentaeurum Apostolic, and an edition of Virgil (Florence, 4to). In 1742 Foggini accepted an invitation from Bottari, second librarian of the Vatican, to come to Rome, where Benedict XIV gave him a place in the pontifical academy of history, and made him sub-librarian at the Vatican. In 1758 he succeeded Bottari as librarian. He died at Rome May 31, 1788. He devoted great part of his life to the study of the MSS. of the Vatican; and published, besides the works already mentioned, Epiphanius, De XII gemma, etc. (Rome, 1748, 4to);—Epiphanius Salerno, Comment, in Cont. (Rome, 1770, 4to);—Appendix Historia Byzantium (Rome, 1777).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 35.

Foli. See Fuss-Her.

Fold (properly ꞌ nipples, gedrobbi, a place scalled in, Numb. xxxii, 16, 24, 36; αἰνος, a court-yard, John, 1, 16; also ꞌ nipples, maked, a place shut up, Hab. iii, 17; Psa., i, 1, xxviii, 70; whereas ꞌ nipples, dober, Isa. v, 17; Mic. ii, 12; and ꞌ nipples, maktekk, 2 Sam. vii, 8; 1 Chron. xvii, 7; Isa. lxv, 10; Jer. xxiii, 8; Ezek. xxv, 14; xxiv, 14, signify pasture, and ꞌ nipples, John, 16, the flock itself), a small enclosure for flocks to rest together (Isa. xxiv, 20). It appears that, before the shearing, the sheep were collected together into an uncovered enclosure (αἰνος), surrounded by a wall (John, xi, 16). The object of this is that the wool may be rendered finer by the sweating and evaporation which necessarily result from the flock being thus crowded together. There are the sheepholds mentioned in Numb. xxx, 16; xxiv, 36; 2 Sam. vii, 8; Zeph. ii, 6, etc. No other kind than this are used in the East (Jahn, Archbok, § 40). See PASTURAGE. Such an enclosure, open above, was often made of hurdles, in which, during the summer months, the flocks are kept by night or at noon. They were usually divided into two parts for the different kinds of flocks, i.e. sheep and goats (Judg. v, 16). See Flock. The gentlemen forming the Scotch Mission of Inquiry to the Jews in 1889, when at Esh- tailor, observed, "Many large flocks of sheep and goats were coming into the village, and we followed the footsteps of the flocks in order to see where they were lodged all night. We found the dwellings to be merely cottages of mud, with a door, and sometimes also a window, into a court-yard. In this yard the flocks were lying down, while the villagers were spreading their mats to rest within. Small mud walls formed frail partitions to keep separate the larger and smaller cattle, for oxen, horses, and camels were in some of these enclosures." In the East it is common for shepherds to make use of ruined edifices to shelter their flocks from the heat of the middle of the day and from the dangers of the night. Thus it was prophesied of the cities of Ammon, Aroer, and Judaea that they should be couching-places for flocks (Ezek. xxv, 5; Isa. xviii, 2; xxxii, 14). But Babylon was to be visited with a far greater desolation, and to become unfit even for such a purpose (Isa. xiii, 19). The peculiar expression in Psa. lxvii, 13, "Though ye have lien among the pots," or, according to J. D. Michaelis, "drinking-troughs" or "water-troughs," would be better rendered, "Though ye have lien among the flocks." See Foss. To lie among the flocks, says Gesenius, seems to be originally of shepherds who married women living in leisure and quiet. In John x, 16, the Jews and Gentiles are represented under the image of two different flocks enclosed in different folds. See Sheep.

Follen, Charles Theodore Christian, LL.D., III.—20

a Unitarian minister, was born at Romrod, Ilceased Darmstadt, September 4, 1876. He was educated at the Gymnasium and University of Giessen, which last he entered in 1818. After the battle of Leipzig he was dismissed from the Roman law in Jena; but he had incurred the hatred of the government for his advocacy of freedom, and in 1830 he retired to Switzerland. In 1831 he was appointed lecturer at the University of Basel, but in 1824 the governments of Russia, Prussia, and Austria demanded his surrender as a political prisoner. He was advised to depart, and, after various adventures and escapes, reached New-York January 12, 1825. He was soon after appointed professor in the man at Harvard, and in 1828 was made professor of Church History in the theological school at Cambridge. He engaged at an early period with all his heart in the American anti-slavery movement, a course which alienated some of his friends, and hindered his advancement. He finally became pastor of a Unitarian church in East Lexington, Mass. On the night of Jan. 18, 1840, he perished in the burning of the steamer Lexington in Long Island Sound. He was a thorough scholar, and a man of the purest principles, and of courageous decision to act on his convictions. His writings were published after his death by his widow, under the title, The Works of Charles Follen, with a Memoir of his Life (Bost. 1841, 5 vol., 12mo).—Christian Examinor, 1842, p. 33; Sprague, Unitar. Phys., p. 588.

Folly. See Fool.

Fonseca, Pedro da, a Jesuit and metaphysician, was born at Cortizada, Portugal, 1628. He entered the order in 1548, and in a few years was made professor of philosophy at Coimbra, and afterwards professor of theology at Evora. He obtained the name of the "Portuguese Aristotle." He stood high in the favor of king Philip II and of pope Gregory XIII. He died Nov. 4, 1599. He was the first who publicly taught the doctrine relative to the divine prescience known as scientia media, and which was discussed long and curiously between the adherents of Molina (who was a pupil of Fonseca) and the Dominican Jean PRESCIENCE. Among his works are Commentarii in Aristotelis (4 vol., often reprinted):—Institutiones Dislectitios (Lissieux, 1664).—De concord. providentia et gratiae Dei cum libero arbit. hom. (Lissieux, 1688).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 81.

Font (baptismal), the vessel containing the water for baptism. It was for some time the custom to baptize in or near flowing streams of water. Then baptisteries were erected outside of churches. Properly

Font, Swaton, Lincolnshire, 1319 (Chamber).
speaking, the baptistery was the building in which baptism was performed; and the vessel in which it was performed was called in Greek σακρατήριον, in Latin piscin. At a later period the vessel for baptism was placed in the church, and called font, fount or fountain. Fontana finally came to be generally made as vases of stone, elevated three or four feet from the floor, supported by a stone standard, and usually placed before the altar. They were frequently lined with silver, lead, or brass, and were usually adorned with ornamental work in the same style as the church itself, or with bas-reliefs of scriptural scenes. In form, the early fonts were sometimes round, and sometimes built in the shape of a cross or of a tombstone (Rom. vii). At first fonts were covered simply with a lid. These were later enlarged into high and highly-ornamented pilasters or spires. —Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. viii, chap. vii; Parker, Glossary of Architecture, a. v.; Martigny, Dictionnaire des antiquités Christianes.

Fonte Avellana, Order of, a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church. The name is derived from the desert of Fonte Avellana, near Fieschi, where the first monastery of the order was established in 1001 by Ludolph, subsequently bishop of Eugsulph. The best known member of this order is the abbot Peter Damiani (q.v.), under whom it made considerable progress. Little is known of its subsequent history, except that it greatly degenerated. In 1570, cardinal Jules de la Rovere, who had been appointed pope Pius V abbot in commendam of the abbey of Fonte Avellana, caused the monks to unite with the Camaldulenses.—Helyot; Migne, Dict. des Ordres Religieux, s. v. Fonte-Avellana.

Fontein, Piet, was born in 1708. He enjoyed the instructions of the celebrated Tiberius Hemsterhuis and Albert Schultena. His taste for the literature of antiquity was developed under their able tuition. His first charge was a Baptist congregation in Rotterdam, to which he was called in 1792. Here he labored seven years. From this field of labor he was transferred to a similar one in Amsterdam, where he remained till his death, which occurred in 1788 or 1789. The literary taste acquired in early life he continued to cultivate. He became an uncommon proficient in Greek and Roman literature. He edited the Characteres Ethici of Theophrastus according to a Florentine MS. He was on terms of friendly intercourse with the most eminent scholars of the age. His library, containing the best editions of the Greek and Roman classics, and enriched with the stores of patriotic, theological, and philosophical literature, was bequeathed to the Baptist church in Amsterdam. By this bequest, which served for the foundation of the valuable library of the Baptists in that city, he conferred a great and lasting benefit on the cause of theological education. See Glauzius, Godgeleerd Nederland; Deel, bl. 470; also Blaupoot ten Cats, Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland enz. ii Deel, blz. 186 var.; S. Muller, Geschiedenis van het onderwijs in de theologie by de Nederl. Doopsgezenden, blz. 70. (J. P. W.)

Fontenay, Pierre Claude, a Jesuit, was born at Paris in 1688. He became rector of the college at Orleans, but was recalled to Paris to continue Longueil's Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, of which he wrote vols. ix, x. He died at Le Fleche, Oct. 15, 1742.---Migne, Dict. de Biog. Chrét. Histoire, s. v.

Fontevraud, Order of, Ordo of (Ordo Fratrum Ebrolicorum), a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, founded at the close of the 11th century by Robert of Arbrissel [see Arbrissel], who in the forest of Ceson united a number of hermits under the rule of St. Augustine. The number of members rapidly increased, and Arbrissel had to establish several convents for men and women. The latter were divided into three different establishments, namely, 1 (Le Grand Monier), for virgins and widows; 2 (St. Lazarus), for lepers and other sick people; 3 (St. Magdalen), for fallen women who wished to reform. The whole order was devoted to the glorification of the Virgin Mary, and the men of the order were placed under the supreme jurisdiction of the abbeys of Fontevraud, who became the general of the whole order. Wernede, a relative of the duke of Brittany, was the first abbot; Petronella, baronness of Chémillé, her assistant. The order was confirmed by pope Paschal II (in 1106, and again in 1115). After the death of the founder, the number of convents gradually rose to about sixty, all of which, with the exception of a few in Spain and England, were in France. The history of the order presents no facts of importance; it soon degenerated to an even higher degree than the majority of the medieval orders. Attempts to reform it were made by the abbesses Marie of Bretagne (1477), Renate of Bourbon.
FOOD (1807), and Antonette of Orleans (1751 to 1808), but they had no lasting results. The whole order perished during the French Revolution; the last abbess, Julie Sophia Charlotte de Pardaillan, died in Paris in 1799. No attempt has since been made to revive it. — Wezet and Kappel, *Krebse*, iv. 109; Helvét (ed. Migne), *Ordores Religiosi*, n. v.; Honore Narcisse, *Hist. de l'Ordre de Fonti* (Angers, 1856). (A. J. S.)

Food (represented by several Heb. and Gr. words [especially some derivative of the verb αὐδᾶν, to eat], which are variously rendered in the A. V.). Compare VICTUALS.

I. Materials.—The original grant of the Creator made over to man the use of the vegetable world for food (Gen. i, 29), with the exception of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. iii, 22), and, as somehow hold, also, the tree of life (iii, 22). So long as man continued in Paradise, he doubtless restricted his choice of food within the limits thus defined; but whether, as is commonly stated, we are to regard this as characteristic of the entire period between the creation of Adam and the Fall, is problematic. It is most interesting to note (Gen. ix, iii) that the very act of eating the forbidden fruit (Gen. iii, 6) shows us an indifferent attitude towards the use of food. It is doing no violence to the passage last cited to view it rather in the light of an ordinance intended to regulate a practice already in use, than as containing the first permission of that practice; and when we consider that man is, by his origin, the most carnivorous of all the animals good to be eaten by man, it is evident that the restriction was as early as the agricultural occupation among men, it seems more probable than otherwise that the use of animal food was not unknown to the antediluvians. Perhaps, some fruits and vegetables were determined by the use of raw flesh, such as Bruce found in his day among the Abyssinians, and such as Moses glances at (Exod. xii, 9), may have prevailed among the more barbarous and ferocious of the antediluvians; and it may have been in order to check this that the command against eating flesh was made to Noah. It is not, however, to be overlooked that, in the traditions of antiquity, the early age of the world was represented as one in which men did not use animal food (Diod. Sic. i. 43; ii. 88; Ovid, *Metam.*, i. 101 sq.; xv. 96 sq.; *Paus.* iv. 205 sq.).

In the use of the food of the ancestors of the Hebrews comprised the flesh of animals both tame and wild, as well as the cereals. We read of their using not only cakes of fine meal, but also milk and butter, and the flesh of the calf, the kid, and game taken by hunting (Gen. xxviii, 6-8; xxvii, 8, 4). They used also leguminous food, and a preparation of lentils seems to have been a customary and favorite dish with them (Gen. xxv, 84). They made use also of honey (either honey of bees or sirup of grapes), spices, nuts, and almonds (Gen. xxiv, 11).

2. Egypt. Egypt the Israelites shared in the abundance of that land; there they "eat by the flesh-pots, and did eat bread to the full" (Exod. xvi, 8); and amid the privations of the wilderness they remembered with regret and murmuring "the fish which they did eat in Egypt freely (the abundance of fish in Egypt, at least, is suggested)" (Gen. xviii, 8). The Hebrews, *De Nat. Anim.* x, 45, the cucumbers and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic" (Num. xi, 5). These vegetable products have always formed an important part of the food of the people of Egypt; and the abundant use also of animal food is sufficiently attested by the monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt. II*, 867-874).

In their passage through the wilderness, the want of the ordinary materials of food was miraculously supplied to the Israelites by the manna. As it was of importance that their flocks and herds should not be wholly consumed or even greatly reduced before their entering on the promised land, they seem to have been placed under restrictions in the use of animal food, though this was not so toward the Gentiles (Deut. xvii, 8 sq.), and when their longing for this food broke out into rebellious murmurs, a supply was sent to them by means of large flocks of a species of partridge very much in use in the East (Exod. xvi, 11-15; *Numb.* xi, 51; comp. *Deut.* xii, 60).

When they reached the promised land, "the land flowing with milk and honey," abundance of all kinds of food awaited the favored people. The rich pasture-lands of Palestine enabled them to rear and maintain large flocks and herds; game of various kinds was abundant in the more mountainous and uninhabited districts; fish was largely supplied by the rivers and inland seas, and seems to have been used to a considerable extent (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14; Neh. iii, 8; Matt. vii, 10; xiv, 17; xv, 8; Luke xxi, 42; John xxi, 4-6), so that the destruction of it was represented as a special judgment from God (Isa. i, 14; Jer. vii, 8; Zeph. i, 8). See FisH. In the Mosaic code express regulations are laid down as to the kinds of animals that may be used in food (*Lev.* xi, *Deut.* xiv). Those expressly permitted are, of beasts, the ox, the sheep, the goat and the roebuck; of birds, the wild goat, the pygarg, the wild ox, the chamois, and, in general, every beast that parteth the hoof and cleaveth the cleft into two claws (that is, where the hoof is completely parted, and each part is separately cased in bone), and cheweth the cud; of fowl, all that have scales and fins; of fishes, all clean birds, that is, all except the carnivorous and piscivorous birds; of insects, the locust, the bald locust, the beetle, and the grass-hopper. Whether the Hebrews attended to the rearing of gallinaceous fowls remains a matter of doubt. See COCK.

Besides animals declared to be unclean, the Israelites were forbidden to use as food anything which had been consecrated to idols (Exod. xxxiv, 13); animals which had died of disease or been torn by wild beasts (*Exod.* xxii, 31; *Lev.* xxii, 8; *comp. Ezek.* iv, 14), and certain parts of animals, viz. the blood (*Lev.* xxvii, 10; xix, 26; *Deut.* xii, 15-23), the fat covering the intestines, the kidneys, and the fat covering them, the fat of any part of the ox, sheep, or goat, especially the fat tail of certain sheep (*Exod.* xxii, 18-22; *Lev.* iii, 4-8; io, 19). They were also forbidden to use any flesh of swine, or any thing that creepeth upon the earth, and also the body of any unclean beast had fallen, as well as all food and liquids which had stood uncovered in the apartment of a dead or dying person (*Numb.* xix, 15). The eating of a kid boiled in the milk or fat of its mother was also prohibited (*Exod.* xxiii, 19; *xxxiv, 26; *Deut.* xiv, 21). These restrictions rested chiefly, doubtless, on religious and theocratic grounds [see FAT], but for some of them reasons of a sanitary kind may also have existed. It belonged to the essence of the theocratic system that the people should be constantly surrounded by what reminded them of their separation to Jehovah, and the need of keeping themselves free from all that would lower or distort the distinction between them and the nations around them. For this reason specific restrictions were laid upon their diet, which were not attended to by other nations, nor even by the Israelites themselves, who were swarming with strangers dwelling within their bounds (*Deut.* xiv, 21). This does not, however, preclude our admitting that reasons of a social or political kind may also have conspired to render these restrictions desirable. In warm climates, where avoiding contact with foreigner was the utmost caution necessary in handling whatever may have been exposed to the influence of a corpse; and it is well known that the use of adipose matter in
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food requires, in such climates, to be restricted within narrow limits. The peculiar prohibition of a kid boiled in its mother's milk was ordained probably for the purpose of preserving confused and to some idolators, or for the purpose generally of encouraging human feelings on the part of the Israelites towards their domesticated animals (Spencer, De Legg. Hebr. 

[Continued on page 612]
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the fat are removed, the nerves and veins extracted, and strict search is made lest any drop of blood should be allowed to remain in any part (Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud. ch. xxvii*). The flesh, thus prepared for cooking, was commonly boiled in water (חָמָה, Piel of בָּעָה), probably also sometimes in milk, as is still the case among the Arabs. Before being put into the pot, the flesh, freed from skin, appears, from above cut into small pieces, or perhaps this was done during the process of cooking (Mic. iii. 3; comp. Hitzig, ad loc.). The broth and the flesh were served up separately (Judg. vi. 15), and both were eaten with bread. Salt was used to season the food; spices were also occasionally introduced. A dish thus prepared was sometimes prepared (Ezek. xxiv. 10; Gen. xxvii. 4; Prov. xxix. 3). For boiling, the pot or caldron was used; and the fuel was usually common wood, especially thorns (Eccles. vii. 6; Ps. lvi. 9; Isa. xlv. 16; Ezek. xxiv. 10); sometimes the dried excrement of animals (Ezek. iv. 15), a species of fuel still much used in the East (Iris and Mangues’s *Travels*, p. 173; Rae Wilson’s *Travels*, ii. 156; Huc’s *Travels*, passim). Food was also prepared by roasting (יְבָשָׁה). This was regarded as the more luxurious mode of preparation, and was resorted to chiefly on festive occasions. The paschal lamb was to be roasted whole (Exod. xii. 4, 6), but it does not appear that this was the usual method of roasting flesh; it is more probable that the ancient Hebrews, like the modern Arabs, roasted their meat in small portions by means of short spits of wood or metal placed near the fire, and turned as the process of cooking required (comp. Odys. iii. 461-2, etc.; IL i. 465, etc.). Birds were roasted whole on such a spit. The Persians roast lambs and calves entire by placing them in an oven (Tavernier, i. 269; Charldin, iii. 88), and this may also have prevailed among the Hebrews. Among the poor, locusts were eaten roasted, as is still common among the Arabs, whose method of cooking locusts is as follows: the legs and wings having been plucked off, and the entrails taken out, the body is salted, and then roasted by means of a wooden spit, on which a row of bodies similarly prepared are strung. Fish were usually broiled (Luke xxiv. 42; John xxi. 5), but it would seem that they were sometimes cured, or at least brought into a state in which they could be used without further cooking (Matt. xiv. 17, 19; xv. 34, 36). In either case they were eaten with bread.

In primitive times the mistress of the house presided over the cooking of the food, as the master of the house charged himself with the slaughtering of the animals (Exod. xii. 6; Gen. iv. 22; comp. IL xxiv. 622, and Odys. ii. 300). Among the Egyptians, servants who were professional cooks took charge of preparing the food (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, II, 882 sq.); and in later times among the Hebrews similar functionaries were employed, both male and female (נְתַנְתַּת, 1 Sam. ix. 30, 34; נְתַנְתִּית, 1 Sam. vi. 33). The culinary utensils were נִמְשָׂא, a deep pan (Num. xii. 8; Judg. vi. 19; 1 Sam. ii. 14); נָעָשׁ, נָעָשׁ כַּלְעֻדִּים, a basin or basin (Exod. xxx. 18; 1 Sam. ii. 14; נָעָשׁ, נָעָשׁ כַּלְעֻדִּים, an iron pan; נָעָשׁ, נָעָשׁ כַּלְעֻדִּים, a frying-pan (Lev. ii. 5, 7; vi. 9); נָעָשׁ, a basin; נָעָשׁ, a basin with which is drawn from the pot (1 Sam. ii. 18, 14), and perhaps the flesh separated from the bones in the pot (Mich. iii. 8); דָּמַד, a word of doubtful significance, rendered by the Sept. ψυχορρατικος (Lev. xi. 84), by the SYR. *place of pots*, by Genesis *range for pots*, by *First hearth* for cooking, consisting of two rows of stones meeting at an angle, by Rosenmüller a place in the heath under which was fire, and on the surface of which pots have been cut into, and placed, and by Knobel an earthenware stew-pan (Ravins, *De re ephoriaria et Heb. Traj.* ad Rhem. 1708; Pareus, *Antiq.*).
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Food, Spiritual, "an expression found in two places in the 'Order for the Holy Communion' in the English Church service, to signify the sustenance which the soul receives from the sacrifices of the flesh and blood, that is, the outward substance of the body of man ("for the blood," says Moses, "is the life") to atone for the sins of the world, and to redeem us from everlasting death. Some have maintained from those words of our Lord, 'This is my body,' that the literal, material flesh and blood of Christ are, in some sense, actually received in the communion; but others see clearly that the Church of England, at least, has taken special pains to guard against and exclude such a notion, both in the above passages, and by the language of the 38th Article of Religion. The opponents of the 'material' view contend also that literal flesh and blood 'cannot be spiritually received,' or 'refresh the soul.' See *Transubstantiation.*

Food (represented by several Hebrew and Greek words, especially בָּשָׁה, נָעָשׁ, דָּמַד). The "fool" of Scripture is not an idiot, but an absurd person; not one who does not reason at all, but one who reasons wrong; also any one whose conduct is not regulated by the dictates of reason and religion (Psas. xiv. 1). Foolishness, therefore, is not a negative quality, but a condition of wrong action in the intellectual or sentient being, or in both (2 Sam. xii. 12, 13; Ps. xxxviii. 5). In the book of Proverbs, however, "foolishness" appears to be sometimes used for lack of understanding, although more generally for perverseness of will. The phrase "fool is wise" (Matt. x. 22) implies not only angry temper, by which such severe language is prompted, but a scornful, contemptuous feeling, utterly inconsistent with the love and meekness which characterize disciples of Christ, and of course exposing the individual who is under its influence to eternal punishment. See *Wisdom.*

Fools, Feast of. See *Feast of Fools.*

Foot (properly פָּשָׂא, re'gel, νοῦς). Of the various senses in which the word "foot" is used in Scripture, the following are the most remarkable. Such phrases as the "slipping" of the foot, the "stumbling" of the foot, "from head to foot" (to express the entire body), and "footsteps" (to express tendencies, as when we say of one that he walks in another's footsteps), require no explanation, being common to most languages.

The extreme modesty of the Hebrew language, which has perhaps seldom been sufficiently appreciated, dictated the use of the word "feet" to express the parts and the acts which it is not allowed to name. Hence such phrases as the "hair of the foot," the "water of the foot," etc. "To be under any one's feet" denotes the submission of a subject to his sovereign, or of a servant to his master (Psal. viii. 6; comp. Heb. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 26); and was doubtless derived from the symbolic action of conquerors, who set their feet upon the neck or body of the chiefs whom they had vanquished, in token of their triumph. It is expressed in similar terms in Scripture (Josh. x. 28), and is figured on the monuments of Egypt, Persia, and Rome. See *Triumph.*

In like manner, "to be at any one's feet" is used for being at the service of any one, following him, or willingly receiving his instructions. The last passage, in which Paul is described as being brought up "at the feet of Gamaliel," will appear still clearer if we understand that, as the Jewish writer
allege, pupils actually did sit on the floor before, and therefore at the feet of, the doctors of the law, who themselves were raised on an elevated seat. See Disci-pline.

1 Lameness of feet” generally denotes affliction or calamity, as in Psa. xxxv, 15; xxxviii, 18; Jer. xx, 10; Micah iv, 6, 7; Zech. iii, 9. See Lamn.

2 To set one’s feet” in a place signifies to take pos-
session of it, as in Deut. i, 36; x, 34, and elsewhere.

3 To water with the feet” (Deut. xi, 10) implies that the soil was watered with as much care as a garden, in which case the channels for irrigation may be turned, etc., with the foot. See Garden.

An elegant phrase, borrowed from the feet, occurs in Gal. ii, 14, where Paul says, “When I saw that they walked not uprightly, one of your sect (literally, “not with a straight foot”), or “did not foot it straightly.”

Naked feet were a peculiarity of the period (Isa. ii, 22).

This must mean appearing abroad with naked feet, for there is reason to think that the Jews never used their sandals or shoes within their doors. The modern Orientals consider it disrespectful to enter a room without taking off the outer covering of their feet. It is with them equivalent to uncovering the head among Euro- peans. The practice of feet-washing implies a similar usage among the Hebrews. See Abolution; Washing. Uncovering the foot was also a mark of adora-
tion. Moses put off his sandals to approach the burning bush where the presence of God was manifested (Exod. iii, 5). In keeping the modern Oriental and as regards the height of profanation to enter a place of worship with covered feet. The Egyptian priests of-
secrated barefoot; and most commentators are of opin-
on that the Aaronite priests served with bare feet in the tabernacle, as, according to all the Jewish writers, they afterwards did in the Temple, and as the frequent washings of their feet enjoined by the law seem to imply. See Sandals.

The passage, “How beautiful upon the mount-
tains are the feet of him that bringeth glad tid-
ings,” that published as a psalm, appears to signify that, although the feet of messengers and travellers are usually rendered disagreeable by the soil and dust of the way, yet the feet of these blessed messengers seemed, notwithstanding, even beautiful, on account of the glad tidings which they bore.

Foot. Joseph Ives, D.D., a Presbyterian minis-
ter and writer, and member of Washington College, Tenn., was born at Watertown, Conn., Nov. 17, 1790. He entered Union College in 1821. Having passed through the usual theological course at Andover, he was li-
censed in 1824, and ordained as an evangelist, when he went to South Carolina, and labored successfully for some months. Returning to New England, he preached for some time at Boston, and at a later period was called to the Congregational church at West Brookfield, Mass. From this charge he obtained a dismissal in 1831 on account of ill health, and in 1833 accepted a call from Salina, N. Y., where he continued for about a year, and then accepted a call to Corland, N. Y., where he opposed with much ability the system of perfectionism then prevalent, on which he wrote an able article in the Literary and Theological Review (1844).

In 1835 he removed to Westport, Conn., and while there he joined the Presbyterian Church, with which he remained connected during his life. In 1839 he accepted a call to the Presbyehian church of Knox-
ville, Tenn. He was connected with the Presbyte-
ries of Bedford and Geneva, and with the Old-school Church, and while at Knoxville was elected to the presidency of Washington College. He was on his way to be inaugurated as president of the college when he was killed by a fall from his horse, April 20, 1840. He published The prominent Triad in Teachers of false Religion (1839);—A Historical Discourse (1839);—Ser-
mons on Insubcerence (1839)—Three Sermons on Per-
fec tionism (1834). A Memoir, with a selection from
his MS. sermons, was published by his brother (1841, 5vo).—Sprague, Aminals, iv, 669.

Foot, Kissing of the Pope’s. The kissing of the feet of rulers was an Oriental mode of testifying reverence or submission. It was also done in the West to some, at least, of the Roman emperors: Diodorean is said to have had gems fastened to his shoes, that the honor of kissing his feet might be more willingly paid. It was introduced as a sign of reverence for the pope at Rome at some date not precisely known. In de-
ference of this practice, the Roman writers adduce an early usage of the sort in favor of all bishops; but it was kissing of the hand, not of the foot, that seems to have been the usage (Bingham, Orig. Eccles, bk. ii, ch. ix).

The first example of an emperor kissing the pope’s feet is that of Justin with the foot of pope John I. A.D. 525. It is now practised (1) after the election of a new pope, when all the cardinals kiss his foot; (2) on the election of a new cardinal, when he kisses the pope’s foot, formally, in sign of homage and submis-
sion; (3) at public audiences of the pope, when per-
sons presented kiss his foot. Protestants are not re-
quired to perform this homage when presented. A crucifix is fastened to the slipper, that the act of adora-
tion may be interpreted as paid to Christ in the per-
on of his so-called vicar.

Footman. A word employed in the A.V. in two senses. See Runner. 1. Generally, to distinguish those of the people or of the fighting-men that went on foot from those who were on animals or in chariots. The Hebrew word for this is דָּגָל, dagel, from root, a foot. The Sept. commonly expresses it by περιοι, or occasionally πωσα, (2 Sam. x, 6; Jer. xii, 5), or those simply who journeyed on foot, whether soldiers or not (Exod. xii, 37; Numb. xii, 21). In the latter case the word perhaps indicates the male portion of the company, those who walked while the females rode, like the Arabic royal, a man. Sometimes it is joined with פָּנָי, a man (Jugd. xx, 2). See Army; Rider.

2. The word occurs in a more special sense (in 1 Sam. xxii, 17) as the translation of a different term, רֹעֵס, part. of גָּרָה, to run. This passage affords the first mention of the existence of a body of swift runners in attendance on the king, though such a thing had been previously alluded to by Sackbel (1 Sam. viii, 11). This body appears to have been afterwards kept up, and to have been distinct from the body-guard—the six hun-
dred and the thirty—who were originated by David (see 1 Kings xiv, 27, 28; 2 Chron. xiii, 10, 11; 2 Kings x, 4, 6, 11, 12, 19). In each of these cases the word is rendered “guard” but the translators were evi-
dently aware of its signification, for they have put the word “runners” in the margin in two instances (1 Kings xiv, 27; 2 Kings xi, 18). This, indeed, was the force of the term “footman” at the time the A.V. was made, and was never quoted, but, among others, from the title of a well-
known tract of Bunyan’s, The heavenly Footman, or A Description of the Man that goes to Heaven, on 1 Cor. ix, 24 (the apostle Paul’s figure of the race). The same Heb. word is also used as a where to denote not the ordi-
nary or priestly guard (2 Sam. xv, 1; 1 Kings i, 5; 2 Kings x, 25). Whether they were the same as the Pedileths is doubtful. The word likewise occurs (Job ix, 22) of any swift messenger, hence a weaver’s shuttle (Job v, 7), and also of the couriers of the Persian king (Ezra iii, 15; viii, 14). Swift running was evidently a valued accomplishment of a perfect war-
rior—a gáboor, as the Hebrew word is—among the Is-
raelites. There are constant allusions to this in the Bible, though obscured in the A.V. from the transla-

FOOTSTEPS 615  FOOT-WASHING

tors not recognising the technical sense of the word *gibbor*. Among others, see Psa. xix, 5; Job xvi, 14; Joel ii, 7, where "strong man," "giant," and "mighty man" are all *gibbor*. David was famed for his *palmis", but these are more mythological. The most characteristic of him (I Sam. xiv, 22, 48, 51; xxv, 6), and he makes them a special subject of thanksgiving to God (2 Sam. xxi, 80; Psa. xxi, 29). The cases of Cush and Ahimaaz (2 Sam. xvi) will occur to every one. It is not impossible that the former—"the Ethiopian," as his name most likely is—had some peculiar custom of running. See CUSH. Ashbel also was "swift on his feet," and the Gadite heroes who came across to David in his difficulties were "swift as the roes upon the mountains;" but in neither of these last cases is the word *ruts* employed. The word probably derives its modern sense from the custom of domestic servants running by the side of the carriage of their master. See GUARD.

Footsteps (generally לְפָעָמָה, *pa' am`, a tread; but spec. לְפָעָמִים, *aweb*; Psa. i, 6; lxvii, 19; lixxix, 51; Cant. i, 8, the *aweb*, as elsewhere rendered). On the meaning of this term in Psa. xvi, 5, 11, Mr. Roberts says, among the Hindus, "a man who has the people watching him, to find out a cause for accusation against him or to trap him, or go great men, says. Yes, they are around my legs and my feet; their eyes are always open; they are ever watching my *swaada*, steps; that is, they are looking for the *impress or footsteps in the earth." For this purpose, the eyes of the enemies of David were "bowing down to the earth."

Footstool (spec. לְפָדִים, *be'ash", something trodden upon; Sept. βροικόν, r. βροίκων, Vulg. oedaculam, 2 Chron. ix, 16). Where sitting is referred to in Scripture, it is frequently spoken of as a posture of more than ordinary state, and means sitting on a throne, for which a footstool was necessary, both in order that the person might ascend to it, and for supporting the legs when he was placed in it (2 Chron. ix, 16). The divine glory which resided symbolically in the holy place, between the cherubim above the ark of the covenant, is supposed to use the ark as a footstool (1 Chron. xxviii, 2; Psa. cxl, 5; cxxxii, 7). So the earth is called God's footstool by the same expressive figure which represents heaven as his throne (Psa. cxl, 1; Matt. xxv. 31). We find, on the paintings in the tombs of Egypt, as well as on the Assyrian monuments, frequent representations of their kings sitting on a throne or chair of state, with a footstool. See THRONE. The common manner of sitting in the East is upon a mat or carpet spread upon the ground, with the legs crossed. Many of the Turks, however, through European intercourse, attempt to sit upon chairs. See DIVAN.

Foot-washing. The custom of washing the feet held, in ancient times, a place among the duties of hospitality, being regarded as a mark of respect to the guest, and a token of humble and affectionate attention on the part of the entertainers. It had its origin in the most ancient Eastern. In general, in warm Oriental climates, cleanliness is of the highest consequence, particularly as a safeguard against the leprosy. The East knows nothing of the factitious distinctions which prevail among us between sanitary regulations and religious duties; but the one, as much as the other, are considered a part of that great system of obligations under which man lies towards God. What, therefore, the health demands, religion is at hand to sanction. Cleanliness is, in consequence, not next to godliness, but a part of godliness of training; this Oriental view may be seen in the origin and reason of much of what the Mosaic law lays down touching clean and unclean, so the practice of foot-washing in particular, which considerations of purity and personal propriety recommended, hospitality adopted and religion sanctioned. In temperate climates bathing is far too much neglected; but in the East the heat of the atmosphere and the dryness of the soil would render the ablation of the body peculiarly grateful than salutary to the weary traveller. The foot, too, was less protected than with us. In the earliest ages it probably had no covering, and the sandal worn in later times was little else than the sole of our shoe bound under the foot. Even this defence, however, was usually only of cloth, and, therefore, the foot was usually bare, in which the inmates were either barefoot or wore nothing but slippers. See SHOE.

The washing of the feet is among the most ancient, as well as the most obligatory of the rites of Eastern hospitality. From Gen. xviii, 4; xiv, 2, it appears to have existed as early as the days of the patriarch Abraham. In Gen. xvii, 42, also, "Abraham's servant" is provided with water to wash his feet, and the men's feet that were with him. The same custom is mentioned in Judg. xix, 21. From 1 Sam. xxvii, 41, it needful, how much less it was sometimes performed by servants and sons, as their appropriate duty, regarded as of an humble character. Hence, in addition to its being a token of affectionate regard, it was a sign of humility. Vessels of no great value appear to have been ordinarily kept and appropriated to the purpose. These vessels of water were in nothing in estimation so lowly, if not mean office for which they were employed. Hence, probably, the explanation of Psa. ix, 8, "Moab is my wash-pot." Slaves, moreover, were commonly employed in washing the feet of guests. The passage, then, in effect, declares the Moabites to be the meanest of God's instruments. See WASH-BASIN.

The most remarkable instance of this custom is found in the 18th chapter of John's Gospel, where our Saviour is represented as washing the feet of his disciples, with whom he had taken supper. Minute particulars in the sacred narrative are to be carefully studied, as presenting a true Oriental picture. From ver. 12 sq., it is clear that the act was of a symbolical nature, designed to teach, à fortiari, brotherly humility and good-will. If the master had performed for his scholars an act at once so lowly yet so noble, the disciples were the disciples of love and service bound to consider any Christian service whatever as a duty which each was to perform for the other. The principle involved in the particular act is, that love dignifies any service; that all high and proud thoughts are no less unchristian than selfish; and that the sole ground of the success of the Church is meekness, gentleness, and self-forgetting benevolence. It was specially customary in the days of our Lord to wash before eating (Matt. xv, 2; Luke xi, 88). This was also the practice with the ancient Greeks, as may be seen in Herod. x, 9. From Martial (Epig. iii, 50, 2, "Deposui solseas"), we see it was usual to lay aside the shoes, lest they should roll the linen. The usage is still found among the Orientals (Niebuhr, i, 54; Shaw, p. 202). But Jesus did not pay a scrupulous regard to the practice, and hence drew blame upon himself from the Pharisaes (Luke xvi, 39). In like manner Peter was probably influenced by the superstitious abuses and foolish misinterpretations connected with washing before meat. For the same reason he may purposely have postponed the act of washing his disciples' feet till after supper, lest, while he was teaching a new lesson of humility, he might add a sanction to a part of that great system of obligations under which man lies towards God. What, therefore, the health demands, religion is at hand to sanction. Cleanliness is, in consequence, not next to godliness, but a part of godliness of training; this Oriental view may be seen in the origin and reason of much of what the Mosaic law lays down touching clean and unclean, so the practice of foot-washing in particular, which considerations of purity and personal propriety recommended,
The Church of England at first carried out the letter of the command; but, instead of it, there are now assembled in Whitehall every year as many poor men and women as the sovereign has reigned years; to each of the walls of the Temple they set many pieces of money as the sovereign counts years. The Anabaptists continued the practice of foot-washing, which, in consideration of the passages John xiii, 14; 1 Tim. v, 10, they considered as a sacrament instituted and recommended by Christ (see the Confessio Anglicana, or ceremonies, of 1609). The La terans Upper Constable of Dresden condemned in 1718 twelve Lutheran citizens of Weida to public penance for having permitted duke Moritz Wilhelm to wash their feet. As the Moravians revived the old love-feasts, the practice revived there; but somewhat strictly enforcing it. It was used to be performed not only by the leaders towards their followers, but also by the latter among themselves, while they sang a hymn explanatory of the symbol, in which it was called "the lesser baptism." The Mercenaires (q. v.) and the River Brethren (q. v.) still practice foot-washing. The Church of God (q. v.) regards foot-washing as a positive ordinance of perpetual standing in the Church, the same as baptism and the Lord's Supper.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 680.

Forbes, Rt. Hon. Duncan, one of the most eminent lawyers of Scotland, was born at Drumchapel in 1740. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and afterwards spent some time at the universities in Leyden, Utrecht, and Paris. In 1717 he became solicitor-general, and in 1742 lord-president of the court of session. In the Rebellion of 1745 he espoused the Hanoverian cause, and it is said that the ingratitude of the government so charmed him that he fell a victim to fever produced by it. President Forbes cultivated the study of Hebrew and Biblical criticism. He was a follower of the English philosopher and theological writer John Hayton. In his work, Thoughts on Religion, natural and revealed (Edinb. 1785-86, 8vo), translated into French by father Houbigant, he lays down the doctrine that a system of natural science as well as religion could be drawn from the books of the O. T. if interpreted according to the radical import or root of the language. Forbes published also Reflections on the Sources of Incredulity with regard to Religion (Edinb. 1750, 2 vols. 12mo, or 1 vol. 12mo)—Letters to a Bishop concerning some Important Discoveries in Philosophy and Theology (Lond. 1755, 4to; also translated into French by father Houbigant). The entire works of Forbes, with a biographical sketch of the author prefixed by J. Bandel (Edinb. 1816, 8vo; 2 vols. 12mo). Bishop Warburton calls him the greatest man that ever Scotland produced, both as a judge, a patriot, and a Christian.—Encyclop. Brit. ix, 771; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 611. (J. H. W.)

Forbes, Eli, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Westborough, Mass., Oct. 1726; graduated at Harvard College, 1741; and in 1758 became pastor of the church at Brookfield, Mass. In 1762 he went on a mission among the Oneida Indians. In 1776 he was installed as pastor at Gloucester, having left his former parish on account of a false charge of Toryism. He died Dec. 15, 1804. He published The Family Book (1801, 12mo), and a number of occasional sermons.

Sprague, Annals, i, 498.

Forbes, John (of Corse), son of Patrick Forbes, was born May 2, 1593. After studying at Heidelberg and Sedan, he was appointed professor of divinity in King's College, Aberdeen, in 1619. In the great struggle in Scotland between Presbyterianism and papacy, in 1627 he favored the latter, by moving at a general council to be a peaceable to publish Innumerous Amatorius Veritatis & Pacis in Ecclesia Scotiae (Aberdeen, 1629). In 1638 he published A Peaceable Warning to the Subjects of Scotland. Refusing to sign the Solemn League and Covenant, he was
deprived of his benefice in 1640. His case was one of peculiar hardship, for he had made over part of his own private property to be attached to the professorship which he held, and he lost this property on being deprived of it. In 1642 he went to Holland, married there, and remained three years. Returning to Scotland, he spent the remainder of his life on his estate at Corse, and died April 20, 1648. His reputation chiefly rests upon his great work Instructioe Historiae et Theologiae de doctrina Christiana et seu revelatione divina, ordinata et contraerata (Amst. 1645, fol.; Geneva, 1660, fol.; abridged by Arnold Montanus (Amst. 1663, 8vo). His collected works were published under the title Joannis Forbessii ad Corse Opera Omnia, inter quam plurima posthuuma, with Vita by Dr. Garden (Amst. 1702, 2 vols. fol.). His Instructioe is still a valuable work; its design was to show, in opposition to Bellarmin, the doctrinal agreement between the Reformers and the earlier fathers, and it formed a precursor of the modern works on the History of Doctrines. Bishop Burnet (Preface to Life of Beddoe) says that Forbes of Corse was a man "of much more extensive learning than his father (Patrick Forbes), in which, perhaps, he was excelled by none of that age. Those who shall read his book of Historical and Theological Institutions will not dispute this title with him; for it is so excellent a work, that, if he had been better known, his retirement had been chosen, and he had applied himself to his studies, and could have finished it by a second volume, it might, perhaps, have been the most valuable treatise of divinity that has yet appeared in the world." Baur names Forbes and Petavius as the two great writers of the 17th century on History of Doctrines. — Encyc. Britonicum, ix. 778; Nicot, Memoires pour servir, etc., t. xiiii; Donaldson, History of Christian Literature, i. 66.

Forbes, Patrick, bishop of Aberdeen, was born of a noble family in Aberdeenshire in 1654, and became "laird of Corse" and baron of O'Neill. He was educated at Aberdeen and St. Andrew's. "For a good space," says bishop Keith, "he refused to enter into holy orders; but at last, when he was forty-eight years old, viz. anno 1612, he was prevailed upon—a very singular accident having intervened, which made him then yield, namely, the earnest obtestation of a religious minister in the neighborhood, who, in a fit of melancholy, had stabbed himself, but survived to lament his error." He became pastor of Keith, in Morayshire, where he remained until 1618, when he was elected bishop of Aberdeen, on the recommendation of the king. He died March 28, 1635. "He was wont to visit his diocese in a very singular and sedate manner, scorning any personation until he came to the church on the Lord's day; and according as he perceived the respective ministers to behave themselves, he gave his instructions to them." He wrote Commentarium in Apocalypse, cum Appendice (Amst. 1646, 4to); translated, An exquisite Commentary on the Revelation (Lon. 1613, 4to), a treatise entitled Escripciones de Verbo Dei; and a Dissertatio de Verbis impropriis. He was a great benefactor to Aberdeen University, of which he was chancellor, and he revived the professorships of law, physic, and divinity.—Keith, Historical Cosmography, vol. ii, 32; (Edinb. Diocese, 1812); Burnet, History of our own Times, Hook, Eccl. Bisc. v. 157.

Forbes, William, bishop of Edinburgh, was born at Aberdeen, 1635, and was educated at Marischal College. About the age of twenty he went abroad and studied at the German universities, especially Helm- stadt and Heidelberg. He returned after five years, and was offered the chair of Hebrew at Oxford; but he declined it, and entered on the service of Sir James Donaldson, of Monimusk, and afterwards at Aberdeen. About 1617 he was chosen principal of Marischal College in that city, and about 1619 he accepted a pastorate in Edin- burgh. When Charles I was in Scotland in 1638 he heard Forbes preach, and said that he had found a man who deserved to have a see erected for him. His pa- rent from the king, to the first bishop of Edinburgh, bears date the 26th of January, 1634, and he died April 18, 1667. In the same year, he published Modestus et pacificus controversius de justificacione, purgatorio, invocato sanctorum, which was published posthu- mously (Lond. 1638, 8vo; reprinted, with an English version, in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Ox- ford, 1656-60, 2 vols, 8vo). This work is a storehouse of learning on the subject of purgatory, without maintaining the Protestant doctrine of justification. It embodied a proposal for an accommodation between the Protestant Episcopal churches and the Church of Rome, the only result of which would have been to make episcopacy regarded with more suspicion in Scotland than it was. Some other polemical works of his which had raised high expectations were lost. Burnet, characterizing his eloquence, says that "he preached with a zeal and vehemence that made him forget all the means of time—two or three hours was no extraordinary thing for him" (English Cyclopaedia).—Hook, Eccles. Bisc. v. 156; Encyclopaedia Britannica, ix. 777.

Forcellini, Egidio, an Italian lexicographer, was born Aug. 26, 1668, at Fener, a village near Pa- dus. As his family was poor, it was only towards manhood that he was able to begin the regular course of studying Latin. Success in studying Latin gained the confidence of Facciolati (q. v.), who associated him with his labors, especially in preparing the Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, coniuncto et cura Jnc. Facciolati, opera et studi a badge Forcellini Lucarvatum (Padua, 1713). The excellence of this work, and the large amount of material attributed to Forcellini. He died April 4, 1768. See FACCIOLATI.

Forces (spec. בָּנָיו, cha'yi, strength, especially in a military point of view; hence, also, arma, fortifica- tion, etc.), in one phrase, "forces of the Gentiles" (Isa. ix. 5, 11), seems to be used in its widest sense (see Al- exander, ad loc.) to denote (as the context implies) not only the subjugation of the heathen, but also the con- secration of their wealth (Gen. xxxiv, 29, where the same Heb. word occurs). The בָּנָיו, מְפֹרֶקְנֵים, or god of strongholds, of Dan. xi, 38, is probably Mars, or rather Jupiter (Olympius or Capitoline), whom An- tocius (q. v.) specially honored. See DANIEL.

Ford (יוֹרָן, mabzar, and יְוֹרָן, mabarakh, a pane), a shallow place in a stream where it may easily be crossed by fording (Gen. 31, 26); by wading (Gen. 32, ii, 2; Judg. iii, 28; xii, 5, 6; Is. xvi, 2). See RV- ZR. The Heb. word is also used both in the singular and in the plural with reference to the mountain pass at Michmash, between Sheen and Bozez (1 Sam. xiv, 4, and Is. x, 29). Mention is repeatedly made of the fords of Jordan (Josh. ii, 7; Judg. iii, 28; xii, 5, 6; 1 A. V. "passages"). These were evidently in ancient times few in number, and well known, though now the Jordan is fordable in hundreds of places (Smith's Dict. of Classical Geog. s. v. Palestine, p. 321). See JORDAN. Of these, that named Bethabara (q. v.) was probably the most noted. Mention is also made of the ford of the Jabbok (Gen. xxxii, 22), and the fords of Arnon (Is. xvi, 2). See ARNON. The fords of the Euphrates (Jer. ii, 32) were probably the bridges across that river built by Nechoe, as the Euphrates was not fordable at Babylon (Hitzig, Erexet. Heb. ad loc.). See EUPHRATES.

Ford, Joshua Edwards, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ogdenborough Aug. 8, 1825, graduated at Williams College in 1844, and studied theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York. In 1847 he became a pastor in the charge at Montauk, N. Y., and was a member of the American Board. His first station was Aleppo. He was afterwards transferred to Beirut, and subsequently to Sidon. Invited by the Turkish Mi- rions Aid Society, he spent some months in England III. — 209.
in 1861, advocating the claims of the Syrian Mission. In 1865 he returned to America on account of illness in his family, and labored earnestly in behalf of his mission; but his exertions enfeebled him, and he died of pneumonia at Genesee, N. Y., April 8, 1866. While in the East he obtained a thorough knowledge of Arabic, and could use it in preaching. He rendered useful service in editing Arabic books for the press, and wrote a book in that language on "Fasting and Prayer." He also used the Turkish language. — Wilson, Prebendary of Historical Almainac, 1867, p. 289.

Fordyce, David, brother of James, was born in 1711 at Aberdeen. In 1742 he was appointed professor of moral philosophy in Marischal College. He perished by shipwreck in 1751. He wrote Dialogues concerning Education: — Theodosia, a Dialogue on the Art of Preaching (London: 1755, 8d ed. 12mo) — Elements of Moral Philosophy (London: 1769, 4th ed. 12mo).

Fordyce, James, D.D., a Scotch divine, was born in 1720 at Aberdeen, was educated at Marischal College, and was successively minister at Brechin and Alloa, in Scotland, and at Monkwell Street, London. In 1782 he relinquished the pastoral office, and retired first to Hampshire and afterwards to Bath, where he died, Oct. 1, 1796. He wrote Sermons to Young Women (London, 3rd ed. 1778, 2 vols. 12mo) — Addresses to Young Men (London, 1777, 2 vols. 12mo) — Addresses to the Deity (London, 1785, sm. 8vo); and several single sermons, which were very popular. — Jones, Christian Biography, s. v.

Forehead ( phírì, ms. teach, from an obsolete root signifying to shine, Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 815; sirwisaw). The practice of veiling the face in public for women of the higher classes, especially married women, in the East, sufficiently stigmatizes with reproach the unveiled face of women of bad character (Gen. xxv, 65; Jer. iii, 8; Niebuhr, Trav. i, 182, 149, 160; Shaw, Travels, p. 228, 249; Haim, Von Transjordanien, p. 168; Buckingham, Arab Tribes, p. 312; Lane, Mod. Eq. i, 72, 229, 248; Burchard, Travels, i, 285). An especial force is thus given to the term "hard of forehead" as descriptive of audacity in general (Ezek. iii, 7, 8, 9; compare Juvelan, Sat. xiv, 242 — Ejectum atritis de fronte ruborem). See VILL.

The custom among many Oriental nations both of coloring the face and forehead, and of impressing on the body marks indicative of devotion to some special deity or religious sect is mentioned by various writers (Burchard, Notes on Bed. i, 51; Niebuhr, Trav. ii, 57; Wilkinson, Anc. Eq. ii, 812; Lane, Modern Eq. i, 66). Sometimes it extends to serious infections. See CUTTING IN THE FLESH. It is doubtless alluded to in Rev. (xiii, 16, 17; xiv, 9; xvii, 5, 10, xx, 4), and in the opposite direction by Ezekiel (ix, 4, 5, 6), and in Rev. (vii, 1; ix, 4; xiv, 1; xxii, 4). The mark mentioned by Ezekiel seems to have been supposed to be the figure of the cross, said to be denoted by the word here used, ὁ, in the ancient Semitic language (Gesenius, Thes. p. 1485; Spencer, De Leg. Heb. ii, 20; iii, 409, 410). See MARK (ON THE PERSON).

It may have been by way of contradiction to heathen practice that the high-priest wore on the front of his mitre the golden plate inscribed "Holiness to the Lord" (Exod. xxviii, 36; xxxix, 30; Spencer, l. c.). See MITRE.

The "jewels for the forehead" mentioned by Ezekiel (xvi, 12), and in the margin of the A. V., Gen. xxii, 22, were in all probability nose-rings (Isa. iii, 21; Lane, Mod. Eq. iii, 223, 226; Hazmer, Observ. iv, 511, 312; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 870). The Persian and also Egyptian women wear jewels and strings of coins across their foreheads (Olearium, Travels, p. 517; Lane, Mod. Eq. ii, 228). — Smith, s. v. See NOSEJEWEL.

For the use of frontlets between the eyes, see FRONTLET, and for the symptoms of leprosy apparent in the forehead, LEPROSY. For baldness in the forehead, see BALD.

Foreigner (φαρένες, nobri, Deut. xv, 8; Obadiah 11, a stranger, as elsewhere rendered; ἱπποτα, Exod. xii, 45, a sojourner, as usually rendered; ἄλλος, lit. a neighbor, Eph. ii, 19, elsewhere rendered stranger or sojourner) in the country not native to him, i. e. in the Jewish sense a Gentile. See ALIEN. Such non-Israelites (ἀλλός, ἄλλος ἄλλοις ἀλλογεῖς, Am. iii, 12, 5) as resided among the Hebrews were by the Mosaic law not only commended in general to the sympathy and humanity of the citizens (Exod. xxii, 21; xxiii, 9; Lev. xix, 9, 34; Deut. x, 19 sq.; comp. Jer. vi, 5; Ezek. xx, 3; Mal. iii, 6; Apionic, i, 28), but were also entitled to certain privileges belonging to the poor, namely, to participation in the festivals and decennial feasts (Deut. xiv, 28 sq.; xvi, 10 sq.; xxvi, 11 sq.; Tobit i, 7), to gleanings in the vineyards and fields (Lev. xix, 10; xxii, 19; Deut. xxiv, 19 sq.), and to the harvest in the year of jubilee (Lev. xxv, 6); prescriptions which found a definite point of support in Oriental hospitality. Before the courts they had equal rights with the native-born residents (Exod. xii, 49; Lev. xxiv, 22; Numb. xv, 15 sq.; Deut. xxviii, 16; xxix, 17; xxxi, 19 sq.; Deut. xxii, 21; xxxi, 14), and the cities of refuge were appointed for them likewise in case of unintentional homicide (Numb. xxxv, 15). On the other hand, they also were not allowed to perform anything which was an abomination according to the Hebrew law (Exod. xx, 10; Lev. xxvii, 10; xxviii, 25; xxv, 2; xxv, 16; Deut. v, 14; Ezek. xiv, 7); yet they were exempted from the prohibitions of using the flesh of animals that died of themselves (Deut. xiv, 21; but there are also other distinctions between this passage and Lev. xvii, 15. See CARCASS). Foreign slaves must be circumcised, but were then entitled to pass the passover (Gen. xvii, 12; Exod. xii, 44). It was lawful to take interest from foreigners for loaned capital (Deut. xxiii, 20). See DEBT. Under certain restrictions, when they submitted to circumcision, they became naturalized, and received the prerogatives of Jewish citizenship; Edomites and Egyptians in the third generation (Deut. xxiii, 7 sq.; comp. Theodoret, Quest. in Deut. 26), others after a longer time. Only Ammonites, Moabites, castrated persons, and the offspring of public harlots were altogether excluded from this privilege (Deut. xxiii, 1 sq.; comp. Neh. xiii, 1). Foreigners accordingly appear in the royal service in the third generation (Deut. xxiii, 7 sq.; Sam. xxii, 7; xxii, 9; 2 Sam. xi, 3, 6, etc.). See GITTITE. Later fanaticism, however, sought to expel all foreigners from the country (Neh. xiii, 3; on the contrary, Ezek. xiv, 22), or impose the hard condition
of circumcision (Josephus, *Life*, 22). See generally Michaelis, *Mos. Rachi*, ii, 448 sq.; Jahn, i, ii, 546 sq. The legal treatment of foreigners was in the earlier ages more humane, as originally at Rome (Adam, *Rom. Ant.* ii, 140) and at Athens. See *Prescr.*.

Foreiro, Francisco (Forrius Franciscus), a Portuguese jurist born at Lisbon in 1628, and entering early into the Dominican order, was sent by John III to study theology in the University of Paris. On his return to Lisbon he was charged with the education of the young prince Antonio, and was appointed preacher to the king. Among the Portuguese at the Council of Trent he held the first place. He offered to preach before the council in any language. The council sent him on a mission to Pius IV, who made Foreiro confessor to his nephew, cardinal Charles Borromeo. He was employed to reform the Breviary and the Roman Missal, and to aid in the preparation of the "Contract" and the "Canon of the Council." On his return to Portugal he was chosen prior of the Dominican convent at Lisbon in 1668. He died January 10, 1687. His principal work is *Inusia Propheti* nec non etiam de Hierico Vernio, cum Commentario, etc. (Venezia, 1663, fol.), inserted in the fifth volume of the *Critici Sacri*.—Echard et Quétif, *Script. Ord. Pred.* ii, 261; *Hook, Eccles. Biogr.* v, 161; Hoefert, *Nov. Biogr.* Generale, xviii, 170.

Foreknowledge. See *Prescience*.

Fore-Ordination. See *Predestination*.

Forester, Leonard, a Jew, born in Switzerland, 1680, was professor of philosophy in many colleges of his order; then chancellor of the University of Dillingen, and finally rector of the Jews' College at Lucerne. He died in 1689, leaving 44 works, a list of which may be found in Sotwell, *Bibliographia de la Societé de Jesus*. Among them is *Symbolum Catholicum. Lutheronam, Calculium cum Apostolico collatum* (Dillingen, 1682, 4to).—Migne, *Dict. de Biogr. Chrétiennes*, s.v.

Forerunner (φορεός, the *prou*, *Acts* xxvii, 80, 41), the bow or stem of a vessel. See *Ship*.

Foreskin (προσκεπτή, av, a native term for this special rite; Greek *exopothoria*, both used in their literal and metaphorical meaning), the prepuce or projecting fold of skin in the distinctive member of the male sex, which was removed in circumcision, so as to leave the *glans penis* artificially uncovered. This well-known symbolical rite was instituted by Jehovah for the consecration of all the male Israelites—originally descendants of Abraham (and in that case on the eighth day after birth, Gen. xxvi, 4; Lev. xvii, 8; Luke i, 59; ii, 21; see *Philos*, i, 5; *Josephus*, *Ant.* i, 12, 2; yet compare *Exod*. iv, 25, with ii, 12, and the Mishna, *Shabb.* xix, 5, where in certain cases the ceremony is deferred till the ninth or twelfth day: the Sabbath, however, did not cause a postponement. John vii, 23; compare *Watstein*, i, 887; but delicate children might be circumcised after weaning, Mishna, *L. c.*, and in later times "Prophylates of Richtigness" (*Exod.* xii, 48; comp. *Judith* xiv, 10; see *Tacit. Hist.* v, 5, 8), as a ratification of their title to the theocratic citizenship. When the circumcisions of all Egypt and Crete stood in connection with Phalus worship [Tuch, *Gen*. p. 844] is not determined, but its use among the Israelites is rather against such a supposition. Baur [*Tob.* Zeitschr.* 1882* i, 104 sq.] refers it to the idea of separation from heathendom, which is consistent with the entire system of Mosaicism (comp. the Mishna, *Nedarim*, iii, 11).) House-born (heathen) slaves were also under the operation (Gen. xvii, 12), as a sign of particular consecration. But children born of a heathen mother and an Israelitish father must not be circumcised, according to *Yekhem*, i, 2; yet *comp. Acts* xvi, 3.) Every Israelite (*Josephus*, *Ant.* xii, 5, 4), generally the father of the house (*Gen.* xvii, 20; but, in cases of exigency, also women; see *Buxtorf*, *Synonymia*, p. 152). Buxtorf quotes a comp. *Exod.* ii, 21, 24, and the Mishna, *Nedarim*, however; yet see *Aboda Zara*, ed. Edward, ii, 40 sq. In adults a physician was required, *Josephus*, *Ant.* xx, 2, 5. In case two sons by the same mother died of the operation, the [later] rabbins allowed the circumcision of the third son to be delayed till he was full grown; *Maimonis, Hc. Melah*, i, 19, should perform the rite, and they employed for the purpose a sharp knife (Queen, *De cultus circumcissi et secer- ptas Hebr.* Regiom. 1714; also in Ugozini *Theaurus*, xxii), earlier an edged stone or stone knife (*Exod.* iv, 22; *Josephus*, *Jewish Wars*, *Ant.* 3, 32, 1); see also in the *Mishna*, *Aviad*, i, 69; *Abicht, De cultus circumcissi et seceptiis L. c.*, p. 1712; also in Hassei *Theaur., i, 497 sq.*; and *Gedal D. de instrumentis circums. I. 1696*; also in the *Nov. theau-, rius phil.* i, 283 sq.; and in Ugozini, xxii, as the Galli or priests of Cybele castrated themselves with a shell (*Gallus*, *Catacom.*, xxvii, 48; *Pomponius Flaccus*, *Civ. Nat.* i, 14; *Iulius, iii, 8; *see Arnoldus, adv. Gent.* v, 16., under the idea that healing was thereby promoted. The Christians of Abyssinia also performed the operation with stone knives (Lodol, *Hist. Aeth.Independentii*, i, 21). Modern Jews use for this purpose steel knives, and the operation is thus described by Oeho (*Lit. Rab.,* p. 160): "The circumciser applies a rod to the organ, and draws the prepuce forward over it as far as possible; then with a forceps he seizes a part of it, and cuts it off with a razor. He next seizes the prepuce with his two thumbs, and rolls it back till the whole glans is exposed, after which he sucks out the blood (Mishna, *Shabb.* xix, 2) till the blood comes from the remotor parts of the body, and finally he applies a plaster to the wound." (Comp. *Thevenot*, *Trav.* i, 58; *Chellus, Homol. d. Chvryhyg.* ii, 5, 60; *Wolters, in Henke, Zeitschr.* xxvi, 48; *Buxtorf*, *Synonymia* i, 200, sq.; also in the *Kuza*, *Wörterb.* d. medic. Wissenesch., v, 256 sq.) On Arab circumcision, see Arvieux, iii, 146. That so severe and painful an operation (comp. *Targ. Jonath.*, on *Gen.* xxvii, 1) could not well be performed on an infant less than eight days old is evident. There are no references to male circumcision, or excision, referred to by several ancient and modern writers, as practiced by certain nations, may have consisted in removing the anterior flap of skin which in some actual specimens of Hotten- tots or Bushwomen has been found to cover the female genitalia, apparently wholly distinct from the vaginal membrane (see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. *Circumcision*). As circumcision was a symbol of purification, the prepuce was a type of corruption; hence the phrase "foreskin of the heart" (*Deut.* x, 16; *Jer.* i, 10), to designate a carnal or heathenish state (*Rom.* ii, 29; *comp. Buxtorf, *Synonymia*, ii, 5, 8). Let us then see how much of this part removed by circumcision thus naturally became one of the hardest terms of opprobrium (*1 Sam.* xvii, 26, 86; *comp. Lodol, *Comment. in Hist. Eit.* p. 274), like verus among the Romans (*Martial*, vii, 62, 6). It was sometimes brought as a present of allies (*1 Sam.* xvii, 25; *2 Sam.* iii, 14), like scalps by the North American savages. Paul, on the other hand, uses the ironical term "concision" (*Phil.* iii, 2) to stigmatize the extreme attachment of a Judaizing party to this ordinance. See *Circumcision*.

FORESKINS, Hill of, a place near Gilgal, so called from the circumcision of the Israelites at that spot before entering Canaan (*Josh*. vii, 8). See *Gibeath-Haraboth*.
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is the rendering in the Auth. V. of three distinct Heb. words. See Topographical Terms.

1. Usually and most properly הָרָה, yar,' or מִנְצָר, pas ra(h) (once rendered 'wood,' Dent. xiv. 5), signifies a clump of trees or shrubs, as in Eccles. ii. 38; Isa. xiv. 14, where the wild beasts had their homes (Jer. v. 6; Mic. v. 8). Hosea (i, 12) appears to use it as equivalent to the Arabic yar'ar, a "rugged and desolate place, like midbar or 'wilderness.'" See Wood.

2. צֵרָה, cho rekh, is apparendly derived from a Chaldee root, צֵרָה, to be entangled, and would therefore signify a thicker of trees or bushes, such as might afford a safe hiding-place (comp. 1 Sam. xxvii. 15, and Cant. v. 1, in which it refers to honey) to an abundance of trees. It is the name given to all the great primeval forests of Syria, where the stately trees grew (Eccles. ii. 38; Isa. xxvii. 14, 16, 18; Jer. v. 6), and the wild beasts had their homes (Jer. v. 6; Mic. v. 8). Hosea (i, 12) appears to use it as equivalent to the Arabic yar'ar, a "rugged and desolate place, like midbar or 'wilderness.'" See Wood.

3. "The wood," a word of foreign origin, like the Greek πάραδεσσα and the Arabic پارداس, q. d. park, means an enclosed garden or plantation attached to a palace, intended either for ornament or for containing animals of the chase (Eccles. ii. 5; Cant. iv. 13; comp. Xenophon, Cyrop. i. 8, 12). It is found only three times in the Bible, and is once translated "forest." In Neb. ii. 8, Asaph is called the "keeper of the king's forest" (Sept. rov παράδεσσον), where it appropriately expresses the care with which the forests of Palestine were preserved under the Persian rule, a regular warden being appointed, without whose sanction no tree could be felled. Elsewhere the word describes an orchard (Eccles. i. 18). See Wood.

Although Palestine has never, in historical times, been a woodland country, yet there can be no doubt that it contained much more wood formerly than it has at present. Tracts of woodland are mentioned by travellers in Palestine, but rarely what we should call a forest. There are still some remnants of ancient oak forests on the mountains of Bashan, Gilead, Hermon, and Galilee. One solitary grove of cedars exists on Lebanon, but fir-trees are there abundant. The other forests of Palestine (2 Kings ii. 23; 1 Sam. xiv. 25; vii. 2, etc.) have almost disappeared. Yet here and there in every district of the country, to the south, east and west, one meets with a solitary oak or terebinth of huge dimensions, as at Hermon, and the valley of Elah, and Shiloh, and Dan. These are the last trees of the forests, and serve to indicate what the forests of Palestine once were. Hence it is probable that the highlands of the country, which were long prior to the forest, of which the celebrated cedars and terebinths (e. g. those of Abraham, Tabor, etc.) scattered here and there were the relics. The woods and forests mentioned in the Bible appear to have been situated where they are usually found in cultivated countries, in the valleys and defiles that lead down from the high to the low lands, and in the adjacent plains. They were therefore of no great size, and correspond rather with the idea of the word than with that of the word. The following are those that occur in Scripture. See Tree.

(1.) The most extensive was the forest (yarar, "wood") of Ephraim, implying a region of Ephraim covered with forests where Mount Jerarm (Hill of For-ests) was situated (Josh. xvii. 10); or in allusion to the name of the forest that Jehovah gave to Ephraim (1 Sam. vii. 1, 2). It clothed the slopes of the hills that bordered the plain of Jezreel, and the plain itself in the neighborhood of Bethshan (Josh. xvii. 15 sq.), extending, perhaps, at one time to Tabor, which is translated ἐρυμές by Theodotion (Acts ii. 1), and which is still well covered with forest trees (Blenley, 380). It is perhaps the same with the wood of Ephratah (Psa. xxxiii. 6). See Ephratah.

(2.) There was a trans-Jordanic forest (yarar, "wood") of Ephraim (2 Sam. xviii. 6; Sept. ἔρυμος). It was here that the army of Absalom was defeated, and he himself slain. It lay near, probably a little to the west of the town of Mahanaim, where David had his headquarters, and where he received the first tidings of the fate of his son (xiv. 26; xviii. 24). Why a forest east of the Jordan should bear the name Ephraim cannot now be explained; but one thing is certain, that in the noble oaks which still clothe the hills of Gilead north of the Jabok we see the remnants of the "wood of Ephraim," and the representative of that "great oak" in one of whose branches Absalom was strangely imprisoned (xviii. 9; see Forte's Handbook for Syria and Mesopotamia, p. 511, 814). Winch was it on the west side of the Jordan; but a comparison of 2 Sam. xviii. 26; xviii. 8, 23, proves the reverse. The statement in xviii. 23, in particular, marks its position as on the highlands, at some little distance from the valley of the Jordan (compare v. 21), in one of the valleys leading down to the plain of Philistia. See Saul.

(3.) The forest (yarar, Sept. παλάτσιο, A.V. "forest") of Harod, in the mountains of Judah, to which David withdrew to avoid the fury of Saul (1 Sam. xxiii. 5), was somewhere on the border of the Philistine plain, in the southern part of Judah. See Beth-shan.

(4.) The wood (chorash, Sept. ἐρυμές, A.V. "wood") in the wilderness of Ziph, in which David concealed himself (1 Sam. xxi. 15 sq.), lay south-east of Horon. See Ziph.

(5.) The forest (yarar, Sept. ἐρυμές, A.V. "wood") of Bethel (2 Kings ii. 23, 24) was situated in the ravine which descends to the plain of Jericho. See Bethel.

(6.) The forest (yarar, ἐρυμές, "wood") through which the Israelites passed in their pursuit of the Philistines (1 Sam. xiv. 25) was probably near Alajan (compare v. 21), in one of the valleys leading down to the plain of Philistia. See Saul.

(7.) The woods (chorash, ἐρυμές, "forest") in which Jotham placed his fcrts (2 Chron. xxvii. 4) must have been similarly situated. See Jotham.

(8.) The plain of Sharon was partly covered with wood (Strah. xvi. 756), whence the Sept. gives ἐρυμές as an equivalent for that name in Isa. lxv. 10. It has still a fair amount of wood (Stanley, p. 260). See Sharon.

(9.) The excellency or pride of the Jordan, so called from its green and shady banks, clothed with willows, tamarisks, and cane, in which lions made their covert (Zech. xi. 8; Jer. xii. 5). See Jordan.

(10.) The forest (yarar of cedars on Mount Lebanon (2 Kings xix. 23; Hos. iv. 5, 6), which must have been much more extensive formerly than at present; see Tree. On the assumption, on the other hand, that the "forest" is the Pinus cedrus, or so-called "cedar of Lebanon," its growth is by no means confined, among these mountains, to the famous clump of ancient trees which has alone engaged the attention of travellers. See CEDAR. The American missionaries and others, trav-
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alling by unrequited routes, have found woods of
less ancient cedar-trees in other places. See LEBANON.

"The house of the forest (yaar) of Lebanon" is several

times mentioned. It appears to have been a part of

the royal palace built by Solomon at Jerusalem,

and seen by Jeremiah (xxviii. 13; xxv. 17-24; 2

Chron. ix. 16-20). The house had "four rows of
cedar pillars, with cedars above upon the pillars,

and it was covered with cedars above upon the beams." Hence,
in all probability, its name (see Keil, ad loc.).

See SOLOMON.

The forest (yaar, ḫนาม) of Carmel" is a phrase

used in 2 Kings xii, 23, and Isa. xxxvii, 24, in refer-

ence to the ravages committed by the army of Sen-
nacherib on the land of Israel. The meaning of the

clause, הָעֵרֶץ הָאָבָב ("forest of his Carmel"), seems to be
to the garden forest; that is, the garden-like cedar

forests of Lebanon, to which reference is made (see

Keil on Kings, and Alexander on Isaiah, ad loc.).

(11) "The forest (yaar) in Arabia" occurs in Isa.

xxxi, 13. The phrase is remarkable, because Arabia is

a country singularly destitute of trees. In no part of it

are there any traces of forests. (The Sept. trans-

lates the passage into ὀ γραφής ἡ ἡγεσία; and Lowth

and others adopt it; but the Masoretic reading is pref-

erable.) The meaning of the word "yaar" in this place

is probably the same as that of the Arabic yaar, a rug-

ered region, whether wooded or not. See ARABIA.

(12) In Zech. xi, 2 there is a singular expression:

"How, O ye oaks of Bashan, for the forest of the vint-

age is come down." The Hebrew וַתִּבְדַּלְתָּ (Sept.

ὄ δαμαρός ο φιλιπτρον) rather signifies "the fortified

forest" (Vulg. salutis manus), and it is probable that

Jerusalem is thus figuratively alluded to, the houses of

which are close together as the trees of a forest (compare

Micah, iii, 12; see Henderson, On the Minor Prophets,
ad loc.). It may, however, refer to the de-

vastation of that region, for the greater portion of Pe-

rerin was, and still is, covered with forests of oak and
terebinth (Isa. ii, 13; Ezek. xcvii, 6; comp. Bucking-


See BASHAN.

Forest is used symbolically to denote a city, king-
dom, polity, or the like (Ezek. xiv, 26). Devoted

kingship, for example, is often represented as a forest,

which God threatens to burn or cut down (See Isa. x, 17, 18, 19, 34, where the briers and thorns
declare the common people; "the glory of the for-
est" are the nobles and those highest rank and

importance (Ezek. xxvii, 24; Jer. xxvi, 14; 7xvi, 28; Zech. xii, 2). It was also an image of unfruitfulness as contrasted with a cultivated field or vineyard (Isa. xxix, 17;

xxxi, 18; Jer. xxvi, 18; Hosea, ii, 12). See PALEST.

Forks (כלע הָעֵרֶץ, sheloah kilelkes), a tried of

progeny), a three-pronged fork, i.e. pitch-fork with

which hay, straw, and the like are gathered (occurs only 1

Sam. xii, 21). The Targum (on Eccles. xii, 11) uses

the same word to express a pointed instrument. See

AGRICULTURE.

The Orientals do not use forks at meals as we do;

but convey the food to their mouth with the fingers.

See EAT.

Forgiveness, the pardon of any offence committed

against us. We are not apt to entertain any

permanent or incurable ill will against the author of

injuries to others, and why should we be irreconcilable

when injuries have been done to ourselves? To love

our enemies, or rather not to hate our enemies, is

a duty which no gentleman can annul, no injury efface.

We are not required to love our enemies as our friends

but, when any injury has been done us, we are to en-

deavor to regard with it so much reverence as any

just and impartial person would feel on hearing it re-

lated, and no more. To revenge injuries is to retali-

ate evil for the sake of retaliation. We are all weak,

frail, and sinful creatures. None of us passes through

even one day without feeling that he requires forgiveness

from his God, and too often also from his fellow-crea-
tures. Mercy is our first and constant prayer. In such a

state, should we not pity and assist each other? Does mutual weakness call for mutual forbearance? Weak, frail, and sinful as we are, we all hope, through the merits of Christ, to attain the happiness of heaven, and can create a heaven for

ourselves. In a few short years, expect to be forever united in the presence of God, to be liberated from all unrans-

on passions, and to live together forever in heaven, in peace,

and joy, and everlasting love—can such creatures hate each other on earth? can they add to the sorrows of

triad? Let these make us so to pray for forgiveness of

life by acts of malice and revenge? can they risk their own eternal happiness by denying to each other

that forgiveness without which they must not dare to hope that they shall be themselves forgiven? We

know, from the express declaration of our Saviour, that if we forgive not our trespassers, neither will our heavenly Father forgive us. Christ estimated virtues by their solid utility, and not by their fashion or pop-

ularity, and hence he prefers the duty of forgiveness to every other. He enjoins it more frequently, with more earnestness, and under a greater variety of conditions; and he adds this weighty and peculiar circumstance,

that the forgiveness of others is the sole condition on

which we are to expect or even ask from God forgive-

ness for ourselves. This preference is justified by the

superior importance of the virtue itself. The feeds

and animoses which exist in families and among

neighbors, which disturb the intercourse of human life,

and collectively compose half its misery, have their

foundation in the want of a forgiving temper, and can

never cease except by the exercise of this virtue. Let

us endeavor to forgive, that we may not be afraid to

ask forgiveness, that our prayers may not justify and increase our condemnation. Let us remember the

amazing condescension of the Son of God, in 'taking upon him the form of a servant,' and hence learn humility.

Let us represent to our minds the terms of our salva-

tion, in order to be prepared for the reception of the

infinite love of our Redeemer, "who laid down his life for his enemies," and let this be the pattern of our

charity" (Fellowes, Body of Theology, ii, 210-213; Pa-

ley, Moral and Politi. Philosophy, i, 209; Warner, Sys-

tem of Moral Philosophy, i, 60; ii, 100; Robinson, Theo-

logical Dictionary, s. v.; American Presbyterian Review,

Oct., 1867, art. ii."

'Some confound things that are separate and dif-

ferent—the act of forgiving with the act of loving with

approbation. Repentance and confession are indis-

pensable, when one has intentionally injured us in

any way, to restore him to our fellowship and appro-

bation. But what is a necessary condition of this is

not a necessary condition of forgiving. Blending these
two things together, and thinking of them as if they

were one and inseparable, has doubtless caused some

to differ in opinion from others who clearly discern the

proper distinctions. It is a mistaken idea that in

the matter of forgiveness we are strictly to imitate God

the Father, and not forgive those who trespass against

us until they repent and ask our pardon. God is cl

clothed with the righteousness of moral government

over his creatures, while we are not. If he had made it

our duty to revenge our own wrongs, and administer

just punishment to the doers of the wrong, then it

would be right and wise to follow his example in that

particular. But the case is far otherwise. The Lord

does not only require us to forgive them in the fullest

sense of the word, and to command us not to usurp al

 prerogatives: 'Avenge not yourselves.' No doubt there are certain cases in
civil and family governments in which the outward acts of forgiveness should be held in abeyance until forgiveness is duly sought. The offender in himself has no right to forgiveness until he seeks it in the true spirit of penitence. In the absence of this, parents should often wait for the outward signs of penitence in their children. The same may be true sometimes in other relations, as between brothers and sisters, and other domestic and civil relations. Hence there is an objective and a subjective view to be taken of the duty of forgiveness. In both, forgiveness is the act of Christ, which is God's own provision, his law is vindicated, and the penalty of sin is paid. To all who will believe in Christ with the heart, God offers a free, full, and present forgiveness (Acts v, 31; xiii, 38, 39; 1 John ii, 12). Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, etc. (Rom. iii, 24, et seq.). By a careful consideration of this language, we see, 1. That every believer in Christ Jesus is justified or pardoned, for justification is called, in verse 25, 'remission of sins.' Yet it is not simply forgiven. The terms justification and justify, when applied to a guilty person, do not import his being morally just, but just with respect to law and the law-giver; that is, placed in the position of a person who has not broken the law, both in respect to exemption from punishment, and the favor and kindness of the judge. Justification is pardon administered consistent with the requirements of justice and law. 2. That such believers are forgiven freely, as a free gift, not of right, not meritoriously and of desert. It is to grace, and not to justice, that the appeal for pardon is made; and we could ourselves have done nothing which could have legally cancelled our debt. The whole scheme is of grace, the result of the pure love of God, who compassionated our misery, himself provided the means of our deliverance, by sending his only-begotten Son into the world, who voluntarily submitted to die on the cross, that he might reconcile us to God. The whole was completed without our intervention, and the faith which is the condition of our salvation is by grace (Farrar, Biblical Dictionary, s. v.). See Justification.

The "forgiveness of sins" is one of the articles of the (so-called) Apostles' Creed, as well as the Nicene. According to the so-called sacramental theology (Acts ii, 38), "forgiveness of sins" is conveyed to the penitent by the act of the priest pronouncing the absolution, making the priest the sole ordinary channel through which remission is to be obtained. But sin being cancelable only by the forgiveness of God, on the condition he prescribes, of repentance, and of this no man can infallibly judge. See Pearson, On the Creed, art. ix.; Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s. v. See Absolution; Justification.

Form (Lat. forma, by transpos. from mojob) is defined by Aristotle as λογος της εικας, the doctrine of the subsistence or essence of a thing. 'A trumpet may be said to consist of the material out of which it is made, and the form which the maker gives to it. The latter is essential, but not the former; since, although the material were silver, it would still be a trumpet, but without the form it would not. Now, although there can be no form without matter, yet as it is the form which makes the thing what it is, the word form came to signify essence or nature' (Plenning, s. v.). The Scholastics distinguished form substantialis from accidentia. Substantialis was defined as actus primarius una cum materia constituentes usum per se; accidental form as actus secondarius constitutis a unit per accidentia. The unit of being composed of soul and body was defined to be of the former sort. Form, according to the ancient definition, is therefore necessary to matter; absolutely formless matter is inconceivable. Lord Bacon (Nov. Orgas, ii, 15), says: "When we speak of forms, we understand nothing more than the laws and modes of action which regulate and constitute any simple nature, such as heat, light, weight, in all kinds of matter such and such of them; so that the form of heat, or the form of light, and the law of heat, and the law of light, are the same thing." Also (Nov. Orgas, ii, 18), "The form of a thing is the very thing itself, and the thing no otherwise differs from the form than from the existent, the outward from the inward, or that which is considered in relation to man from that which is considered in relation to the universe.

"The sense attached at the present day to the words form and matter is somewhat different from, though closely related to, these. The form is what the mind impresses on the phenomena of objects when it classifies them as the matter; form therefore means mode of viewing objects that are presented to the mind. When the attention is directed to any object, we do not see the object itself, but contemplate it in the light of our own prior conceptions. A man, for example, may regard the poor and ignorant under the form of a very fortunate person, able to purchase luxuries which are above their own reach; by the religious mind under the form of a person with more than ordinary temptations to contend with; by the political economist under the form of an example of the unequal distribution of wealth; by the tradesman under that of one whose patronage is valuable. Now the object is really the same to all these observers; the same rich man has been represented under all these different forms. And the reason that the observers are able to find many in the object that they connect generally with their own prior conceptions. The form, then, in this view, is mode of knowing, and the matter is the perception or object we have to know" (Thomson, Outline of Laws of Thought, p. 54). Sir W. Hamilton calls the theoretical or ideal forms "the three supreme realities, which are con- sidered as realities joined with, and not as mere dispositions or modifications of matter" (Hamilton's edition of Reid's Works, p. 527).

Dr. M'Cosh remarks, on the distinction between form and matter, that "this phraseology was introduced by Aristotle, who represented everything as having in itself both matter (aion) and form (aion). It had a new signification given to it by Kant, who supposes that the mind supplies from its own furniture a form to impose on the matter presented from without. That of a tree corresponds to the a priori element, and the matter to the a posteriori. But the view thus given of the relation in which the knowing mind stands to the known object is altogether a mistaken one. It supposes that the mind in cognition adds an element from its own resources, whereas it is simply so constituted as to know what is in the object. This doctrine needs only to be carried out consequentially to sap the foundations of all knowledge; for if the mind may contribute from its own stores one element, why not another? why not all the elements? In fact, Kant did, by this distinction, open the way to all those later speculations which represent the whole universe of being as an ideal construction. There can, I think, be no impurity in speaking of the original principles of the mind as forms or rules, but they are forms merely, as are the rules of grammar,
which do not add anything to correct speaking and writing, but are merely the expression of the laws which they follow. As to the word 'matter,' it has either no meaning in such an application, or a meaning of a misleading character' (Intimations of the Mind, N. K.). Formal, in philosophy, is that which relates to the form, as opposed to material, or that which relates to the matter. So formal logic gives the theory of reasoning as grounded in the laws of thought, without reference to the subject-matter to which reasoning may be applied.—Fleming, Vocabulary of the English Language, 1869. How, in Bible, Dictionary of the Biblical religions. Wissenschafts, ii, 56.


Formathe. See Littere Formatae.

Formosus I., Pope (891-986), was bishop of Porto, and was sent by Nicholas I. in 866 as legate to Bulgaria (q. v.), and would have been made archbishop there but that the canons (at that time) forbade transference from one see to another. In the time of Pope John VIII he was condemned on a charge of conspirency against Charles the Bald and the pope (Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, iv, 496), A.D. 876. He was deprived of his episcopacy, and of all rights except lay communion. Pope Martin V restored him to his see in 883. Nicholas was elected pope in 901, 903, and was the first instance in the West of a bishop transferred from one see to another. Soon after his election, legates sent by the emperor Leo and the Eastern bishops arrived in Rome to obtain a confirmation of the ordinances of Photius (q. v.), but Formosus would not grant the request, and the East and West were still farther alienated. In 893 he took sides politically with Charles the Simple against Odo. On the death of Guido, 894, Formosus invited Arnulf to Rome, and crowned him emperor, 885. Formosus died on Easter day, 896. Pope Stephen VI caused the dead body of Formosus to be dug up, and cast into a synod at Rome, condemned as guilty of intrusion into the holy see, and treated with gross indignity. Stephen declared all the acts of Formosus null and void. His 'character' was restored by pope John IX, A.D. 906. —Bower, Lives of the Popes, v, 71-73; Baronius, Annals, A.D. 891-906.

Forms of Prayer are set prayers, prepared to be used in worship, public and private. As to the propriety and utility of such forms there has been much dispute. The arguments are about as follows.

I. From Scripture. — (1) On the one hand it is asserted that forms are found in the slightest trace in all the New Testament of any established liturgical service of Christian worship. There are no forms of prayer prescribed for such worship—a thing which we conceive must be inevitable if such liturgical form had been the best form, the most accordant with the will of the Great Head over all things to the Church, and the most consonant with the mind of the Spirit, the most appropriate for the bestowment and exercise of his influences. In things of much less importance we have explicit directions; and it is hardly to be supposed, if a liturgy for public worship were most appropriate for the wants of men, and most agreeable to the will of God, that there should have been no directions, nor even intimations in regard to it. It is hardly to be supposed, when all things were set in order in the churches, that this main thing should have been left unattended. In place of the liturgy. To use not a single trace even of so much as a prescribed articulat confession of faith or form of prayer can be found in the New Testament oracle’ (Cheever). In the same spirit, Coleman (Apostolical and Primitive Church, ch. xi) undertakes to prove, 1, that the formal prayer is no part of the Christian dispensation; 2, that it is opposed to the example of Christ and of his apostles; and, 3, that it is unauthorized by their instructions. (2) On the other hand, in favor of forms, it is declared that “the slightest acquaintance with Scripture is enough to convince that contrary to Scripture could not be a better practice for which we can plead the precedents of Moses and Miriam, and the daughters of Israel, of Aaron and Moses, of David and the Psalmists; for what are the Psalms but an inspired form of prayer for the use of the Church under the Gospel, as well as under the law? and, when they blessed the people, as in the time of Deborah and Barak; when the practice was even more directly sanctioned by the Holy Ghost at the time he inspired David and the Psalmists; for what are the Psalms but an inspired form of prayer for the use of the Church under the Gospel, as well as under the law? And when the transactions of the symbols which they blessed the people, it is well known, were conducted according to a prescript form. To those services our blessed Lord did himself conform; and severely as he reproved the Jews for their departure, in various particulars, from the prin- ciples of their private devotions, he does not charge them with this particular never did he utter one word of censure; nay, he confirmed the practice when he himself gave to his disciples a form of prayer, and framed that prayer, too, on the model, and in some degree in the very words, of prayers then in use. Our Lord, moreover, who is the form of his Filiorum et Filiae; he, at the same time that he conferred on them authority to bind and to loose, directed them to agree touching what they should ask, for which, seems almost to convey an injunction to the rulers of every particular church, to provide their people with a form of prayer. But if ‘far more wisely,’ as the other argument together has the one obvious and simple reason that our Lord’s especial blessing and favorable reception of petitions is bestowed on those who, assembling in his name, shall agree touching what they shall ask in his name. Now this surely implies the exclusive use of precomposed prayers in a congregation, since it plainly seems an impossibility for un instructed men to agree together in a prayer offered up by one of them if they do not know at least the substance of the prayer before they hear him utter the words, and if the form does not direct to do them, let individuals address their ‘Father who seeth in secret’ in any expressions (that are but intelligible to themselves) which occur at the moment. But congregational prayer, common supplication, joint worship, is a very different thing. And accordingly our Lord supplies to his disciples, in form, as the purchases for solitary devotion, but does teach them a form evidently designed for joint worship. The contrast is most remarkable: ‘Thus, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, etc. ; ’ when ye pray, say, ‘Our Father,’ etc. Our Lord, by teaching him this form of prayer, which is not the only form of prayer, of course, in the same passages that teach the multiplicity of forms at all the times of day and night, etc. But in another place he says ‘And in like manner also kneeling, Luke xxi, 1, 2), gave the strongest possible sanction to the use of precomposed prayers for congregational worship.

II. From Antiquity and Usage. — Extreme views are maintained as to the usage of the primitive Church in prayer. (1) On the one hand, lord King says (Constitution of the Primitive Church), ‘There is not the least mention of fixed forms in any of the primitive writings, nor the least word or syllable tending thereto, that I can find, which is a most unaccountable silence if ever such there was, but rather something indicating the contrary.’ One of the principal authorities which he adduces is Justin Martyr, who, describing the manner of the prayer before the celebration of the marriage of the Lord’s Supper, says that the bishop sent up prayers and praises to God with such a variety of forms. This he expounds, that he prayed with the best of his abilities, invention, expression, and judgment, exerting his own gifts and parts in suitable manner and apt expression. He also quotes Tertullian and Origen in vindication of his views, that written forms of prayer were not named in the first spirit of Christ and the Church. Coleman (Apostol. Church, ch. xi) maintains that forms are “opposed to the simplicity and freedom of primitive worship,” and that their use, in fact, was un-
known in the primitive Church." In proof of this position, he (with lord King) adduces Justin Martyr († 165) (transl. by Semisch, i, 72), and Tertullian († 220) (Apolog. ch. xxxix), who uses the phrase ex preci; whether it be left for them to deny; or, as are, through
monitore, quia de pecore), and also the fact that the four earliest liturgies originated in the 4th century.

(2.) On the other hand, it is argued that the Jewish
synagogue had its liturgy, to which Christ and the apostles conform. After their return rather at the constitution and discipline of his disciples to pray, and that Christ gave a form to his followers in answer to their request; that if the four ancient
liturgies can only be traced to the 4th century, there are numerous passages in the fathers that imply their use in the apostolic age, and that fragments of them exist as far back as Clement (A.D. 194) and Dionysius of Alexandria (247) are found; that the passages from Justin and Tertullian, rightly interpreted, bear as strongly in favor of liturgies as against them; that the Apostolical Canons (q. v.) enjoin them; and that, from the 4th century downw.ards, both the Eastern and Western churches have uniformly used forms of prayer. On the historical questions as to the early use of liturgies, see Liturgy.

III. From the Tendencies and Results of their Use.—
(1.) Agentia forms, it is alleged that those adopted in one church may have been adopted in another, and that the external repetition of the same prayers makes them wearisome, and destroys their significance; that they must often be unsuited to the occasion, to the sermon, and to the circumstances of the congregation; and that their general tendency is, and always has been, to formalism and a mere outside worship, not of the heart, but of the lips.

(2.) For the use of forms, it is asserted that the forms in use are, like the Psalms, from which they are largely derived, adapted to the worship of the Church in all, not as a devotion, but as a devout mind as extemporaneous prayers of the same length; that for special occasions special prayers can always be framed; and that their tendency has been proved, in the history of the Church, to be most salutary. It is further objected to extemporaneous prayers that (1) "it must be generally impossible that the whole congrega-
tion should join in a prayer they never had heard before, the instant it is uttered; and totally impossible many distinct congregations should all be uniformly employing the same extemporaneous prayer." (2) That free prayer gives too little scope to the congrega-
tion; that men are not so affected; that it is not thorough-
and receptive; they hear the minister pray rather than join in public prayer; at best, they follow the minister rather than worship in prayer. (3) That free prayer tends to degenerate into preaching or ex- eurism, so that the preacher can hardly fail to aim at edifying his congregation instead of being simply their mouthpiece in the act of worship, and so his prayer becomes homiletical instead of devotional. (4) That unpremeditated prayers are apt to depend on the impulse of the moment in the preacher, his state of health, etc., and may therefore be either short and cold on the one hand, or long and diffusive on the other; and that it is apt, therefore, to be personal rather than represen-
tative, if the prayer is the natural outflow of the minister's heart, which, on the theory, it ought to be.

A judicious writer in the Br. and For. Eveng. Rev. (Jan. 1860) asks whether, because from the heart pre-
sitions possible on this question—(1) the use of forms, with the exclusion of free prayer; (2) free prayer, ex-
cluding all forms; (3) the combination, in greater or lesser measure, of both—argues that the Reformers and others of the Reformed Church, in leading off the three lines of the practice they stood precisely midway between the two antagonist positions of modern times, and can be le-
gitimately claimed as partisans by neither. They were the advocates neither of form nor of freedom, but of both. They at one sanctioned the use of liturgical

aids, and vindicated the right of personal freedom. Whether rightly or wrongly, whether as a remnant of the old bondage which they could not all at once throw off, or the dictate of that divine conservative wisdom which in most things, and Generalisimo guided them, but in reforming, not new founding, the Church, having regard also, perhaps, in some measure, to the circum-
stances and necessities of their times, the fact, at least, is historically certain that with one consent they sided neither with the Latin nor the Greek, but with the middle element, to which the exclusive predominance of either. While not confining their churches to any unbending ritual, they yet deemed it their duty to provide for them such lit and solemn forms of common prayer as should serve at once as a model and as an aid in the public worship of God. This was the principle alike of Knox and of Cranmer, of Calvin equally with Luther and Melancthon. At Geneva, at Zurich, at Wittenberg, at St. Andrew's—wherever the great leaders of the Reformation were at liberty to carry out their views, the solemn service of the house of God proceeded according to a certain formal order, which was designed to regulate and assist, not to re-
strain, the free outpourings of the heart. England was an apparent, but only an apparent, exception to this rule. In her case the more rigid enforcement of the forms was perhaps less the effect of external circumstances than of the personal convictions of her leading divines. The principle of comprehension on which their reformation was based rendered a certain restraint necessary in the interest, not of ritual uniformity, but of Protestant truth. The object of suspicion then was the Roman priest, not the evangelical
pastor, and the design of ritual restriction was rather to curb the license of the one than to fetter the liberty of the other. Ave Maris must be silenced, even though at the sacrifice of free prayer; the com-
xamation service must be prescribed by imperative
rubic, or it would be turned by many into a farce. But
for this adventitious, and, in their view, probably temporary necessity, there is every reason to believe that the liturgical ordinances of the English reformers would have been much less fixed and stringent, and that in the matter of worship, as well as in other ele-
ments of her constitution, the Church which they founded would have been brought into much nearer conformity with the general model of other Reformed communions. Be this, however, as it may, the real and essential point of difference, even in practice, be-
tween Continental and English church government, is the exclusive use of forms. The one confined, the other permitted and encouraged, the spontaneous ut-
erances of devotion. The one supplied an aid, the
other ordained a law. In truth, in the Scottish form at least, when we speak of 'the Presbytery,' this was the pres-
scribed. Instead of the Anglican 'then shall the priest say,' its gentler and wiser language is 'the min-
ister utter one of these two confessions,' or 'this pray-
er following, or such like.' The accustomed order, in
short, was rather observed as a rule than obeyed as a law; worn as a dress than borne as a burden; followed
with free and willing heart in the spirit rather than the letter—as a law of liberty, not a yoke of bondage" (p. 600 sq.). We cite also the Princeton Review as follows: "As to stated forms of prayer, their value
must vary with circumstances. In no case ought the liberty of expounding them to be so marvellously curtailed as by the minister in the pulpit. As well might preaching be
confined by authority to prescribed forms of words. The discretion of the ministry may be trusted as freely
in the one as the other. But if, in the solemn office of
leading off the three lines of the practice they stood precisely midway between the two antagonist positions of modern times, and can be legitimately claimed as partisans by neither. They were the advocates neither of form nor of freedom, but of both. They at one sanctioned the use of liturgical

aids, and vindicated the right of personal freedom. Whether rightly or wrongly, whether as a remnant of the old bondage which they could not all at once throw off, or the dictate of that divine conservative wisdom which in most things, and Generalisimo guided them, but in reforming, not new founding, the Church, having regard also, perhaps, in some measure, to the circumstances and necessities of their times, the fact, at least, is historically certain that with one consent they sided neither with the Latin nor the Greek, but with the middle element, to which the exclusive predominance of either. While not confining their churches to any unbending ritual, they yet deemed it their duty to provide for them such lit and solemn forms of common prayer as should serve at once as a model and as an aid in the public worship of God. This was the principle alike of Knox and of Cranmer, of Calvin equally with Luther and Melancthon. At Geneva, at Zurich, at Wittenberg, at St. Andrew's—wherever the great leaders of the Reformation were at liberty to carry out their views, the solemn service of the house of God proceeded according to a certain formal order, which was designed to regulate and assist, not to restrain, the free outpourings of the heart. England was an apparent, but only an apparent, exception to this rule. In her case the more rigid enforcement of the forms was perhaps less the effect of external circumstances than of the personal convictions of her leading divines. The principle of comprehension on which their reformation was based rendered a certain restraint necessary in the interest, not of ritual uniformity, but of Protestant truth. The object of suspicion then was the Roman priest, not the evangelical pastor, and the design of ritual restriction was rather to curb the license of the one than to fetter the liberty of the other. Ave Maris must be silenced, even though at the sacrifice of free prayer; the communion service must be prescribed by imperative rubric, or it would be turned by many into a farce. But for this adventitious, and, in their view, probably temporary necessity, there is every reason to believe that the liturgical ordinances of the English reformers would have been much less fixed and stringent, and that in the matter of worship, as well as in other elements of her constitution, the Church which they founded would have been brought into much nearer conformity with the general model of other Reformed communions. Be this, however, as it may, the real and essential point of difference, even in practice, between Continental and English church government, is the exclusive use of forms. The one confined, the other permitted and encouraged, the spontaneous utterances of devotion. The one supplied an aid, the other ordained a law. In truth, in the Scottish form at least, when we speak of 'the Presbytery,' this was the prescribed. Instead of the Anglican 'then shall the priest say,' its gentler and wiser language is 'the minister utter one of these two confessions,' or 'this prayer following, or such like.' The accustomed order, in short, was rather observed as a rule than obeyed as a law; worn as a dress than borne as a burden; followed with free and willing heart in the spirit rather than the letter—as a law of liberty, not a yoke of bondage" (p. 600 sq.). We cite also the Princeton Review as follows: "As to stated forms of prayer, their value must vary with circumstances. In no case ought the liberty of expounding them to be so marvellously curtailed as by the minister in the pulpit. As well might preaching be confined by authority to prescribed forms of words. The discretion of the ministry may be trusted as freely in the one as the other. But if, in the solemn office of leading off the three lines of the practice they stood precisely midway between the two antagonist positions of modern times, and can be legitimately claimed as partisans by neither. They were the advocates neither of form nor of freedom, but of both. They at one sanctioned the use of liturgical
the edification of our people in public worship would be enhanced. We must not make our library a cloak of licentiousness. There are few of our most able and eminent ministers who come as near the true standard of pulpit prayer as they do that of the sermon. When we hear it said of such a man as Robert Hall that his prayers were felt by his hearers to be strikingly unequal to the rank of his position, we are keenly sensitive to the proprieties of pulpit prayer an aversion to making prayer the work of genius, and at the same time some lack of zeal in cultivating the peculiar talent for its just and most useful performance. But among our brethren of the lower grades of ability and holiness, the matter is not unfrequent in this service from which many of our sensible and pious people would gladly take refuge in a book of prayers. When we sometimes hear the intimation that the Book of Common Prayer, could it be quietly introduced, would be an improvement upon the present forms of devotion in many of our pulpits, we know this preference not to be for written prayers in general, but as an alternative and a way of escape from peculiar and unnecessary faults in prayers with which the observers are often afflicted. We cannot assent to such a rule, while we condemn the needless and imperfect perfection of our present standard, and desire to speak that impression with emphasis. We are confident that our standard may be so raised that all would feel the transition from extemporaneous to written prayers as a descent and a deflection. When we observe the introit, when the service of the faithful worshipers with what appear to us the indefinite and comparatively barren forms of the English liturgy, we see the great power of a few striking points of propriety in public prayer to engage the heart of true devotees of God. (Butler, c. xiv, p. 81, 82).

The conclusion arrived at by Richard Watson (Institutes, ii, 507) is just and temperate, viz, that there are advantages in each mode of worship, and that, when combined prudently, the public service of the sanctuary has its most perfect constitution. Much, however, in the practice of churches is to be regulated by due respect to differences of opinion, and even to prejudice, on a point upon which we are left at liberty by the Scriptures, and which must therefore be ranked among things prudential. Here, as in many other things, Christians must give place to each other, and do as is meet in all things.

Among the modern Protestant churches, the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church use forms of prayer to the exclusion (generally) of free prayer in public worship. The Methodist Episcopal Church, however, has no sacraments for social use, no exhortation, and other services, and free prayer in worship. The Presbyterian churches use free prayer (Directory of Worship, ch. v). The Lutheran and Reformed churches have liturgical forms for certain services, but generally use free prayer in worship. A movement toward more full liturgical services has been going on for some time in the German Reformed Church. See German Reformed Church, and Liturgy. A tendency in the same direction appears to have arisen in the Presbyterian Church in the United States (see Shields, Liturgy Espirical, Philadelphia, 1864; see also Beazley, Duties of the Presbyterian Liturgist, N. York, 1855, 18mo; reprinted in London as A Chapter on Liturgies, edited by Thomas Binney, 1856, 18mo). In the Established Church of Scotland, Dr. Robert Lee, of Edinburgh, was tried before the General Assembly in 1831 for his sermons, which tended to dispense with the public in the services of Old Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh; and the Assembly enjoined Dr. Lee to discontinue the practice. But the tendency went on; and in 1867 appeared Euchologia, or Book of Prayers, being Forms of Worship issued by the Church-service Society (Edinburgh, and London, 1867), under the auspices of Dr. Lee and Dr. Macleod. See, besides the works already mentioned, Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. xiii.; Pale- stine, Orig. Liturgies, London, Words, ii, 429; Milton, Prose Works (Philadephia, 1880), i, 96 sq. (against forms); Shields, The Book of Comm. Prayer as amended by the Westminster Divines A.D. 1661, with a historical and liturgical treatment (Philadelphia, 1867, 12mo); Brownell, Family Prayer-book (Introduction); Butler, Common Prayer Illustrated, Long, xiii, 489 sq.; xviii, 487 sq.; xxvii, 445 sq.; Merriam, Review, Jan. 1868, art. vii; Evangelical Quarterly Review, Jan. 1869, p. 80.

Formularies, a general name for the articles of religion, forms of service, etc., adopted by any particular church. See CREEDS; CONFESSIONS; LITURGY.

Formula Concordiae. See Concord, Formula of.

Formula Consensus Helvetica. See Hel- vetic Confessions.

Formula (ουτη), tauta, ἡ τινος, illicit sexual intercourse, especially of a married woman). See ADULTERY. From the Scriptures we learn that long before the time of Moses morals had become very much corrupted, and not only the prostitution of females, but also the licentiousness of boys, and the immorality of the needless and imperfect perfection of our present standard, and desire to speak that impression with emphasis. We are confident that our standard may be so raised that all would feel the transition from extemporaneous to written prayers as a descent and a deflection. When we observe the introit, when the service of the faithful worshipers with what appear to us the indefinite and comparatively barren forms of the English liturgy, we see the great power of a few striking points of propriety in public prayer to engage the heart of true devotees of God. (Butler, c. xiv, p. 81, 82).
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is an elaborate article on Forster in the *Zitschrif f.

FORTER, Nathaniel, a learned English divine, was born at Stadsmes, Devonshire, Feb. 8, 1717; educated at Corpus Christi, of which he became fellow in 1729; and was in 1750 a grand stall of the cathedral of Bristol and the vicarage of Rochdale in 1754. In 1757 he became preacher at the Rolls, and died Oct. 20 in that year. He wrote *Reflections on the high Antiquity of Government, Arts, and Sciences in Egypt (Oxf. 1745, 8vo);—A Dissertation on Joseph's Account of the Jews Christ (Oxf. 1740); Bible Hebraica Minchach (1755, 2 vols. 4to)—Popey destruction of the Evidences of Christianity (Oxf. 1746).—Biog. Britannica, s. v.

Forster, William, a member of the Society of Friends, was born at Tottenham, England, in 1794. He was carefully trained by his parents, who were excellent "Friends," and at nineteen began to exercise his gifts as a "minister." Most of his life was devoted to missionary journeys through the British Islands, the Continent of Europe, and the United States, on his third visit to which, "with an antiallevial address to the president and governors," he died in Tennessee, in the sixty-first year of his age. In the preceding year, 1822, he visited the Vaalhuis of Riedemond, and printed a large number of books and tracts in Italian for circulation. Everywhere he scattered blessings by word and deed, "leaving his mark for good on everything he set his hand to." His son, William, a regular member of the Board of the Testamen-t, and an eminent Liberal in politics.—Seeborn, *Memoirs of William Forster (London, 1866, 2 vols.); Christian Remembrance, January, 1866, art. iv.

Fort, the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. words: תֶּבַע, betah (so called as a place of lying in wail), a cave, esp. on a hill, Exxx. xxxii, 27 (elsewhere usually "stronghold"); or fem. מַטָּסָה, metasah, a kind of small fastness, e. g. the Citadel of Zion, 2 Sam. vii, 9 (elsewhere "fortress," etc.). מַטָּס, mas (so called from its strength), a stronghold, fortified by nature and art, Dan. xi, 19 (elsewhere usually "strength," etc.). דָּגֵק, dagik (so called from looking out), a watch-tower, especially a scaling-tower in a siege, 2 Kings xxi, 1; Jer. ili, 4; Ezek. iv, 2; xvii, 21, 22; xxvi, 8. מַטָּס, metasah (so called as being compact), a fortification, e. g. in the siege of a city; generally for defence ("fenced city," q. v.), but also for assault, Isa. xxix, 8. דָּגֵק, ophel (q. v.), a mount (so called from its tumulus form), Isa. xxxii, 14 (elsewhere "tower," "stronghold"). מַטָּס, masgul (so called from its height), a refuge (as often rendered; also "tower," "defence," Isa. xxv, 12. See FORTIFICATION.

Forti d'UrbAN, Marquis of, was born Feb. 18, 1756, and died at Paris Aug. 4, 1848. After completing his studies at the Military School in Paris, he entered the army in 1773, but resigned his commission in 1779 to attend to an important suit in Rome before the papal court of appeals (the Rota), pending the decision of which he devoted himself to the study of the fine arts, antiquities, and mathematics. He was a prolific author, and wrote on a variety of subjects, of which we mention Principes et Questions de Mora Naturelle (Paris, new ed., 1834, 2 vols.); *Essai de la Connaissance d'un roi (Paris, 1821, 12mo);—Chronologie de la vie de Jezus-Christ (Paris, 1827, 8vo, and 1830, 12mo);—Note sur la Gene de du Christiaannisme (Paris, 1830, 8vo);—Essai sur l'Origine de l'ecriture, etc. (Paris, 1830, 8vo);—Essai sur l'impossibilité de l'Anes et sur la resurrection (Paris, 1833, 12mo);—Discours prononces au Cirque de Morule Universelle (Paris, 1835-9, 12mo);—Membres pour servir a l'histoire de l'introduction du Christiannisme dans les Guzes (Par.
FORTIFICATION

He was also a collaborator in the Chiefes des Planches of the Fortifications, and the Annales de la Philosophie Chrétienne. — Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, viii, 217—221. (J. W. M.)

Fortification. The Hebrews had several terms which include the idea of military walls, and which are variously rendered in the Auth. Vers., as "fort," "fortress," "fenced city," "castle," "strong-hold," "mound," "trench," etc., all of which see in their places.

Inventions for the defence of men in social life are older than history. The walls, towers, and gates represented on Egyptian monuments, though dating back to a period of fifteen centuries before the Christian era, bear evidence of an advanced state of fortifications—of walls built of squared stones, or of squared timber judiciously placed on the summit of bare rocks, or within the circumference of one or two wet ditches, and furnished along the top with regular battlements to protect the defenders (see Wilkinson, i, 407 sq.). All these are of later invention than the accumulation of unbewn or rude-chipped uncemented stones, piled on each other in the form of walls, in the so-called Cyclopean, Pelasgian, Etruscan, and Celtic styles, where there are no ditches, or towers, or other gateways than mere openings occasionally left between the enormous blocks employed in the works. As the first three styles occur in Etruria they show the progressive advance of military architecture, and may be considered as more primitive, though perhaps posterior to the era when the progress of Israel, under the guidance of Joshua, expelled several Canaanitish tribes, whose system of fortification, in common with that of the rest of Western Asia, bore an Egyptian type, and whose

Ancient Assyrians attacking a Fort.

As among the Hebrews there was no system of construction of an elaborate kind, and so called fortifications of the means of defence to the localities, no uniformity of adaptation existed, and therefore we refer to the foregoing as specimens of the numerous illustrations of this subject which occur on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, and to other explanations which are given under the several terms in other parts of this work. See also CITY; TREB; WAR, etc.

The wall, מָעַן, chomah, was sometimes double or triple (2 Chron. xxxii, 5), successively girding a rocky elevation; and "building a city" originally meant the construction of the wall. See WALL. Before wall-towers, מָעַן, migdaloth, were introduced, the gate of a city, originally single, formed a kind of citadel, and was the strongest part of all the defences: it was the armory of the community, and the council-house of the authorities. "Sitting in the gate" was, and still is, synonymous with the possession of power, and even now there is commonly in the fortified gate of a royal palace in the East, on the floor above the doorway, a council-room with a kind of balcony, whence the sovereign sometimes sees his people, and where he may sit in judgment. Hence the Turkish government is not unfrequently termed the Porte, and in this sense allusion to gates often occurs in the Scriptures. The tower, נֵבֶן, tera'ach, was another fortification of the earliest date, being often the citadel or last retreat when a city was taken; or, standing alone in some naturally strong position, was intended to protect a frontier, command a pass, or to be a place of refuge and deposit of treasure in the mountains, when the plain should be no longer defensible. This was the kind of citadel which defended passes, and in the mountains served for retreat in times of calamity, and for the security of the royal treasures; and it was on account of the confined space within, and the great elevation of the ramparts, that private houses frequently stood upon their summit, as was the case when the harlot Rahab received Joshua's spies in Jericho (Josh. ii, 1). Watch-towers, מִשְׁמַר, mishaph, and מִשְׁמַר, n.
Fortress, the rendering in the A. V. of the following Hebrew terms: "mētsor, "mas ter" (from its increasement), "fortification," Jer. x. 17 (elsewhere "bulwark," "fenced city," etc.). הָסְרוֹמָה, "metodch" (from its security), a castle, esp. post, 2 Sam. xvii, 2; Ps. cviii, 2, 8; lxxi, 8; xci, 8; cxlv, 2 (elsewhere usually "stronghold"). נַמְלָשׁ, "milbar" (as being inaccessible), a fortified place, Isa. xviii, 8; xxv, 12; xxix, 18; Hos. xii, 14; Amos v, 9 (elsewhere "fenced city" ["q. v."] "stronghold," etc.). מָשָׂא, "mose" (from its strength), a stronghold, Jer. xvi, 19; Dan. xi, 7, 10 (elsewhere "strength," etc.). See fortification.

Fortunatius, bishop of Aquileia, was of African origin, and an active participant in the strife which agitated the Church in the 4th century. At the Council of Milan, A.D. 355, he joined in the condemnation of Arianism, but after 367 we hear no more of him. He wrote commentaries on the Gospels, characterized by Jerome as useful, though incorrect in style.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvii, 222; Cellier, Histoire des Autres Eclesiastiques, t. vi, p. 11. (J. W. M.)

Fortunatus (Græcized Φωτονταύς), a disciple of Corinth, of Roman birth or his name, as his epistles indicate, who visited Paul at Ephesus, and returned, along with Stephenas and Achaicus, in charge of that apostle's first Epistle to the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. xvi, 17), A.D. 54. Some have supposed that these three Corinthian brethren were "they which are of the house of Chloe" (oi Xλοοις), alluded to in 1 Cor. i, 11; but the language of irony, in which the apostle must in that case be interpreted in ch. xvi as speaking of their presence, would become sarcasm too cutting for so tender a heart as Paul's to have uttered among his valedictions. "The household of Stephanas" is mentioned in chap. i, 16 as having been baptised by Paul himself; perhaps Fortunatus and Achaicus may have been members of that household. There is a Fortunatus mentioned at the end of Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians, who was possibly the same person.

Fortunatus, Venantius, Honorius Clemen-

rak, used by shepherds all over Asia, and even now built on eminences above some city in the plain, in order to keep a look-out upon the distant country, were already in use, and occasionally converted into places of defence (2 Chron. xxvi, 10; xxvii, 4). See TOWNS. The gateways were likewise surmounted by folding doors, דֶּלֶּת הַנָּחָה, being secured by wooden bars: both the doors and bars were in after times plated with metal. See GATE. A ditch (מַעֲרָה, "chezy"), where the nature of the locality required it, was dug in front of the rampart, and sometimes there was an inner wall, with a second ditch before it. See Ditch. As the experience of ages increased, huge "counter forts," double bulwark, or masses of solid stone and masonry (not bulwarks), were built in particular parts to sustain the outer wall, and afford space on the summit to place military engines (2 Chron. xxvi, 15). See FORTIFICATION.

Modern Persian Fort.
he scholar. He was the author of, 1. The Washing of Repentation, or the Divine Right of Immersion:—2. Primitive Baptism defined:—3. A Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel (Newport, 1787). (L. E. S.)

Foster, James, D.D., an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born at Exeter in 1697. He began preaching as an Independent in 1718. In 1724 he became a Baptist, succeeding the eminent Gale. His eloquence gained for him enthusiastic popularity. Pope, Savage, and Bolingbroke were among his eulogists. But, with all his personal virtues and popular talents, 2 he neither professed nor possessed much zeal for the essential doctrines of Christianity. He published Sermons (London, 1745, 4th ed. 8vo);—Discourses on Natural Religion and the Social Virtues (London, 1749); and an Essay on Fundamentals, especially the doctrine of the Trinity. His most important work, and that by which he is best known, is his Defence of the Unfallah, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Religion, written against Tyndale (London, 1734, 3d ed. 8vo). He died in 1753. (L. E. S.)

Foster, John, the celebrated essayist, was born at Chichester, Sept. 17, 1755. In early life he was set to the trade of a weaver. At the age of seventeen, having joined a Baptist church, he entered the Baptist College at Bristol. On the completion of his studies he began preaching at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Being somewhat unsettled in his doctrinal views, he soon returned to Dublin. He then made an unsuccessful attempt to establish himself at Dublin. Returning to England, he labored successively at Chichester, Frome, and Downend. His moderate success as a preacher was in striking contrast with his unquestionable intellectual powers and his literary reputation. While residing at Downend he produced the Essays which have won a permanent place in English literature. Becoming disabled for labor in the pulpit, he removed to Stapleton, near Bristol, and gave himself wholly to literary pursuits. For thirteen years he was a prominent contributor to the Eclectic Review. In 1819 he published his essay On the Evils of Popular Ignorance, which he esteemed his best production, though it has never attained to the popularity of the essay On Decision of Character. His contributions to the Eclectic Review were published in 1842 in two volumes. A volume selected from these has been published in this country. He died Oct. 15, 1843. Since his death have appeared Lectures delivered at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol (2 vols.), a discourse on Missions, an essay On the Importance of Religion, written in Dedication of the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel, and an unfinished essay On the Improvement of Time. His Life and Correspondence, edited by J. E. Ryland (1846), is a work of great interest (reprinted in Boston). A letter written late in life, and then first published, disclosed the fact, before unsuspected, that he had renounced the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment. His writings are marked by strong, original, often sombre thought, stimulating to the best principles and purposes. (L. E. S.)

Fothergill, Samuel, an eminent Quaker preacher, was born Sept. 3, 1715 (O. S.), travelled and preached in many parts of England, Scotland, Ireland, and North America, and died June 15, 1772. He wrote Remarks on an Address to the People called Quakers, etc. (1716, 8vo).—Reply to E. Owen on Water Baptism (1758, 8vo).—Letters (1816).—Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, s. v.; Rose, vii, 428.

Foucher, Paul, a learned French abbot, was born at Tours in 1704, and died at Paris in 1778. He studied theology at the Sorbonne, but showed more fondness for foreign languages. His chief work, Titres historiques de la Religion des Prés, inserted in the Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions (tomo. xxvi, xxxix, xxxvi, xxxix); German translation by Kleuker, Riga, 1781-3, 2 vols. 4to), combats the opinion of Hyde that the Persians had preserved natural religion and the worship of the true God. A supplement, after the appearance of Du Perron's Œd Aosta, retracts many of his previous opinions. His next most important work, Recherches sur l'Origine et la Nature de la Religions des Prés, inserted in the Memóires de l'Académie, considers the gods of the Greek and Roman pantheon as only deified men, and claims a historical basis for their myths.—Hoefer, Nouv. Encyc. Géner. xlviii, 284, 285.

Foucher de Chartres. See Fulcherius.

Foullas, Henry, was born about 1685, and died in 1766. He pursued his studies at Oxford, was ordained for the ministry, but devoted himself to history. We have from him, History of the wrecked Plata and Composition of the extended Samian, etc. (London, 1689, and Oxford, 1674, fol.);—History of the Roman Treasons and Usurpations, etc. (Oxford, 1671, fol.); and, according to Watt, Cudoba, or the History of the Constitution Uncased (1664, 4to).—Sermons, etc. Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s. v.; Wood, Ath. Oxon. (J. W. M.)

Foulques de Neulliy. See Fulco.

Foundling Hospitals are institutions for the reception and care of children, especially illegitimate ones, abandoned by their parents. They owe their origin, it is said, to the desire of preventing infanticide and childbirth in the Mazowsze of the Christian Pagans, and the infant children of the鼗cient Greeks and Romans, infanticide and abortion not only prevailed to a fearful extent, but were tolerated, nay, in certain cases, even sanctioned by the laws and by the opinions of philosophers (see Plato, De Leg. v, 460, C.; Aristotle, De Leg., xili, 87; Cicero, De Leg. iii, 8, et al.). The exposure of children was a still more prevalent custom, commended itself, we may suppose, to the natural feelings of the parents as less cruel than infanticide, since it promised a chance, at least, of saving life. The foundling became the slave of the individual, or community, at whose expense it was cared for and educated. To facilitate the finding of exposed infants, places of public resort were chosen for the exposure, such as market-places, temples, road-crossings, wells, etc. In Athens the cynoarges, and in Rome the columnar lacticinum, were usually chosen for this purpose. It was usually taken (crepusculo), as rings or other costly ornaments, or, in the case of poor parents, trinkets of small value, were deposited with the child, for the purpose of inducing some one to receive it, or as a means of identifying the child, should its parents ever discover it. In the time of Gibbon this custom fell under the limitations of paternal authority in his chapter on Roman jurisprudence (Hist. iv, 344, N. Y. 1862), says: "The exposition of children was the prevailing and stubborn vice of antiquity; it was sometimes prescribed, often permitted, almost always practiced with impunity by nations who never entertained the Roman ideas of paternal power; and the dramatic poets, who appeal to the human heart, represent with indulgence a popular custom which was palliated by the motives of economy and compassion." As some relief to the dark shading of this picture, and yet a proof of its correctness, let it suffice to mention the strange and curious custom of exposing children to be adopted and brought up by the spoilt gods (see Tacitus, Hist. v, 5; Josephus, Contra Apion, ii, 24; Philo Jud. De Leg. Spec. ad precept. 6 et 7).
The teachings of Christianity, by causing infanticide and child-exposure to be regarded as sins, gradually wrought a change in the laws and customs in regard to them, though the first Christian emperors did not venture to forbid exposure as a crime. Constantine, however, is reported to have been persuaded by the humane Lactantius, sought in his decrees, A.D. 315, 322, 331, to prevent the murder, sale, giving in pawn or exposure of children, by making provision out of the public treasury for those whose parents were too poor to support or receive them (Cod. Theod., lib. vi, tit. 7, De Expositis, l. i, p. 467, ed. Bitter). The cruel custom was, however, not entirely prohibited until the first half of the 4th century, when, under Valentinian and his colleagues, such murders were brought "within the letter and spirit of the Cornellian law" (Codex Justinian, lib. iv, tit. 52). A further advance of opinion in the right direction was made by Justinian, A.D. 529, which forbade the enslavement of foundlings (Codex Justinian, lib. viii, tit. 21, De Infantia, Expos. l. iii).

Some suppose that foundling hospitals, or institutions of a similar character, were, at a very early period, established in the cities of Rome and Athens, mentioned above as places of exposure. The Justinian Code, by the term brephotrophium (βρηφοτροφίου), mentioned in connection with, but as distinct from, other institutions (for the relief of strangers, the poor, orphans, etc.), appear to refer to hospitals for foundlings. An establishment of the kind is said to have been founded at Treves in the 6th or 7th century. The Capitulaires of Charlemagne employ the Justinian term brephotrophia apparently with reference to foundling hospitals, though the Franks at that time regarded foundlings as the children of evil or impure parents and anathematized all foundlings. An attempt at the kind was said to have been founded at Milan, A.D. 787, by Datheus, a priest, because of the prevalence of infanticide. If the child had not been washed, salt was strewn before it to drive the swaddling-clothes before it to the hospital to denote that fact. The children were suckled by hired nurses, supplied with necessaries, taught some handicraft, and at seven years of age discharged as free. In 1070 Olivier de la Trave founded at Montpellier, in Languedoc, one of whose vows was to provide for the maintenance and education of foundlings. Since that time hospitals for foundlings have been gradually established in most European, and Spanish, and Portuguese-American states, to the most important of which only we have space to refer. Attached to the hospital of the Spirito Santo in Rome is one for foundlings, with accommodations for 3000 children; the number annually received is about 800, some of whom are sent to the country to be nursed; the mortality in the hospital was 1850 57 per cent., and still greater in the country. The Speciale degli Innocenti at Florence was founded in 1616; special means are taken to identify each child by securely fastening a leaden badge, stamped with a certain number, around the neck. The use of tokens of some sort, attached to the person or clothing of the child, is not uncommon in the history of other hospitals. There are many other foundling hospitals in Italy to provide for the numerous foundlings, for whom it is stated that Naples makes the best provision (1850). The Hospices des Enfants Trouvés at Paris was founded in 1635, by Mary de la Prés. In this hospital and many others in France, in order to secure secrecy in depositing the child, a turning-box (tour) is provided, in which the child is placed, and a bell rung for its removal without the person who brought it being seen. A decree in 1811 ordered that such boxes should be provided for all the French foundling hospitals, but, owing to a conviction that the great increase in the number of foundlings since that time was due largely to the tours, they were abolished in 1856 in connection with the 141 hospitals then existing in France. In 1856 the number of foundlings in France was estimated at 120,000 under 12 years of age, when the administrative control ceased; and 50,000 to 70,000 between the ages of 12 and 21 years. (C. N. of France, 1856.) The number of deaths was 1 to 488; to births, 1 to 89; the annual number, 25,000 to 30,000, of whom nine tenths were illegitimate. The average life of the foundlings was only 4 years; the mortality 52 per cent. the first year, and 78 per cent. up to 12 years; while the general average for the country was only 15 per cent. up to 21 years. The male foundlings constituted 18 per cent. of the convicts and prisoners, and the female one fifth of the prostitutes in that country. Foundling hospitals are numerous in Belgium, where the number of abandoned children in that country was estimated in 1859 to be 1 to 18 births. In 1859 there were only two foundling hospitals in Holland; that of Amsterdam receives at once 8000 children annually. There is a well-managed one in Vienna, founded in 1784 by Joseph II, and others, in the chief cities of the Austrian empire, but the system of foundlings in that country is not regarded with favor in Germany. In Spain the number may be reckoned at 60 to 70, with some 13,000 foundlings, with larger proportionals for Portugal. The great hospitals of Moscow and St. Petersburg are said to be well managed under strict governmental supervision, to which an enormous number of children are sent from various parts of the Russian empire, very many of which die on the way. The children are, it is said, carefully educated, those of superior promise specially so; and many of them become useful, the females as governesses, teachers, etc., and the males as engineers, doctors, and others. Books are provided for the army and navy are also supplied from these hospitals. Foundling hospitals are numerous in Sweden, where the average of illegitimate births is said to be large, 1 to 11 in the country, and 1 to 2 in Stockholm. Norway has fewer, and is a less propitious country for illegitimate children. The foundling hospital in London was established in 1738 through the efforts of captain Thomas Coram, but not opened fully until 1756, from which time to 1760, 4 years, 14,384 children were received into it, but only 4400 lived to be apprenticed, or 30 per cent. of the total number. One of the duties of the asylum in the matter of admission, and the difficulty of correcting them or adequately providing against their recurrence, Parliament withdrew its grant of public funds, and the institution "ceased to be a receptacle for foundlings," and was made a hospital for poor illegitimate children whose mothers are known, and children of soldiers and sailors killed in the service of their country. One was also established in Dublin in 1730, in which the mortality is said to have been even greater than in London. The average yearly admissions from 1848 to 1856 were about 900; the hospital has been established in Canton, but had not, up to 1859, much influence in preventing infanticide. The most important ones in America are those in the city of Mexico and Rio Janeiro. There are no foundling hospitals in the United States where provision is made for foundlings in connection with any of public or private charity, and the number of such children is comparatively small. Whether such institutions may or may not have proved beneficial under the conditions of ancient or mediaeval society, we cannot at this day determine, but the trials to which they are exposed as parts of the system of the charitable and philanthropic agencies of modern times, either as controlled and supported in whole or part by the state, or as left to the care and direction of private benevolence, presents re
rults, we think, contrary to the expectations of their founders; and the general tendency of opinion, especially in Protestant countries, is against their usefulness as means for the attainment of the desired ends. Granting that they may have some effect in diminishing the frequency of direct Guinean intercourse, which, however, their statistics do not prove, they certainly tend to increase the number of children abandoned by their parents, while the frightful mortality connected with them would seem to demonstrate that there can be no actual saving of human life through such establishments. We believe that vastly more children have prematurely died from causes inseparably connected with their transmission to and treatment in these hospitals than would have been destroyed outright by the parents from the same motives. Statistics seem clearly to show that they tend to foster licentiousness, increase the number of illegitimate births, and relax morals. In reviewing all the facts, the language of the author of the article Medical Jurisprudence, in the Encyclop. Britannica, xiv, 444, 8th ed.), seems hardly too strong: "Foundling hospitals, from the mortality in them, are among the most pestilential institutions of mistaken benevolence."—New Amer. Cyclop. viii, 634-640; Beckmann, History of Inventions, ii, 434-440 (Bohn's ed.); Cassel's Magazine, i, 123-4; Knight, Popular History of Agriculture and Industry of England, vii, 118-119; Chambers, Encyclopaedia, a. v.; Encyclopaedia britannica, a. v.; Guerry, Dictionnaire Morale et Politique de la France; Beenoison de Châteauneuf, Consideration sur les Eaux-fortes trouvées dans les principaux états de l'Europe. (J. W. M.)

Fountain, the rendering in the A. V. of the following Hebrew terms: 1. Properly and usually יָבָא, yàḇāʾ (lit. the eye), so called from flowing (Genesius, Thea. Heb. p. 1017), a natural source of living water. See Eze. 14. 2. likewise יָבָא, yàḇāʾ (from the same root), a well-watered place (Psa. xxvi.xiv, 6, "well"); also a single spring (as rendered in Psa. lxviii, 7; csc, i.e., any of the springs of king xvi, 5, 2; Chron. xxxii, 4; Psa. lxxix, 15; cxxiv, 8; Prov. vi, 16; viii, 24; xx, 26; Cant. iv, 12, 13; Isa. xiii, 18; Hos. xiii, 15; Joel iii, 18); spoken of the tide or influx of the sea (Gen. vii, 11; viii. 2). It is also sometimes so obscurely rendered in the A. V. as "well," as in Exod. xv, 27; in Elim were twelve wells of water; that is, not artificial wells, but natural fountains, as still seen in wady Ghoruneld (Hartlett's Forty Days in the Desert, p. 45). These two words, on the contrary, designating a flowing or bubbling spring, are always used to denote a stream of "living" or constantly-running water, in opposition to standing or stagnant pools, whether it issues immediately from the ground or from the bottom of a well. See Ains. 3. יָבְעָר, yàḇûr (so called from quaking or bubbling forth), a native rill (fig. of the vital flow, Eccl. xii, 6; elsewhere literally a "spring" in general, Isa. xxxv, 7; xlix, 13). 4. יָבָב, yàḇāḇ (so called from having been opened by digging), an artificial source of bowing water, used both literally and figuratively, and mostly in such phrases as "fountain of life" (Prov. xiii, 14), "fountain of wisdom? (xviii, 4), etc.; occasionally rendered "spring," "well," etc. 5. Improperly יָבָב, yàḇāḇ, or יָבָב, yàḇāḇ, baʿīr (Jer. vi, 7), which designates only a pit or standing water. See Well. The idea of a fountain is also implied in the phrase יָבָב, yàḇāḇ, motaḥ maqām, or going forth of waters ("spring," 2 Kings ii, 21; Psa. cvii, 33, 35; Isa. vi, 13; xvii, 11; "course," 2 Chron. xxxii, 30); as likewise in יָבָב, yàḇāḇ (from its rolling down the water), or יָבְעָר, yàḇāḇ, purling stream or overflowing fountain ("spring," Cant. iv, 12; Job. xv, 19; Judg. i, 15). See Topographical Terms.

Among the attractive features presented by the Land of Promise to the nation migrating from Egypt by way of the desert, none would be more striking than the natural gush of waters from the ground. Instead of watering his field or garden, as in Egypt, "with his foot" (Shaw, Travels, p. 408), the Hebrew shepherd was taught to look forward to a land "drinking water of the rain of heaven, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and springs from valleys and hills" (Deut. viii, 7; xi, 11). In the desert of Sinai, "the few living, perhaps perennial springs," by the fact of their rarity, assume an importance hardly to be understood in moist climates, and more than justify a poetical expression of national rejoicing over the discovery of one (Numb. xxii, 17). But the springs of Palestine, though short-lived, are remarkable for their abundance and beauty, especially those which fall into the Jordan and its lakes throughout its whole course (Stiel, Palestine, p. 17; Watters, Burckhardt, Syria, p. 844). The spring or fountain of living water, the "eye" of the landscape (see No. 1), is distinguished in all Oriental languages from the artificially sunk and enclosed well (Stanley, p. 605). Its importance is implied by the number of topographical names compounded with En or (Arab.) Āṭa: En-gedi, Āṭā-iṣdī, "spring of the gazelle," may serve as a striking instance (1 Sam. xxiii, 29; see Reland, p. 763; Robinson, i, 504; Stanley, App. § 50). Fountains are much more rare on the eastern side of the Jordan than on the western. There are a few among the mountains of Gilead; but in the great plateaus of Moab on the south, and Bashan on the north, they are almost unknown. This arises in part from the physical structure of the country, and in part from the dryness of the climate. Huge cisterns and tanks were constructed to supply the want of fountains. See Cistern. Some of the fountains of Palestine are of great size. All the perennial rivers and streams in the country have their sources in fountains, and draw comparatively little strength from surface water. Such are the fountains of the Jordan at Dan and Banias; of the Abaran at Ephel and Zalmanah; of the Leontes at Balci and Balibek; of the Orontes at Ain and Lebeh; of the Adonis at Afka, etc. Palestine is a country of mountains and hills, and it abounds in fountains of lesser note. The murmur of their waters is heard in every dell, and the luxuriant foliage which surrounds them is seen on every plain. For a good classification of these natural springs, see Robinson's Physic. Geog. of Palestine, p. 238 sq.; and for descriptions of many of them, see Tristram's Land of Israel, and Sepp's Hege Land.

Advantage was taken of these fountains to supply some of the great cities of Palestine with water. Hence, in Oriental cities generally, public fountains are frequent (Poole, Eng. Bible. in E. i, 180). Perhaps the most remarkable works of this kind are at Tyre, where
several copious springs were surrounded with massive walls, so as to raise the water to a sufficient height. Aqueducts, supported on arches, then conveyed it to the city (Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Pal.* 2, p. 142, 555, 380). One of the most extensive conveyed a abundant sup-
ply to Damascus from the great fountain at Fijeh. Hence no Eastern city is so well supplied with water as Damascus (Early Trav. p. 294). At Beyrut there is an ancient aqueduct that brings water from a source at least twenty miles distant, and two thousand feet above the level of the sea (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 48). An aqueduct some ten miles in length brought water to Jerusalem from a fountain near Solomon's Pools by subterranean channels. In these may perhaps be found the "sealed fountain" of Cant. iv, 12 (Hasselaquist, p. 145; Maundrell, *Early Trav.* p. 457). Traces of fountains at Jerusalem may probably be found in the names En-Rogel (2 Sam. xvii, 17), the "Dragon-well" or fountain, and the "gate of the fountain" (Neh. ii, 18, 14). But Jerusalem, though mainly dependent for its supply of water upon its rain-
water cisterns, appears from recent inquiries to have possessed either more than one perennial spring, or one issuing by more than one outlet (see Robinson, i, 343, 945; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 436, 468; comp. Ezek. xxviii, i, 12). With this agrees the "fonsennis aqua" of Tactius (Hist. v, 12), and the ἄρεως ἀποθητήριος of Aristea (Josephus, ii, 112, edit. Havercamp; compare Raumer, p. 258; Kittel, *Physical Geog.* p. 412, 416). See JERUSALEM. In the towers built by Herod, Josephus says there were cisterns with ἀποθήτηριαι through which water was poured forth (War, v, 4, 4): these may have been statues or figures containing spouts for water after Roman models (Plin. *Hist. nat.* xxvi, 15, 121). The fountain of Nazareth bears a traditional antiquity, to which it has probably good derivative, if not actual claim (Rob-
erta, *Visits in Palestine*, i, 21, 29, 38; Fisher, *Visits in Syria*, i, 81; iii, 44). See NAZARETH.

The volcanic agency which has operated so power-
fully in Palestine has from very early times given tokens of its working in the warm springs which are found near the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. These have been famous from time immemorial for their medicinal properties (Pliny, *Hist. nat.* x, 15; Lightfoot, *Opp. ii*, 224). They are confined to the vol-
canic valley of the Jordan, and all are strongly impreg-
nated with sulphur. The temperature of that of Tibe-
rias is 244 °Fahr. (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* 2, p. 421, 423). One of the most celebrated of these was Callirhoe, mentioned by Josephus as a place to be-
sorted to by Herod in his last illness (War, i, 33, 5; Kittel, *Phys. Geogr. of Pal.* p. 120, 121; Stanley, p. 285). His son Philip built the town, which he named Tibe-
rrias (the Hanh of Josh. xix, 35), at the sulphureous
hot springs on the south of the Sea of Galilee (Joseph.
*Antiqu.* xviii, 2, 3; Hasselaquist, *Travel. App.* p. 288; Kit-
to, p. 114; Burchhardt, *Syria*, p. 328, 380). Other hot
springs are found at seven miles' distance from Tibe-
rrias, and at Omkia on the coast, near Gaash, mentioned by
Ptolemy (v, 775; Burchhardt, p. 276, 277; Kitto, p. 116, 118). See CALLIRHOE.

From the value of such supplies of water in arid
countries, fountains figure much in the poetry of
the East as the natural images of perennial bless-
ings of various kinds. In the Scriptures foun-
tains are made the symbols of refreshment to the
weary, and also denote the perpetuity and inex-
haustible nature of the spiritual comfort which
God imparts to his people, whether by the influ-
ences of the Spirit, or through the ordinations of pub-
lie worship. There are also various texts in which
children, or an extended posterity, are, by a beauti-
fully apt image, described as a fountain, and the father
or progenitor as the source or spring from which
that fountain flows (Deut. xxxii, 28; *Ps. cxlii, 26; Prov.
v, 16, 18; xiii, 14, etc.). See WATER.

The FOUNTAIN-GATE (ןַּחַל by, קָה' עָשְׂרֶים, Sept. τὸν τόιον Α' λίου οὖν αὐτοίς, Vulg. porta fontis; A. V. "gate of the fountain") at Jerusalem was in the first or old wall, along the Valley of Hinnom, south of the Dung-gate, and adjoining the Pool of Siloam (from which it was probably derived in the name), on the
south of the Tyropoeon (Strong's *Harm. and Expos.* Append. p. 11). See JERUSALEM.

POQUEURÉ, Jean Antoine-Michel, a learned Ben-
edictory of the Congregation of St. Maur, was born at Châtesauroux in 1641, and died at Meaux Nov. 3, 1709.
He was made teacher of rhetoric in the mona-
stry of St. Pierre de Maur, where he acquired the reputation
of being an excellent professor, especially of Greek.
In 1678 he was appointed superior of his convent, and
filled the post for fifteen years, after which he retired
to the abbey of St. Faron at Meaux, where he died.
His works are, (1) a Latin translation of a work of
Dionysius, patriarch of Constantinople, on points of
controversy between the Calvinists and Roman Cathol-
ics, published, together with original text, under the
title of *Dionysia patriarchae Constantinopolitani super Calvinitarum errores et ac redacta imprimis prosenecia Re-
gionum*; and with the preceding, (2) a Latin transla-
tion of the acts of the council held at Jerusalem A.D.
1672, under the title of *Synodus Belletromicae pro redacta
prosera anno 1672 celebrata, grecce et lat. (Paris, 1678, 8vo).* (By the advice of François Combeffs and A. Ar-
naud, these translations were revised and corrected, and
a new edition published in 1678, the latter under the
title of *Synodus Hierosolimitanae pro redacta prosenecia*.
(3) Under the pseudonym of Tamagninus, *Historia
Monothelitarum atque Honori controversione scrutata
octo comprehensione* (Paris, 1678, 8vo), a work which
excited a good deal of interest.—*Houter, Nouv. Dic-
Générale*, xvii, 800-100.

POQUEURÉ, Jean-François, a French Jesuit, was
sent as a missionary to Central Asia in the early part
of the 18th century. He made himself acquainted with
the language, idioms, and the theogony of the Cen-
tral Empire, and was struck with their points of resem-
bances not only to Christian doctrine, but especially to
the primitive religions then dominant in the border.
According to him, the Chou-King (sacred book of Confucius) is only a paraphrase of Genesis, and the
praises addressed to Wen-wang and to Tchou-oung in
the Chi-King are only hymns in honor of the Mes-
thiah. One can only hope with this information that
poqueuré would aid in proselytizing the Chinese, who thus
had only to change the names of their deities to claim
priority in holding the doctrines of revelation over
Christians themselves. Strict theologians attacked
his opinions and censured his means of conversion;
neithertheless, on his return to Rome in 1739, pope Clement XI made him bishop of Eleutheropolis. He was recommended by the Academy of Inscriptions as the only person capable of criticizing Fourmont's Chinese Grammar. His Tabula Chronologica historiarum Sinicorum, 1729 (on 3 sheets), contains a list of the Chinese monarchs, with the dates of the chief events of the Chinese history and a complete series of the Nan-hao, or names of years (new edition by Seutter, Augsburg, 1746). He wrote also a letter to the duke de La Force, and inserted in tom. v of Lettres édifiantes, which furnishes curious details in regard to the Chinese army and the bonzes.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 352.

Fourier, François Charles Marie, a philosopher, was born at Beauconisse, 1772. His father designed him for trade, but he never took to it willingly. In 1796 he entered the French army, and in 1798 he left it and entered a mercantile house at Marseilles. His mind seems to have been turned about this time to social questions by the scarcity of food and the terrible sufferings of the poor. The relations of capital to labor, and similar social problems, occupied his mind intensely for several years, and in 1806 he issued his first book, entitled Théorie des Quatre Mouvements et des Destinées Générales. "It is the strangest, most mystical, and most startling of all his works, though merely given as a general announcement of his theory. Surprise and wonder were the only effects it produced on those who read it, and the few public writers who reviewed it." In 1821 he removed to Paris, in order to publish his writings, and lived there, with some interruptions, to his death, Oct. 10, 1837. His principal works are: Théorie des Quatre Mouvements et des Destinées Générales (1806, 8vo);—Traité de l'Association Domestique Agricole (1822, 2 vols. 8vo);—Le Nouveau Monde, Industriel et Sociétaire (1829);—a Livre d'annonces (1830);—Pieges et Chevaux socialistes, dans les deux séries des Mers et Oceans (1831);—La Fausse Industrie, morcelée, repugnante, nuisible, et l'Antidote, l'Industrie naturelle, combinée, attrayante. His Oeuvres complètes were published at Paris in 6 vols. (1840-46). The Positions of the Human Soul, translated by Morell, was published in London in 1840. With his philosophical speculations, he divided himself into science and praxis, or his psychological and ontological theory and its application in his social system. The first comprises what he styles passionale attraction, the last its application to society in industrial association. His psychology is confined to an analysis of the affections, from which he infers that the Newtonian principle of attraction is equally applicable to the social and mental worlds, and that society should be moulded in accordance with the diversity and intensity of individual attractions. Unity in diversity and harmony in contrast is what he professes to achieve in his new social system. This principle of passionale attraction is regarded by Fourier as his grand discovery, which had been culpably neglected and overlooked by past philosophers (Tennemann, Hist. Philos. § 485). Among the followers of Fourier are counted Considérant, Pompery, Lemoyn, Hennequin, Jules Lechevalier, and Trannen. Several periodicals, mostly short-lived, have been established for the defence of Fourierism, as Le Nouveau Monde, Le Phalanisnire, La Phalanxerie, La Démocratie Pacifique. Several attempts to carry out the view of Fourier were made in France and in the United States, but all failed. See Gamond, Fourier and his System (London, 1842, 8vo); Doherty, False Association, with Memoir of Fourier (London, 1841, 8vo); Christian Examiner, xxxix, 57; Methodist Quarterly Rev. v, 545. See COMMUNISM.

Fourier, Pierre, of Matalincourt, a Roman Catholic, was born at Matalincourt, Nov. 30, 1655, and died at Gray Dec. 9, 1669. He reformed the regular canons of the congregation of St. Sauveur de Lorraine, and established the religious of the congregation of Notre Dame for the instruction of girls. He died in the odor of sanctity, and his name was placed on the list of the beatified at Rome Jan. 29, 1780. See lives of him by Bedel (Paris, 1846, 8vo) and Frantz (Nancy, 1746, 12mo).—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 544-5.

Fourmont, Étienne (Stephen), a French Orientalist, known as Fourmont the elder, to distinguish him from his more famous son, the abbé Fourmont, was born at Herbelay, near Paris, June 29, 1685, and died Dec. 19, 1746. He was an earnest and indefatigable student, and, being endowed with an unusually quick and retentive memory, stored his mind with a vast amount of information in regard to the classic and Oriental languages and their literature. On the death of the abbé Galland in 1718, Fourmont succeeded him as professor of Arabic in the College of France and as member of the Academy of Inscriptions, and subsequently became a member of the learned societies of Paris, Berlin, and London. Fréret describes him as being of a gentle and cheerful disposition, wholly absorbed in his labors, and possessed of little knowledge of men, but offensively vain of his knowledge. For a list of Fourmont's numerous writings, published or in manuscript, see his life by De Guignes and Des Hautes-Pyées (Vie d'Étienne Fourmont et Catalogue de ses Oeuvres) of 1751. An edition of his Critique des Manuscrits sur l'Antiquité et la vie des scribes of 1722, and his Notes on Ancient History, and Catalogue des Ouvrages de M. Fourmont (Amst. 1781), is said, however, to contain some works only projected and never completed. Besides his famous commentary on the Psalms and Hebrew poetry, we mention here only Méditations Simicamica, complectens artem legendi linguis Sinicam Characteres (Paris, 1737, fol.), which is the preliminary portion of the following, published separately: Linguae Sinicarum mandarinicae hieroglyphicae grammatica duplex, katale et cum characteribus Sinarum (Paris, 1742, fol.);—Religions sur l'Origine de l'histoire et la succession des anciens peuples, Childiens, Hébreus, Phéniciens, Égyptiens, Greece jusqu'au temps de Cyrus (Paris 1735 and 1747, 2 vols. 4to).—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 564-565; Rose, New General Biog. Dict. vii, 427; Quérard, La France littéraire. (J. W. M.)

Fowl is the rendering of the following Heb. words in the Bible: 1. Usually שָׁעִיר (shā‘ir, פָּעִית, any winged animal, a generic term for the feathered race, frequently with the addition of the heavens, "of the heavens." 2. שְׁבָעָה (shē‘āh, so called from rushing on its prey; compare Jer. xii. 9, where it is spoken of a beast), 3. שְׁבָעָה (shē‘ēm, so called from the warlike king (Isa. xlii. 11), collect. for birds of prey (Gen. xvi. 11; Isa. xvi. 8; Ezek. xxxix. 4), like בִּשְׁמוֹ (besom, as a vulture (Rev. xvii. 2; xix. 17, 21); translated fowl in Gen. xv. 11; Job xxxvi. 7; Isa. xvii. 6, 8; נְפָשָׁת (nipash), so called from its twittering; Chald. נְפָשָׁת. Dan. iv. 9, 11, 18, 30), a small bird, spec. a sparrow (Psa. lxxxiv. 4; cii; Prov. xxxvi. xxvii. 3; Job xii. 29; Eccles. xii. 6), or similar small birds. 4. שָׁעִיר (shā‘ir, civ. xvi. 17; Prov. vi. 5, vii. 28; Amos iii. 5, etc.) also collect. birds of any kind, Gen. xv. 10; Lev. xiv. 4-53; Dent. iv. 17; Psa. viii. 9; cxliv. 10, etc.; and even a bird of prey, Ezek. xxxix. 4), occas. rendered by strange spellings, as shē‘ir. In Neb. v. 18, the word seems to have the special sense which "fowl" has with us, as it is enumerated among the viands provided for Nehemiah's table. 4. פָּעִית (pa‘ith), בְּרָיָם (barayim), "fatted fowls," 1 Kings iv. 28, as provided for the table of Solomon, where Kimchi understands apexana, but Gesenius, with the Jeraus, Targum, and other rabbis, understands תַּלְמָדוֹת (telmadot), the Governamental plumes of the ancient Egyptians had spacious poultry-yards, set apart for keeping geeze and other
wild-fowl, which they fattened for the table; and their poulterers bestowed especial care upon the geese (Wilkinson, ii, 218; iii, 174, abridgm.). See FATTED FOWL.

The Hebrew word translated "fowl is most frequently rd שֵׁרטִים, which comprehends all kinds of birds (including rosen, Luke xii, 24); but in Lev. xix, 17-21, where the context shows that birds of prey are meant, the Greek is ρυχαῖα. The same distinction is observed in the apocryphal writings: comp. Judges xi, 7; Eccles. xvii, 4; xili, 14, with 2 Macc. xv, 33. See Cock; SPARROW.

The following statements cover the remaining details.

Clean birds (םַגָּהְּכֵּנָהָיֶהוֹנָא, Deut. xiv, 11, 20), i. e. all not named in Lev. xi, 13-19; Deut. xiv, 12-18, were (as well as their eggs, לְכֹלָהָיֶהוֹנָא) used for food (Luke xii, 12), e. g. quails (q. v.), chickens, doves, also wild-fowl; hence bird-catching was very common (Psalms, 77; Amos iii, 5; Hos. v, 1; vi, 12, etc.), for which purpose nets, traps, and stool-birds (Jer. v, 27; Eccles. xi, 31 [97]) were used (see Gesenius, Thee, p. 695). See FOWLERS. In robbing a nest of its eggs or young, however, the mother-bird must be allowed to escape (Deut. xxiii, 6 sq.; see Michaelis, Synag. Comm. ii, 89 sq.; Mose Recht, iii, 181 sq.), a prescription founded not only on motives of humanity (comp. Lev. xii, 28), yet see Heumann, Das legis die. temum, Gött. 1748; also in his Novus Syllaba Dissert., p. 299 sq.); although the Talmudists (Mishna, Chohin, xii, 2) refer this only to clean birds, and make many nice distinctions in the matter, with various penalties attached (Maccaboth, iii, 4). Birds were not regularly offered in sacrifice, except in communion for some nastier victim (Lev. i, 15-17; compare Mishna, Kissim, v, 11). See Doves.

The bird was first brought to the altar, where the priest (with his nail) nipped off the head, or rather cracked (נָשָׁף) the neck, so that it still hung to the bird (Lev. v, 6); he then squeezed out the blood (sufficient, at least, in quantity for sprinkling), and finally threw the body into the fire, but without the crop, which (with its contents and the offal) was separately (נָשָׁף) thrown into the ash-heap under the altar. Before the flesh was committed to the flames, however, a folding back or breaking of the wings (נָשָׁף פָּרָר) is prescribed, a symbol of which the meaning is not clear (see Dassow, De ave urogynsecta, Viteb, 1697; Es ...)
Birds of various kinds abound, and no doubt abounded in ancient times, in Palestine. Stanley speaks of "countless birds of all kinds, aquatic fowls by the lake side, partridges and pigeons hovering, as on the Nile bank, over the rich plains of Gennesaret" (Stanley and Palestine, p. 427). The capture of these for the table or other uses would we might expect, form the employment of many persons, and lead to the adoption of various methods to effect it. See PALESTINE.

We read of the "snare," שַׁלְּשָׁ, pack (Psa. xxi, 3; xxiv, 7; Hos. ix, 8), and of the "net," רַעְשָׁ, re shedh (Prov. i, 17; Hos. vii, 11), "of the fowler," אֵבָהוֹ or אֵבָהוֹ = sower. In Hos. vi, 1, both net and snares are mentioned together. The mawkת (מָשַׁקָּה) is used synonymously with the pack in Amos iii, 5. This was employed for taking either beasts or birds. It was a trap set in the path (Prov. vii, 28; xxii, 6), or hidden
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Fowler, Edward, bishop of Gloucester, was born in 1682 at Westerleigh, in Gloucestershire, where his father was minister. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, but, removing to Cambridge, he took his master's degree as a member of Trinity College, and, returning to Oxford, was incorporated in the same degree July 5, 1656. About the same time he became chaplain to Arabella, countess dowager of Kent, who presented him to the rectory of Northill, in Bedfordshire. As he had been brought up among the Puritans, he at first objected to conformity with the Church of England, but became afterwards one of its greatest ornaments. In 1681 he was made vicar of

FOWLER

... on or in the ground (Psa. cxl, 6; cxlii, 4). The form of this springs, or trap net, appears from two passages (Amos iii, 5, and Psa. lxxix, 25). It was in two parts, which, when set, were spread out upon the ground, and slightly fastened with a stick (trap-stick), so that, as soon as a bird or beast touched the stick, the parts flew up and inclosed the bird in the net, or caught the foot of the animal. See SNARE.

By a humane as well as wise regulation, Moses forbade any one finding a bird's nest to take also the dam with the eggs or young (Deut. xxvii, 6, 7), lest the species should become exterminated (Kitto, Pictorial Bible, ad loc.). See Bird.

Fowler, Christopher, an eminent Puritan divine, was born at Marlborough in 1611, and died in 1676. He was educated at Oxford, and took orders first in the English Church, but became a Presbyterian in 1641, and signalized his zeal by the earnestness of his preaching. He was made vicar of St. Mary's, Reading, but lost the post at the Restoration. Wood's prejudices doubtless influenced his view of Fowler, whom he calls "a conceited and fantastical Presbyterian." He wrote, 1. Demoniwm Meridikwm (1655, pt. i, 4to; 1656, pt. ii, 4to);—2. Anti-Christian Blas-
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FOX

size of an English cur fox, and similarly formed; but the ears are wider and longer, the fur in general ochry-rufous above, and whitish beneath: there is a faint black ring towards the tip of the tail, and the back of the ears are sooty, with bright fulvous edges. The species burrows, is silent and solitary, extends eastward into Southern Persia, and is said to be found in Natalia. The Syrian Tašleb is reputed to be very destructive in the vineyards, or, rather, a plunderer of ripe grapes; but he is certainly less so than the jackal, whose ravages are carried on in troops, and with less fear of man. Ehrenberg's two species of Tašleb (one of which he takes to be the Araðis of ancient Egypt, and Geoffroy's Canis Niloticus, the Abu Bossein of the Arabs) are nearly allied to, or varieties of the race, but residing in Egypt, and further to the south, where it seems they do not burrow. The Egyptian Vulpes Niloticus, and doubtless the common

Egyptian Dog-Fox.

FOX (V. vulpes), are Palestine species. There is also the so-called Turkish fox (Cynalgus Turcicus) of Asia Minor, not unknown to the south as far as the Orentes, and therefore likely to be an occasional visitor at least of the woods of Libanus. This animal is one of an oc culent group, with the general character of vulpes, but having the pupils of the eyes less contractile in a vertical direction, and a gland on the base of the tail marked by a dark spot. There is, besides, one of a third group, namely, Thコンテンツしますが、contextを理解するためのプログラミングが必要です。現在のテキストを手動で処理することはできません。
which is sufficiently common along the coast, is eminently gregarious, offensive in smell; bowls intolerably in complete concert with all others within hearing; burrows; is crassipalatus and nocturnal, impudent, thievish; penetrates into outhouses; ravages poultry-yard by night. Then, if they chance on game, lizards, locusts, insects, garbage, grapes; and leaves not even the graves of man himself undisturbed. It is probable that *Canis Sylvius* is but a chryseseus, or wild dog, belonging to the group of *Dholeus*, well known in India, and, though closely allied to, different from, the jackal, *Canis*; and that if four species of *Canis* at Aleppo, Empirich and Ehrenberg of four in Libanus, not identical with each other; nor are any of these clearly included in the thirteen species which the last-named writers recognize in Egypt. They still omit, or are not cognizable of, wild dogs [see Doc.] and jackals, [see Juc.], and have been gradually extinguished by local circumstances, such as the destruction of the forests of or the inhabitants, and the consequent reduction of the means of subsistence; or, finally, they may have been extirpated since the introduction of gunpowder. Hasselquist [see E. v., 184] says foxes are common in the stony country about Bethlehem, and near the Convent of St. John, where, about vintage time, they destroy all the vines unless they are strictly watched. Thomson started up and chased one when passing over that part of the plain which Timnath is believed to have been situated. Land and Book, ii, 340. That jackals and foxes were formerly very common in some parts of Palestine is evident from the names of places derived from these animals, as Hazar-Shual [Josh. xv, 28], Shael-bim (Judg. i, 35). See JACAL.

The fox is proverbially fond of grapes (Aristoph. Egen. 1976 sq.; Theocr. v. 112 sq.; Nicand. Alexiph. 165; Phaedr. iv. 2; Galen. Alim. Facult. iii, 2), and a very destructive visitor to vineyards (Cant. ii, 15). The proverbially cunning character of the fox is alluded to in Ezek. xliii, 4, where the prophets of Israel are said to be like foxes in the desert, and in Luke xxi, 32, where our Saviour calls Herod "that fox." The fox's habit of burrowing among ruins is referred to in Neh. iv, 8, and Lam. v, 18 (see also Matt. viii, 20). (On Pas. lxxiii, 11, see Pausan. iv, 18, 4.) The Rabbinical writers make frequent mention of the fox and his habits. In the Talmud it is declared, "The r. Gerson does not die from being under the earth; he is used to it, and it does not hurt him." And again, "He has gained as much as a fox in a ploughed field," i.e. nothing. Another proverb relating to him is this:

"If the fox be at the rudder, speak him fairly. My dear brother."

Foxes are figured in hunting-scenes on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt., i, 224, abridgment). See CHASE.

None of the usual explanations of the controverted passage in Judg. xv, 5, relative to the foxes, jackals, or other canines which Samson employed to set fire to the corn of the Philistines is altogether satisfactory. First, taking Dr. Kennicott's proposed explanation of the case (Remarks on Select Passages in the O. T., Oct. 1877, p. 100), on the authority of seven Heb. MSS., by changing וְלִשֵׁגֵר to וְלִשֵּגֵר, thus reading amautus (comp. the Sept. at 1 Kings xx, 10), i.e. "sheaves" instead of "foxes," and translating כּוֹסֵה instead of "tail," the meaning then would be, that Samson merely connected three hundred shocks of corn, already reaped, by hands or ends, and thus burned the whole. We admit that this, at first view, appears a rational explanation (see Hopkins, Plumb-line Papers, Auburn, 1862, p. 20 sq.); but it should be observed that three hundred shocks of corn would not make two stacks, and therefore the result would be quite inadequate, considered as a punishment or act of vengeance upon the Philistine population, then predominant over the isles. This latter is a species of fox, found in France, used to mean corn-stacks, then it may be asked how, and for what object, were three hundred corn-stacks brought together in one place from so large a surface of country. The task, in that hilly region, would have occupied all the cattle and vehicles for several months; and then to this would not be added the undertaking of making the whole population travel repeatedly, in order finally to reload the grain and take it to their threshing-floors. Nor will the verb מִּקְשָׁת ("caught") bear the rendering thus required, for it properly means to ensnare, to take captive, and is specially applied to the act of catching animals (e. g. Amos iii, 5). (See, also, what an anonymous French author has written under the title of Rénardes de Samarc, and his arguments refuted in a treatise, De Vulpibus Simonesca;" by Gebhard, in Thea. Nov. Theol. Phil. i, 558 sq.; and comp. Gasser, Comment. ad loc. [Hal. 1751]; Pfaff, Von dem Fuchsemusam [Tub. 1736]; Schröder, De vulpibus Simonesca; [Tub. 1715]; and Tzagi, De ranae usam [Paris 1717].) The proposed reading of Ken- nicott has deservedly found little favor with commentators. Not to mention the authority of the important old versions which are opposed to this view, it is pretty certain that מִּקְשָׁת cannot mean "sheaves." The word, which occurs only three times, denotes in Isa. xi, 12, "the hollow of the hand," and in 1 Kings xx, 10; Ezek. xiii, 19, "handfuls." Reverting, therefore, to the interpretation of foxes burning the harvest by means of firebrands attached to their tails, the case is borne out by Ovid (Fast. iv, 661):

"Oor igniter missae jumbita ardentia telis
ducta foras vulpes".

In allusion to the fact that the Romans, at the feast in honor of Ceres, the goddess of corn, to whom they offered animals injurious to cornfields, were accustomed to turn into the circuit foxes with torches so fastened to them as to burn them to death, in retaliation of the injuries done to the corn by foxes so furnished. Again, in the fable of Aphonius, quoted by Merrick; but not, as is alleged, by the brick with a bass-relief representing a man driving two foxes with fire fastened to their tails, which was found twenty-eight feet below the present surface of London (Leland, Collectanea); because tiles of similar character and execution have been found in other parts of England. The r. de Cange is representing the history of Susanna and the elders, and others the four Evangelists, and therefore all derived from Biblical, not pagan sources. Commentators, following the rendering of the Sept. (eisipon, Vulg. condi), have, with common consent, adopted the interpretation that two foxes were tied together by their tails with a firebrand between them. Now this does not appear to have been the practice of the Romans, nor does it occur in the fable of Aphonius. Hence some have understood the text to mean that each fox had a separate brand; for it must be questioned whether two united would run in the same direction. They would be apt to pull counter to each other, and perhaps fight most fiercely; whereas there can be no doubt that every canine would run, with fire attached to its tail, not from choice, but necessity, through standing corn, if the fire was to have effect in the direction of the animal. For foxes and jackals, when chased, run direct to their holes, and sportsmen well know the necessity of stopping up those of the fox while the animal is abroad, or there is no chance of a chase. But this explanation requires that by the words rendered "tail to tail" we should understand this kind of the firebrand attached to the extremity of the tail, i.e. one apiece; this would be using the word in a double sense in the same pas-
sage, an equivocate not in accordance with the direct style of the narrative. It is also probable that after a few fruitless efforts at trying to pursue each of his own course, the animals would soon agree sufficiently to give themselves up to the butcher, and many of them, being free from all sense of anything as to the length of the cord which attached the animals, a consideration which is obviously of much importance in the question at issue, for, as jackals are gregarious, the couples would naturally run together if we allow a length of cord of two or three yards, especially when we recollect that the terrified animals would endeavor to escape as far as possible out of the reach of their captor, and make the best of their way out of his sight. Finally, as the operation of tying 150 brands to so many fierce and irascible animals could not be effected in one day by a single man, nor produce the result intended if done in one place, it seems more probable that the name of Samson, as the chief director of the act, is employed to represent the whole party who effected his intentions in different places at the same time, and thereby insured that general conflagration of the harvest which was the signal of open resistance on the part of Israel to the long-endured oppression of the Philistine people. (See Clarke's Comment. ad loc.; Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations, ad loc.; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 341). See Samson.

FOX, Edward, one of the English Reformers, was born in Gloucestershire (date not known precisely). He was educated at Exon, and at the University of Cambridge, of which he became provost in 1528. He held this post during his life. Wolesey sent him on an embassy to Rome, with Gardiner, to promote a bull from Clement VII authorizing the divorce of the king from Catherine of Aragon. It was in conversation with Fox and Gardiner, in 1528, that Cranmer first saw the method of settling the question of the king's divorce, by taking the opinion of the most learned men and universities in Christendom; and he it was who made it known to the king as Cranmer's suggestion, when Gardiner would have taken the credit of it to himself. In the prosecution of this plan he was sent with Stephen Gardiner, in 1530, to obtain the determination of the University of Cambridge. The heads of the university, the vice-chancellor, and the afterwards notorious Bunner, were on the king's side, but the university itself was divided. It was honorable to the University of Cambridge that so strong a resistance was offered to the will of the king. The royal authority being at this time on the side of reform, the commissioners, Fox and Gardiner, the latter being afterwards the great opponent of the Reformation, at length, though with difficulty, did it on their point, and it was thought then that 'the king's marriage was contrary to the law of God.' In 1531 he became archdeacon of Leicester, and in 1538 archdeacon of Dorset. In 1535 he was appointed bishop of Hereford. Shortly after his consecration he was sent ambassador to the Protestant princes in Germany assembled at Smalkald, whom he exhorted to unite, in point of doctrine, with the Church of England. He spent the winter at Wittenberg, and held several conferences with some of the German divines, endeavoring to conclude a treaty with them upon many articles of religion, though nothing was effected. Bishop Burnet gives a particular account of this negotiation in his History of the Reformation (pt. iii). He returned to England in 1538, and died at London May 8, 1538. He published a book, De Vera differentia Regni Pontificis et Ecclesiae Divinitatis, et quae sit iure veritas et virtus utriusque. (London, 1534 and 1538), which was translated into English by Henry Lord Stafford.—Burnet, History of the Reformation, vols. i, ii; Hook, Eccles. Biography, v, 166; Collier, Eccles. History of England, iv, 312 sq.

Fox, George, founder of the Society of Friends, was born at Drayton, Leicestershire, England, in July, 1624. His parents were pious members of the Church of England, and brought him up carefully. His mother, Mary Lago, was of the martyr stock, and had inherited their intense feelings and religious enthusiasm. To her he probably owed his education and many of the habits he formed. From his father, he was indebted for the incorruptible integrity and tenderly scrupulous regard for truth by which he was characterized. As a child, he was singularly quiet, docile, observant, and meditative. He sat among his elders silently, watching their frivolity, untruthfulness, and dishonesty, until he came to reflect seriously and deeply, resolving, 'If ever I come to be a man, surely I shall not do so, nor be so wanton.' Some of his relatives would have had the thoughtful lad trained for a clergyman, but others objecting, he was apprenticed to a person who, as the manner then was, combined a number of trades—shoemaking, wool-stapling, cattle-dealing, and so on. George proved a valuable assistant to him. The fear of God rested mightily upon him, and he was anxiously watchful in all things to maintain strict integrity. 'Verily' was a favorite word of his, and he was in the custom of saying among those who knew him, 'If George says "Verily" there is no altering him' (Christian Times). His early religious experience was very deep; and, after the termination of his apprenticeship, he felt himself impelled by a divine monition (1645) to leave his home and friends, seek the "light." For economic reasons, however, in these travels he wore a leathern doublet. In 1647, after, as he says, "forsoaking the priests and the separate preachers also, and those esteemed the most experienced people," none of whom could "speak to his condition," he "heard a voice" calling him to Christ, and his "heart leaped for joy." This was in 1647, in which year he began the ministry, which lasted during his life. When he began his work the mind of England was in a state of ferment, and he found many willing auditors. His personal peculiarities of dress and manner attracted the attention and personation of the lord. Then the Lord sent me forth into the world, he forbade me to put off my hat to any, high or low, and I was required to 'thee' and 'thou' all men and women, without any respect to rich or poor, great or small; and as I traveled up and down, I was not to bid people 'good-morrow' or 'good-evening', but neither more nor less, I should gape with my leg to any one; and this made the sects and professions to rage' (Journ. 1648). He taught (Journ. 1649, p. 25) that "it is not the Scriptures, but the Holy Spirit, by which opinions and religions are to be tried." Of course these novel and earnest views excited great opposition: Fox was imprisoned for some time as a "disturber of the peace." He continued, however, to travel up and down England, preaching, and exhorting, and leaving permanent traces behind him almost everywhere. His followers were first called "Quakers" at Derby, in 1656, by Justice Bennet, as Fox says, for 'Quaker' out of some reference to the Lord, and in 1655 he was brought before Cromwell, who pronounced favorably upon both his doctrines and character. Nevertheless, he was frequently imprisoned by country magistrates. In 1669 he married the widow of Judge Fell. He was again sent to America, where he spent two years in propagating his views with much success. On his return to England in 1673, he was imprisoned for some time in Worcester jail, under the charge of having held a meeting from all parts of the nation for terrifying the king's subjects. On the land hisHolliwell devoted himself to the advancement of learning in Germany, and was always endeavoring to persuade men to listen to the voice of Christ within them. He died in London, January 13, 1691 (Chambers, Cyclopædia, s. v.). The person and character of George Fox was, in many respects, a lofty one. In self-sacrifice, earnestness, and purity, he was a model. His intellectual powers were not of a very high order. His doctrine of the "inner light" was elaborated by Robert Barclay. (q.)
ely, he was brought to the notice of the earl of Rich-
mund, who, when he became king (Henry VII), made
Fox a privy councillor, a bishop of Exeter, and send
him on several embassies, then transferred him to
the see of Durham, and finally to that of Winchester.
Fox evinced his appreciation of learning by founding
Corpus Christi College, Oxford, with two lectures for
its benefactors, and by establishing several free
schools. He died in 1559, and was buried in Win-
chester Cathedral. He wrote The Contemplation
of Synners (Lond. 1499, 4to)—Letter to Cardinal Wolsey.
-Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, s. v.; Rose, New
Chalmers, Church and State, 2d ed. (L. W. M.)

FOX, William Johnson, an English Unitarian
minister, and also a politician, was born at Ugleyhall
Farm, near Wrentham, Suffolk, in 1786, the son of
a small farmer. In youth he gave promise of talent,
and was dedicated to the Christian ministry, and
studied at Homerton College, then under the direction
of Dr. Prys Smith. He soon abandoned the orthodox
independent, and became first a Unitarian, and later
a deistical heresiarch, who preached more on politics
than on religion. His chapel at Finsbury Square
was filled by auditors attracted by his eloquence and
his spirit of philanthropy. Politics at last became
more attractive to him than preaching, and in 1847 he
entered Parliament, in which he held a seat for Old-
ham until 1862, when falling health compelled him to
resign. He died June 3, 1864. He was a man of liter-
tary tastes, and was a frequent contributor to the
Westminster Review, and to the Retrospective Review.
His peculiar theological views are set forth in his Re-
ligious Ideas (Lond. 1849). He also published Lectures
on Morality (1836, 8vo). These, with other writings
of his, are collected in Memorial Edition of the Works
of W. J. Fox (Lond. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo).

FRANCHET, GERARD DE, a monkish ecclesiastical
historian, was born at Châlons (Limousin), in France,
about the beginning of the 18th century, and died at
Limoges Oct. 4, 1721. He entered the Dominican or-
der in 1722, and filled in succession the posts of prior
of the convent of Limoges (1733-45), then of that of
Marseilles, provincial of Provence (1751-9), and (1786)
was chosen assistant (de한설) provincial by the
chapter of Limoges. He wrote (according to Layard),
by the order of the chapter general which as-
sembled at Paris in 1786, Vitae Fratrum ordinis Prudi-
catorum (Douay, 1619, and Valence, 1657); Chronicon
ab Iniusto; and left, besides, some manuscripts.

FRAGMENTS OF WOLVENBUTTLE. See WOLVEN-
BUTTLE FRAGMENTS.

Frame is the rendering in the A. V. of ρέιτορ, 
πρεστον, form (usually spoken figuratively of imagin-
ation), e. g. the bodily formation (Psa. cii. 14; "thing
framed," Isa. xxiii, 16); and מים, mibôch, building,
e. g. of a city (Exek. xl, 2).

FRANCE, a country of Europe, having an area of
201,092 square miles, and in 1886 a population of
38,218,408 inhabitants.

I. CHRISTIAN HISTORY.—(1.) From the first establish-
ment of Christianity until the 11th Century.—France
as it was formerly called, Gaul, was among the first
of the European countries in which Christian
Churches were founded. Roman Catholic writers
tell us that the apostle Peter ordained bishops for Limoges, Tou-
loise, Bordeaux, Montpellier, Arles, Sens, Aix, Mâcon, Vienne,
Chalon, Bourg, Clermont, Avignon, and Saintes is not historical;
it but is certain that Christianity
was planted in many parts of Gaul at least as early as the 2d century.
The first Christians in
Gaul doubtless came from Asia Minor. We may as-
sume as certain that the first Churches were
ready tolerably large at the time of Ireneus (q. v.).
who in 196 presided at three provincial synods, and seems to have established a school of catechists at Lyons. At the beginning of the 4th century there was no province in Gaul as to which we have not accounts of bishops, or at least of Christian churches. Of the nation with which the Belgic kingdom in Gaul in the 5th century, the Burgundians were already Christians when they left the southern districts of Germany, and settled between the rivers Saone and Rhone and the Alps, before the year 417. Among the Franks, king Clovis (q. v.) overtook Christian, under whose avaricious, and with more than 8000 soldiers, after the battle of Tolbiacum, in 496. In the mean time Christianity became so generally extended in all parts of the country, in the north as well as in the south, that Church provinces began to be formed everywhere, the capital of each political province generally became also the seat of the metropolitan. The Franks, embracing the Catholic faith while a considerable part of Europe was still under the rule of the Arians, began soon to be regarded as the chief Catholic nation of Europe. Through the establishment of the empire of Charlemagne, France seems of for a time to become only a part of the union of all the German nations, but soon after the division of the empire in 843 it recommenced its development as an independent state. King Lothaire I. was obliged to humble himself before the pope, as the hostile power. In the year 900, the Franks were the papal threats, and the Frankish bishops did not object to have the spurious decretales used for the first time against Hincmar (q. v.) of Rheims, for they thought it better to obey a distant pope than a threatening metropolitan at home. But when, after the death of Lothaire I. (898), Charles the Bald compelled the king to summon bishops to acknowledge Ansegisus, archbishop of Sens, as the primate and papal vicar for Gaul and Germany; but, under the counsel of Hincmar, they persisted in obeying the holy father only as far as was consistent with the respect of all the metropolitans and with the laws of the Church. In general, the bishops of France, as well as the kings, resisted more energetically that any other nation the ever-growing claims of the popes, and their unceasing efforts to establish an absolute sway over all bishops, synods, and kings. The 6th century, with the downfall of the Merovingian kings, was the prominent defender of national and episcopal rights against papal usurpations. Urban II., at the Council of Clermont (1095), excommunicated King Philip for his adulterous connection with the countess Bertrade, and, aided by the sympathy of the people, compelled him to give up his paramour. Louis IX. (q. v.), though so firmly attached to the doctrines and usages of his Church that, after his death, he was declared a saint, confirmed the rights of the nation by the Pragmatic Sanction in 1268, the great palladium of the freedom of the Church. In 1249, of the position to pope Boniface VIII., who declared every one a heretic who did not believe that the king in temporal as well as in spiritual matters was subject to the pope, the three estates of France, convened in a General Diet (1802), were unanimous in maintaining the independence of the kingdom, and the king in 1670 pronounced an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually opposed against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichroud the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichroud the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichroud the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichroud the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichroud the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichroud the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichourd the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichourd the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichourd the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authority. In 1803, the king of France even succeeded in having a pope elected who took up his residence at Avignon, whichourd the kingdom in 1670, but that pope proclaimed an interdict upon the whole of France, but popular opinion effectually protested against all attempts to bend the spiritual with the secular authori...
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were taken possession of by the French (1808), and when the pope declared every one who laid his hand upon the patrimony of St. Peter excommunicated, Napoleon had the pope arrested and brought to France. An attempt to render, by means of a synod convoked at Paris (1811), the French Church independent of the Vatican, failed, and the Concordat, by which it was definitively restored, in de novo, concordant, some important concessions from the imperial pope; and when the pope revoked all he had done, Napoleon published the concordat as the law of the empire on the very next day (March 25). After the overthrow of Napoleon (1815), the Concordat of 1801 recognized the Roman Church as the religion of the state, though granting religious toleration to every form of public worship. Powerful efforts were made to re-establish among the French the belief in the doctrines of the Roman Church, and the leaders in this contest—Lamennais (q. v.), de Morny (q. v.), and the "savoir du Mission" (q. v.)—attached themselves more closely to the papal than to the Gallican school. Gallicanism, at least in its ancient form, began to die out. The Apostolic Congregation, though in opposition to the inclinations of the prudent king, obtained a concession by which the concordat of 1801 was revoked, and that of 1516 substituted for it. So decided, however, was the opposition of public opinion that it was never laid before the Chamber of Deputies. Without the consent of the Chambers, the government of Louis XVIII hesitated to make the concordat of 1816 effective. Yet Louis Philippe made as great concessions to the Church as the origin of his own authority would allow. Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and others anticipated great results from a union between ultramontanism and democracy, but the condemnation of their "reconciliation" by the pope, which was in their power, although to appease public excitement, a royal ordinance (June 16, 1829) had to close the schools of the Jesuits. The revolution of 1830 was connected with some outbursts of popular indignation against the Church, which lost the prerogative of being the religion of the state. Yet Louis Philippe made as great concessions to the Church as the origin of his own authority would allow. Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and others anticipated great results from a union between ultramontanism and democracy, but the condemnation of their "reconciliation" by the pope, which was in their power, although to appease public excitement, a royal ordinance (June 16, 1829), had to close the schools of the Jesuits. The revolution of 1830 was connected with some outbursts of popular indignation against the Church, which lost the prerogative of being the religion of the state. Yet Louis Philippe made as great concessions to the Church as the origin of his own authority would allow. Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and others anticipated great results from a union between ultramontanism and democracy, but the condemnation of their "reconciliation" by the pope, which was in their power, although to appease public excitement, a royal ordinance (June 16, 1829), had to close the schools of the Jesuits. The revolution of 1830 was connected with some outbursts of popular indignation against the Church, which lost the prerogative of being the religion of the state. Yet Louis Philippe made as great concessions to the Church as the origin of his own authority would allow. Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and others anticipated great results from a union between ultramontanism and democracy, but the condemnation of their "reconciliation" by the pope, which was in their power, although to appease public excitement, a royal ordinance (June 16, 1829), had to close the schools of the Jesuits. The revolution of 1830 was connected with some outbursts of popular indignation against the Church, which lost the prerogative of being the religion of the state. Yet Louis Philippe made as great concessions to the Church as the origin of his own authority would allow. Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and others anticipated great results from a union between ultramontanism and democracy, but the condemnation of their "reconciliation" by the pope, which was in their power, although to appease public excitement, a royal ordinance (June 16, 1829), had to close the schools of the Jesuits. The revolution of 1830 was connected with some outbursts of popular indignation against the Church, which lost the prerogative of being the religion of the state. Yet Louis Philippe made as great concessions to the Church as the origin of his own authority would allow. Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and others anticipated great results from a union between ultramontanism and democracy, but the condemnation of their "reconciliation" by the pope, which was in their power, although to appease public excitement, a royal ordinance (June 16, 1829), had to close the schools of the Jesuits.
which was strengthened by the cruel rigor with which the princes generally persecuted it. This element was developed the more strongly as the general spirit of those times was democratic, and as Calvin himself, the father of the Reformed Church, inclined to theocratic principles. In 1559 the French Reformed church was established in Paris. All the chief towns followed this example. The first synod of the French Protestant Church assembled privately in Paris, May 25, 1559. Owing to the danger of the enterprise only thirteen churches sent deputies. But the spirit of the whole protestant party was active; superintendents were then and there laid. A complete system of ecclesiastical polity was speedily adopted, for the members of the synod had too vivid a sense of the dangers to which they were exposed to waste time in unprofitable discussions among themselves. The form of government was established thoroughly Presbyterian in its character. It seems to have corresponded very closely to that of the Church of Scotland. The Consistory may be viewed as representing the Kirk Session, the Colloquy the Presbytery, while the French Synods and the General Synod correspond to the General Assembly. The Consistory was elected at first by the whole congregation over which it was to rule, but vacancies occurring afterwards were filled up by the Colloquy. The ministers were elected by the Colloquy. A minister who had served for several years was before the congregation on three consecutive Sabathays; whereafter, if no objection was made, the congregation was considered as acquiescing in the appointment. If there was any objection, the matter was referred to the Provincial Synod, whose decision was final. These provincial synods have been generally sixteen in number. The National Synod has met but seldom, owing to the severe persecutions to which the Church has been exposed, and the increasing restrictions which have been imposed upon her. The Confession of Faith adopted at the first synod consisted of forty articles. Its doctrines were strictly Calvinistic. Though the Church was much harassed by persecution during the reign of Henry II, still it greatly increased; so much so that we are told that Beza, who died in 1605, could count 2150 churches in connection with the Protestant Church. The ministers and superintendents in the one province of Normandy, and in Provence there were 60' (Eadie, s. v.). The cruel persecution to which the Calvinists were subjected after the death of Henry II, under the reign of Francis II, led them to organize the Conspiracy of Amboine, in which some discontented members of the Roman Catholic Church also took part, though the majority of the conspirators were Calvinists. Its aim was the overthrow of the proud duke of Guise and his brother, the cardinal of Lorraine, who were the uncles of the king, and the chief instigators of the persecution of the Protestants. But the conspiracy was betrayed, and many of the participants lost their lives. Calvin and Beza had been notified of the enterprise, but discouraged it, though they did not feel themselves bound to betray it. The weak king of Navarre, and still more his brother, the prince of Conde, who had been implicated in the plot, was required, but the death of the king saved their lives. The Calvinists henceforth received the name Huguenots, a name whose etymology is not quite certain. See Huguenots. During the regency of Catharine of Medicis the Huguenots suffered innumerable persecutions, and the great party, which feared that their extinction was not possible without exposing France to the terrors of civil war, was inclined to grant them religious toleration.

The dukes of Guise saw the necessity of enlarging and consolidating the Catholic party. They prevailed on the aged and vainglorious constable of Montmorency to form with them a triumvirate, which was soon also joined by the king of Navarre, who was induced by Monsieur de la Faisle to establish friendly relations with the Huguenots. The cardinal of Lorraine even followed his inclination to the Confession of Augsburg, and, contrary to the wishes of his own party, brought about a religious conference with the Calvinists at Polesey (1561), at which Beza brilliantly defended the Reformation against the attacks of the representatives of strength of others. A mixed committee, consisting of five members of each party, was appointed to conciliate the views of the two churches concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It succeeded in drawing up a formula which was accepted by the Calvinists, as well as by the queen-mother and the cardinal. But the Sertonne declared it to be heretical, and it was soon generally abandoned. The celebrated edict of January, 1562, granted to the Huguenots provisionally the right to assemble for religious worship outside of the towns, until further provision should be made by an ecclesiastical council. Beza and the Huguenots accepted this trilling concession with gratitude, but a number of parliaments, especially that of Paris, raised against it the strongest remonstrances. The duke of Guise threatened to cut it with the edge of his sword, and commenced hostilities in the persons of the Huguenots. In one place, where a number of the Huguenots were massacred. A bloody civil war ensued, in which the Huguenots suffered heavy losses, and which was ended by the Peace of St. Germain (1570), in which the government gave to the Huguenots four fortified towns as security for the future. The Huguenots conceived new hopes; their chief defender, Henry of Navarre, was married to the king's sister; but when all their chief men were assembled at Paris to celebrate the nuptials, the queen-mother gave treacherously the sign for that general and bloody massacre known in history as the Night of St. Bartholomew, in which from 20,000 to 100,000 Protestants perished, and among them the great Coligny (q. v.). The Protestants again rose in despair, and received new concessions in the Edict of Poitiers (1577), but the Holy League, which had been organized by the pope and the Catholic princes of France, reappeared, and, after the death of Henry II, was allowed to the Protestants, yet, to overcome the hostility of the Roman Catholic party, he believed it necessary to join the Roman Church (1598). He gave, however, to his former coreligionists, by the Edict of Nantes (1598), which he declared irrevocable, freedom of faith and of public worship (with only a few restrictions), their rights as citizens, and great privileges as an organized political corporation. They were declared eligible for all positions of honor and dignity, and for appointments in the public service, and received an annual grant of 1000 crowns. The remonstrances of several magistrates and provinces against this decree were in vain. Thus brighter days seemed to approach. During the twenty-six years which elapsed between the massacre and the publication of this document, there was in the country a great improvement in both the Church and the state. After the assassination of Henry IV (1610) the Protestants were again forced by persecution to take up arms in defense of their rights; but they were disarmed as
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a political party by cardinal Richelieu, though, by an
act of amnesty at Niames (1629), be secured to them
their former ecclesiastical privileges. About this time
their number had been reduced to only about half of
what it was before the massacre of St. Bartholomew.
Louis XIV regarded it as his special mission to break
the power of the Protestants in the kingdom. The Protes-
tants were deprived of a great many churches and
schools; the utmost efforts were made to convert all
who were accessible to fear, promises, or persuasion;
children were taken from their parents; "booted mis-
sions of dragoons" were sent in every direction (after
1650), and the Press Edit of Niamey was destroyed and
subsequently punished in 1685. See NANTES, EDIT OF.
One mountain tribe [see CAMBRIERS] in the Cevennes took
up arms against the king, but his prophets and heroes ei-
ther perished on the battle-field, or gained only the privi-
lege of going into exile (1794). It is calculated that
from 80,000 to 40,000 Protestants fled from France at
this time. Nevertheless, two millions of the Reformed
remained, with no congregations except in the wilder-
ness, and in 1744 they again held their first National
Synod. "In the closing years of the reign of Louis
XIV, the influence of the Church was strong enough to
keep the Protestants within bounds; the great law of the
Protestants was more leniently dealt with. Though
now enjoying external peace, the Church began to ex-
hibit signs of internal declension. The chief causes
producing this effect were the want of trained and edu-
cated men to fill the office of pastor, and the spirit of
fanaticism existing among the Roman Catholics."

The Reformation of Luther found early adherents in
France, some of whom suffered martyrdom for their
faith [see REFORMATION in France], but the influ-
ences of Calvin soon prevailed. In 1648, Alsem, and a
number of other districts and towns in which the Lu-
theran Church was either exclusively or partly estab-
lished, were ceded to France by the Peace of Westphalia.
That peace was regarded by the Lutherans, and again confirmed by the Peace of Nymwegen in 1678. On the same terms France acquired, in 1681, Strasbourg, and in 1796, from Württemberg, Mompel-
gard. The congregations of these districts gradually
decayed, and the number of entire congregations which
have been brought back to the Roman Church is said
to be over sixty.

The National Assembly of 1789 gave to all religious
denominations equal rights, yet the Revolution soon
afterwards raged against the Protestant churches as
much as against the Roman Church. The clergy of the
latter were first restored by the decree of 1802, in which
Napoleon assigned to the clergymen of the French Re-
formed and the French Lutheran churches salaries from
the public treasury, and gave them, of his own authority,
as a new constitution. The principal points of this
constitution were as follows: The lowest ecclesi-
astical board for both denominations is the Consistory,
which consists of the pastors of the consistorial dis-
trict, and from six to twelve laymen. There is to be
one Consistory for every 6000 souls, no matter whether
they belong to one or several congregations (Churches)
of France, showing the diversities of its origin by the
variety of liturgies, hymn-books, catechisms, etc., which
are still in use. The free exercise of their worship has
not, on the whole, been interfered with; yet many roy-
al decrees have favored the Roman Church and prose-
lutism. A member of entire congregations which
have been brought back to the Roman Church is said
to be over sixty.
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A great revival in the Protestant churches commenced about 1829. Those who, under the influence of this revival, sought to unite themselves by closer spiritual bonds than the state churches afforded, were generally designated by the name Methodists, although they were not in the sense of the word Methodists. Many of the converts kept themselves aloof from the state churches, and began to lay the foundation of independent congregations. In the state Church a violent contest arose between the Evangelical and the Rationalistic parties. The "Evangelical Association," founded in 1838, was supported as a home missionary society by evangelical Christians both in and out of the state churches. A large number of religious societies sprung up, partly supported by only one of the great parties, but partly also by both. In 1846, Frederick Migne, I. C., with several other men, organized the Evangelical school, succeeded from the Reformed State Church because the synod of the Church refused to demand from all ministers an adhesion to the fundamental articles of the evangelical faith. With the assistance of Count Gasparin and others, he succeeded in having all the dissident churched; itself, into a Diocese des églises évangéliques de France, which held its first General Synod in 1849. The churches belonging to this union are entirely independent of the state, and their General Synods meet biennially. In both the state churches and in some leading men and journals of the Rationalistic party have gone so far as to undignify deistical views, and all attempts to force them out of the Church have failed. On the other hand, when a pastor of the Evangelical school showed an inclination towards Baptist views, the choice was left to him either to resign or to be appointed for life by the government, instead of being elected by the district assemblies. The supreme Church board is called the Supreme Consistory, and the government appoints his president and one member. All the inspectors are also members of this Supreme Consistory, with the liberty of deposing them, and, held district, and one deputy of the theological seminary. The election of these latter two classes is left to the Church. The Directory has the right of appointing all pastors, subject to the approval of the government. Soon after the publication of the decree of March 26, a new division, and an increase of the consistory of the two churches, and of the Inspections of the Lutheran Church, took place. This reorganization of the two churches afforded to both this theoretical advantage, that each department was assigned to a Consistory, so that the archbishops and bishops are formed, in the inspection of their dioceses by vicars-general, whose number ranges from two to fifteen, and by two or three secretaries. The ecclesiastical courts have risen in importance since the re-establishment of the provincial and diocesan synods, and consist of a president, an official, a promoteur, one or several assessors, and one greffier. As the bishops are not elected, but nominated by the government, the chapters have less importance than in other countries. The canons of these chapters, all of whom are appointed by the bishops, form the assemblé general, and are divided into assemblé de chanoines honoraires, and assemblé titulaires. The third class contains the active resident members. The first class contains bishops of other dioceses; the second class (the most numerous), many pastors, vicars, professors of theological faculties, presidents of seminaries, college rectors, and members of religious orders, foreign bishops and archbishops and others, under the names of foreigners. Rural deaneries, other chapters, and the office of archdeacon were swept away by the Revolution, but a new chapter of St. Denis (Dionysi), prominent not so much by influence as by high position, has been founded, near the tomb of the imperial family, by Louis Napoleon, in the hands of the members: first, the bishops who have retired; and, secondly, ten canons, with ten honorary members, these latter including the imperial chaplains. The
lower clergy are divided into curias, dozeatures, and vicariates. There are about 3600 of the first, about 18,000 of the second, and more than 9000 of the third class. Besides, there are a number of aumoniers (chaplains) appointed for the lyceums, colleges, normal schools, hospitals, and jails; also for the army and the navy, each of which has its aumonier en chef. Thus the total number of religious vocations within the Church needs 40,000. In the administration of the secular affairs of the parishes, some members of the laity take part as marguilliers de paroisse (treasurers), or members of the so-called Fabrique (church council).

In the Roman Church, the religious orders and communities of the clergy, and societies and confraternities among the laity, are very numerous. Among the monastic orders the Jesuits (q. v.) occupy a prominent position, both by the number of their establishments and by their influence. Some of their members (e.g. Ravignan and Félix) have shown themselves the greatest pulpits orators of modern France. The Benedictines (q. v.) have re-established a convent at Solesmes, and have resumed the literary labors of their order, but have not been able as yet to obtain many members. The Dominicans, though not very numerous, have gained prestige from the reputation of the cardinal, who re-established the order in France. Nearly all the monastic orders of the Roman Church have now some establishments in France, and a number of new ones (e.g. the Oblates, Marists, and society of Pécoux) have been founded. Many of the religious orders and communities receive with open arms the zeal to the work of foreign missions. At the head of them are the Lazarists (q. v.), whose principal establishment is in Paris. With them vies especially the Seminary of Foreign Missions at Paris, which was founded in 1853, abolished in 1792, and re-established in 1896. It is under the administration of a superior and six directorgs, and sends out every year large numbers of missionaries to Eastern Asia. The Oblates, the Marists, the Pécoux Society, the Jesuits, the Priests of Mercy, the Capuchins, and many other orders and congregations, sent in missions in foreign lands. A new missionary seminary for the missions in Africa was established at Lyons in 1858. The communities of women, who nurse the sick and the aged poor, or devote themselves to teaching and to the reforming of prisoners and wrecked females, are very numerous and prosperous. A great number of these congregations of societies—such as the Sisters of Charity (q. v.), the congregation of the Good Shepherd (q. v.), the Little Sisters of the Poor, etc.—increase with a rapidity which is almost without example in the entire history of the Roman Church. The religious families among the laity also increase in strength and numbers every year. The most important among them are the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, the central missionary society of the Roman Church, to which now nearly all countries of the world contribute. It was founded in France in 1822, has its centers at Paris and Lyons, and its contributions amount to about 5,000,000 francs annually, more than one half of which is contributed by France. The society publishes a bimonthly, Annals of the Propagation of Faith, in various languages. The central children's missionary society of the Church, called the Society of the Holy Childhood, has its central organization in France. Its annual income amounts to about 1,000,000 francs. The St. Vincent Society, for visiting and assisting the poor, has established branch associations in more than 9000 localities, and expenses for the assistance of the poor more than 2,000,000 francs annually. Primary education in France is almost entirely under the control of the bishops. Most of the schools are conducted by religious congregations, such as the Brothers of the Christian Schools, the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, the Brothers of St. Joseph, Brothers of St. Mary, members of the Society of Mary, Daughters of the Holy Spirit, and many others. The seminaries, in which those who have the priesthood in view are educated from their early boyhood (Grands et Petits Séminaires), are now, as they always have been, under the sole control of the bishops. The relations of the Church to the State colleges were, until the Revolution of 1848, not to the satisfaction of the Church, and in 1850 the college had its establishment terminated by the law of March 15, 1850, which grants the Church the liberty to found free colleges. This permission has called into existence a very considerable number of Roman Catholic colleges and boarding-schools. Of theology exist at Paris (the Sorbonne), at Lyons, Rosel, and Bordeaux, but, as the professors and deans are appointed by the minister of public worship, they do not enjoy the patronage of the bishops, and have but a limited number of students. Moreover, the course of studies at the three last-named is by no means superior to that of the Grandes Sémianires. In order to promote the study of scientific theology, which, on the whole, is cultivated but little, the bishops have organized at Paris an école ecclésiastique des hautes études.

Nominalistically, the immense majority of the population of France is still connected with the Roman Catholic Church. The census of 1851 claimed out of the entire population (35,781,627) 34,931,082 as Roman Catholics. At the last French census the religious denominations were not taken into consideration. In 1866 the Roman Catholic population of the French dominions was estimated at in France, 36,000,000; French possessions in America, 814,000; Algeria, 190,000; other French possessions in Africa, 183,000; possessions in the West and South America (Bolivar), 200,000; possessions in the East Indies, 500,000. A very large portion of these, however, are practically not only without any connection whatever with the Church, but even decided opponents of it. Among the daily journals published at Paris only a few are considered as Roman Catholic papers. The number of religious journals, in proportion both to the Roman population of France and to the religious press of other Roman Catholic countries, is small. The most important among the Roman Catholic papers are the Monde and the Univers, both dailies of Paris, and counted among the most important organs of the ultramontane party in the world. The following table gives the list of ecclesiastical provinces, with number of dioceses, clergy, and religious communities in each, as reported in 1869:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Canons</th>
<th>Bishops or Prelates</th>
<th>Canons or Vicaire</th>
<th>Titulature</th>
<th>Casual</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alsace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzère</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avignon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béarn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambrai</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaïe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheims</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>3219</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Protestantism. Of the Protestant churches of France, the Reformed and the Lutheran, are recognised as state churches. The French government appropriates a certain sum of money every year for their support. The budget for 1861 gave, as the total sum of this appropriation, 1,462,286 francs—a little less than 800,000 dollars. It was divided as follows: 200,000 francs for the salaries of Reformed pastors, 890,400 francs for the salaries of Lutheran pastors, 415,750 francs; in aid of
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theological schools, 82,000 francs. The remainder was devoted to buildings and repairs, to the support of widows, and to incidental expenses. The salaries are allotted by law, according to the population of the communes, or districts. The pastors of Paris receive 6,000 francs per annum. The commune, with a population of over 30,000 souls have 2000 francs; from 30,000 down to 5000 souls, 1800 francs; below 5000 souls, 1500 francs. Thus a pastor in one of the state churches in the poorest village in France, or in a remote country parish, is insured a salary of 300 dollars a year. The state also pays a salary to the bishops of the churches, according to their importance as the religious and political despots of their respective See. The clergy are divided into three classes: the Church, the Academy (where they are able and willing to do so. Some of the parishes, especially in the departments of the Doubs, Bas-Rhin, Haut-Rhin, and Vosges, have funded or real property, the proceeds of which are devoted either to the support of the pastor, or to repairs, church expenses, etc. The salaries for parochial purposes, for the poor, are taken up at the church-doors every Sunday. In general, the parishes have parsonages; where they have not, the communes are bound by law to furnish a subsidy for rent, unless the funds of the parish afford sufficient income for the purpose. A provision in the law is not de geure, but the communes are authorized to provide it (Napoleon's Decree of May 5, 1806). The state also provides for two Protestant theological seminaries—one at Stras- burg, for the Lutheran Church, and the other at Montauban, for the Calvinists. One pastor can be admitted to the ministry before twenty-five years of age. No parish can augment its number of ministers without the consent of the government. No religious service at which more than twenty persons shall assemble can be held except in an authorized place of worship. No preacher is allowed to incur any penalties, directly or indirectly, in his sermons, or to attack the Roman Catholic religion, or any other authorized by the state. The highest Church judicatures are, in part, filled with nominees of the government, and no real autonomy of the churches is allowed. No one can be admitted to the ministry before twenty-five years of age. How vacancies are to be filled was not stated. Its president for 1868 was General Dutheil, of the Engineers; secretary, M. Sayous, sub-director of the non-Catholic cults in the Ministry of Worship. Besides them there were 11 other members. The Council is the organ of communication between the Reformed Church and the government of the state. Its functions are not clearly defined, and its working, on the whole, has been not Infected by animosities. The whole body of the churches, under the Central Council, are the Consistories, Synods, and Presbytery Coun- cils. The whole of France was in 1868 divided, for the Reformed Church, into 104 Consistorial Districts, intended to embrace at least 6000 souls each, though this has not always been the case. The functions of the Consistory is composed of all the ministers of the Consistorial District, and of a body of laymen elected by the Presbytery Councils of towns other than the chief town of the parish. The Presbytery Council of the chief town has the functions of the Consistory. The president is elected by the Consistory, subject to the appointment of the government of the state. The functions of the Consistory are to see that church-worship and discipline are regularly observed; to receive, judge of, and transmit to the government the acts of the Presbytery Council; and to superintend the schools of the district. It has no legislative power whatever, but it superintends the general interests, both religious and civil, of the various churches under its jurisdiction. It nominates to the government pastors for vacant parishes. The Presbytery Council is a body of laymen in each parish, not less than four in number, nor more than seven. They are elected by the parish every three years. The minister of the parish is president. It performs the functions of the council of the Synod, administers the property, order, and discipline of the parish, under the authority of the Consistory. The Synods are essentially ecclesiastical bodies, superintending the spiritual element, as the Consistories do the general administration of the Church. Five consistorial churches constitute a Synodal District, and each sends a secretary to the Synod, a lay deputy to the Synod, which thus consists of ten members. Of these Provincial Synods there are twenty-one in France. No periodical sessions are allowed, nor can any session be called without the permission of the government. The decisions to be treated at the session must be stated beforehand; they cannot be treated at the sessions, which cannot last more than six days. The result of all these restrictions may be readily imagined. The Provincial Synods either do not meet at all, or, if they do, their sessions have no importance for the govern- ment of the Church. No National Synod is provided for, and none is held. Thus the Reformed Church of France lacks the most vital element of presby- terian connectional government—a General Assembly. The feebleness of the Church government is la- mentally manifest in many points. The present con- test about Rationalism brings this weakness out in the strongest light. The old French confession of faith is nominally the standard of doctrine, but a man may preach Unitarianism, Universalism, or even Panthe- ism, and there is no power to call him to an account before any ecclesiastical tribunal constituted to try him and to depose him. The Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church is at Montauban, in the South of France (Tarn et Garonne). No one can be a minister in the Reformed Church of France without a certificate that he has studied at one of the theological schools (of France or Geneva), and the diploma of bachelor in theology. All the regulations of the theological schools must be approved by the government. Ac- cording to Th. de Prat, Annaire Protestant, 1868-1870 (Paris, 1868), the statistics of the Reformed Church in 1868 were as follows: Consistories, 104; parishes, 507, with 957 "assemblies"; temples or oratories, 908; schools, or "salles d'asile", 1885; official pastors, 606; auxil- iary pastors, suffragans, and coundomiers (chaplains), 86. The population reported by the Consistories (eight Consistories which made no report being estimated) amounts to 690,000.

Lutheran Church.—The highest judicatures of the Lutheran Church are the Higher Consistory and the Directory. Under these are Inspections, Consistories, and Presbytery Councils. The Higher Consistory consists of 57 all holding office for life. It is composed of a president and one layman nominated by the government; of 16 laymen chosen by the In- spectors or Inspectorial Assemblies; of one professor from the theological seminary, chosen by the faculty; and of eight pastors, who are at the same time inspectors and members of the Consistory. The re- spect to the inspection at least every other year. The con- sistory is the highest executive body of the church; it must meet at least once a year. It is the final court of appeal, and has the right to be represented official- ly by the Consistory of Paris. The Directory consists of five members, also holding office for life; the pres- ident, appointed by the government (who is also pres-
FRANCE 647

ident of the Higher Consistory); one lay member and one clerical inspector appointed by government; and two deputies named by the Higher Consistory. Its functions are purely administrative, but that means a great deal in France. It nominates to the government all passive inspectors, has full authority over the schools and the theological seminary, not only to name the professors, but to direct the course of instruction. The Inspectors are territorial districts, under the government of Inspectors or Inspectorial Assemblies. Of those that are not elected in France, there are more inspectors than there are schools; the largest Inspection includes nine Consistorial Inspectors. The Inspectorial Assembly includes all the pastors embraced in the district, and an equal number of laymen chosen by the Consistorial Inspectors. They meet only at times fixed by the state. In each Inspection there is an ecclesiastical inspector appointed by the government, who convokes and presides over the Inspectorial Assemblies. These inspectors, under the authority of the Directory, visit each parish at least once in four years; ordain and install ministers; have supervision over the publication of books for schools, and over the religious instruction in the primary schools under Inspectional supervision of the district. The Consistorial Inspectors of the Lutheran Church of France are forty-four in number. They are composed of both lay and clerical members, the laymen holding office for three years. All the pastors of the district, with the members of the Presbytery, constitute the chief city and the equal number of laymen chosen by the more popular parishes, constitute the Consistorial Assembly. The functions and jurisdiction of the Consistorial Inspectors are very much the same as those of the Consistorial Inspectors of the Reformed Church, which have already been described. One of the most important points of difference between them is, that in the Reformed Church the Consistorial Inspectors nominate the pastors, while in the Lutheran this function is discharged by the Directory, as above stated. The powers and duties of the Presbyterial Council are similar to those of the Consistorial Assembly of the Reformed Church. The theological seminary of the Lutheran Church is at Strasburg. The president of the Director is ex-officio director of the seminary. There are six professors, whose salaries are paid by the state. The faculty of theology are also professors in the Seminary of Strasburg, which has 600 members. This, as well as the Directors, is in the hands of the Ministry of Fine Arts. The school is well organized and conducted. According to the Annaire Protestant, the statistics of this Church in 1868 were as follows: 44 Consistorial Inspectors, 233 parishes, 202 amnesties, 886 temples (96 were supplied by government, or joint government and private bodies), 713 schools, 271 official pastors, 46 vicars, auxiliary pastors, and numéros. According to the report furnished by 42 Consistorial Inspectors, and estimates for the two other Consistorial Inspectors, the Lutheran population amounted to 1,056,000.

In Italy, the United Protestant Church (Reformed and Lutheran) has 3 Consistorial Inspectors, 16 parishes (9 Reformed, 7 Lutheran), 66 annexes, 25 temples or oratories, 14 schools, 16 official pastors (7 Reformed, 9 Lutheran).

Independent Churches.—The largest body of independent (i.e., not state) Protestants in France is that which is organized under the name Union des Eglises Evangéliques de France (Union of Evangelical Churches of France). Five churches in Paris, with nine stations, are connected with the Union. The number of provincial churches in France is 86, and each of these is under an inspector, elected by a majority of the clergy of the parish. The total membership is 2,725, an average of 60 to each church. The largest church is that of the Taitbout, in Paris, with 210 members. There are seven independent churches not in connection with the Union, and numerous small stations, and has a chief agent in its administration (General Bodies). In Algiers the Union has six stations. As yet the Union has no theological seminary. Its candidates for the ministry study at Geneva or Lausanne, and aid is furnished by an education society to such students as need it. There is great vitality in this organization; it numbers Pressensé, Borsier, and des Gasparin among its leaders.
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FRANCIS OF ASSISI

Francis, founder of the Order of Friars, was born in 1182 at Assisi, in Umbria, where his father, Peter Bernardone, was a rich merchant. The son was intended also for business; but, having a taste for military life, he took part in a contest between Assisi and Perugia, and was taken prisoner.

After a year's captivity he was released by a fit of sickness which brought him near the gates of death. He determined to renounce the world. But, on recovering his health, he abandoned his religious life and plunged into gayety. Suddenly conscience-stricken, he vowed to live a life of poverty. The following incident illustrates this time.

"Worshiping in a country church consecrated to St. Damian, he seemed to hear a voice saying, 'Francis, go and prepare my house, which thou seest falling into ruins.' What was the man pledged to poverty to do? He quietly went home, stole a horse from a stable, then went to his father's warehouse, and stole from thence silks and embroideries, with which he loaded the profligate horse, and sold both horse and goods at the neighboring town of Foligno. Romish casuists say that this action was justified by the simplicity of his heart. It is clear that his religious training had not instructed him in the ten commandments. He offered the money to the officiating priest at St. Damian, who cautiously refused to take it. Francis cast the money into the fire, but vowed that the building should be his home until the day when it was filled, and he found himself out, and, though Francis was twenty-five years old, gave him a sound whipping, and put him into prison in his own house. Francis was set at liberty by his mother during his father's absence from home. He returned to St. Damian's, and his father followed him thither, insisting that he should either return home, or renounce before the bishop all his share in his inheritance, and all manner of expectations from his family. The son accepted the latter condition with joy, gave his father whatever he had in his pockets, told him he was ready to undergo blows and chains for the love of Christ, and went with his eight years old father before the bishop of Assisi to make a legal renunciation of his inheritance in form.

By the world, and, it would seem, by his father himself, he was regarded as a madman, but the bishop viewed the enthusiasm of the youth with allowance, and treated him with kindness. He soon after renewed his vow of poverty, imagining himself warned from heaven to do so. He begged for and labored at the restoration of several churches. At this time he pretended to the gifts of prophecy and miracles. He soon attracted followers, and, associating with himself Bernard of Quintavalle and Peter of Catania, on the 16th of August, 1209, laid the first foundation of the Franciscan Order.

The number of his adherents increased rapidly, and he drew up, in twenty chapters, a rule for his order. He carried his rule to Rome, there to obtain the papal confirmation. In 1219, Francis, Innocent III, who regarded Francis as a madman, but saw how well fitted for his purposes such a man and such an order might be, he ordained Francis a deacon in 1210, and gave his verbal approbation to the rule he had brought him up. Among his anemaphs he had to record his conversion of Clara, or St. Clare. See CLARE, St.

Born to rank and fortune, St. Clare had recourse from her early years to ascetic practices. She heard of Francis, was captivated by the luster of his piety, and, assisted by him, she eloped from her friends. "Although a raint, Francis was obviously deficient in the moral sense. They fled to the Portiuncula, a church which the Benedictines had now given to the Franciscans. He spent this time in her nineteenth year. She was welcomed by the monks and sisters, and guided by her spiritual guide, and took sanctuary in the neighboring church of St. Paul until arrangements could be made for her reception in a convent. Francis, regardless of filial duty and parental authority, induced her to return. Agitation and anxiety, notwithstanding the agony of her father, to follow her in her flight, and to partake of her seclusion. The church of St. Damian became the convent of the Order of Poor Sisters thus established. It was at first the design of Francis and his associates to study how they might die to the world, live in poverty and St. Paul, now that he had reached a sum of renown and influence, he imagined that he had a further commission.

He consulted Silvester and Clara, who declared that it was revealed to them that the founder of their order should go forth to preach. And the Franciscans became a preaching order, though the founder was an illiterate man. He persevered in his devotion to poverty, though many of his followers soon showed an inclination to appropriate to themselves some of the comforts of life. He would not permit even his friends to drink for the love of Christ, but he usually put water thither upon it. He spent rigourously eight Lents in the year." (Hook, s. v.)

It is unnecessary to record the miracles he said to have performed. In Roman Catholic phrase, he had a singular devotion to the Virgin Mary, whom he placed for his patroness of his order, and in whose honor he fasted on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul to that of the Assumption. Roman writers tell us that he was endowed with an extraordinary gift of weeping; his eyes seemed two fountains of tears, which were almost continually falling from them, and which caused his buff coat to be fastened rigidly by his habit. He was continually heard to lament the year he had a "cure" prescribed that, in order to drain off the humor by an issue, he should be burnt with a hot iron, Francis was very well pleased, because it was a painful operation and a wholesome remedy; when the surgeon was about to apply the searing iron, Francis said to his father, who was present, "Burn me gently, that I may be able to endure thee." He was seared very deep from the ear to the eyebrow, but showed no sign of pain!"

At length, finding Europe insufficient for his zeal, he resolved to preach to the Mohammedans. With this view he embarked, in the sixth year after his consecration, for Syria, but a tempest drove him upon the coast of Dalmatia, and he was forced to return to Ancona. In 1214 he set out for Morocco, to preach to the famous Mohammedan king Miramolin, and went on his way, but was shipwrecked, and was taken by the Moors, and by various accidents, so that he could not go into Mauritania. But he brought several pretended miracles in Spain, and found there some converts, after which he returned through Languedoc into Italy.

Ten years after the first institution of the order in 1210, Francis and the other members of the general chapter called the Matte, because it was assembled in booths in the fields. Five thousand friars met on the occasion. The growing ambition of the order showed itself in their praying Francis to obtain from the pope a license to preach everywhere, without the leave of the bishops. His wishes were opposed to them, but employed the more ambitious spirits on foreign missions. He reserved for himself the mission to Syria and Egypt, and the affairs of his order
FRANCIS OF ASSISI

FRANCIS OF PAULA

Drafted him to defer his departure. Innocent III had approved of his order by word of mouth. Honorius III, who succeeded Innocent in 1216, had appointed cardinal Ugolinus to the post of protector of the Minorite brethren, and approved of their missions. Francis set sail with Illuminatus of Reata and other companions from Ancona, and landed at Acro or Polomais in March. He remained there as a crusader for some time before Damiatsea, Francis was taken by the infuld scouts, and brought before the Sultan, who treated him as a madman, and sent him back to the Christian camp. He returned by Jerusalem into Italy, where, he had the consolation that Elia, whom he had left vice-general of his order, had introduced several novelties and mitigations, and worn himself a habit of finer stuff than the rest, with a longer capuche or hood, and longer sleeves. Francis called such innovated bastard children of his order, and despised Elias from his office. Resigning the generalship that year (1220), he caused Peter of Cortona to be chosen minister general, and after his death, in 1221, Elias to be restored. Francis continued always to direct the government of his order personally while he lived. Having revised his rule and presented it to Honorius III in 1224, he advised a second revision by a council summoned by a bull of the Pope on the 24th of November, 1223. In 1215, Count Orlando of Cortona had bestowed on Francis a secluded and agreeable residence in Mount Alberello, a part of the Apennines, and built a church there for the friars. To this solitude Francis was glad to retire, and to pass the remainder of his life there before his death, according to his monkish chronicles, he had a vision of Christ under the form of a seraph. "The vision disappearing, left in his soul a seraphic ardor, and marked his body with a figure conformable to that of the crucified, as if his body, like wax, had received the impress of a seal, for soon the marks of the nails began to appear in his hands and feet, such as he had seen in the image of the God-man crucified. See Stigmata. His hands and feet were pierced with nails in the middle: the hands, round and black, were on the palms of his hands and fore part of the feet. The points of the nails, which were very little long, and which appeared on the other side, were bent backwards on the wound which they made. He also had on his right side a red wound, as if he had been pierced with a lance, which often shed a red blood on his tunic."

Francis is the saint who has received more favors of heaven ever after by covering his hands with his habit, and by wearing shoes and stockings—a modesty which prevented others from seeing, and therefore from bearing witness to the marks, for whose existence we have no evidence. The bishop of Olmutz denounced the practice as superstitious. A papal bull of 1253 vindicated the claims of the miracle. "The Dominicans represented the whole affair as an imposture, the invention of the new order of Franciscans to raise their credit, but it is now generally believed in the Roman Church."

Worn out at last, Francis retired to Assisi. In a year he began to act as an itinerant preacher throughout Umbria, and it was "during this time that a woman of Bagaria brought an infant to him that it might be healed. Francis laid his hands on the child and it recovered: that child grew to be a man, and the man continued (q.v.), who had received his gratitudes by becoming the biographer of Francis, carefully recording all the wonderful circumstances of his life, and working up them into a beautiful fiction."

"In the letter part of his life he had attributed no value to self-mortification, in itself considered, but regarded it solely as a mean to an end, to overcome sensual desires and for promoting purity of heart. Love appeared to him to be the soul of all. Once, when one of the monks, who had carried his fasting to excess, was deprived by it of his sleep, and Francis perceived it, he brought him a portion of his own (q.v.), which he ate to recover."

On the next morning, when he assembled his monks, he told them what he had done, and added, 'Take not the eating, but the love, my brethren, for your example.' Later in life, he did not shrink from preaching before the pope and the cardinals. 'His words,' says Bonaventura, 'penetrated, like glowing fire, to the inmost depths of the heart."

Once, when he was to preach before the Roman court, he had occasion to remember a carefully written discourse, he felt all of a sudden as if he had forgotten the whole, so that he had not a word to say. But after he had openly avowed what had occurred to him, and invoked the grace of the Holy Spirit on him, he began to speak with such power, which produced a wonderful effect on all present. Again, as the ascetic bent admits of being easily converted into a contempt of nature, so we cannot but regard as the more remarkable that love, pushed even to enthusiasm, with which Francis embraced all life, was often tinged with a feeling of relationship with all nature, by virtue of its common derivation from God as Creator, which seems to bear more nearly the impress of the Hindoo than of the Christian religion, leading him to address not only the brutes, but even inanimate creatures, as brothers and sisters, with an affectionate tone, especially such as are employed in the sacred Scriptures as symbols of Christ. This bent of fanatical sympathy with nature furnished perhaps a point of entrance for the pantheistic element which in later times was quite prominent."

(Neandert, Church History, Torrey's transl. 4v, 273 sq.)

Francis died Oct. 4, 1226, and was canonized by Gregory IX in 1230. His order soon rose to great power and splendor. See Franciscans.

His writings (epistles, sermons, sacristy treatises, discourses, poems, etc.), with his life by Bonaventura, were published by H. Haye, general of the Minorites (Par. 1641, fol.).

His life will also be found in Wadding, Annales Minorum, vol. i (Rome, 1781); Voigt, Leben von Franz von Assisi (Tübinz. 1840); Chavir de Malan, L'Ex de St. François (Par. 1811, 8vo); and in Böhringer, Kirche christi in Biographien, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 496; Hahn, Franz von Assisi, ein Heiligenbild (Lips. 1856).—Hase, Ch. History, p. 255; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xiii, pt. ii, ch. n, 49; Jortin, Remarks on Ecles. History, vol. v; Hook, Eccl. Biography, v, 296.

Francis of Borgia, a Jesuit and saint of the Roman Catholic Church, was a Spanish nobleman, born in Valencia in 1516. After a careful education he became a Jesuit, and, after the death of Charles V, was turned to a religious life by the solemn circumstances attending the funeral of the empress Isabella, after which he became a disciple of Ignatius Loyola, and was appointed by him to preach the Gospel in Spain and Portugal. On the death of Laines in 1556, he was elected general of the order of Jesuits. He is the author of many ascetic writings, and contributed much to the perfection of the organization of the Jesuits. He would have been made pope on the death of Pius V, had not the state of his health prevented it. Francis of Borgia died at Rome in 1572, and was canonized by Clement IX in 1671. See Vie de St. François de Borgoia, by Verjus, after Ribadeneyra (1727, 4to); Ortínez-Joly, Histoire de la Comp. de Jesu (vols. i, ii). The writings of Francis were translated into Latin by the Jesuit Deux (Brux. 1675, fol.).—Hoefner, Newes. Biog. xxx, 259, 1877.

Francis of Paula, founder of the order of Minims, was born at Paula, in Calabria, in 1416. He was brought up in a Franciscan convent at St. Mark, where he distinguished himself by rigid asceticism. In order to exceed St. Francis himself in austerity of life, he retired to a cell on the desert part of the coast, where he obtained from the Pope a dispensation to eat; and as the monk still shrank from touching it, he set him the example, and ate first. On the next morning—III.—21°
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named Francis superior general, 1474. He enjoined on his disciples a total abstinence from wine, flesh, and fish; besides which, they were always to go barefoot, and never to sleep on a bed. Alexander VI changed the name of the order to Mission, as better expressing the humility professed by the new monks. Francis died at Nancy, France, on May 3, 1567, and was canonized by Leo X. Francis was in high favor with Louis XI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII of France, and established many houses of his order in that kingdom, where they are called Boms Hommes.—Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, Hilianar de Conti, Le Portrait de St. François de Paul (Paris, 1655).

Francis of Sales (Saint) was born near Annecy, Aug. 21, 1567, and was carefully educated at the colleges of La Roche and Annecy. He went to Paris in 1578, and studied with great success at a Jesuit college. He was ordained priest. For some years he was employed in "converting" the Protestants in Savoy, and in 1595 he got the duke of Savoy to expel the Protestant ministers from several districts. He instructed and communicated to the English, and the German Protestants, and abandoned the one or the other ally as the revolutions of feeling, the promptings of policy, or the influence of favorites determined. It is said that he finally died from the effects of a disease which an injured husband found means of communicating to his wife, a Frenchwoman, a traitor of artists and literary men, and his name is justly associated with the Renaissance of literature and art; but he was despotic, devoted to pleasure, and grossly licentious—now inclining to religious toleration, now witnessing himself the torch applied to light the fires of the stake; in 1581 an ally of the Protestant "League of Smalcald," in 1545 permitting a most atrocious persecution of the peaceable Vaudois. His life presents a picture wherein the virtues of the brave chevalier are overlapped and almost hid by vice that darkened the luster of his early fame, and left his traces in the corrupt morals of successive reigns.—Wright, History of France (London, 3 vols. 4to), i, 656-676; Sismondi, Histoire de France (Bruxelles, 1840, 18 vols. 8vo; see Index in vol. xviii); Runke, Histoire de la Papauté (1861, 2 vols. 8vo); Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 510-520. (J. W. M.)

Franciscans, the name of several monastic orders which follow the rule of Francis of Assisi (q. v.). Francis himself founded three orders: an order of friars, called Minorites (Francis Minores), an order of nuns (see Clarisse), and an order of Terziaries (q. v.). These orders split into a large number of divisions, some of which even assumed other names, and became entirely independent of the original Franciscans. See MINORS; CAPUCHINS.

1. Franciscan Friars. —This order was founded in 1210; in that year, at least, Francis gave the rule which united his followers into a monastic community. As, however, their life in common commenced before that period, some historians account the year 1298 or 1296 as the year of foundation. The origin of the Franciscans marks a turning-point in the history of monasticism; because, as far as we know, they were the first and most prominent representa-
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atives of the mendicant (q. v.) orders. Francis with some difficulty obtained the papal approval of his order [see FRANCIS or ASSISI] in 1210, and in 1215 he received also the sanction of the Council of Lateran. The growth of the order was astonishingly rapid. At the first General Chapter, held in 1215, more than 5000 friars assembled, and it was resolved to send agents of twenty-three others of Germany, France, Spain, England, Hungary, and Greece. In 1223 the rule of the order was written down, and at the same time the order received extensive privileges from Honorius III. Francis resigned the burden of the generalship in 1225. His first successors, Peter of Corvaro, and John of Paris, assumed, however, only the title of ministers general, regarding Francis, notwithstanding his resignation, as the chief superior. Elias introduced various changes; the monks assumed a less coarse garb, built beautiful churches and convents, and commenced to cultivate science. Francis had severely censured these misgivings, but after his resignation, they soon began to prevail. The advocates of the primitive rigor, at their head Anthony (q. v.) of Padua, succeeded, however, in enlisting the sympathy of pope Gregory IX, by whom Elias was deposed. But a few years later (1228) Elias was re-elected, and returned to his old principles of mitigation. The rigorous party, and especially their leader, Cassarius (q. v.) of Spires (hence their name, Cassarites), were subjected to a cruel persecution, by which Cassarius even lost his life (1230). This, however, caused the second desertion of Elias, and the first two successors favored the strict party. But Crescentius of Jesi, elected in 1244, followed the footsteps of Elias, and the Cassarites were again persecuted until Bonaventura (q. v.) was elected general in 1256. He gradually restored the strict discipline, and raised the order to a degree of prosperity which it had never enjoyed before. The ascendency of the strict party lasted until the generalship of Mathero di Aquas Spartas, who again sided with the other party, which henceforth remained predominant until the whole order permanently split into two parties.

The advocates of the primitive rigor sought to form themselves into independent congregations, such as the Celestines, the Minorites of Narbonne, and the Spirituals [see DISCALCIRI], but they suffered from their opponents an almost uninterrupted persecution. The Celestines (established in 1291) were condemned to a common life as heretics by the Minorites of Narbonne and the Spirituals in 1318. The Minorite Clarenses, founded in 1302 by the ex-Celestial Angelo di Cordona, obtained toleration as an independent congregation and existed as such until 1517, when they united with the Observants. Two other congregations, the Minorites of the Congregation of Philip of Majence, and the Minorites of John of Valesg and Gentile of Spoleto, were of very short duration. In 1388 Pauletto di Foligno founded a new congregation, which followed the unaltered rule of Francis, spread rapidly, was approved by the popes, and thus caused the order of Franciscan friars to split into two main branches, the Conventuals, who followed the mitigated rule, and the Observants, who adhered to the primitive strict rule. The efforts of the Conventuals to suppress their opponents failed, for the latter were confirmed by the Council of Constance in 1415, received the permission to hold General Chapters, and obtained possession of the church of Portinacola, the celebrated birthplace of the order. From both the Observants and Conventuals other congregations branched off. The consequent confusions in the order induced Pope Sixtus II to command by a bull all congregations to unite either with the Observants or Conventuals. The former received also, in 1517, from Leo X, the right to elect the general of the whole order, while the Conventuals could only elect a minister general, whose election had to be ratified by the general. The following independent congregations joined the Observants in consequence of the measures of Julius II and Leo X: the Minorites of Peter of Villarecavas, founded in 1290 upon Mount Celia; the Minorite Coletans, founded by the Clarisse Colette of Corbie, in Savoy; the Minorite Amadistes, founded by the Spaniard Amadeo in 1457. Some congregations became extinct before the sixteenth century; thus the Minorites of Phelip of Berenguel (Minorites of the Little Cow, della Capuciosa) existed only from 1426 to 1434, the Minorites Caporolans from 1475 to 1481, the Minorites of Anthony of Castel St. Jean, who were suppressed soon after their foundation in 1475. The Minorites of Mathias of Tivol, founded in 1485, were united with the Conventuals. The Minorites of Juan de la Puebla, founded in Spain in 1498, joined in 1568, when they counted fourteen convents, the Observants, but continued to remain a separate province with a number of peculiarities. The Minorites of John of Guadaleoupe (a disciple of Juan de la Puebla), also called Discalcerate Minorites of the Cow, or Minorites of the Holy Gospel, were founded in Spain in 1494, and united with the Observants in 1517; but they assumed the name Reformed Observants, and formed two separate provinces, which gradually increased to twelve (in Spain, Portugal, and France, and in Portugal, in 1307, the Minorites of the Province of Portugal). They still held a procurator general at Rome. An Italian congregation of the Strict Observance (Riformati) was founded in 1525, and still exists; a French Congregation, called Recollets, by the Duke of Nevers in 1593. The most rigorous among the congregations of Reformed Observants was that founded by Peter of Alcantara in 1540. It spread especially in Italy and Spain, and was joined by the Puchasites, or Reformed Minorites of St. Paunchasius, and then formed into a province, which was afterwards divided into several. This branch of the Reformed Observants had also in Rome a procurator general. At present it has only a small number of convents. In 1583 some Observants of Westphalia received papal permission to erect convents of this congregation in Germany, but they soon fell out with the bishops, and then also with the pope, and at the request of the bishops the incipient organization was suppressed by the Prussian government. The Franciscan friars have always been, and still are, very numerous. In the eighteenth century they counted more than 180,000 members, in 1900 convents. The Conventuals, by far the less numerous, had in 1789 about 30 provinces, with about 15,000 monks.

"As a literary order, the Franciscans have chiefly been eminent in the theological sciences. The great school of the Scotists takes its name from John Duns Scotus [see SCOTUS], a Franciscan friar, and it has been the pride of this order to maintain his distinctive doctrines both in philosophy and in theology against
the rival school of the Thomists, to which the Dominican order gave its allegiance. See Thomists. In the Nominalist controversy the Thomists were for the most part Conceptualists; the Franciscans adhered to the realist Realism. See Nominalism. In the following question the Franciscans stood: Domini restituit, Domini dedit: 'Give to God what is God's.' In reality, however, the practical mechanician, who in itself has sufficed to make the reputation of his order, had his contemporaries not failed to appreciate his merit. Two centuries later the great cardinal Ximenes was a member of this order. The popes Nicholas IV, Alexander V, Sixtus IV, and Clement XI, also belonged to the institute of St. Francis. In history this order is less distinguished; but its own annalist, Luke Wadding, an Irish Dominican, bears a deservedly high reputation as a historian. In lighter literature, and particularly poetry, he has already named the founder himself as a sacred poet. Jacopone da Todi, a Franciscan, is one of the most characteristic of the medieval hymn-writers; and in later times the celebrated Lope de Vega closed his eventful career as a member of the Third Order of St. Francis. It may add that in the revival of art the Franciscan order bore an active, and, it must be confessed, a liberal and enlightened part.

No order of monks, save the Benedictines, has had so many members as that of the Franciscans. About fifty years after its foundation it reckoned no fewer than 33 'provinces,' the aggregate number of convents in which exceeded 8000, while the members fell little, if at all, short of 200,000. Some ideas, indeed, of the extraordinary extension of this remarkable institute may be formed from the startling fact that, in the first fifty years after its foundation it exceeded the number of the Roman Catholic Church, is vested in an elective general, who resides at Rome. The subordinate superiors are, first, the 'provincial,' who presides over all the brethren in a province; and, secondly, the 'guardian,' who is the head of a single convent or community. These officers are elected only for two years. The provincial alone has power to admit candidates, who are subjected to a probation of two years [see Novitiate], after which they are, if approved, permitted to take the vows of the order. Those of the members who are advanced to the holy orders undergo a preparatory course of study, during which they are styled 'scholars;' and if eventually promoted to the priesthood they are styled 'fathers' of the order, the title of the other members being 'brother' or 'lay brother.'

2. Statistics.—At present the number of Franciscans is much smaller than it was in former times. It exists in Italy, France, Austria, Belgium, England, Ireland, Holland, Switzerland, Prussia, Bavaria, Poland (54 convents in 1848), Russia, Turkey, Ionian Isles, Greece, Mexico (60 convents in 1848), in most of the states of Central and South America, China, India, Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, Morocco, in Australia, and Polynesia. In the United States of America there are Observants in the dioceses of New York, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Alton, Cincinnati, and Louisville. The principal convent of the Regular Observants is at Coelli; that of the Reformed, St. Francis a Ripes—both at Rome. The Conventuals have convents in Austria, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States of America (in Philadelphia). Their principal convent is at Rome (the Twelve Apostles). The superiors now residing in Rome are a general of the Observants, a minister general of the Observants of the Province of Germany, a procurator general of the Conventuals, and a father provincial of the Conventuals of the Capuchins, and a general of the Geralder (Capitans). Together, all these branches of Franciscans had in 1862 about 3800 houses and 50,000 members.

See Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, iv, 666; Weitzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, iv, 196; Henriot-Fehr, Gesch. der Mönchorden, vol. i; Helyot, Ordres Religieux, s. v.; Wadding, Annales Minorum (Rome, 1781-41, vol. i-xvii, reaching to 1640; continued by De Luca to the year 1568); Dom. de Gubernatis, Orbis Seraphicus, s. titulus de ordinibus a St. Francisco institutis (Rome, 1663); Orazio Ferri, Storia di tutte le ordini religiosi minori (Milan, 1832); Karl vom beil, Aloys, Jahrh., Buch der Kirche (Ratisbon, 1862), gives an alphabetical list of all the convents.

A. J. S.)

Francisco de Vittoria, a Spanish theologian, was born at Vittoria, and died at Salamanca August 14, 1549. He completed his studies at Paris, entered the order of St. Dominic, and returned to his native country to teach. His Theologiae Prelectiones (of which there have been several editions; last one, Antwerp, 1604, 2 vols. 8vo) embrace divers treatises. He published also Confessioantarum, (Salamanca, 1562, 12mo); Instrucio y Regalio de la Animae (Salamanca, 1552, 8vo); and left in MS. Commentary on the Hierro Summum theologiae et sacrae Salamancae, 18th century (Paris, 1822); P. Karl vom beil, Aloys, Jahrh., Buch der Kirche (Ratisbon, 1862), gives an alphabetical list of all the convents.

Franciscus, August Hermann, an eminently pious divine and philanthropist of Germany, was born at Lubec March 23, 1668, and studied theology and philosophy at the universities of Erfurt, Kiel, and Leipzig; and Heilbronn, with great success, at Hamburgh. In 1685, in connection with Paul Anton, he established at Leipzig the Collegium Philosophiae for the study of the Bible with practical exegesis. It met with great success, but made him many enemies. In 1687 he went to Lüneburg to study exegesis with Sandhagen, and here he imbued a deep spiritual experience. The reforming zeal of his childhood, which made him a Catholic, separated him from the Christian Church; all his labors and studies were consecrated to the glory of God. In 1688 he taught school in Hamburgh, and laid the basis of his subsequent mastery of the art of teaching. After visiting Spener, from whom he derived comfort and strength in the Christian life, he returned to Leipzig in 1699, where he gave expository lectures on St. Paul's epistles. Crowds attended them, and a new impulse was given to the study of the Bible. His instructions developed a new religious spirit among the students. Opposition was soon awakened, and he and his friends were stigmatized as pietists. In 1690 his lectures were arrested by the faculty. He then 'accepted an invitation to preach at Erfurt, where his sermons attracted such numbers (among them many Roman Catholics) that the elector of Meinz, to whose jurisdiction Erfurt then belonged, ordered him to leave the city. Only twenty days afterward, however, he went to Halle (1692) as professor in the new university, at first of the Oriental languages, and afterwards of theology. At the same time he became pastor of Glaucha, a suburb of Halle, the inhabitants of which he found sunk in the deepest ignorance and infidelity; and for whose advancement, and to enable them to devise schemes of usefulness, he first instructed destitute children in his own house, and gave
Francke, Theophil August, son of August Hermann Francke, was born at Halle on 12 December 1762. In 1770 he was made pastor of the House of Correction in Halle, in 1773 adjoint to the faculty of theology, and in 1777 succeeded his father as dean of the inspector and director in the orphan House and pedagogium, and subsequently became archbishop and consistorial court-chancellor, knight of the Order of St. Wenceslaus; he was the editor of various works.

See also Prussia.
and wrote introductions to Nickamp's Misiones-Ge
schichte and the Caustite Bibe, and published a con
tinuation of the memoirs of Danish missionaries in
572.

Francken, Zégidus, was probably born at Dott, where his father, Rev. Henricus Francken, was settled from 1692 to 1704. The son was called in 1704 to take charge of a church at Rijswort. Having labored here a few years, he accepted a call to Maassluis, where he served as minister till removed by death in 1743. He was warmly attached to the Voetian party in the Reformed Church. He was a zealous advocate of
their views, and was highly esteemed by the party. He insisted much on experimental and practical religion.
He excelled in analyzing the workings of the human heart, and in exposing to view its hidden re
cesses. His writings, though not wholly free from mysticism and asceticism, were productive of great
good. His work on ascetic theology, entitled Heugie Godgelderdeid, published in 1719, was frequently re
printed; this was also the case with his Kern der God
gelderdeid. His Wote Kunresten van Leren deme appeared in 1724. Several other volumes on practical
religion were published by him. Their titles are suf
ficiently quaint, and remind us of Rutherford's mode of expression. His brother Peter was settled at Geer
trudenberg from 1685 to 1726. He was a member of the Godge
erd Nederland, ib. 471 en var. (Te 's Hertogen
bosch, 1801). Geschiedenis der Nederlandische Hervorm
de Kerk door Jepje en Dernont, 111 Deel, ib. 306 en
var. (Te Breda, 1821.) Geschiedenis van de Preesth
ekunde in de Protestantische Kerk van Nederland door J.
Hartog, Predikant bij de Doogneweg gemeente te de
Zandam (Amsterdam, 1865). (J. P. W.)

Francken, Christian, a German divine, sur
named the weathercock from the instability of his re
ligious opinions, was born at Gardelegen in 1549, and
died about the close of that century. He was first a Lutheran, then became a Jesuit, after his return
more to the Lutheran faith, then became a Socinian, and finally a Roman Catholic again. The most important of his writings is Colloquium Jenaicum, etc. (Leipzig, 1579 and 1580), a severe satire on the Jesuits.—Hoefer, Nov. Bih. Géneal., xvii., 466-7; Rose, Nov. Bih. Géneal., viii., 439. (J. W. M.)

FRANCO.

FRANCO, See BONIFACE VII.

FRANCOIS, Laurent, a French abbe, was born Nov. 2, 1698, at Arinthod (Francois-Comte), and died at Paris Feb. 24, 1782. He was for some time a chevalier of St. Lazare, but, quitting that society, went to Paris, and engaged in teaching. He there composed several books, defending Christianity against the at
acks of the philosophers, which attracted the atten
tion of Voltaire, who sought to cast ridicule upon their author, but only succeeded in giving him a more prominent position in the list of apologists. His principal works are, Les Preuves de la Religion de Jesus-Christ, contre les averses et déistes (Par. 1751, 4 vols. 12mo):—Les Preuves de la Religion Chrétienne contre les divirices (Paris, 1755, 2 vols. 12mo):—Examen du Catechisme de l'homme homme, etc. (Brussels and Paris, 1764, 12mo):—Reponse aux déistes propres contre la religion Chrétienne par J.-J. Rousseau, etc. (Paris, 1768, 12mo):—Examen des faits qui servent de fonde
erales, viii., 439. (J. W. M.)

FRANCOIS de TOULOUSE, a French theologian
and preacher, lived in the latter half of the 17th cen
try, and was notably zealous in striving to bring the
Protestants of the Cevennes back to the Roman faith.
He belonged to the order of Capuchin monks, of which he became provincial. Of his writings, we name La
Parfait Missionaire (Paris, 1662, 2 vols. 8vo):—Le Mi
sionaire Apologete (Paris, 1664, 8 vols. 8vo):—Ser

FRANCUS, or Franck, Sebastian, a so-called
enthusiast of the times of the Reformation, was born
about 1500 at Donauwurth. He was first a Roman
priest, then a Lutheran minister, afterwards samp
ufacturer and printer, always a thinker and writer. He anticipated the chief ideas of the modern religious
views: e.g. exalting the spirit of Scripture in dis
tinction from the letter; viewing religion in a thor
oughly subjective way; holding that one believes only on the united testimony of one's heart and con
science. Well read in ancient and mystical philo
sophy, he imitated it in a sort of pietistic pantheism.
He held that whenever man passively submits to God, then God becomes incarnate in him. The divines at Smalcald (1640) received Melanchthon to write against him, and signed a severe declaration about his writings: "as the devil's favorite and special blas
phem'er." He was driven out of Strassburg, made an exile, and died at Basle 1584. An account of him may be found in Wald, De Vita Franci (Erlangen, 1739); Ch. K. am Ende, Nachweise zu F. l. Lehren und Schriften (Nurembs, 1756). See also Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv., 450; Erlangen, 1739, d. Herz. Selten von der Reformation; C. A. Hase, Schr. Franck von Werd, der Schweizerm (Leip. 1868); Hase, Ch. History, § 373; Hayle, Dictionary, s. v.

FRANK, JACOB (Jankele Lewowicz), founder of the Jewish sect of the Frankists, was born in Poland in 1712. While a young man he travelled through the
Countries and neighboring parts of Turkey, where he received the surname of Frank, given to the Turks to Europeans, and which he retained. Having returned to Poland in 1750, he acquired great reputation as a scholar, and settled in Podolia, where he was sorely surrounded by ad\pts, among whom were several rab
cbis. His most zealous followers were among the
Jewish communities of Landskren, Buk, Qairan, Opotechin, and Kirlatitsch. He preached a new doctrine, the fundamental principles of which he had borrowed from that of Suboba-Seri, and which he explained in a book which his disciples looked upon as directed and inspired from God. The chief abuse of Podol
ia, jealous of his influence, caused him all sorts of an
noyances, and had him arrested, but he was liberated
through the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy,
and authorized by the king to profess freely his te
nets. His followers then, under the name of Zohar
ites (from their sacred book Zohar) and Anti-Talmud
ites, opposed their former adversaries in turn, and
even obtained an order from the cardinal of Kamienitz to have all the copies of the Talmud in his diocese
burned. They soon, however, lost their influence, the
papal nuncio at Warsaw declaring against them. Some fled to Moldavia, where they were badly treated,
and most of the others, including Frank, professedly
embraced Christianity; but, as he continued to make
proselytes, he was imprisoned in the fort of Czestochow until the invasion of Poland by the Russians in
1773. His sect had disappeared in the meanwhile, and
he made large collections in Poland and Bohemia.
In 1788 he went to Vienna, and then went to Brunn, in Moravia, where he lived in princely style on the
means furnished him by his followers. Driven again from Vienna, where he had returned, he settled at Offen
bach, in Hesse, where he died of apoplexy (standing his disciples believed him immortal) Dec. 10, 1791.
The sect exists yet, and has its head-quarters in
Warsaw, but the mystery which surrounds it has not
yet been dissipated. Their profession of faith has
Frankenberg, Johann Heinrich, count of Frankenberg, a cardinal of the Roman Cahth. Church, was born at Leobendorf, September 18, 1686. He studied first at Breslau, and afterwards in the German-Hungarian College at Rome. After his return to Germany he became successively coadjutor of the archbishop of Gortz in 1745, archbishop of Mecklenburg in 1758, and soon after member of the Belgian Council of State, and cardinal in 1778. He defended the liberties of the Church and of the episcopal seminaries against the innovations of the emperor, Joseph II, but, being accused of having taken part in some disturbances which occurred in Brabant in 1788, the emperor deposed him from his council afterwards of having opposed the measures taken by the French against the churches of his diocese, he was condemned to deportation, and taken to Brussels. He lived for a while at Emmerich, then in the village of Ahual, in Westphalia, and finally removed to Breda, in Holland, where he died, March 14, 1814. See A. Theumer, Der Cardinal von Frankenberg (Freiburg, 1850); Pietro, Uniearrivali-Lezioni, s. v.

Frankfurt, Concordat of. See Concordat.

Frankfurt, Council of (Concilium Franciordienser), a synod of great importance in Church history, held at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, A.D. 794. Some Roman writers deny the authenticity of the acts of the Council of Frankfurt (e. g. Barruel, Du Rom. Pope, Paris, 1603, ii. 402), but Baronius (Annales, A.D. 794) admits it, and Labbe publishes the canons enacted at it (Concil. viii.), 1057. Mansi publishes but two of the canons (Concil. xii., 916), referring to Capit. Reg. Franc. (ed. Baluz. 1, 263) for the rest. Dupin holds that it was considered in France to be a general council, and that three hundred bishops attended it (Ecles. Hist. cent. viii.). They came from Germany, Gaul, Spain, Italy, and England, and there were two delegates from the pope.

The Council of the council was as follows. After the close of the second Council of Nicæa, A.D. 787, the pope sent a copy of its acts to Charlemagne, seeking the approval of the French bishops, which they declined on the ground that the worship of images, sanctioned at Nicæa, was unauthorized in the Church, and unlawful. The Liber Carolinis (see CAROLINE Books) were composed under the name of Charlemagne, and by his order, to refute the canons of Nicæa. "Nothing can be stronger than the opposition which they offer to every act of appearance of worship as paid to images, even to bowing the head and bending the knees before them; the Gallican bishops, as well as the author of these books, were deceived by a false translation of the acts of the second Council of Nicæa, which, they say, led them to fancy that the council had inscribed the paying-divine homage, and worship to images, and that it was this false notion which induced the bishops to dissolve the council; but this is evidently untrue, since it is an historical fact that authentic copies of the acts of the council were sent into France by the pope, as also that Charlemagne received another copy direct from Constantineople (Palmer, On the Chal. Conc. iv., ch. x., § 4). Roger de Hoveden has the following: "In the year 792, Charles, king of the Franks, sent into Brit- ain [to Offa, king of the Mercians] a "synodal book, sent to him from Constanti nope, in which, alas! were found many things inconvenient, and contrary to the true faith, especially in this, that it was established by unanimous consent of almost all the doctors and bishops of the East, no less than three hundred, that images ought to be worshipped" (imagines adorari deberent... hic in Catholica Graecia... adoratio absumatur)" (exegetarum). "Against which Albinus [Alchimus] "wrote an epistle, fortified with the authority of the holy Scriptures." Matthew of Westminster, anno 796, gives a similar account.

Finally, in France, a dispensation called the Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794, to consider this question, and also that of the Adoptionist heresy (q. v.). Fifty-six canons were passed at the council, of which the following are the most important: Canon 1. Condemning Felix and Elipandus, the propagators of the Adoptionist heresy. 2. Condemning the second Council of Nicæa, and all worship of images. "Alla est in medium quos- tio de nova Gregorum Synodo, quam de adorandia imaginibus Constantino poore concedunt, in qua scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctarum, ita ut deificis Trinitatis, servitium aut adorationem non im ponderem, anathema judicaretur. Quis supra sanctissimati patres nostri omnimodi adorationem et servitutem renun tes contemperant atque conscientes condemnavere num."

6. Ordering that bishops shall see justice done to the clergy of their diocese; if the clergy are not satisfied with their judgment, they may appeal to the metropolitan. 11. Ordering all monks to abstain from business and all secular employments. 16. For bidding to take money for the ordination of monks.

See, besides the authorities already cited, Gieseler, Church History, period iii., § 12; Landon, Manual of Councils, s. v.; Inest, History of the English Church, p. i, chap. xii.; Hefele, Concilien geschichte, iii., 635 sq.; Harduin, Concil. iv., 904; Schröck, Kirchengeschichte, xx, 568; and the article Image Worship.

Frankfurter, Moses ben-Simeon, a distinguished printer and Hebraist, lived at Amsterdam between 1700 and 1762. His reputation as a scholar chiefly rests on the "Great Rabbinic Bible" (came פֶּרֶס נִכְנָס, the Congregation of Moses, Amerst. 1724-1727, 4 vols. fol.), which he edited, and to which he gave the greatest part of his life. It is the first Bible and Talmud in which the notes and interpretations constitute in itself a library of Biblical literature and exegesis, and is indispensable to every critical expositor of the O. T. Besides giving the text in Hebrew and Chaldee by Onkelos, it contains the Massora, the commentaries by Rashii, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Levi, Ge- shon, Abraham, Samuel b. Levi, Bene Joseph, Duran, Saadis, Chasik, the Sephardim, a number of other rabbis, and by the editor, Frankfurter. Not less noteworthy is his Index Rerum, the different Introductions written either by himself or by distinguished rabbis; his Index to the chapters and sections of the O. T., giving the commencement of the verses; a treatise on the design of the law by Obadiah Sephoron; the Great Massora; the various readings of the Eastern and Western Coed.; a treatise upon the Accents; and last, but not least, the differences in text between Ben- Naphthali and Rashi. The most important of these differences of the Bible, entitled יָדִיעַת אֲנָשִׁים (a small offering); יָדִיעַת אֲנָשִׁים (the great offering) — Kitzo, Cyclopaedia, Bib. Lit., ii., 57; Etheridge, "The evening offerings"— Peri, Tab. Lit. 101; Fürst, Biblioth. Jul. i., 205. See Rabbinical Bibles. (J. H. W.)

Frankincense (_natom, lebomma; whence נַיִּ֣וֹם, nayo), an odorous resin, so called from its whiteness (Phleb. xii., 82); mostly imported from Arabia (Isa.
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ix. 6: Jer. vi. 20; see also Strabo, 16; Virgil, Georg. ii. 117), yet growing also in Palestine (Cant. iv. 14; unless perhaps some odontorhinchus Dioscorides and here refer to), and used for perfume (Cant. iii. 6), but more especially in sacrifices for purification (Lev. ii. 16; v. 11; Isa. xliii. 23; lxvi. 8; Luke i. 9), and it also was one of the ingredients in the perfume which was to be prepared for the sanctuary (Exod. xxx. 34).

I. History of产地

It is also mentioned (Lev. xvi. 18; 15; xxv. 7; 2 Chron. v. 15) arose from its fragrant odor when burnt, in which respect the incense was a symbol of the divine name, and its diffusion an emblem of the publishing abroad of that name (Mal. i. 11; comp. Cant. i. 9); and from this, as prayer to God, the incense became an emblem of prayer (Psa. cxlii. 2; Luke i. 10; Rev. v. 8; viii. 3). In this symbolic representation the frankincense especially set forth holiness as characteristic of the divine attributes, so that the burning of it was a celebration of the holiness of Jehovah (Bähr, Symbolik d. Ms. Cultus, i. 466; ii. 329, etc.). In this respect its name (= schinkens) likewise became significant.

Frankincense was also used in the religious services of the heathen (Herod. i. 183; Ovid, Trist. v. 5, 11; Metam. vi. 164; Arnob. adv. Gentes, vi. 3; vii. 26). On the altar of Mylitta and the Pantheon of Venus only incense was burnt (Münzer, Relig. der Babylonier, p. 55; Der tempel d. himmel. Göttin zu Popko, p. 29; Homer, Od. viii. 368; see Damm, s. v. Τιμία; Tacitus, Hist. ii. 3). The substance itself seems to have been similar to that now known as such, a vegetable resin, balsamic, glistering, and of a bitter taste, obtained by successive incisions in the bark of a tree called the arbor thuris, the first of which yields the purest and whitest kind (10275, άλομον ζώονανθής, or καλαθίς); while the produce of the after incisions is spotted with yellow, and, as it becomes old, loses its whiteness altogether. The Indian oliobum, or frankincense, is imported in chests and cases from Bombay as a regular article of sale. It is chiefly used in the rites of the Greek and Roman churches; and its only medical application at present is as a perfume in sick rooms. The oliobum, or frankincense used by the Jews in the Temple services, is not to be confounded with the frankincense of commerce, which is a spontaneous exudation of the Ficus religiosa, or Norway spruce fir, and resembles in its nature and use the olibanum pitch which is obtained from the same tree. See INCENSE.

The ancients possessed no authentic information respecting the plant from which this resin is procured (Strabo, xvi. 778, 782; Diod. Sic. ii. 40; Pliny, vi. 26, 28, 32; Apuleius, Metam. iii. 96, 97; Oribasius, Alex. vii. 20; Virg. Æn. i. 416; Georg. i. 57, etc.), and modern writers are nearly as much confused in their accounts of it. Even Pliny and Theophrastus, who had never seen it, give merely contradictory statements concerning it. It is described by the latter as attaining the height of about five ells, having many branches, leaves like the pear-tree, and bark like the laurel; but at the same time he mentions another description, according to which it resembles the mastick-tree, its leaves being of a reddish color (Hierocles, Hist. Nat. vi. 14, 42); it is a small tree, resembling the Egyptian hamathorn, with gold-yellow leaves like those of the wood. The difficulty was rather increased than otherwise in the time of Pliny by the importation of some shoots of the tree itself, which seemed to belong to the terebinth (x. 39), resembling the plane. It also resembles with a leaf like that of the mastick: he distinguishes two kinds: the finer, growing on the mountains; the other, dark and of an inferior quality, growing on the plains. Chardin says that the frankincense-tree on the mountains of Carmania resembles a large pear-tree. The Arabian botanist Abúl-Fad'll says it is a vigorous shrub, growing only in Yemen and on the hills, and in respect to its leaves and fruit resembling myrtle; a description which has been repeated by Sprengele, Lillie, and Reid (Bot. i. 12, 257) to apply very well to the frankincense (Forskal, Flor. p. 80), or (Gesch. d. Botan. i. 16) to the Amyris kafjar (Forskal, p. 19), or even to the Junipera thurifera (Martius, Pharmakoym. p. 884). Niebuhr, in his Description of Arabia, ii. 356, says, "We could learn nothing of it from which (Lev. i. 16; ii. 16; vi. 15; xxv. 7; Numb. v. 15) arose from its fragrant odor when burnt, in which respect the incense was a symbol of the divine name, and its diffusion an emblem of the publishing abroad of that name (Mal. i. 11; comp. Cant. i. 9); and from this, as prayer to God, the incense became an emblem of prayer (Psa. cxlii. 2; Luke i. 10; Rev. v. 8; viii. 3). In this symbolic representation the frankincense especially set forth holiness as characteristic of the divine attributes, so that the burning of it was a celebration of the holiness of Jehovah (Bähr, Symbolik d. Ms. Cultus, i. 466; ii. 329, etc.). In this respect its name (= schinkens) likewise became significant.

Frankincense was also used in the religious services of the heathen (Herod. i. 183; Ovid, Trist. v. 5, 11; Metam. vi. 164; Arnob. adv. Gentes, vi. 3; vii. 26). On the altar of Mylitta and the Pantheon of Venus only incense was burnt (Münzer, Relig. der Babylonier, p. 55; Der tempel d. himmel. Göttin zu Popko, p. 29; Homer, Od. viii. 368; see Damm, s. v. Τιμία; Tacitus, Hist. ii. 3). The substance itself seems to have been similar to that now known as such, a vegetable resin, balsamic, glistering, and of a bitter taste, obtained by successive incisions in the bark of a tree called the arbor thuris, the first of which yields the purest and whitest kind (10275, άλομον ζώονανθής, or καλαθίς); while the produce of the after incisions is spotted with yellow, and, as it becomes old, loses its whiteness altogether. The Indian oliobum, or frankincense, is imported in chests and cases from Bombay as a regular article of sale. It is chiefly used in the rites of the Greek and Roman churches; and its only medical application at present is as a perfume in sick rooms. The oliobum, or frankincense used by the Jews in the Temple services, is not to be confounded with the frankincense of commerce, which is a spontaneous exudation of the Ficus religiosa, or Norway spruce fir, and resembles in its nature and use the olibanum pitch which is obtained from the same tree. See INCENSE.

The ancients possessed no authentic information respecting the plant from which this resin is procured (Strabo, xvi. 778, 782; Diod. Sic. ii. 40; Pliny, vi. 26, 28, 32; Apuleius, Metam. iii. 96, 97; Oribasius, Alex. vii. 20; Virg. Æn. i. 416; Georg. i. 57, etc.), and modern writers are nearly as much confused in their accounts of it. Even Pliny and Theophrastus, who had never seen it, give merely contradictory statements concerning it. It is described by the latter as attaining the height of about five ells, having many branches, leaves like the pear-tree, and bark like the laurel; but at the same time he mentions another description, according to which it resembles the mastick-tree, its leaves being of a reddish color (Hierocles, Hist. Nat. vi. 14, 42); it is a small tree, resembling the Egyptian hamathorn, with gold-yellow leaves like those of the wood. The difficulty was rather increased than otherwise in the time of Pliny by the importation of some shoots of the tree itself, which seemed to belong to the terebinth (x. 39), resembling the plane. It also resembles with a leaf like that of the mastick: he distinguishes two kinds: the finer, growing on the mountains; the other, dark and of an inferior quality, growing on the plains. Chardin says that the frankincense-tree on the mountains of Carmania resembles a large pear-tree. The Arabian botanist Abúl-Fad'll says it is a vigorous shrub, growing only in Yemen and on the hills, and in respect to its leaves and fruit resembling myrtle; a description which has been repeated by Sprengele, Lillie, and Reid (Bot. i. 12, 257) to apply very well to the frankincense (Forskal, Flor. p. 80), or (Gesch. d. Botan. i. 16) to the Amyris kafjar (Forskal, p. 19), or even to the Junipera thurifera (Martius, Pharmakoym. p. 884). Niebuhr, in his Description of Arabia, ii. 356, says, "We could learn nothing of it from which
simple axillary racemes. By incisions in the bark a very odorous gum is obtained, which the spice-merchants of London recognised as albotham or frankincense, although it had been sent to England as an entirely different species of perfume (see Oken, Lehrs, u. Botanik, ii, 267 sq.; Gieger, Pharmacc. Botanik, ii, 1294 sq.). The Boswellia serrata grows to a height of forty feet, and is found in Ambonya and the mountaneous districts of India. Another species, the B. papyrifera, occurs on the east coast of Africa, in Abyssinia, about 1000 feet above the sea-level, on bare limestone rocks, to which the base of the stem is attached by a thick mass of vegetable substance, sending roots to a prodigious depth in the rocky crevices (Hogg's Veg. Kingdom, p. 249). Its resin, the olibenum of Africa and Arabia, usually occurs in commerce in brownish masses, and in yellow-tinted drops or "tears," not so large as the Indian variety. The last is still burnt in Hindustan temples under the name of "rubinda" and "liban"—the latter evidently identical with the Hebrew lebanon; and it is exported from Bombay in considerable quantities for the use of Greek and Roman Catholic churches. From Cant. iv, 14 it has been inferred that the frankincense-tree grew in Palestine (compare Athen. iii, 101), and especially on Mount Lebanon. The connection between the names, however, goes for nothing (Lebanon, Lebanon); the word may be used for aromatic plants generally (Gesen. Lex. s. v.); and the rhetorical flourishes of Florus (Epit. iii, 6, "thursis silvis") and Asconius (Mosaici, p. 110) are of little avail against the fact that the tree is not at present found in Palestine. (See Celsius Itiber. i, 231; Bod. a. Stapel, comment. in Theor. p. 976 sq.; Gesenius, Hel. Theurp. p. 741; Penny Cyclop. s. v. Olibanum and Boswellia Thurifera). See AROMATICS.

Franks, Conversion of. See CHLIDWIO; FRANCE.

Frans, or Francis, Wolfgang, a Lutheran theologian, was born at Plauen, 1564. He became professor of history, and afterwards of theology, at Wittenberg, where he died Oct. 26, 1628. Among his voluminous writings are Animalium historia Sacra (best ed. Frankfort, 1712, 4 vols. 4to.) — Proreutica theologica de interpretazione S. S. (Witten. 2d ed. 1708, 4to.) — Schola ecclesiastica patriarchali sacra, asserting the orthodox doctrine of the atonement against the Socinians (Wittenb. 1554, 4to, and often).

Fra Paolo. See SARPI.

Franz, Alexander, D.D., minister of Kirkhill, wrote Key to Prophecies not yet accomplished (Edinburgh, 1735, 8vo), described by Urne (Bibl. Bibl.) as "a work of some merit," containing "rules for the arrangement of the unfulfilled prophecies, observations on their dates, and a general view of the events foretold in them," also the treatise Commentary on Isaiah (1800, 8vo). See FRATU ECLIIS. Scotici, iii, 296.

Fraser, James, D.D., a minister of the Church of Scotland, born about 1690, and died 1763, was the author of The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctionification (Edinburgh, 1774, 12mo), of which several editions have appeared, the last an abridgment (London, Tract Society, 1810, 18mo). This work was edited by Dr. Erskine, and is highly praised by Urne (Bibl. Bibl.). See FRATU ECLIIS. Scotici, ii, 583.

Frassan, Claude, a Franciscan monk, was born in Picardy in 1620. He was doctor of the Sorbonne, theological professor at Paris, and superior of the Franciscan convent there. He wrote Dissertationes Bibliicas (Paris, 1682, 2 vols. 4to)—Cours de Théologie (Paris, 1672, 4 vols. fol.); reprinted, with additions by the author, in Latin, as Scutut Academicae seu universae doctoris subtilis theologicae dogmata (Venice, 12 vols. 4to). He died in Paris, Feb. 26, 1712.

Frater, the Latin word for brother. See BROTHER.

Fraternity (confraternitas, sodalitas), the name of associations in the Roman Catholic Church which pursue special religious and ecclesiastical purposes, observe corresponding statutes and religious exercises, and are endowed with indulgences, and sometimes with other privileges. Among the purposes to which fraternities are devoted are the nursing of the sick, support of the poor, the practice of a special devotion to some part of the Roman Catholic worship, the veneration of a particular saint, etc. In the earlier times of the Christian Church, as all Roman Catholic writers admit, there is no trace of fraternities. The first reference to them is found in an order of bishop Odo of Paris (died 1298), providing for the annual meeting of a Marianic fraternity. In the 13th century the fraternity of Bridge Brethren (q. v.) arose at Avignon. Among the oldest associations of this class belongs also the fraternity of the Gonfalonieri, who were confirmed by pope Clement IV. In the 17th and 18th centuries the "Marianic Congregations" spread widely, especially in Southern Germany, and in connection with the order of Jesuits. Among the other most noted associations were that of the Scapular (q. v.), Roman Dominican, and Corpus Christi. The popes Clement VIII, Paul V, Benedict XIII, and Benedict XIV issued several constitutions and decrees concerning fraternities. All the fraternities of the Church are subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop and his right of visitation. No fraternity can be erected in a diocese without the consent of the bishop, who has the right of examining, sanctioning, and, whenever he chooses, altering their statutes. Among the fraternities of modern origin, none has extended so widely as the "Fraternity of the most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary," for the Conversion of Sinners, which was founded in 1837 by the abbe Dufriche Desgenettes in Paris. Among the many religious societies which have been of late established by the High Church school in the Anglican Church are many which assume the name "Brotherhood" or "Confraternity." The "Kak Brun" of the English Church came in 1869, and the "Kak Brun" of 1869 mentions all societies of this kind then in existence in England, among them the "Guild of St. Alban the Martyr," all the branches of which call themselves brotherhood or sisterhood; the "Confraternity of the most Holy Trinity;" the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ;" the "Brotherhood of St. Luke the Physician and Evangelist;" —"Algemeine Real-Encyklopädie, iii, 134 (s. v. Bru
Frater, plural of frater. See BRETHREN.

Fraticelli, Fraticelli, or Fratelli, a low Latin or Italian diminutive, denoting fratres minores, little brothers. The term has been applied to so many different sects that its use in writers of the Middle Ages is not free. It was the first appellation of the Franciscans which arose in Italy about the year 1294. It was used as a term of derision, as the greater number of them were apostate monks; and for this reason it was sometimes given to other sects, as the Catharists, Waldenses, etc. When this name was applied to the followers of St. Francis, the Franciscans were honored. As there were many divisions among the Franciscans (q. v.), Pope Celestine V authorized Pet. de Macerata and Pet. de Sempronio to form a new order, who were called Pauperes etemati Dom. Celestini, and who obtained permission to live in solitude, as heretics and to observe the rule of St. Francis in all its rigor. Many of the more ascetic and extravagant monks joined them, who, living according to their own fancies, and making all perfection consist in poverty, and opposed by the regular Franciscans, were condemned by Eutychius, in 1360, and the inquisition was ordered by John XXII (1318) to proceed against them as heretics, which commission they executed with the utmost barbarity. After this, many of them adopted the views of Peter John Oliva de Serignan, published in his commentary, See Olivia. They held the Roman Church to be Babylon; that the rule of St. Francis was observed by Jesus Christ and his apostles. They foretold the reformation of the Church, and the restoration of the true Gospel of Christ. They affirmed that St. Francis was the angel mentioned in Rev. xiv. 6, that their knapsack was to be abolished in 1259, and to give place to a new Gospel, a book founded under the name of the abbot Jobuchim; that the ministers of this reformation were to be barefooted friars. They were repeatedly condemned; and from authentic records it appears that no fewer than two thousand persons were burnt by the inquisition from 1298 to the time of Innocent VI. These severities were repeated by pope Nicholas V and his successors; nevertheless, they maintained themselves down to the 15th century.


Frauds, Pious, "artifices and falsehoods made use of in propagating what is believed to be useful to the cause of religion. They are the offspring of sincerity and insincerity; of religious zeal combined with a defective morality; of conscientiousness in respect of the end, and unscrupulous dishonesty as to the means. Without the one of these ingredients, there could be no fraud; without the other, it could in no sense be termed a pious fraud. These frauds have been more particularly practised in the Church of Rome. But Prot-estants, in their adherence of the frauds that have been so often employed in support of that corrupt system, are prone to forget, or at least not sufficiently to consider, that it is not the corruptness of the system that makes the frauds detestable, and that their separation from the Church of Rome does not place them in a situation which exempt them from all danger of falling into corruptions; amongst the rest, into the justifi- cation of pious frauds, substantially to those with which that Church is so justly reproached. See Whately, Errors of Romanism." See CASUISTRY: PHIOBASIA.

Fraysseux, Denis, COUNT OF, an eminent prelate of the Gallican Church, bishop of hernoepol, peer of France, commander of the order of the Holy Ghost, etc., was born May 9, 1765, at Currières, in Gascony. His father designed him for the law, but he preferred the Church, and in 1788 he attached himself to the community of Laon, directed by the priests of St. Sul-pice, in Paris. The society was broken up by the Revolution, but after the adoption of Napoleon's concordat in 1801 it was reunited, and Fraysseux became a lecturer on dogmatic theology. In 1809 he instituted a series of "catechetical conferences" in St. Sul-pice, which had great success. Napoleon threatened to break up these conferences unless Fraysseux would make certain political recommendations to his hearers; but this he would not consent, nor was he further disturbed. These meetings were suspended by the Church authorities from 1809 to 1814, then continued till 1822; and his lectures at them were printed under the title Défense du christianisme (Paris, 1823, 3 vols. 8vo), containing a résumé of previous books on the evidences, according to his scientific scrupulousness. It was translated into English, Defense of Christianity, as a Series of Lectures, etc. (London, 1836, 2 vols. 8vo). After the restoration (1814) he became very popular at court, and was made first almoner of Louis XVIII. He refused to accept the bishopric of Nismes, but in 1822 was made bishop of Hermione in parihcure infaldum. In the same year he was made grand master of the University and a member of the Academy, and one of his first acts was to put an end to Guiot's lectures on history "as of dangerous tendency." In 1824 he became peer of France and minister of public instruction and works. He was also minister to the king, successor Charles X, but soon retired and gave his advice, in retirement, against the famous Ordonnances which led to the Revolution of 1830. He followed the fortunes of Charles X, who died in his arms at Goritz. Fraysseux died at St. Germain Dec. 12, 1847. His life was written by Henrion (2 vols. 8vo). Besides the work mentioned above, he wrote Les Vrais Principes de l'Eglise Catholique sur la puissance ecclésiastique, la pa-pauté, etc. (1817, 8vo), a work said by the Ultramontanists to look towards Jansenism, or something worse. According to it, he thought religious liberty only when in harmony with the voice of the entire Church.


Frédégise or Fruidugius, a mediæval monkish writer, is of English origin, and flourished in the 9th century. He was a pupil of Alcuin, who took him to France, where he obtained employment at the court of Charlemagne. He succeeded Alcuin in the abbey of St. Martin, and had also conferred on him those of St. Bertin and Coronery, and was chancellor to Louis le Débonnaire. His Epistola de Niki and tenodris (preserved in the Miscellanea of Baluze, tom. i) is divided into two parts, and the author attempts to show in the first part that nihilism is something in the second that the tenet are a corporeal substance. His work against Agobard is lost, but the description of Coronery in the poems of Alcuin is generally attributed to him. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxviii, 326.

Frederik, WILLEM, was an enlightened Roman Catholic priest, who contributed much to prepare the way for the Reformation in Holland. In 1572 he enjoyed the friendship of John Wessel and A. Agrippa, and in later years that of Erasmus. He was a man of learning, and also skilled in medicine. He was pastor of St. Martin's church in Groningen. He also frequently served the city in a political capacity. He acquired great influence and was highly esteemed. Erasmus regarded him not only as an enlightened man, but as a model priest. He belonged to a circle in which the spirit of Wessel continued to live. Associated with such men as Everard Jarches, Herman Abrig, Nikolaus Lendorp, Johannes Timmermans, and Gerard Peteris, he was the most widely using the views of Reformers than with those of the Roman hierarchy. The Dominicans attempted to counteract these liberal views.
by offering to defend certain theses. A debate ensued in 1538. In the progress of it became apparent that this circle of friends had deeply imbibed the spirit and sentiments of the Illustrious Wessel. The liberty which they enjoyed in the expression of their views was greatly due to the extraordinary influence of a man named Wessel, who, in full obedience to his calling, was not unwilling to sacrifice his own life on his fatherland's behalf, and his church for the sake of the Reformation. See Schmelzer, "Die protestantische Freunde" (Altenburg, 1840); Haym, "Israel unter der Judenrechtigung" (1857); and "Dokumente der Geschichte der Niederlandischen Reformationszeit" (3d ed., Amsterdam, 1866), "Schem, American Everett. Manoeuvres for 1808 (N. Y. 1868)." (A. J. S.)

**Freedom** (Ὠθελήσια, chryshabos, manumissionem, Lev. xix, 20; entirely different from polity, citizenship, Acts xxii, 28; "commonwealth," i. e. polity, Eph. i, 12). Strangers resident in Palestine had the fullest protection of the law, equally with the native Hebrews (Lev. xxiv, 22; Num. xxv, 12; Deut. i, 10; xxiv, 17); the law of usury was to be strictly enforced, or expiated, or be 20. The advantage the Hebrews could attain over the Gentile was essentially spiritual, in being the members of the ecclesiastical as well as the civil community of Jehovah. But even to this spiritual privilege Gentiles were admitted on condition of circumcision (Deut. x, 19; Jer. vi, 11; Sam. xx, 7; 2 Sam. xi, 13). The Ammonites and Moabites were excluded from the citizenship of the theocracy, and the persons mentioned in Deut. xxii, 1-6. See FOREIGNER. The Mosaic code points out the several cases in which the servants of the Hebrews were to receive their freedom (Exod. xx, 29; Lev. xxv, 39, 41, 47-55; Deut. xv, 12-17). See SLAVE. There were various modes whereby the freedom of Rome could be attained by foreigners, such as by merit or favor, by money (Acts xxii, 28), or by family. The inquisitor or freeman came directly by birth to freedom and to citizenship. The liberato or freeman was a manumitted slave, and his children were denominated liberini, i. e. freedmen or freedmen's sons. See LIBERTINE. Among the Greeks and Romans the freedmen had not equal rights with the freemen or those of free birth. The Roman citizen could not be legally scourged; he could not be confined, or be examined by question or torture, to extort a confession from him. If, in any of the provinces, he deemed himself and his cause to be treated by the president with dishonesty and injustice, he could, by appeal, remove it to Rome, and the determination of the emperor was final (Ant. xvi, 37-39; xxi, 58; xxii, 25; xxi, 11, 12). Christians are represented as inheriting the rights of spiritual citizenship by being members of the commonwealth or community of Jehovah (Eph. ii, 12; Phil. iii, 20). See CITIZENSHIP. The Christian slave is the Lord's freedman, and a partner of all the privileges of the children of God; and the Christian freeman is the servant of Christ (1 Cor. vi, 22; Rom. vi, 20-22). Paul acknowledges that freedom is worthy of being eagerly embraced; but the freedom which he esteemed most important was the freedom which came through our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. vii, 21-23). The Jews, under the Mosaic law, are represented as in a state of servitude, and Christians as in a state of freedom (John viii, 31-36; Gal. iv, 21-31). See SLAVERY.

**Free (or Free-will) Offering** (ὢθελήσια, nedaboth, i. e. voluntary, as often), spoken of a spontaneous gift (Exod. xxxv, 29; Ezra 4, 4; comp. 7), but chiefly of a voluntary sacrifice (Lev. xxi, 25; Ezra iii, 5; Ezek. xxi, 12; plar. 2 Chron. xxxi, 14; Lev. xxiv, 24; 8; Amos iv, 5; fig. Ps. cxxix, 108), as opposed to one in consequence of a vow (vow, 72), or in expiation of some offence. See Thank-offering.

Freeske, William, an English Socinian, born in 1648, wrote a book in the form of questions and answers.
swers, entitled A Dialogue on the Daily, and a Confuta-
tion of the Doctrine of the Trinity, which was publicly
burned; and the author was fined £500 and compelled
to make a recantation in Westminster Hall.—Allibone,
Dict. of Authors, s. v.; Rose, New Bibl. Dict. viii, 448-
9. (J. W. M.)

Freeman (coxalgou, one unawed, a freed-
man, 1 Cor. vii, 22; so Josephus, Ant. vii, 11, 2; 
odochines, lxx, 20; Xenophon, Athen. i, 10), FREEWOM-
an (iswoua, a freely-born female, Gal. iv, 22, 23, 30; 
elsewhere simply "free"). See Freedom.

Freeman, James, the first pastor of a Unitarian
church in New England, was born in Charlestown
and graduated at Harvard in 1777. His theological
studies were carried on with difficulty dur-
ing the war. In 1782 he was invited to officiate as
reader in King's Chapel for six months, and in 1788 he
was chosen pastor of the church, stipulating, however,
for permission to omit the Athanasian Creed from the
service. He soon began to feel doubts as to the do-
trines of the Trinity, and finally preached a series of
sermons to his people renouncing the doctrine.
The church resolved (in 1785) to alter their liturgy and re-
tain their pastor. Thus the first Episcopal church in
New England became the first Unitarian church in
America. Application was made to Bishop Provost in
1787 to ordain Mr. Freeman; but the bishop, of course,
refused, and the pastor was ordained by his own people.
He was a man of fine social qualities, and of excellent
intellectual powers, and was very popular as a pastor and
preacher. He died November 14, 1838. Beside him, 14, 1858. He
contributed to periodical literature and to the Collec-
tions of the Massachusetts Historical Society, he pub-
slished Sermons and Addresses (Boston, 1825).—Ware,
Unitarian Biography, i, 148, 149; Sprague, Annals, viii, 162.

Free Religious Association, the name of an
association established in Boston, United States, in
May, 1867. The Constitution adopted at the first
meeting declared the objects of the association to be
to promote the interests of pure religion, to encourage
the scientific study of theology, and to increase fellow-
ship in the spirit; and to this end all persons interest-
ed in these objects are cordially invited to its mem-
bership. Each member of the association is left indi-
vidually responsible for his own opinions alone, and
affects in no degree his relations to other associations.
A person belonging to co-operating or co-operating
association will be considered a member, with full right to speak
in its meetings, but is required to contribute a small
annual fee as a preliminary to the privilege of voting
on questions of business. The association is to hold
an annual meeting at Boston, one month's notice of
the meeting being previously given. A permanent
organization was effected of officers and committee.
At the first meeting speeches were made by Unitari-
ans, Universalists, Spiritualists, Progressive Friends,
Progressive Jews, and others connected with no par-
ticular religious denomination. At the second meet-
ing, held in 1868, a Baptist clergyman, who had been
censured for close communion practice, and an Epis-
copalian clergyman, who had been tried for an ex-
change of pulpits with a non-Episcopal clergyman,
were among the speakers. (A. J. S.)

Free Spirit, Brethren of the. See Breth-
ren of the Free Spirit.

Free-thinkers, "a name adopted by sectics to
express the liberty which they claim and exercise, to
think (or doubt) as they please upon all subjects, es-
specially those connected with religion. The term
originated in the 18th century, though 'free-thinking'
had earlier appeared in England. In 1718, a weekly
paper, entitled "The Freethinker", was published; and
in France and Germany a corresponding spirit exten-
sively prevailed."—Eden, Churchman's Dict. s. v. See
Infidelitv.

Free will. See Will.

Free-will Baptists. See Baptists.

Freelinghusen, the name of a family eminent in
the history of the American Church.

1. FREELINGHUYSEN, THEODORUS JACOBUS, first
minister of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in
Somerset County, N. J. 'He was born at Lingen, in
East Friesland (now in Hanover, Prussia), about 1691, was
educated there, and was ordained in 1717. By the person-
ality of his son, Simon Tjedde, one of the ministers of the
churches of Amsterdam, Holland, he was in-
duced to come to America, where he arrived in Janu-
ary, 1720, and became pastor of the Dutch people
in the vicinity of the present city of New Brunswick,
upon the banks of the Raritan and its tributaries.
Encountering all the difficulties of a newly-settled
country and a sparse population, whose religious spirit
was very formal and relaxed, his faithful and fearless
ministry gave great offence to many, and aroused a
spirit of persecuting opposition. But, with apostolic
zeal, he declared, "I would rather die a thousand
deaths than not preach the truth." A great revival
of religion resulted from his evangelical labors.
The highest testimony to his success has been left on rec-
ord by such men as Rev. Gilbert Tennent, George
Whitefield, and President Edwards; and by Rev. Dr.
A. Moseley in his Historical Review of the Reformation
in the Dutch Church of New Jersey, 1734, and in his paper entitled "The Hollanders
in New Jersey," read before the New Jersey Histori-
cal Society, September, 1850—a valuable document.
A characteristic volume of his sermons, translated
from the Dutch language by Rev. William Demarest,
was issued in 1856 (12mo, pp. 492) by the Board of
Publication of the R. P. D. Church, New York.
His biographer says "his labors continued for more than
a quarter of a century; and although he was often
attacked in the civil courts, before the colonial author-
ities, and in the pulpit by his colleagues, he never suc-
ceeded. He was always unsought by the ecclesiastical
authorities. All his children were believers. His five sons were ordained to the minis-
try, and his two daughters were married to ministers."
His ministry closed about 1747 (see Memoirs of Hon.
Theo. Freelinghysen, by Rev. T. W. Chambers, B.D.,
N. Y., Harper's, 1868). (W. J. R. T.)

2. FREELINGHUYSEN, Rev. THIODORE, eldest son of
the above-named, came to this country in 1745 an or-
dained minister, and was settled over the Reformed
Dutch Church in Albany, N. Y. He is represented
as having been in the Anti-Slavery, and the popula-
tion of spiritual eloquent, tender, and warm-hearted as a preacher; of
spotless life, and of eminent piety—"the apostolic
and much-beloved Freelinghuyse", as the name was for-
merly written. After a ministry of fifteen years in
Albany, he returned to Holland in 1760, partly be-
cause of ministerial discouragements from the exces-
sive worldliness of the city, partly to visit his native
land, and, according to some accounts, to procure
funds for founding a literary and theological institu-
tion. But he never returned, having been lost at sea
on the voyage. It is remarkable that his two broth-
ers, Jacobus and Ferdinandus, both of whom had
been educated and ordained as ministers in Holland,
also died at sea in 1758, of small-pox; and that the
youngest brother, Henricus, pastor of the churches in
Warwaring and Rochester, Ulster County, N. Y., died
of the same disease soon after his settlement in 1756. (W. J. R. T.)

3. FREELINGHUYSEN, John, second son of T. J. Fre-
elinghuyse, was educated and ordained in Holland, and
succeeded his father as pastor at Raritan, N. J., in 1750.
He "was a man of greater suavity than his father, but
had a strong and upholding, simple, and emotional
Christianity. He was distinguished for his gifts in the
pulpit, for his assiduity in the religious training of
the young; and for his zealous endeavors to raise up
worthy candidates for the sacred office." He died, greatly lamented, in 1754, in the twenty-eighth year of his age. His wife, who afterwards married the Rev. Dr. Jacobus Rutea Hardenbergh, and who survived her first husband more than fifty years, is represented to have been "as eminent in her day for intelligent piety as any of the female saints of the Old Testament of the New" (see Chambers, Memoir of Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen, Harpers, 1863). (W. J. R. T.)

4. FRELINGHUYSEN, THEODORE, an eminent Christian lawyer, statesman, orator, and educator of youth, was great-grandson of the Rev. Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, and the son of major-general Frederick Frelinghuysen, of the Revolutionary army, member of the Provincial Congress of New Jersey and of the Continental Congress, and senator of the United States from his native state (New Jersey). He was born at Millstone, Somerset County, N. J., March 28, 1787, educated in schools at New Brunswick and at Basking Ridge, and graduated at Princeton, New Jersey, in 1804, with the highest honors of the institution. After studying law in the offices of his brother John at Millstone and of the Hon. Richard Stockton at Princeton, he was admitted to the bar in 1808, at the age of twenty-one. His eminent qualities as a lawyer led to his election as a member of the New Jersey legislature in 1817, and in 1829 he was elected to Congress, where he held his seat until 1832, when he was elected to the Senate of the United States. At the end of his term in the Senate he resumed the profession of the law, but soon accepted the chancellorship of the University of the City of New York. From 1839 to 1850 he occupied this high place, and then became president of Rutgers College at New Brunswick, N. J., where he died, April 12, 1861, after a protracted illness. During his residence in New York he was a candidate for the vice-presidency of the United States, on the ticket of Henry Clay, in 1844. In 1844, Mr. Frelinghuysen's civil, forensic, and political eminence was eclipsed by the loss of his Christian and philanthropic fortunes. His piety was humble, devout, genial, simple, and most carefully cultivated. His religious life was felt with unusual power at the bar, in the Senate, in society, and in the Church. He was a Sunday-school teacher almost until his death. His efforts for the salvation of men—presidents, governors, senators, judges, and others—were most remarkable and blessed. Especially was he in the place of father, pastor, and adviser to the younger men over whom he presided in the university and college. He was one of the foremost Temperance advocates and laborers in his generation. His eloquent tongue was ever ready to plead for every good Christian or humane cause. The American Sunday-school Union, the American Colonization Society, and other benevolent enterprises, often shared in these efforts. At one time, and for years together, he was the president of those three greatest of our Christian voluntary associations—the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Reckoned he was a Christian patriot of the first order. His eloquent speech in the United States Senate on the Indian Bill, and his course on the Sunday-mail Question, told with electric force upon the whole country. And when the civil war broke out in 1861, he was among the first, the most decided, and the most influential of all the eminent defenders of the Union. The completeness of his elevated character and record is remarkable, and his name will ever be illustrious for its goodness and greatness. A memoir of his life and services by Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., was issued by Harper and Brothers, N. Y., 1863, 12mo. (W. J. R. T.)

FRENCH, WILLIAM, D.D., a distinguished divine and mathematician, was educated at Cambridge, and became second wrangler in 1811. Soon after became fellow and tutor of Pembroke College, which he also left in 1817. He was ordained a deacon in 1820, and a priest in 1821. He was successively appointed vice-chancellor in 1821 and 1824, rector of Moor-Monkton, Yorksire, in 1827, and canon of Ely in 1832. He died in 1849. He published A New Translation of the Book of Psalms from the original Hebrew (1821-1824), with Notes by W. French and G. Skinner (Lond. 1831, 3vo).—Darling, Cyclop. Biblolog. s. v.

French Confession (Confeffio Gallicana). See Gallican Confession.

French Lutheran Church. See France.

French Reformed Church. See France, and Reformation.

French Roman Catholic Church. See France, and Gallican Church.

French Prophets, the name given in England to a sect formed by the Camisards, who came over to England about 1706, and who brought with them the "gift of prophecy," and soon made converts in England. The great subject of their predictions was the speedy establishment of the Kingdom of the Messiah; and (and they were to proclaim it as heralds to every nation under heaven), that the grand jubilee, "the acceptable year of the Lord," the accomplishment of those numerous scriptures concerning the new heavens and the new earth, the kingdom of the Messiah, the marriage of the Lamb, the resurrection of the dead, or the world of the rising in the day of judgment, was now even at the door; that this great operation was to be effected by spiritual arms only, proceeding from the mouths of those who should by inspiration, or the mighty gift of the Spirit, be sent forth in great numbers to labor in the vineyard; that the mission of God's servants should be witnessed to by signs and wonders from heaven, by a deluge of judgments on the wicked universally throughout the world, as famine, pestilence, earthquakes, wars, etc.; that the exterminating angels should cut off the tares, and there shall remain upon earth only good corn; and the works of men being thrown down, there shall be but one Lord, one faith, one heart, and one voice among mankind. And they declared that all the great things they had spoken of would be manifest over the whole earth within the term of the world. They thus prophesied a deluge in the gift of languages, of miracles, of discerning, etc.: discerning the secrets of the heart; the power of conferring the same spirit on others by the laying on of hands, and the gift of healing. To prove they were really inspired by the Holy Ghost, they alleged the complete joy and satisfaction they experienced in the spirit of prayer which was poured forth upon them, and the answer of their prayers by the Most High. These pretensions, however, laid the foundation of their detection and complete overthrow. They went so far as to pretend to raise the dead, and fixed upon one of their own number for the experiment, who was to rise on a particular day. But Dr. Eames did not rise! (Adams, View of all Religions). They obtained, for some time, considerable success in Great Britain, having their admiring followers not only in London, but also in the chief provincial towns. They were even joined by some parties of influence, such as Sir Richard Bulkeley, Lady Jane Forbes, John Lacey, Esq., and others. Mr. Lacey, who was originally a member of Dr. Calamy's congregation, entered, we are told, "into all their absurdities, except that of a community of goods," and was strongly obliged, having an income of £2,000 a year. The influence of the prophets speedily declined; but their proceedings left a stigma for a time upon the reputation of the Huguenot refugees settled in Britain. See Huggison, A Curious Account of the French and English Prophets, in London, 1814.
emitted from the Burning, by Samuel Keimer, who was one of the sect, and afterwards became a Quaker and came to America, professes to give an account of the French prophets "by one of themselves." The claims of the French prophets resemble, in some respects, those of the modern Irvingites (see English Review, ix, 22, 33). 3. VERSIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.—I. We may gather from the conciliar edicts prohibiting the use of translations of the sacred books in the vulgar tongue that such existed as early as the beginning of the 13th century (Acta Concil. Toulouse, c. 14, ap. Marcellus, p. 889); these also served at the synod of Tarragona in 1224, and Beziers in 1246, and even as early as 1199, Pope Innocent III had heard that "evangelia, epistolae Pauli, moralia Job, et phræs aliis libros in Gallico sermone," were in use among the Albigenses (Epist. ed. Baluze, i, 482); but we are very much in the dark as to the character of the translations or the source whence they emanated. Writers on the Wal- densian Church assert the existence of translations in the Romance dialect possessed by that church anterior to the 12th century (Monastier, History of the Vandois, p. 73; Henderson, The Vanois, i, 447; The Romance of the Gospel of St. John, etc., Lond. 1849); but the evidence on which this advanced does not stand the test of a thorough scrutiny. In the Novela Legem, which contains the religious belief of that church, there are several citations of Scripture, but there is no evidence that these are made from any ex- tant version; and, at any rate, this work cannot be placed earlier than the end of the 12th or beginning of the 13th century (Hallam, Hist. of Literature, i, 26). Walter de Mage says that, during the pontificate of Alexander III (1159-1181), he was present at a synod at Cividale, where certain Waldensians presented to the pope a book written in the Gallic tongue, "in quo textus et glossa Psalterii plurimumque legis utriusque libros continebatur" (De Scriptu Car. p. 64, Camden Society ed.; Ussher, De Chr. Eccles. Success., in Opp. ed. Elrington, ii, 244); but it is doubtful whether any part of this was in the vernacular except the gloss, which in a translation would be of little use. That Peter Valdo himself possessed a vernacular translation of the Scriptures has been asserted; but, when examined, this tradition resolves itself into the fact that he requested a grammarian, Stephen de las Anas, to help him and had his attention to the curious text of the Gospels and other books of the Bible, "et auctoritates sanctorum;" but whether it was a "textus cum glossa," or "sententias per titulos congregate," the witnesses leave uncertain. From what Reimer says (ap. Ussher, l.c.), "Glossa de sanctis psalmis et psalmorum" by a certain "Testamenti textum docuit ecclesiasticus," the presumption is that no vernacular version existed, but that Valdo in preaching translated for his hearers, i.e., probably gave them the glosses which Stephanus had collected for him. Friehemius, however, expressly says, "Libros sacroscriptorum maximi Novi Testamenti sibi in linguam Gallicam fecit translati" (Ann. Hervigniana, anno 1100, i, 442). The MSS. of the Wal- densian versions preserved at Zürich, Grenoble, Dub- lin, and Paris are not of an earlier date than the 14th century, nor can the version they present claim any higher rank than has been given to it. The best portion of the Old Testament is from the MSS. of the N.T., and portions of the Old, existed among the so-called Sartories of the south of France from an early period does not admit of doubt, but we are not in circum- stances to say anything definite concerning them. Dr. O. C. Patau, in 1838, who had visited the South of France in 1835, was told by the priests of the south of the O.T. (together 7 vols. 8vo), the last portion being issued at Antwerp, in consequence of attempts on the part of the French clergy to prevent its appearance. Tradition ascribes this version to Jacques le Fevre d'Etiapes, who had before this distinguished himself by a Latin translation of Paul's epistles, and by exege- tical works on the Gospels and Epistles; and there is no them (Gisseler, Church Hist. iii, 409). In the north of France also we have some clear traces of vernacular copies of the Scriptures. A translation of the four books of Kings in the dialect of the north of France (langue d'Oïl) has been published (Paris, 1811, 4to) by M. Leroux de Lincy, who attributes it to the 12th century. M. Réau has examined and described in the Revue des deux mondes, i. 93, a Codex preserved in the library of that city, which contains in the same dialect, somewhat varied, the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, with the Glossa ordinaria et interlinearis [see Gloss], and the rest of the historical books of the O. T., written in the dialect of that city, but without the gloss. As respects the translation said to have been made in the year 1250, for Louis IX, that of Du Vignier (cir. 1340), that of De Sy (1350), and that of Vaudecar (1372), we can say nothing more than that tradition asserts that such did once exist. Of translations of parts of Scripture, chiefly the Psalms, into the more modern French, a large number exist in MS., of which a copious list is given by Le Long in his Bibliotheca Sacra. At out the year 1380 a translation was undertaken by command of Charles V of France, by Raoul de Prailles, of which more than one copy has been extant. Le Long gives a specimen of the Codex containing it, with some extracts, by way of specimen, of the language; and there is another MS. of it in the British Museum, of which a full description is given in the Bibliotheca Landowskiana, p. 284 sq. This version in these codices does not go beyond Pro- verbs.

II. Emerging from these obscure regions of in- quiry, we come to those versions which have been printed, and of which it is possible to give a certain account.

I. That of Guiars des Moulines, an ecclesiastic of Picardy. Taking as his basis the Historio Scholastica of Peter Comestor, a digest of the Bible History with glosses, he freely translated this; adding a sketch of the history of Job, the Proverbs, and probably the other books ascribed to Solomon; substituting for Comes- tor's history of the Macabees a translation of this from the Vulgate, and in general conforming the whole more closely to the text of the Vulgate than Comestor had done. The Psalms, Prophets, and Epistles were not in the work as it first issued, and it is uncertain whether the Acts were not also omitted; all these, how- ever, were added in a later translation. The chief merit of this work, the most important of which, is at Jena. An edition of this Bible, as completed by different hands, was issued from the press by order of Charles VIII, about the year 1487, edited by the king's con- ciliars, and published at Lyons, in a quarto folio. Twelve editions of this, some at Paris and some at Lyons, appeared between 1487 and 1545. This is called La Grande Bible, to distinguish it from a work entitled La Bible pour les simples gens, which is a sum- mary of the history of the O. T., and of some of those editions which have been examined. Previous to the edition of 1487, an edition of the N. T., of the same translation as that found in the completed works of Guiars, but not by Guiars himself, was printed at Ly- ons by Barth. Buyer, fol., and edited by two Augustin- ian monks, Julien Macho and Peter Farget: it is un- dated, but is referred to the year 1478, and this seems to be the Edicta Principis of the French Scriptures.

2. In the year 1523 appeared at Paris, from the press of Simon de Colines, an anonymous translation of the N. T., which was often reprinted, and to which, Dr. O. C. Patau, in 1838, was told by the priests of the south of the O.T. (together 7 vols. 8vo), the last portion being issued at Antwerp, in consequence of attempts on the part of the French clergy to prevent its appearance. Tradition ascribes this version to Jacques le Fevre d'Etiapes, who had before this distinguished himself by a Latin translation of Paul's epistles, and by exege- tical works on the Gospels and Epistles; and there is no
reason to question the justice of the ascription. This version is made from the Vulgate, with slight variations in the N.T., where the author follows the Greek. The complete work appeared in one vol. fol., at Antwerp, in 1530, and again from the same types in 1532. It was placed in the papal Index in 1546; but in 1550 it was reissued at Louvain in fol., edited by two priests, Nisius and Jansen. Franz van den Veyt corrected the style, and struck out all that savored of what they deemed heresy. Of this corrected version many editions have been issued.

3. The first French Protestant version was prepared by Pierre Robert Olivieran, a relation of Calvin, and a relation, at that order, near Neuchâtel, in Switzerland, in 1535, fol. Of this edition very few copies remain. It was reprinted at Geneva in 1540, at Lyons in 1541, and, with a few emendations from the pen of Calvin, again at Geneva in 1545. In 1551 a thoroughly revised edition, with the addition of some of the apocryphal books by Beza, and a new translation of the Psalms by Budé, was issued at Geneva. It has often been reprinted since. An edition for the use of the Vaudois, and for which they subscribed 1500 golden crowns, was printed at Neuchâtel in 1556. This translation was on the O. T. in the Latin version of Santes Pagninus, and for the N. T. after the versions of Lefèvre and Erasmus. In its first form it was very imperfect, and even after the revival of Calvin, and the emendations of subsequent editors, it remained behind the requirements of an authorized version.

4. To remedy the defects of Olivetan's version, and to produce one more suited to the wants of the age, the Venerable Company of Pastors at Geneva undertook a thorough revision of the work, with the special aid of Beza, Gouart, Fay, etc., and under the editorial care of Cornelius Bertrand. This appeared in 1559. In this revision, 775,777, all that is in the other Protestant versions is rendered by a word equivalent to Lord, is throughout translated L'Éternel. Revised editions have been issued by the Venerable Company in 1568, 1712, 1726, 1803, and of the N. T. in 1833; the last two very much modernized in style. This claims to be the most elegant of the French versions, but it is far from being an adequate rendering of the original.

5. The Bible of Diodati, Gen. 1614; of Desmarets, Amst. 1609; of Martin, Utr. (N. T.) 1606, (Bible) 1707, 2 vols. fol.; of Roques, Basle, 1744; Osterwald, Amst. 1731, 2 vols. fol.; of Martin, Utr. 1744, are more revisions of Olivetan's text undertaken by individuals. Of these, Osterwald's is the most thorough, and may be viewed as occupying the place in the French Protestant Church of an authorized version, though Martin's is the one most esteemed by the more orthodox of its members, while that of Desmarets is sought by those who attach much value to fine paper and printing. A carefully revised edition of Osterwald's Bible, with parallels by the Rev. W. Mackenzie, has been issued by the French Bible Society, Paris, 1861.

6. Of a number of translations from the original by individuals may be mentioned that of Seb. Castillon (Castallo), 2 vols. fol., Basle, 1555, in which the translator aimed to impart classical elegance to the style, but which was universally regarded as neither conveying the just sense of the original, nor being in accordance with the Church litanies; that of Le Clerc, 2 vols. 4to, Amst. 1703, in the interests of Arminianism; that of Le Cene, published after his death in 2 vols. 4to, Amst. 1741, deeply marked by Socinian leanings; and that of Beausoleil and L'Enfant, 2 vols. 4to, Amst. 1718. This last is by much the best, and has been repeatedly reprinted.

7. Of Roman Catholic versions of the Bible, the first is that of René Bénoliel, a member of the theological faculty at Paris, which appeared in 1566. It was condemned by Pope Gregory XIII in 1573, and involved the author in much trouble because of its supposed Protestant leanings. It is, in fact, only a slightly altered transcript of the Geneva Bible. A revised edition, conformed to the Vulgate, was issued by the divines at Louvain. Four translations of the N. T. had appeared before this, viz. that of Claude Deville, 1618; that of Jacques Corbin, an advocate of Paris, 1643; that of Michel de Maréolles, abbé of Villebon, 1640, who corrected the style, and struck out all that savored of what they deemed heresy. Of this corrected version many editions have been issued.

8. In our own day several versions of the Psalms have appeared in France. A translation of the whole Bible from the Vulgate, by Eugene Geronde, in 28 vols. 8vo, appeared at Paris between 1809 and 1824. This has frequently been reprinted, and has excited much attention. Some of the journals have recommended it, while by others it has been no less severely criticised. The latest appearance in this department is the translation of the Gospels by La Memmio, 1846, the style of which is admirable, but the notes appended to it are in the interest of Socialism. But the most important work of this kind is undoubtedly the translation from the Hebrew of the O. T. by S. Cahen, La Bible: Traduction Nouvelle avec l'Hébreu en regard, etc. Par. 1822-39, 18 vols. 8vo. (Le Long, Bibliotheca Sacra; Simon, Huit. Crit. du N. Test. liv. ii; Brunet, Manuel du Libraire; Horne, Introduction vol. ii, 1825; Reuss, Gesch. des V. T. sec. 466, etc.; and in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. s. v. Romanische Bibelwerke.; Darling, Encyl. Bibl. ii, 99 sq.)

Fréret, Nicholas, a celebrated French scholar, was born at Paris February 15, 1688, and died in the same city March 8, 1749. He at first studied law, but abandoned it, especially for improving the knowledge of the languages, history, and religious systems of ancient and Oriental peoples. At the age of twenty-five he was admitted to the Academy of Inscriptions, and gave as his inaugural a discourse on the origin of the Franks, which, though favorably received by the Academy, and
vindicated in great part by the subsequent progress of historical research, was strongly opposed by the abbé Vertot, and led to Fréret's being sent for a short time to the Bastille. On his release he produced a long series of papers for the Academy of Inscriptions, with the object of throwing the university into disturbance, and engaging it in a bombastic and recherche. In treating mythology, he rejected the theory which traces back religious fables to historical facts [see Ezechiel], assigned to the historical element a secondary place, and thought that the Greeks had borrowed most of their divinities from the Egyptians and Egyptians. In the meantime, the school of the ancient Greek mysteries, which had adhered to the religions of the Celts, the Germans, the Hindus, the Chinese, the Persians, and the Romans, and was one of the first in France to prosecute the study of Chinese. Of his writings we name only those which belong more especially to the subjects contained in this work, viz.: Essai sur la Chronologie de l'Écriture Sainte (Histoire de l'Acad. tom. xxi.);—Observations sur les fêtes religieuses de l'année perse, et en particulier sur celle de Mithra, ainsi que sur les Persians que chez les Romans (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xvi.);—Reflexions générales sur la religion des Grecs, et sur l'existence du dieu dans l'Église (Histoire de l'Acad. tom. xxi.);—Recherches sur le Culte de Bacchus parmi les Grecs (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xii.);—La Nature du Culte rendu à Bacchus en Grèce aux époques, et particulièrement à l'Antiquité (Histoire de l'Acad. tom. xxi.);—Hist. des Cyclopes, des Décylies, des Thraciens, et des Persians (Histoire de l'Acad. tom. xxi.);—Les Fonds historiques de la fable de Bellerophon et de la maimère de l'Éadephe (Histoire de l'Acad. t. vii.);—Observations sur les médaillons par les âmes des morts (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xii.);—Observations sur la religion des Gaulois et sur celle des Germains (Mem. de l'Acad. t. xii.);—Ethologie du mot Druid (Histoire de l'Acad. t. xii.);—La Nature et les dogmes des peuples de Gaule historiquement démontrés (Histoire de l'Acad. t. xii.);—L'Usure des sacrificies humains révélée chez les différentes nations et particulièrement chez les Gaulois (Histoire de l'Acad. t. xii.);—Recherches sur les dieux Herm. Euculémoniaux et sur quelques autres antiquités ibériques (Histoire de l'Acad. t. ii.);—Les Assassins de Parce (Mem. de l'Acad. t. ii.);—Le Clerc de la Usure de la main d'or; and a collection of Fréret's works under the title Œuvres complètes, nouvel. édit. considérablement augmentées de plusieurs ouvrages inédits (Paris, 1766-99, 20 vols. 12mo.), but, despite its title, by no means a complete edition.


Fresco Painting, a method of painting with mineral and earthy colors dissolved in water upon freshly-plastered walls. As only so much can be painted in one day as can be executed while the plaster is wet, and as the colors become lighter on drying, fresco painting is very difficult of execution. As the wall dries, all the color that is applied is carried to the surface, and the artist is forced to work in a great hurry. But little retouching can be done. Fresco painting was carried to great perfection by the ancients. It was revi

Fresco, Johann Philipp, a German Lutheran clergyman, was born Oct. 22, 1705. After finishing his theological studies at the University of Strasl

burg in 1725, he became tutor of the young Rhinegrave of Salm-Gummbach. In 1727 he succeeded his father as pastor of Oberwiesen, and in 1728 became second "Bürgprediger" at Giessen. In the following year he also began to give exegetical and ascetic lectures at the university; and this, in 1730, brought him to see that the influence of the leading men of the day was more than a temporary one. In 1732 he was appointed professor of divinity. Fresenius enjoyed great reputation as a powerful preacher and experienced spiritual guide. From early youth he displayed a great zeal in the defence of Lutheran orthodoxy and of Lutheran preachers, frequently bringing himself into conflict with the leading preachers of the day, and was one of the first to denounce the vices of the clergy. In 1733 he wrote a work, "Amsteloligia", against a scrupulous pamphlet ("Friss Vogel der Steli") against Lutheranism by the Jesuit Weilingher, and produced thereby so great an excitement among Roman Catholics that a plan was made to kidnap him, with the aid of an Austrian army then stationed on the Rhine. He had to flee for safety to Darmstadt. In that city he caused the establishment of an institute for preachers, and became its director and inspector. In 1734 he opposed the efforts of the Reformed congregations to obtain the public exercise of their religion and the institution of a university. In this he was, in particular, a determined and even violent opponent of Count Zinzendorf and the Moravians. Zinzendorf regarded him as the most energetic opponent, and called him an "incarnate devil" ("eingefesselt gefluchten Teufel"). Some of his works are still in common use in the German Lutheran Church. Thus the Historische Betrachtungen über die Sowohl und Fütterungsverhältnisse, which first appeared in 1750, were published in a new edition in 1845 (2d ed. 1854) by Johann Friedrich von Meyer (q. v.), and of his Epitome prelicseni, first published in 1746, the second edition was issued in 1838 by Ledderose. His historical writings against the Moravians number 24 volumes ("Streitschriften gegen die Herrnhuter, Frankfurt, 1748-60").—Stetz in Herzog, Real-Encycl. xix, 501.

Fresen, Du. See Du Cange.

Frey, Jean Louis, a Swiss theologian and philologist, was born at Basel in 1682, and died in the same place in 1768. He is said to have been familiar with Hebrew at ten years of age. He was a pupil of Jean Buxtorf, under whom he studied Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Syrian, and Arabic. In 1703 he became a minister, and then travelled through Europe to increase his knowledge. In 1711 he was made professor of history and theology at Berne, and subsequently of Biblical exegesis, which chair he filled till his death. He was distinguished for the extent and variety of his knowledge. He left a considerable sum of money, and his own library of more than 8000 volumes, for the benefit of the library and students of the college at Basle. Together with other works, we have from him Disputatio ex qua moniana de Jean Chriost e societate, Basle (1703):—De Officio Doctoris Christiani dissertationes iv (1711-1715). He edited a corrected and enlarged edition of Suius' Theologiae Ecclesiastici (Amsterdam, 1728, 2 vols. fol.), an edition of J. Grynaeus' Opera, etc., and wrote most of the notes for the edition of the Patres Apostolici, published in Basel in 1742.—Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Genr. xviii, 841-2.

Frey, Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick, was born in Germany of Jewish parents. At the age of twenty-five he became a Christian, and in 1810 came to the United States. He was then and for some years a Presbyterian minister, and subsequently a Baptist. But he never ceased to be a Jew in feeling, and was an enthusiastic votary of Rabbinical studies,
which influenced him as a Biblical interpreter. He
latter chaffed for the conversion of the Jews, was
agent of "The American Society for Alemorating
the Condition of the Jews" and edited a periodical called
_The Jewish Intelligence_. He died at Pontiac, Michi-
gan, in 1800, in the 79th year of his age. He was
the author of a "Narrative" of his life:—"Joseph and
Ben-
jamin," a comparison of the two branches of the Jews and
Christians;—_Judaah and Israel; or the Restoration of
Christianity_ (1837, 12mo);—_Lectures on Scripture Types_ (1841, 12mo).
He also published an edition of the Hebrew
Bible, a Hebrew Lexicon, Grammar, and Reader,
and _The Hebrew Student's Pocket Companion_. See
Stoddert, A. H. N. 14, 375. (E. S. C.)

_Frêya_, the goddess of the moon and love in the
Scandinavian mythology, was the daughter of Niord
and sister of Freyr, and is regarded by some as origin-
ally the same with Frigg (q. v.), to whom, among the
goddesses, she ranks next in power and honor. She
is described as beautiful, virtuous, gentle, and ever
ready to hear the prayers of men; as fond of music,
flowers, fairies, and the spring, and the source of in-
spiration of the love-songs of the scalds. In the myths,
which represent her, like Fiax, as seeking her absent
spouse (Odin), and as ranking next to Frigg, the
earth mother may have symbolized the relation of
the moon to the earth and the sun, and find an ex-
planation of those resemblances which have led to the
confounding her with Frigg. "She is always de-
scribed as attended by two of her maids" (see pl. 18,
fig. 4, _Mythology and Religious Rites_, in _Icon. Encyclo._).
The name of Friday, the sixth day of the week, is de-

erived from her. _Iconographic Enyclopedie, iv_, 276-90
(N.Y. 1851); Thorpe, _Northern Mythology_. (J. W. M.)

Freylinghausen, Johann Anastasius, an emi-
nent German Pietist theologian, was born at Ganders-
heim Dec. 2, 1670. He studied theology at Jena in
1695, and at Halle in 1692. In the latter place he gain-
ed the friendship of A. G. Francke, whose wife he
married in 1655 at Glauchau, a suburb of Halle. In 1715
he became Francke's son-in-law, his adjunct in the church of
St. Ulrich, and was afterwards made director of the
Waisenhaeuser (orphans house). He died Feb. 12, 1739. His
principal works are, _Grundlegung der Theologie_ (Halle, 1703, often reprinted)—_Predigten an
d. Sow u. Festtagenstelln_ (Halle, 1729)—_Baustreitungen_ (1734)—_he also published Geistliches Gesangbuch_, (Halle, 1704-1714, 2 vols.; last edit. 1741). Forty of his hymns are of his own composition, and some of
the hymns of them are translated in Miss Winkworth's
_University of Leipzig, 1673, and Feb. 7, 1757. He

Freyr, in the Scandinavian mythology, one of the
dynasty of the Vanir, or second class of gods, and
son of Niord, was, together with his father and sister Freya,
given as a hostage to the Asir, or first class of gods, who
adopted them, and bestowed on Freyr for a dwelling
the celestial castle of Afthrin. He was the god of the
sun and fruitfulness, to whom men paid the honoring sea-
s and peace, and was regarded as well disposed to
men. He was a patron of marriage, and the patron
god of Sweden and Iceland. His chief temple was at
Upasala, and sacrifices of men and animals were made to
him. His festival was at the winter solstice, and his processions
were a signal for the opening of the rites. The
mythology relates that Freyr, once mounting the Hlidskialf,
the lofty seat of Odin, whence everything on earth
was visible, beheld in the high north, where dwelt the
giants, the wondrously beautiful Gerda, the brightness
of the earth, who was arrayed in arms filled with air and
sea with light, and was so smitten with love for her that he
could neither eat, drink, or sleep. His parents, by means
of his faithful servant Skyrmir, found out the cause of
his malady, and, after much trouble, succeeded in
obtaining Gerda for his wife. Freyr is represented
 ICON. ENCYCLOP. MYTHOLOGY, and _Religious Rites_, pl. 18, fig. 3) with a halo around his head, and holding in
his right hand ears of wheat, and in his left an urn whence
water flows, with the boar Gullinbursti at his feet, and
riding a horse named Sleipnir (see pl. 11, fig. 6) standing at the left
of Odin, with a branch of something in his right and a
drinking-horn in his left hand._Iconographic Encyclopedia_, iv, 270 (N. Y. 1851); Thorpe, _Northern Mythology_.
(J. W. M.)

Frier (lat. _Frater_, Fr. _frère_, brother), a term com-
mon to monks of all kinds, founded on the supposition
that there was a brotherhood between the persons of the
same monastery. It is especially applied to members of
the four mendicant orders, viz. 1. _Francis_, Mi-
norites, or Gray Friars; 2. _Augustines_; 3. _Dominicans_,
or Black Friars; 4. _Carmelites_, or White Friars. In
a more restricted sense, the word means a monk who is
not a priest: those in orders are generally denoma-
nated _father._

Frick, Albert, a German theologian, was born at
Ulm Sept. 18, 1714, and died May 30, 1776. He
studied at Leipsic, and was appointed assessor (judge)
at the faculty of theology. In 1748 he became minis-
ter at Jungingen, but, returning to Ulm in 1744, filled
the post of tutor to the professor of medicine. In 1751
he went to Münster as preacher, and in 1768 was
named head librarian. Among his writings are _Hist-
toria traditionum ex monumentis Ecclesiae Christiana_
(Ulm, 1740)—_De Natura et Constitutione THEOLOGIAE_ Catecheticae (Ulm, 1761-64, 4to)._—Hoefer, _Novae_._BIBL._
_Générale_, xvii, 971.

Frick, Elias, a German theologian, was born at
Ulm Nov. 23, 1673, and Feb. 7, 1757. He studied at
the gymnasium of his native city and at the universi-
ties of Leipsic and Jena, and in 1704 was pastor at
Bohringen, in 1708 pastor at Bermaingen, in 1712
preacher in Ulm, in 1729 professor of morals in the
gymnasium of Ulm, and also, in 1739, head librarian.
We have from him _De StuЯe pacis et beneficiorum omnium
ergy omnes_ (1704)—_Dis. i et ii de cura veteris circa
hernes_ (Ulm, 1704 and 1739), followed by his treatise
_Del Catechismatione veteris et recentioriae Ecclesiae:—Holl-
landische Wahrheit der Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahl_,
etc. (Ulm, 1726).—Hoefer, _Novae_._Bibl._ Générale, xvii, 971.

Frick, Johann, a German theologian, brother of the
present Albert, was born at Ulm Dec. 23, 1673, and
died March 2, 1739. After studying at the gymnas-
um of his native city he went to the University of
Leipsic, where he applied himself especially to theo-
logy, and at an early date took part in editing the _Acta
Eruditorum_. In 1698 he was named archdeacon of
Ilmenau, but, owing to bad health, could not perform
the duties. After his recovery he was appointed pas-
tor at Pfuhl. In 1701 he went to Münster as preac-
cher, and in 1712 was called to the chair of theology
there. His principal works are, _Grund der Wahrbir
von dem grossen Hauptunterschieden der evangelischen
and romisch-katholischen Religion_ (1707);—_Staatlich-
rechtu de Lutherean edocta, etc._ (Ulm, 1709, 4to)—_In-
elementia Clementis examinata_, etc. (Ulm, 1714)—_Dis-
bulis Unigentu, oder Clementis XI Constitution, etc._ (1714)—_Discur variolae de culpa schismatiso prot-
ometzias temperi impetuus_, etc. (Ulm, 1717, 4to).—_Zunum
in Clementis XI reditu_, etc. (Ulm, 1719, 4to).—
Nepi roy abyz, sim de Verbo isterno De Filio, ad pro-
emium Evangelii Joannis_ (Ulm, 1725, 4to)—_De Curn
Ecclesiae veteris circa Quoniam S, Scripturae et con-
scriptionem codicis purissimae_ (Ulm, 1729, 4to).—_Hoe-
fer, _Novae_._Bibl._ Générale, xvii, 899-70; _Ersch u.
Gaertner, Allgemeine Enyclopädie_, etc. (J. W. M.)

Friday is a day of fasting in the Greek and Latin
churches in memory of the crucifixion of Christ. It
FRIDEGODE - 666 - FRIEND

Is a fast-day in the Church of England, unless Christ-
mas-day happens to fall on a Friday.

Fridegode was a monk of Dover in the 10th cen-
tury, who was chosen by his patron, Odo, archbishop
of Canterbury, to write in heroic verse a life of St.
Wilfrid, when, in 956, the relics of that saint were
brought from Northumberland. (Vita Eowulfi, in Wharton's Anglia Sacra) says that
Fridegode was Oswald's teacher, and was thought to
excel the men of his time in secular and divine learn-
ing (Ang. Sac. ii, 193). His life of Wilfrid is merely
a poetic version of that by Editha Stephens, and so
abstracted a church history, with a few words that, as
related by William of Malmsbury (De cust. Pont. p. 200), it needed a sibyl
to interpret it. Malloini has published it in the Acta
Sanctorum, etc.; a part from an imperfect MS. at Corv-
el in Sec. iii. pars prima, p. 171-196, and the remain-
der from a MS. in England in Sec. iv. pars prima, p.
722-726. Several other works not now extant have
been attributed to Fridegode.—Wright, Biog. Brjt. Lit.
(Anglo-Saxon Period, p. 433-4). (J. W. M.)

Fridolin, Sr.—The history of Fridolin, written in
the 10th century by Valterus (Walter), a monk of
Säckingen, cannot, according to Rettberg, be consid-
ered as a purely historical source, but as the work of
learned Roman Catholics as an authority. The best
edition is contained in Mone's Quellenzusammenl. d. bät-
dischen Landesgeschichte. All our knowledge of him
is derived from this biography. The exact time of his
life even is unknown, but he is generally considered
as the first missionary of Chlodwig I. (A.D. 481-511).
According to this biography he was a Celt, but left the
British islands to escape the reputation he had gained by his
preaching. In Poitiers he brought back the people
and the clergy to the veneration of their St. Hilary,
whose relics he brought to light, and to whom he
erected a church. He is also said to have been the
first apostle of Germany. While seeking an island
in the Rhine which had been shown him in a vision
by Hilary, he came to Chur, or, according to others,
to Glarus, where he brought a dead man back to life;
in consequence, he is considered the patron of the
Canton, and is still represented on its coat of arms.
He finally found the island he sought between Schaffhau-
sen and Basel, and founded there a church to St. Hilary,
and the nunnerie of Säckingen, when, after the Rhine
had, at his request, moved to another bed (7), he died,
on the 6th of November, on which day he is recommem-
dated. According to Rettberg, this biography is a
legend invented for the purposes of establishing the
right of the convent to the whole island; and his
travels were imagined to give the divers churchers
erected to St. Hilary in different places a renowned
founder.—Herzog, Real-Encyclop. i, 655.

Friedländer, David, a Jewish scholar, was born
at Königsberg (Prussia) Dec. 6, 1749. The Reform
movement at Berlin, under the leadership of Mend-
elsohn (q. v.), attracted him to the Prussian met-
ropolis, and brought him into relations with Men-
delssohn. He devoted himself to educational and oth-
er reforms among the Jews, and at one time went so
far as to propose a union of the Jewish Church with
the Christian. In a Sendrachtbriefe addressed to the
Protestant clergyman Teller, he asked "how it might
be possible for a conscientious Jew to enter into Chris-
tian communion without making a profane confession."
The unfavorable reply which he received to this
inquiry, and the disapprobation with which it was
met from many Jews, caused him to abandon the proj-
et. Friedländer was a constant contributor to the
Bernische Monatschrift, and to the Sammler (a Jew-
isch periodical) published in Königsberg, by subscription, by dis-
ciples of Kant. Besides a number of works of infe-
rior merit, he translated the liturgies, and contributed
to Mendelssohn's great Bible work ("H. P. D. Das Buch
Koheloth", in Original mit d. hebräisch. Commentar
Mendelssohn's u. d. Uebers. David Friedländer's (Ber-
lin, 1772). He died at Berlin, Dec. 26, 1844.—Jost,
Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Secten, iii, 516; Biographie
Universelle, lviv. 518; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Litt. ii;
Eutherode, Intro. to Bib. Litt. 477. (J. H. W.)

Friend, a term for one of our friends, with whom we esti-
tem above others, to whom we impart our minds
more familiarly than to others, and that from a con-
didence of his integrity and good will towards us; thus
Jonathan and David were mutually friends. Solon-
us, in his book of Proverbs, gives the qualities of a
true friend (Proverbs xlii, 15), among which is loving
him at all times, and with William of Malmesbury (De cust.
Pont. p. 200). It needed a sibyl to interpret it. Malloini has published it in the Acta
Sanctorum, etc.; a part from an imperfect MS. at Cor-
vel in Sec. iii, pars prima, p. 171-196, and the remain-
der from a MS. in England in Sec. iv, pars prima, p.
722-726. Several other works not now extant have
been attributed to Fridegode.—Wright, Biog. Brjt. Litt.
(Anglo-Saxon Period, p. 433-4). (J. W. M.)

—Ointment and perfume rejoice the heart, so does the sweet-
ness of a man's friend by hearty counsel; by such counsel the heart feels more exal-
ted, and the language of his inward and most serious thoughts.
The company and conversation of a friend is refreshing
and reviving to a person who, when alone, is sad, dull,
and inactive. 'Iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpen-
eth the countenance of his friend.' The title, 'the
friend of God,' is particularly given to Abraham, and the
phrase, 'he that is my friend, saith the Lord,' is not
thou our God, who gavest this land to the seed of
Abraham, thy friend, forever? And in Isaiah xii, 8,
'But thou Israel art the seed of Abraham, my friend.'
And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham
beloved God, and it was imputed to him for righteous-
ness; and he was called the friend of God' (James ii,
23). This title was given him, not only because God
frequently appeared to him, conversed familiarly with
him, and revealed his secrets to him, 'Shall I hide from
Abraham that thing which I do? (Gen. xviii, 17),
but also because he entered into a covenant of
perpetual friendship both with him and his seed.
Our Saviour calls his apostles 'friends,' 'But I have call-
ed you friends;' and he adds the reason of it, 'For all
things that I have heard of my Father I have made
known unto you' (John xvi, 15). As men use to com-
municate their counsels and their whole mind to their
friends, especially in things which are of any concern,
or may be of any advantage for them to know and un-
derstand, so I have revealed to you whatever is neces-
sary for your instruction, office, comfort, and salvation.
And this title is not peculiar to the apostles only, but
in common with them is given to those who do not
think it unreasonable to trust a true believer with the
affairs of the bridegroom, who does the honors of the wedding, and leads his friend's spouse to the
nuptial chamber. John the Baptist, with respect to
Christ and his Church, was the friend of the bride-
groom; by his preaching he prepared the people of the
Jews for Christ (John iii, 29). Friend is a word of or-
dinary salutation, whether to a friend or foe; he is
called friend who had not on a wedding garment
(Matt. xxii, 12). And our Saviour calls Judas the	traitor friend. Some are of opinion that this title is
given to this disciple by an irony, or an interrogative,
construing the contrary to what the word importeth; or
that he is called so because he appeared to others to be
Christ's friend, or was so in his own esteem and ac-
tount, though falsely, being a hypocrite. However,
is being spoken in the person of him who meant the
least, it is a title of honor for a usual assurance, and
that Christ, following the like courteous custom of
appellation and friendly greeting, did so salute Ju-
das, which yet left a sting behind it in his conscience,
who knew himself to be the reverse of what he was
called. This name of friend is like a friend to a
neighbor. 'Which of you shall have a friend, and shall
he go to him at midnight, and say, Friend, lend me
FRIENDLY ISLANDS

FRIENDS

Friendly Islands, "as distinguished from the Fiji Islands (q. v.), generally reckoned a part of them, are otherwise styled the Tonga Group. They stretch in S. lat. from 18° to 29°, and in W. long. from 172° to 176°, and consist of about 32 greater and 150 smaller islands, about 30 of which are inhabited. The great majority are of coral formation, but some are volcanic, and in the latter case, small cones arise among the corals. Two volcanoes are active, one on Tongatapu, the other on the island of Tonga, where Christianity had made much less progress than in Habaí and Vavaú, broke out in rebellion. Captain Croker, of the British ship Favourite, who happened to arrive just at this time, united the force under his command to that of king George, but was obliged to retreat to the colony. Twenty-three towns and villages were set on fire, about 5000 inhabitants, and the Ha Ii group, with about 4000. "The Friendly Islands were discovered by Tasman in 1643, but received their collective name from Cook. Both these navigators found the soil closely and highly cultivated, and the people apparently unprovided with arms. The climate is salubrious, but humid; earthquakes and hurricanes are frequent, but the former are not destructive" (Chambers, s. v.).

The first attempt to introduce Christianity was made in 1757, when captain Wilson, of the Duff, left ten missionaries and two houses on Tongataboo, and monastic cloisters, and a capacity of the missionaries. This attempt met with no success. The chief under whose protection they resided was murdered by his own brother, and the island involved in a civil war. Three of the missionaries were murdered by the natives; the others were robbed of all their goods, and in the course of a few months deserted. Even the bishop was murdered. The bishop's wife, and the bishop's son, with another missionary, were killed in the course of a man-of-war to chastise the king. George. The latter, however, succeeded in suppressing the revolt. In November, 1822, a French man-of-war arrived, the commander of which, captain Bolland, had been commissioned by the French governor of Tahiti to inquire into certain complaints lodged against the king by captain of a French whaler, and by the Roman Catholic priests residing in Tonga. The king obeyed the summons of the captain, went on board the man-of-war, and had a five-hour conversation with the captain, who declared himself satisfied with the reports made by the king, and in the name of the French government recognised him as the king of the Friendly Islands, only stipulating that the king should protect the French residents and tolerate the Roman Catholic Church. These conditions were accepted by the king. In 1848, paganism in the Friendly Islands was almost extinct. Great numbers of the Islanders can speak English, and, in addition, have learned writing, arithmetic, and geography, while the females have been taught to sew. The missions are still under the care of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, which in 1850 had in the islands 5 churches, 5 schools, and 8 preaching-places, 19 missionaries and assistant missionaries, 1886 subordinate paid and unpaid agents, 1763 members, 756 on trial for membership, 6017 scholars in schools, and 28,484 attendants on public worship.

Friends, Society of. This body of Christians now subsists in two main divisions, generally known to the public as the Orthodox and the Victorian; but these designations are not used by the bodies themselves. The former body is designated below as No. 1, and the latter as No. 2. The body is usually designated as the "Friends," and the latter body as the "Quakers," and the last is written by Samuel M. Janney, of Lincoln, Indiana, Va.

FRIENDS (No. 1). The organization of the Friends as a distinct society or church was not the result of any deliberate design to form a sect, but must be regarded as a providential ordering, and as a necessity growing out of the degradancy, corruption, and the lines which sects created the churches in the early part of the 17th century. They did not profess to establish a new religion, or claim to have discovered any new truth. Their object was the revival of primitive Christianity, which had been maintained through the centuries of the Christian Church by successive testimony to the truths of their faith. Many of them had no idea of the truth with their
blood, and been counted unto the Lord for a generation. Especially they were led to call the attention of the people to the Holy Spirit as the living and infallible guide, as a precious and glorious reality, essential to the Christian life, and sufficient to lead into true holiness and perfect peace of soul; for the gift of the Holy Spirit as a mere theory, or ignored the great truth that this unpeaksable gift proceeded from the adorable Giver, and was consequent upon the death and victorious sacrifice of him who for our sakes laid down his life upon Calvary. They always regarded the close connection of comfort and effect held in our Lord's words: "Tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." (John xvi, 7.) This truth George Fox began to teach and preach, not as an invention of his own, but as a priceless jewel thrown aside and hidden under the rubbish of dogmas and forms. The Divine Spirit asserted himself almost simultaneously in the hearts of many contemporaries, who were ready to respond to the preaching of Fox: "It is the very truth." Had the eagles, George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, pierced their hearts to the spirituality of the Christian religion, and yielded themselves to the Spirit's guidance, the Church would have been reformed, and Fox would have been satisfied. The religious awakening of this period was well described by the pen of Milton: "Thou hast sent out thy good Spirit upon all the earth to this effect, and stirred up their vows as the sound of many waters about thy throne. Every one can say that now certainly thou hast visited this land, and hast not forgotten the uttermost corners of the earth, in a time when men thought that thou was gone up from us to the farthest end of the heavens, and hadst left to do marvellously among the sons of these last ages." Christ the object of faith, the Spirit the transforming power, was the doctrine of the first Friends, as it has ever been that of their true successors. The divinity of our Lord was not called in question by the teachers of that day, whilst the guidance of His Spirit, the light of Christ in the conscience, was denied or ignored; and hence the prominence given to the latter truth, and the comparative silence respecting the other, in the controversial writings of the early Friends. George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, was born in 1624, and in 1647, after much deep experience of the blessedness of the Comforter, "even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father," he went forth through England, on foot and at his own charges, freely preaching to the people the unspeakable riches which he had received for them, and was ready to give liberally to all who would ask for it, coming unto God by him. To the spiritual standard thus raised many flocked—ministers of various churches, sin-sick members of their flocks who had wandered unsatisfied upon "barren mountains and desolate hills," magistrates, rich men and poor, and "honorable women not a few." Eight years from the date last given, ministers of the new society preached the Gospel in various parts of Europe, in Asia, and Africa, and bore, with heroic endurance, persecutions through all the political upturnings, caused by the dominant Roman power in Rome, Malta, Austria, Hungary, etc. An authentic history of their sufferings was collected by Joseph Besse, and published, London, 1758, in two large folio volumes. The systematic interference by the state in matters of religion and conscience, which was the policy of England, was felt through all the political upheavals, causing shameless oppressions and wrongs to be perpetrated upon this peaceable and God-fearing people, three thousand four hundred of them at one time being incarcerated in filthy and unworthy prisons, where many of them died before the truth of the Spirit seemed to think of purchasing exemption from persecution by yielding, even in appearance, a point of principle.

and, whilst men and women were perishing in jails, even the little boys and girls would meet together at the places appointed, and in the beauty and sweetness of early morning, they worshiped the God of the Spirit in and truth. But not even childhood was sacred from religious intolerance and official interference. These babies in Christ (as truly they might be called) were disturbed at their worship, savagely threatened, and sometimes cruelly beaten. The early history of Friends is closely connected with that of George Fox, and necessarily included in the various biographies of that remarkable man. He commenced his career as a seeker after the truth, and meeting, in Europe and America, with many whose warnings were not similar, they were called Seekers. The epistle of Quakers was given in derision, because they often trembled under an awful sense of the infinite purity and majesty of God, and this name, rather submitted to than accepted by them, has become general as a designation. "To this man will I look," said the Holy Spirit of God, "for there is in him that poors of a contrite spirit, and trembles at my word." To tremble, then, at the presence of the God of the whole earth, and especially when speaking in his name, is not to be regarded as any reproach; but their name, as a body, is "The Religious Society of Friends." The spread of the society in North America, in fact, was the result of the founding of Pennsylvania in 1680 by William Penn, whose career as a wise legislator is prominent in history, and who, as a Christian philanthropist, a statesman, a writer, and a minister of the Gospel of Christ, established a reputation which even the vindictive attacks of Marcian could not undermine. As early as 1672 George Fox found an established settlement of Friends in Peruquins County, N. C., which proved the germ of an independent diocese, or Yearly Meeting, whose members from that time have been exemplary upholders, at the cost of persecution and much loss of sustenance, of the principles of civil and religious liberty, steadily testifying against slavery and war, and maintaining the freeness of the Gospel. During the War of the Rebellion their heroic firmness in refusing to bear arms was proof against cruel tyranny, so simple that the Alabama firing on the Rebels, about seven hundred thousand joined the society from conviction. The membership of that Yearly Meeting, although many times thinned by emigration to free states, is now about three thousand souls. The persecution of Friends in New England was so sanguinary that

"Old Newbury, had her fields a tongue,
And Salem's streets, could tell their story
Of faithful woman dragged along.
Gashed by the whip accursed, and purify,

and four Friends actually suffered martyrdom—a Quaker woman of remarkable refinement and piety, and three other Friends—caused to be hanged on Boston Common. The number of victims was likely to be increased, when proceedings were checked by a royal mandamus. The membership of the society becoming very widely extended, a formal organization by a system of Church meetings was adopted; the three ecclesiastical bodies being thus united, George Fox evinced much sagacity, mental soundness, and spiritual guidance in successful efforts to establish rules for the government of the Church, and meetings for discipline in a harmonious chain of subordination, which was under the highest worship of the Lord in meeting. The Yearly Meetings are. In a sense, diocesan, having each a defined territorial jurisdiction, and independent of each other in their government and law-
The Society of Friends is not at issue with other orthodox churches on the general points of Christian doctrine. Avoiding the use of the word Trinity, they reverently believe in the Holy Three: the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten of the Father, by whom all things were made; the Holy Spirit, who is the mediator between God and man, and in the Holy Spirit, who proceedeth from the Father and Son—One God, blessed forever. They accept in its fullness the testimony of holy Scripture with regard to the nature and offices of Christ, as the Second Person of the Trinity, Messiah, the Word made flesh, the atonement for sin, the mediator between God and man, and the only mediator of the forgiveness of sins; they have no reliance upon any other name, no hope of salvation that is not based upon his meritorious death on the cross. The charge that they deny Christ to be God William Penn denounced as "most untrue and uncharitable," saying, "We truly and expressly own him to be so, according to the Scripture." As fully do they admit his humanity, and that he was truly man, "in sin only excepted." They so fully believe in the Holy Spirit of Christ, that without the inward revelation thereof they feel that they can do nothing to God's glory. They believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and man, and that he is enabled to bring forth fruits unto holiness, and to stand perfect in their present rank. As it was the design of Christ, in going to the Father, to send as a comforter his Spirit to his disciples, so it is with his Spirit that he baptizes and doth them, it being impossible, in the estimation of the Friends, that an outward ablation should wash from the spirit of man the stains of sin. Hence they attach importance only to "the baptism which now saveth," and which John the Baptist predicted should be administered by Christ. And it is by his Spirit, also, that his followers are enabled to partake of the true supper of the Lord: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open unto me, I will come in and sup with him, and he shall sup with me." Thus they hold that the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh was that of his Spirit, who is the central fact and central truth of the new system, and that types, and shadows, and all ceremonial observances, which had their place before as shadows of good things to come, now that they have been fulfilled in him, are only shadows of those shadows. The type is the property of the real, the reality of the type is the shadow of the reality. Hence the beforeshadowed; "but," says Paul (1 Cor. xiii, 10), "when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."

Their view respecting the resurrection may be briefly stated in the language of one of the society's documents: "The Society of Friends believes that there will be a resurrection both of the righteous and the wicked; the one to eternal life and blessedness, and the other to everlasting misery and torment, agreeably to Matt. xxv. 31-46; John v. 25-50; 1 Cor. xv. 12-58. That God will judge the world by that man whom he has again raised from the dead, even Christ Jesus the Lord, who will render unto every man according to his works; to them who by patient continuing in well-doing during this life seek for glory and honor, immortality and eternal life; but unto the contentious and disobedient, to them which do not obey the gospel of God: wrath and indignation and tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that sinneth, for God is no respecter of persons" (Thomas Evans).

They have ever regarded war as inconsistent with Christianity. For this they refer to the teaching of Christ and his apostles, the example of the early Christians, and to the witness for truth in their own con-
whilst there is an attendance of its meetings by non-
members of 8558. There are settlements of Friends
in France, Germany, Norway, and in several parts of
Australasia, which all make annual reports to London
Yearly Meeting, and acknowledge subordination to it.
In all these, there are a hundred or more, in proportion
to their population. There is a limestone in Irela
in Ireland, one in Canada, and nine in the United
States, viz., the Yearly Meetings of New England,
New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, North Carolina,
Ohio, Indians, Western Indiana, and Iowa. The in-
crease of membership in the United States has been
rapid of late years, and settlements of Friends are
starting up in Kansas, Missouri, etc. The member-
ship of the society may be rated at 80,000.
In all these Yearly Meetings, First-day Schools are
conducted during the day. Many of them have been
in honor of pagan gods, preferring the numerical nomen-
clature adopted in the Scriptures. In dress they aim
at plainness and simplicity, avoiding the tyranny of
an ever-changing fashion. As a natural result, a de-
gree of uniformity of dress prevails among them, bear-
ing much resemblance, and exercising too great an
influence on the rise of the society. This approach to uniformity, which at
first was unintentional, came to be cherished as a hedge of
defence against worldly and ensnaring associations,
and a means by which they recognized each other.
The principles not in the tenets of a garb, but in the simplicity and the avoidance of changes of fash-
on. Were the customary patterns all abandoned to-
day, and the principle of simplicity still consistently
adhered to, the kaleidoscope of fashion would make
frequent changes in the people around them, and
Friends would be less peculiar in their appear-
ance as at present.
Whilst Friends, as good citizens, have cheerfully
paid all legal assessments for the support of public
schools and of the poor, and have contributed abun-
dantly to the various charities and general claims of
benevolence, be they in the nation or the province of
generosity, so their scrupulous care in relieving their own poor,
so that none of their members come upon the public for
maintenance or for gratuitous education.
A dangerous tendency to hold the truth in parts
led a portion of the society, in the early part of the
present century, into the error of inventing too great
upon the precious doctrine of Christ within the hope of
glory, and of denying, or at best holding lightly, a
belief in his true divinity whilst incarnate, and in the
atonement, cleansing, saving efficacy of his blood which
was shed for our sins. Nor were the truths of love, calling, sanctifying, and footing
in the society, to the grief of those who held the
ancient faith, and in 1827 an extensive and much-to-be-
resented secession occurred, in which doctrinal and
personal considerations were mingled; and, in the ex-
citement of the division, it is believed that many failed
to comprehend the true issues, and that not a few who
were essentially one in faith were discovered for life as
regards church fellowship. Thus two entirely distinct
societies now exist, each claiming exclusive right to
the same name, and causing confusion among other
professors as to their identity. In this secession por-
ticipated six of the ten Yearly Meetings then existing by
joined with the body popularly designated by the
name of their leader (though they have never acknowl-
edged the title). In Great Britain and Ireland, and in
two of the American Yearly Meetings then existing,
no schism occurred.
There are thirteen independent Yearly Meetings of
the Religious Society of Friends. The oldest of these
is that of London, the records of which are preserved
from the year 1672. This body is regarded by the
others with respectful affection as the mother of Yearly
Meetings, and its General Epistle of Christian Coun-
sel, which is issued annually, is gladly received, repub-
lished, and circulated by nearly all the co-ordinate
bodies. The number of members in England is 15,458,
In the year 1827 a schism took place in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, which afterwards extended to most of the other Yearly Meetings in America. The space allotted for this article will not suffice to give an intelligible account of it (see Janney’s List of Friends, vol. iv. The part relating to the separation has been republished in a small volume by T. W. Good Zell, Philadelphia). At the time of the separation, those who took the name of Orthodox Friends were in the Western States the more numerous; but in the Atlantic sea-board States they were less numerous than those who are by some called Hickites, but who persistently refuse to be known as or other name than that of Friends or Quakers. It is of this branch only that we now treat.

11. Doctrines.—We hold the doctrines of the early Friends, as expounded in the writings of Fox, Penn, Pennington, and Barclay. A committee which represents Philadelphia Yearly Meeting has recently so far approved of a “Summary of Christian Doctrines,” from which the following abstract is taken, as to order its purchase for distribution:

The Scriptures.—The Religious Society of Friends, from the beginning of their existence, till the present day, has maintained its belief in the authenticity and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, referring to them for proof of its principles, and acknowledging them to be the only fit outward test of Christian doctrines. We do not call them the Word of God, because this appellation is suited to the Scriptures that Eternal Jehovah, the Power by which the worlds were made; for “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

We assign to the Scriptures all the authority they claim for themselves, which is chiefly expressed in the following texts: “Whencever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope” (Rom. xv, 4). “The holy Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus” (2 Tim. iii, 15-17). “All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (Barclay’s Apology, prop. iii, § 5).

In its use, according to our several Yearly Meetings, the Scriptures are very frequently and earnestly recommended to the attention of our members. In the year 1854, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, after referring to “those sublime truths which are recorded in the Holy Scriptures,” thus continues: “In these invaluables, in the only authoritative record of the early history of our race, the purest strains of devotional poetry, and the sublimi discourses of the Son of God. Their frequent perusal was therefore especially urged upon our younger members, who were encouraged to seek for the guidance of divine grace, by whose alone we realize in our experience the saving truths they contain.”

In the year 1863, the following minutes of Baltimore Yearly Meeting was sent down to its subordinate meetings, viz.: “We have been reminded that this Yearly Meeting has had various times written to its members inviting them to the frequent reading of the Holy Scriptures, the authenticity of which has always been acknowledged by the Society of Friends.

• We believe it is not the part true of wisdom to dwell upon defects, whether real or imaginary, in the sacred records, but rather to use them as they were intended, ‘for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,’ remembering that it is only through the operation of the Spirit of Truth upon our hearts that they can be made availings to us in the promotion of our sal-

The following extract is taken from the Rules of Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in Philadelphia: “If any in membership with us shall blaspheme, or speak profanely of Almighty God, Christ Jesus, or the Holy Spirit, he or she ought early to be tenderly treated with for their understanding, that they may experience repentance and forgiveness; but should any, notwithstanding divine grace, continue in their error, or deny the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit, or the authenticity of the Scriptures; as it is manifest they are not one in faith with us, the monthly meeting where the party belongs, having extended them due care, shall, by the help of the Lord, deliver the individual without effect, ought to declare the same, and issue their testimony accordingly.”

Immediate Revolutions.—The highest privilege granted to man is that of entering into communion with the Author of his being. “Ye are the temples of the living God,” writes the apostle Paul; “as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people” (2 Cor. vi, 16).

“The anointing which ye have received of him;” says the beloved disciple, “abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you.” “He that teacheth thee to despise thy own soul, and teacheth thee of all things, and is truth, and is no lie. and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him” (1 John ii, 27).

In the ordering of divine Providence, instrumental means are often employed to convey religious truth, such as the inspiration of the Scriptures that Eternal Jehovah, the Word, and the vicissitudes of life; but in all cases the good effect is from the immediate operations of divine grace upon the heart and conscience. In fact, there can be no saving knowledge of Christ but from immediate revelation. “No man can come to me,” says Jesus, “except the Father which hath sent me draw him.” This drawing of the Father is the operation of His Spirit, for “the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal” (1 Cor. xii, 7). To the wicked he comes as a reprover for sin, a spirit of judgment and a spirit of burning, “but to the praying and sober-minded, a spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind” (2 Tim. i, 7).

The original and present state of man.—It is a scriptural doctrine that neither righteousness nor unrighteousness can be transmitted by inheritance, but every man shall be judged according to his deeds. The language of the prophet Ezekiel is apt on this point. “As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel.”

. . . ”The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.” . . . “Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the iniquity of the father shall be imputed unto the son.”

“The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him” (Ezek. xviii, 3-20).

Man was created in the image of God; he was pure, benevolent, and blissful, and he enjoyed the privilege of communion with God, that is, to partake of “the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God” (Rev. ii, 7). But, although he was made a free agent, he was debarred to be so independent of God as to know of himself good or evil without divine direction. And when he presumed to set up his own will, and to be governed by it in opposition to the divine will, he became under the Holy Spirit, he ceased to partake of “the tree of life, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” Then he experienced the fulfillment of the divine prediction. “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;” for “to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.”

Animal propensities may be transmitted from parents to children; but the Scriptures do not teach that we inherit any guilt from Adam, or from any of our
ancestors; nor do we feel any compunction for their sins. The language of our Saviour clearly implies that little children are innocent, for “of such,” he says, “is the kingdom of heaven.”

The Divine Being.—The unity, omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience of God, the only fountain of wisdom and goodness, are fully set forth in the Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testament. He declares by the mouth of his prophet, “Thus saith the Lord, The Holy One of Israel, his Maker.” “... I, even I, speak in righteousness, dealing promise to them that hear.” “Thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel” (Isa. xliii, 11, 14). These declarations are reiterated and confirmed in the New Testament. “Jesus answered, ‘The first of all the commandments is, ‘Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.’” (Mark xii, 29).

That spiritual influence or medium by which the Most High communicates his will to man is called his Word, and the same term is applied to his creative power, by which all things were made. The unity of the Eternal Word, or Logos, with God, may be illustrated by the light which emanates from the sun; for “God is light,” and of Christ it is said, “In him was life, and the life was the light of men.” The connection between the great luminary of the solar system and the light proceeding from him is so perfect that we cannot separate one from the other. So it is with the relation between the Eternal Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, it is a manifestation of his wisdom and power, being called in the Old Testament “The angel of his presence” (Isa. lxiii, 9), “The Redeemer of his people;” and in the New Testament, “The Son of God, by whom all things consist.” (Heb. i, 3).

The term Christ was also applied by the apostles to the Spirit of God as manifested in men. For instance, Paul writes of the children of Israel under Moses, “They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and they did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ” (1 Cor. x, 4). Peter says that the prophets “prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow” (1 Pet. i, 11).

The most full and glorious manifestation of the divine Word, or Logos, was in Jesus Christ, the immaculate Son of God, who was miraculously conceived and born of a virgin. In him the manhood or son of man was united with the divinity or the Son of God, with the flesh, or was manifested in the flesh. “He took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham.” “... Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God, blessed forever.” Being “in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,” he was an example to all succeeding generations, “a man approved of God by miracles, wonders, and signs which God did by him.” The intimate union between Christ and his Church is illustrated in the epistles of Peter and Paul by two simultaneous and mutually having many members, of which Jesus Christ is the head; and only one temple, of which he is the chief corner-stone. The holy manhood of Christ, that is, the soul of him in whom the Holy Spirit dwelt without measure, is new, and always will be, the head, or chief member of that spiritual body, and as such it will be the faithful servants of God of all ages and nations.

“‘There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus’” (1 Tim. ii, 5). As Moses was a mediator to ordain the legal dispensation, so Jesus Christ was and is the Mediator of the new covenant, first to proclaim and exemplify it in the day of his outward advent; and, secondly, through all time, in the ministration of his Spirit.

“The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God” (Rom. viii, 26).

When the apostles went forth preaching Christ and his spiritual kingdom, which was attributed to his name or power their wonderful success. Acts ii, 32, 33; iv, 10, 11, 12: “This is the stone,” said Peter to the rulers, “which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.”

Salvation by Christ.—The great work of the Messiah for the salvation of man is beautifully portrayed in the passage which he read from Isaiah in the synagogue at Nazareth (Mark ii, 23). “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord” (Luke iv, 18, 19). He came to establish a spiritual kingdom of truth and love in the hearts of mankind, and thereby to put an end to the kingdom of evil. A work of reformation was then begun which has not ceased to this day, though often obstructed and retarded. To this work the Lord Jesus came, and the Christian generations have built, and no moral reform of any value or permanency can take place unless it be founded on Christian principles.

Another prophecy of Isaiah is referred to by the evangelist Matthew as having been fulfilled by the miracles of Christ. He says, “When the even was come they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils, and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick;” that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, “Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses” (Matt. eight, 17). As part of the outward relation he took away the infirmities of the people and healed their sicknesses, so in the inward and spiritual relation he heals the maladies of the soul, and raises it from death in sin to a life of righteousness.

The great object of the Messiah’s advent is thus declared by himself: “To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice” (John xviii, 20). He could not bear witness to the truth among that corrupt and perverted generation without suffering the same fate. The Word took the flesh, that is, was manifested in the flesh. The Word planted the kingdom, and the kingdom grew, so that they would put him to death, and he went forward calmly doing his Father’s will, leading a life of self-sacrifice, wounded for the transgressions of the people, baptized spiritually in suffering for them, and finally enduring on the cross the agony of a lingering death, thus sealing his testimony with his blood. His obedience in drinking the cup of suffering was acceptable to God, for “he hath loved us and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour” (Eph. v, 2).

It was requisite to man to God by removing the enmity from (man’s) heart that Jesus Christ lived, and taught, and suffered, and for this purpose the Spirit of Christ is still manifested as a Redeemer from the bondage of corruption. Hence the apostle says, “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.”... “We pray you, in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God” (2 Cor. v, 19, 20). It is in man that the change must be wrought and the reconciliation effected, for there can be no change in Deity.

“If, when we were in the flesh, we walked [in] the manner of Paul, ‘we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life’” (Rom. v, 10); for “in him was life, and the life was the light
of men” (John i, 4). It is the life of God, or spirit of truth revealed in the soul, which purifies and saves from sin. This life is sometimes spoken of as the blood, according to the Mosaic law, “the blood is the life.” And when Jesus told the people, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,” he alluded to the life and power of God which dwelt in him, and spake through him. In the next verse, he said to his disciples, “It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.”

It is obvious that the sinner cannot come into a state of concord with God until the sinful nature is re- moved; and nothing can remove anything but the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The dealings of the Most High with the children of men are beautifully exemplified in the parable of the prodigal son, who had wandered far from his father’s house, and spent his substance in riotous living. When he came to himself, and determined to go back, confessing his sins, and offering to become as one of the hired servants, his father did not stand off and order him to be punished, neither did he lay his punishment upon the other son who had been faithful; but his compassion was awakened by his penitent repentance. He not only spared him, but also took him upon himself, and “while he was yet a great way off he ran and fell on his neck, and kissed him.” The conduct of the parent, as represented in this parable, answers exactly to the divine character, and corresponds entirely with the character of Jesus Christ, who was filled with the Spirit, and said, “the scripture is not read of me as pertaining to me.” But the doctrine taught by God cannot, or will not forgive sins without a compensation or satisfaction, and that man, not being able to make this satisfaction, it was made by Jesus Christ, who was appointed or given up to be killed for this purpose, is so inconsistent with the divine character, that it cannot be reconciled with the teachings of the Son of God. It appears to deprive the Deity of that infinite love which is his most endearing attribute; and if a human parent were to act upon the same principle towards his children, we could not justify his conduct.

When the sinful nature in man is slain by the power of God being raised into dominion in us, then is divine justice satisfied, for there is nothing vindictive in the character of the Deity. He does not afflict his creatures for any other purpose than their own reformation or purification, and, when that purpose is accomplished, he is ready to pardon and bless the children. The only sure ground of acceptance is the new birth; for, when Christ’s kingdom is established within us, then his righteousness becomes ours; not by imputation, but by our becoming really “partakers of the divine nature” (2 Pet. i, 4). “Not the works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us,” by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour” (Titus iii, 5).

Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.—Friends believe that the “washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost” is the only baptismal essential to salvation. “There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in you all” (Eph. iv, 5, 6). The baptism of Christ was a washing of the body, and as spiritual, as may be shown by the following texts: Matt. iii, 11, 12; Acts i, 5; xviii, 25, 26; 1 Cor. xii, 13; vi, 11; Col. ii, 20, 23; 1 Pet. iii, 21. We have no grounds to believe that “the passover” which Jesus ate with his disciples was intended to be perpetuated in the Christian Church; nor does it appear that he instituted a new ceremony on that occasion. He conformed to the Mosaic law, which was not abrogated until his crucifixion, when he blotted out the handwriting of ordinances, and “took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross” (Col. ii, 14). “Behold, I stand at the door and knock,” says Christ; “if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me” (Rev. iii, 20). The Lord’s Supper, in which the new wine of the kingdom and the bread of life are distributed to sustain the soul.

Worship, Discipline, etc.—The author of Christianity has prescribed no set form of worship, enjoining only that it must be in spirit and in truth. Friends have adopted silence as the basis of public worship, believing that it is free from the objections that exist against all prescribed forms; that it gives to each worshipper an opportunity for self-examination and secret prayer, with the benefit that results from the sympathy of other minds present; and that it affords the best preparation for the exercise of spiritual gifts in preaching or praying.

The Christian ministry can be rightly exercised by those only who have received a call and qualification from the Head of the Church, and the prophecy of Joel, quoted by Peter, is fulfilled under the Gospel: “It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.” As it was in the primitive Church, so it is now in the Society of Friends, women as well as men are permitted to preach the Gospel. No salary or pecuniary compensation is allowed to them; but those who travel in the service of the Gospel may partake of the needful hospitality or assistance of their friends.

Testimonies.—The testimonies of Friends against war, slavery, oaths, lotteries, and the use, as a beverage, of intoxicating drinks, as also against vain fashions, corrupting amusements, and flattering titles, are founded on Christian principles, and have been found salutary in practice.

Discipline.—The system of Church government existing in this society is in accordance with the doctrine, “One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.” There is no distinction like that of clergy and laity, but all the members of both sexes have a right to participate in the deliberations and decisions of the body. In meetings for discipline the men and women meet in separate apartments, and are co-ordinate branches of the body, each transacting the business pertaining to its own sex; but, in some cases, when needful, they act in concert, by the appointment of joint committees of men and women. The co-operation of women in the administration of discipline has been found salutary in many respects, but especially in promoting among them self-reliance and dignity of character.

Statistics.—We have six Yearly Meetings, connected by epistolary correspondence, but independent of each other in regard to discipline. The aggregate membership of these is about 35,000.

Large numbers of persons not members, but who affiliate with us in religious profession, regularly attend our meetings and public worship.

We have, in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Richmond, Indiana, extensive and well-sustained schools, adapted to a high standard of useful and practical education. There are also numerous schools of varied character throughout the Yearly Meetings.

Swarthmore College, situated about eight miles south-west from Philadelphia, on the line of the Western Railroad, is designed for three hundred pupils of both sexes. Here our children, and those instructed to our charge, may receive both a thorough collegiate education, under the guarded care of members of our religious society. (S. M. J.)

FRIENDS, PROGRESSIVE. A religious society organized in 1858, in Chester County, Pa., as a result, in part, of a division in Kennett Monthly Meeting of Friends ("Hickites"). The division was caused by differences of opinion upon questions of reform and
progress; the official members of the Society of Friends generally discouraging activity in temperance, anti-slavery, and other social organizations, which a large proportion—in many localities a majority—of the laity were warmly in favor of co-operating with them. After years of contention, the two parties in Kennett Monthly Meeting fell asunder, and finally, in 1868, an association was organized under the name of "Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Friends." The new society opened its doors to all who recognized the equal brotherhood of the human family, without regard to sex, color, or condition, and who acknowledged the duty of defining and illustrating their faith in God, not by assent to a creed, but by lives of personal holiness and unselfishness. It disavowed any intention or expectation of binding its members together by agreement as to theological opinions, and declared that it would seek its bond of union in the identity of object, oneness of spirit in respect to the practical duties of life, the communion of soul with soul in a common love of the beautiful and true, and a common aspiration after moral excellence."

It disclaimed all disciplinary authority, whether over individual members or local associations; it set forth no forms or ceremonies, and made no provisions for the solution of questions of discipline as distinguished from the laity; it set its face against every form of ecclesiasticism, and denounced as the scum of superstitious imposture the claim of churches to hold an organic relation to God and to speak by his authority, maintaining that such bodies are purely human, the repositories of false creeds, and the distinguishing marks by which the members of the religious society are distinguished from the laity; and, during a large portion of every year, maintains a First-day School for children. This local body has never employed a religious teacher, though there is nothing in the principles of the organization to forbid such a step whenever its members may think it necessary or expedient.

The Uniformity of practice in this respect is neither expected nor desired, it being held that the arrangements for meetings should be in every case adapted to the peculiar needs and tastes of the communities in which they are held. The division in the Society of Friends was not confined to Kennett Monthly Meeting, but spread to other Yearly Meetings of that denomination.

As early as 1849, that division led to the organization, at Green Plain, Ohio, of a society exactly similar to that of the Progressive Friends, but under a different name. This society is now extinct. At June, near Watertown, N. Y., in the same year, a society called "Congregational Friends" was formed. This society afterwards took the name of "Progressive Friends," and, at a later day, that of "Friends of Human Progress," by which it is still known. In Salem, Columbiana County, Ohio, in 1852, a society called "Progressive Friends" was organized, which had but a brief existence. In North Collins, Erie County, N. Y., there is a society bearing the name of "Friends of Human Progress," which, in its principles, is very similar to the "Progressive Friends." (O. J.)

Friends of God. In the 14th century a spirit of mysticism, or spirituality of life, began to manifest itself in the Low Countries to the very borders of Italy. It brought under its influence all ranks and classes, and led ultimately to the formation of an extensive but unorganized brotherhood, the so-called Friends of God. A Yearly Meeting ofProgressive Friends was organized, which had but a brief existence. In North Collins, Erie County, N. Y., there is a society bearing the name of "Friends of Human Progress," which, in its principles, is very similar to the "Progressive Friends." (O. J.)
the gulf of pantheistic self-delusion." And that this gave rise to "the wild, fanatic, pantheistic mysticism, which was for getting beyond Christ, beyond all positive calm reflection, "was unequaled in the divine, amok, see it exemplified particularly among a portion of the so-called Beghards (q. v.) . . . and the so-called Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit (q. v.). Among those of the Friends of God who by unwise speculation, and by an intoxication of self-forgetting love discarding all calm reflection, "were unconfessedly rayed into effusions and expressions upon which that wild, fanat- cal pantheism afterwards seized and fastened itself," is reckoned Master Eckhart (q. v.), from whose writings and sermons twenty-six propositions connected with a pantheistic mode of thinking — the divine vapors in such a mode of thinking, had been drawn, were formally condemned. But he promptly retracted all those propositions which were found to be heretical or scandalous, » and in general submitted himself to be corrected by the pope and the Church. These "pan- theistic and theistic views and spiritual opposition by Ruybroek (q. v.) and by Tauler. The former especially secured himself against the danger of pantheism by the prominence he gives to the will, "which he describes as the main-spring on which all development of the higher life depends." Another of the leading preachers of the divine life was the Italian monk Heinrich Suso (q. v.), of Swabia, who, like Tauler, gave "proclamations to the medication of Christ as necessary to the attaining to true communion with God, and was thus distinguished from those pantheistic mystics who, notwithstanding the mediation, were for sinking directly into the depths of the divine essence." Many of the leaders of the Friends of God were put to death by order of the Inquisition on the charge of being Beg- hards. Among those were Nicholas of Basel and two of his associates, Martin of Reichenau, and a Benedictine, Master Adam von Thurning. Milman (History of Christianity, p. 486) says that the influence of the doctrines taught by the Friends of God, especially of Tauler and his followers, were "seen in the earnest demand for re- formation by the councils; the sudden estrangement, notwithstanding the reunion to the sacramental yoke, during the Reformation; the dispensing from the spiritual life, and reformation by the councils seemed hopeless;" and that it is especially "seen in the remarkable book German Theology, attributed by Luther to Tauler himself, but doubtless of a later period." — Neander, Church History, v. 390; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, 2, 139; Schrock, Geschicht des Zehn Jahrhunderts (Jena, 1865); Pfeiffer, Deutsche Mystiker des 14 und 15 Jahrh.; Mil- man, Latin Christianity, vili, 800; Kurtz, Church Hist. i, 484; Bennet, in Methodist Quart. Rev. Jan. 1869, p. 45 sq.; Theologia Germannca, edit. by Dr. Pfeiffer and transl. by Susanna Winkworth. (J. H. W.)

Friends of Light. See Free Congregations.

Fries, Jacob Friederich, an eminent German, philosopher, was born at Barby August 28, 1773. He was at first private tutor in Switzerland, became professor of philosophy in 1804, then successively professor of mathematics at Heidelberg in 1806, and of the theoretical philosophy at Jena in 1816. In 1819 he was deposed for political reasons, but restored in 1824 as professor of natural philosophy and mathematics, and died there August 10th, 1848. The personal religious life and its influence have left a Heritage in his writings, not a heritage of his father. He was a Moravian, but died when the son was only five years old. The school education to which he was subjected seems to have estranged him from Christianity when quite young. While yet a young man, he wrote: "The essence of God's imagination and supposi- tion have changed my religious sentiments. All the religious system in which I was bred has been over- thrown; but this causes me no un easiness. It was easy for me to throw the atonement overboard; I have never had any dread of God; the thought of the Holy One has always been to me a thought of peace." In 1793, when his mother died, he wrote: "The belief in a reunion I leave to others; I am not plantastic enough to hold by it since 1806 we are still a Moravian brother: "My peace cannot compare with yours; the deserted Penates will probably punish me for a long time yet." A sketch of his life has recently appeared, by E. L. D. Henke, J. F. Fries aus seinem mutterschlichen Nachlass dargestellt (Leipzig, 1867, 5vo).

The profound aim of Fries in philosophy was to give a firmer basis to Kant's system than that philosopher himself had laid down. "He found two faults with Kant: 1st. The vicious logical arrangement of his doc- trines, which makes its metaphysics vapid. 2nd. His propositions depend on transcendental proofs, and that of his ideas on moral proofs, instead of rising, without any proof, to the immediate knowledge of reason. On this point Fries approaches the views of Jacobi. 2d. The con- founding of psychological ideas with philosophy, prop- erly so called, and not properly distinguishing the aids that psychology furnish to metaphysics from metaphys- ics themselves. He regarded the life and independence of Kant's practical philosophy as the most beautiful part of his system. Fries maintains that he has rem- oved the errors of Kant, and that he has placed the system on a different plane. In fact he supposes that the doctrines of Kant are based on a false final conviction, on a solid basis. And he asserts that he has effected this by means of researches carried on in the spirit of Kant himself. Fries, as well as Kant, makes the limits of science his starting-point; hence he arrives at some faith of reason that is not a philosophical, a faith that is strengthened by presentment (Anhäng). Knowledge, or science, is only concerned with sensuous phenomena; the true essence of things is the ob- ject of faith; we are led by feeling to anticipate, even amidst appearances, the value of belief, which is the offspring of a faith in the immanent in the understanding, that faith is the key to the ideas of reality. Fries, again, in placing feeling and presentment (Anhäng) above science, Fries approaches the doctrine of Jacobi. His labors in connection with philosophical anthropology, which he regards as the fundamental science of all philosophy, are of great interest. They contain particular truths and spiritual life, and are placed on the three fundamental faculties of the mind—cognition, feeling (Gemüt, the faculty of being interested), and the faculty of action, which is supposed to precede the two former. Afterwards follow theories on the three degrees of development—sensation, understanding (as the development of the mind); on the degrees of thought, qualitative and quantitative abstractions of the imagination, mathematical intu- ition, attention, the difference between the understand- ing and the reason, etc. His anthropological logic con- tains also some excellent views on the subject of reason- ing, method, and system. He regards practical philosophy as the theory of the value and end of human life and of the world, or the theory of human wis- dom. It is there that you find the last goal of all philosophical research; it is divided into a moral theore- try and a religious theory (theory of the final goal of the universe). The former may be also subdivided into general ethics, or theory of the value and end of human actions, theory of virtue, and theory of the state" (Tennemann, Manual Hist. Philos., revised by Morell, § 422).

Fries applied his system 'Philosophical Anthropology,' since he made all further philosophical knowl- edge dependent on man's self-knowledge. He distin- guished three grades of Erkenntniss; we know (wissen) the phenomena of our subjective thinking; this is the realm of philosophers, it is the knowledge (Wissen) we are appearance—Erscheinung—theout of the mind that all is not a mere subjective creation. We have a feel- ing, a presentiment (ahnem), that there is a reality, a substance behind these appearances; here Fries places all that pertains to God, the existence of the soul and
Fries was a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Westphalia, Germany, April 24, 1777, and came to America in 1803. He laid aside his parsonage, and became a "Re- 
demptioner," and served a farmer in York County, Pa., three years. Being free, he studied theology with Rev. Daniel Wagner, in Frederick, Md. He was licensed in 1810, and not long afterwards ordained. For two years he served eight congregations in York County, Pa., and in 1812 he removed to Buffalo Valley, in Union County, Pa., where he continued the remainder of his life, doing a pioneer work, his labors extending over several counties. He died October 9, 1835. He was noted for his extraordinary memory, his eclecticism of principles, his great love of American institutions, his fondness for politics, his active life in the ministry, and his great success in laying the foundation of numerous now flourishing German Reformed congregations in the beautiful valleys of the Susquehanna. He preached only in German. (II. II.)

Fries, or Fries, or Friesius, Martin, a Jutland theologian, was born at Riepen in 1686, and studied theology at the University of Copenhagen under Wanda- 
lin, Masius, and the ex-rabbi Steenbuck. In 1712 he was appointed instructor in philosophy, and in 1717 preacher and confessor to the household of a nobleman. In 1719 he was called to the university at Kiel as third professor of theology. Here he lectured especially upon Exposition of the New Testament part of New Testament po- 
lemical works. After a visit to the libraries at Nurem- 
berg and Wolfenbüttel, he was, on his return in 1725, 
promoted to the second professorship, and at nearly 
the same time was elected Prokonzel, which position he held up to the time of his death, August 15, 1750. His works are: Disertatio de pictorum contra historiam sacrum (Copen. 1708-5, 4to); —Scholiasmata de carminio tois isocratis tov eunipos- 
avn ad Matt. x, 14 (Copen. 1706, 4to); —Disertatio de 
documento e hortatoribus fransis, ad unum nem inter Eocene 
proposed: Demonstratio e geologiae ephemeris (Copen. 1722 and 1723); —Fundamenta Theologiae theistic, selec-

Friesland, Friesian. Friesland, in the wider sense of the word, was formerly the name of the whole north-western coast of Germany and the coast of Hol- 

land, embracing the country from the mouth of the 
Weser to the central mouth of the Rhine. It was di- 
vided by the Zuyder Zee and the Zuyder Zee into East Friesland and East Friesland. The latter was subse- 
sequently again divided into two parts, the country be- 
tween the Zuyder Zee and the Ems, now forming the 
Dutch provinces of Friesland and Groningen, and the 
Fly, and thus opened a wider field to the Christian 
missionaries, constituting the modern East Friesland, which was until 1744 a separate principality, was then united with Prussia, 
falling in 1815 to Hanover, with the whole of which it was in 1866 again annexed to Prussia. A branch of the 
Friesians, the North Friesians, inhabited the western 
coast of the Schleswig and the islands of Heligoland, 
Föhr and Syd. The first Christian missionary among the Friesians was bishop Amundus, who entered the country in the train of the conquering Franks. He met with but little success, but established two convents at Ghent, 
Hemiksem, and Blandenburg, and was at one time sent by the king of the Franks, built the first Christian church of Fries- 
land at Utrecht, at that time called Wiltenburg; and 
St. Eligius (q. v.), bishop of Noyon, made great efforts to 
gain a footing for Christianity among the people, 

but he had likewise but little success. About 675, 
Adalhod II, brother of the great Pippin, who was 
not conquered by the Franks, gave permission to the 
English bishop Wilfrid to preach. The defeat of 
his successor Radbod by Pepin of Herstal extended 
the territory of the Franks up to the Yssel and the 
Fly, and thus opened a wider field to the Christian 
missionary. The English monk Wilfrid was conse-
crated by pope Sergius I archbishop of the Friesians, 
and took up his residence at Wiltenburg. After the 
death of Pepin in 714, Radbod made an attempt to 
shake off the yoke of the Franks, and to expel Christi- 
anity from his country, but he was again defeated by 
Charles Martel in 717, and had to become a Christian 
himself. He died, however, a pagan in 719. Poppe, 
the guardian of Radbod's minor son, Adilhod II, was 
apparently friendly to Christianity, which found now 
a very zealous missionary in Winfrid (St. Boniface, 
q. v.), but when a favourable opportunity offered 
he risked a new war against the Franks, in which, 
in 734, he lost his life. Adilhod II, who received 
the title of king, but was a vassal of the Franks, openly 
professed Christianity, but the resistance of the people 
to the new doctrine continued. Adilhod II was suc- 
ceeded by his two sons: first Gundobald, and, later, 
Radbod II, the latter of whom was a violent opponent 
of Christianity, and was expelled from the country by 
Charlemagne, who embodied the whole of Friesland 
with his empire. Christianity at this time was firmly 
established in the southern part of the country, the 
successor of Wilfrid as bishop of Utrecht, Gregory, 
established in his episcopal city a theological school, 
in which many missionaries for Friesland and North- 
western Germany were educated. Among his as-
sistants, Leubin and Willhelm, ornaments of the church. The 
latter was almost entirely.charismatic by Charlemagne, 
bishop of Bremen, and in that position he zealously 
worked for the conversion of the Frisians. With him 
laboring for seven years S. Liudger (q. v.), a native of 
Friesland, and pupil of the school of Utrecht, when the 
rising of the Saxons under Wintfrid, was followed 
by a general revolt of the Frisians. The defeat of
this revolt terminated the resistance of the Frisians to the Franks and Christianity. Frisland was now regarded as a Christian country, but remnants of paganism maintained themselves until late in the Middle Ages.

At the time of the Reformation, West Friseland was a part of the Netherlands. Into East Frisland, which was ruled by a count, and a part of the German empire, the Reformation was introduced by count Edzard I, probably as early as 1519, became acquainted with the writings of Luther, and favored the Reformation, without, however, using any coercive measures against those who preferred to remain in the Church of Rome. Among those who successfully labored in behalf of the Reformation was master Jörgen von der Ditr (Magister Apocalyptus), who had been educated at Zwolle by the Brethren of the Common Life. After the death of Edzard, in February, 1528, his son Enno began to despise the churches, suppress the convents, and introduce the Reformation by force. In 1529, Bingenhausen, at the request of count Enno, sent two Lutheran preachers from France, to organize the new administration of the churches. But already a number of the Protestant ministers and laity had come under the influences of the Anabaptists and Reformed Zuinglean views. Count Enno expelled Carstain, and ordered all the Anabaptists out of the country; but the clergy, in 1530, could not be prevailed upon to adopt the whole of the Lutheran Church discipline which was laid before them. Several other attempts to introduce Lutheranism by force failed, and the Reformed system of Zuingle maintained the ascendency. In 1543, the widow of Enno, countess Anna, who, during the minority of her son, acted as regent, called a distinguished Reformed theologian, Johann A. Lascot [see Lascot], to Friesland. He was appointed superintendent general, and under his administration the Reformed Church of Friesland attained a high degree of prosperity and reputation. As a refuge of many Protestant exiles from France, the Netherlands, and Great Britain, it received the name "Refuge of the oppressed and exiled Church of God."—Hertzog, Real-Encyk. iv, 607; Onno Klopp, Geschichte Ostfrieslands (Hanover, 1854-55, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

Friesen, in classical architecture, the middle division of an entablature, lying between the architrave and the cornice or modillion. In the Doric it is divided by three raised flutes, called triglyphs, into spaces called metopes, which are usually filled with sculpture. In the Ionic it is sometimes ornamented with sculpture; sometimes the metopes swell out in the middle. In the Corinthian and Composite it is ornamented in various ways, but usually either with flowers or figures. Any horizontal band that is occupied with sculpture is called a frieze by some writers.

Frigga, the wife of Odin, and supreme goddess of the race of the Asir (or Aesir), the celestial gods of the Scandinavian mythology, was a daughter of the giant Fjorgyn, presided over marriages and in the assemblies of the goddesses, which were always held in her palace, was prescient of, but never revealed, the fate of men, knew the language of plants and animals, and through her great wisdom aided Odin by her counsels. Her abode was said to be "the magnificent mansion of Fævir (the marshy halls), which denotes the deep, moist earth," and from her relation to Odin, the sun in this mythology, she may be regarded as typifying the earth, which, drawing from him the generative principles of light and warmth, gives growth and fruitfulness to living things. She is closely related to, and frequently confounded with Freya (q. v.), and is generally represented (see pl. 12, fig. 1, Mythology and Religious Rites in Iron. Encyclop.) seated in a golden chariot drawn by two white cats, her tresses and veil floating in the wind, with two attendants, with veils and tresses likewise floating, flying near her. —English Cyclopedia, s. v.; Icon. Encyclop. iv, 277-8 (N. Y. 1831); Thorpe, Northern Mythology. (J. W. M.)

Fringe (ge'dil), twisted thread, i. e. a tassel, Deut. xxii, 12; a "wreath" or festoon for a column, 1 Kings vii, 17; 12²x², taisith, a flower-like projection, i. e., a tassel, Numb. xv, 38, 39; the "fore-lock," Ezek. viii, 9, an ornament worn by the Israelites upon the edges, and especially at the corners of their robes, as an affectation of piety (comp. Matt. xxi, 5). These terms must have denoted pedicles in the shape of bows or flowing threads. Fringed garments, elaborately wrought, were very common among both the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians. See Embroidery. Such fringes, however, as appear upon the tunics and outer robes of figures delineated on the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments probably did not entirely correspond with those in use among the Jews, although it may be presumed that there was a general resemblance between those worn for general purposes, i. e. as ornamental appendages. Moreover, it may be doubted whether fringes of that description were intended by the Jewish legislator, since they were in such common use that they could form no proper mark of distinction between an Israelite and a Gentile; and, besides, they seem appropriate to state-dresses rather than to ordi-
nary attire, while it is plainly the latter which is con-
templated in the prescription of Moses, and this es-
pecially with a religious reference. See Phylac-
tery.

The Mosaic law respecting these ornaments is con-
tained in Num. xv, 38-41; Deut. xxiii, 12, where the
children of Israel are enjoined to append fringes or
tassels (נֵצֶעַ, נִצְעָתִים), consisting of several threads,
to the four corners (נֵצֶעַה, נִצְעָת) of their outer gar-
ment (נִציָה, נִציָה), to put one distinguishing thread
(נֵצֶעַה, נִצְעָת), not "ribbon," as the A.V. of deep blue in
each of these fringes, and constantly to look at them,
in order to be put in mind thereby of God's command-
ments to keep them. What number of threads each of
these symbolic fringes is to have besides the said
blue one, of what material, or how they are to be
made, the injunction does not say. Like most of the
Mosaic laws, it leaves the particulars to be determined
by the executive powers according to the peculiar cir-
cumstances of the time. The following account of
them relates chiefly to Rabbinical usages.

Guided by the fact that they are symbolical, tradit-
ion, in determining the manner in which these fringes
are to be made, endeavored to act in harmony with
their spiritual import, and hence fixed that each of
these four fringes or tassels for the four corners of
the garment should consist of eight threads of white
wool, the emblem of purity and holiness (Isa. i, 18);
that one of these threads is to be wound round the
others, first seven times, and then a double knot to be
made; then eight times, and a double knot (15 = 77);
then eleven times (מ–מ), and a double knot; and fin-
ally thirteen times (מ–מ), and a double knot, so as
to obtain, from the collective number of times which this
thread is wound round, the words נֶצֶע נֶצֶע (Jeb-
ovah is one), constituting the creed which was the dis-
inguishing mark of the Hebrew nation, and which
was inscribed on their banners, whilst the five knots
represent the five books of the law. As the law, how-
ever, is said to contain 613 commandments [see
Schoo], and as the design of these fringes is to re-
mind the Jews of all these commandments, tradition
has so arranged it that the word נֶצֶע נֶצֶע, which is nu-
merically 600, with the 8 threads and 5 knots, should
exactly comprise this number, and thus constitute a
perfect symbol of the law.

Originally, as we have seen, this fringed or tasseled
garment was the outer one. It was more like a large oblong
piece of cloth, with a hole in the centre through which the
head was put, thrust into the two halves, one covering
the front, and the other the back of the body, like a
tunic.

But when the Hebrews be-
gan to mix with other na-
tions, and especially when
they were dispersed and be-
came a by-word and a hissing, this ancient badge of
distinction which God conferred upon them became the
signal of persecution, inasmuch as it indicated that the
weaver of it was a Jew, on whom Christians thought
they ought to avenge the blood of Christ. Hence the
Israelites found it necessary to discard the fringed gar-
ment as an outer dress, and to wear it in a smaller size,
and a somewhat altered form, as an under garment, in
order to conceal it from their persecutors. This under
fringed garment is called נִציָה נִציָת, the four-cor-
nered dress, or simply נִציָת, fringes or tassels, and is
worn by every orthodox Jew to the present day.

Yet, though the Jews have been
compelled to relinquish the large out-
er fringed garment as a permanent
article of apparel, they continue to
wear it in a somewhat modified form at their morning prayers,
and call it נֶצֶע, נֶצֶע, i. e. cover or
scraper. This נֶצֶע, or fringed
wrapper, is generally made of a
white woolen ma-
terial; the wool
must be spun
by Jews for this ex-
Moabit Form of
purpose. It is said that the fringed
Garment has three or more
blue stripes running in parallel
lines across the whole garment, at
the right and left side. In some
cases, however, the נֶצֶע is also
made of silk. Every married Jew
must wear it at morning prayer;
a single man can do what he likes.

When putting it on, the following prayer is offered: "Blessed art
thou, O Lord, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with a
word of commandments, and enjoined us to array ourselves with fringes." The
Jews attach the utmost importance to the fringed gar-
ment. Thus it is related in the Talmud that "R. Jo-
seph asked of R. Joseph ben Joseph, who is
your father admonished you to observe more than
any other? He replied, The law about the fringes.
Once when my father, on descending a ladder, stepped
on one of the threads and tore it off, he would not
move from the place till it was repaired" (Sabbath, 118,
4).

Some of the Rabbis go so far as to say that the
law respecting the fringes is as important as all the
other laws put together (see Rashi on Num. xv, 41).
It was for this reason that the woman with the issue of
blood (Matt. ix, 20), and the inhabitants of Gennes-
aret (Matt. xiv, 36), were so anxious to touch a fringe of
their garments (ἐπαρίχεται ὁ ἐμφύλωτος). This superstitious reverence for the external symbol,
with little care for the things it symbolized, led the
Pharisees to enlarge their fringes, believing that the
larger they made the tassels, the better they did God
service. The Rabbis in their sayings, "Whoso dis-
gently keeps this law of fringes is made worthy, and
shall see the face of the majesty of God"—Baal Hatu-
rim on Num. xv, 3; "When a man is clothed with
the fringe, and goes out therewith to the door of his
habitation, he is safe and God rejoiceth, and the angel
[of death] departeth from thence, and the man shall
be delivered from all hurt," etc.—R. Menachem on
do; and this it was that our Saviour rebuked (Matt.
xxiii, 5). See Maimonides, i, 100, etc.; Orach Chay-
aim, § 7; the Hebrew Prayer-book, called דֵּת פְּנֵיה (Vien, 1869), p. 21, a, etc. See REM.

Print, Jaco, a Roman Catholic bishop of Austria,
was born in 1756 at Bömsich-Kamnitz, in Austria. He
was for several years professor of theology at the Uni-
versity of Vienna, and caused the establishment of a
higher theological institution for secular priests, of
which he himself became the first director. He was
appointed in 1827 bishop of St. Poelten, and died in
1834. He is the author of numerous theological works,
as Handbuch der Religionswissenschaften (Vienna, 1816:
4, 6 vols.);—Das alte und das neue Christentum, od.
Krit. Bearbeitung der Stunden der Andacht (Vien,
1822-24, 4 numbers)—Geist des Christenthums (Vie-
nia, 1868, 2 vols.). From 1818 to 1826 he was the ed-
itor of a journal for scientific theology, which was con-
tinued by Plötz and Sebeck. (A. J. S.)
FRISBIE, Levi, professor in Harvard College, was born at Ipswich, Mass., in 1784. He entered Harvard College in 1774, and during the last year of his graduation in 1792, he supported himself by labor as a clerk in a tucking shop. He commenced the study of law, but was compelled to desist by an affection of the eyes, which hindered his progress through life. In 1805 he was made Latin tutor at Harvard, and in 1811 professor of Latin, which post he held until 1817, when he was transferred to the chair of moral philosophy, for which he had peculiar qualifications. His lectures on ethics, government, etc., were considered very able; they were chiefly delivered extemporaneously, but some of them have been published (see below). He died July 9, 1840, and was buried in the American Reviewer, and to other periodicals; and a "Collection of the Writings of Professor Frisbie," edited by Andrews Norton, appeared in 1823, containing portions of his lectures, as well as of his periodical contributions.

Frischmuth, Johann, a German theologian and Orientalist, was born at Wertheim in 1819, and died at Jena in 1867, in which city he was professor of Hebrew. He was also acquainted with Arabic. Besides other works, he wrote 60 dissertations on philological, Biblical, and theological subjects, of which the most important is "De Pontificio sacro:—De Sacrificiis:—De Pontifici Mois contra Nixius:—De: Graviss XL Interpret, versione:—De Mutilatione Mortis et Memoriae:—Quorundarn in sacra et litteraria Virorum."—Hoefler, Nuovo Biog. Generale, xvii, 888.

Frisian. See Friesland.

Firth or Fryth, John, an English reformer and missionary, was born at Severn Woks, in England, where his father kept an inn, and was educated at King's College, Cambridge, where he so greatly distinguished himself that, when Wesley formed his new college at Oxford, he was appointed one of its first members. About 1754 he became acquainted with Tyndale, and by his influence was won over to the principles of the Reformation. With others, he found it necessary to retire to the Continent in 1758. On his return to England in 1780 he was put into the stocks at Reading as a vagabond, but was taken out of them by the schoolmaster of the town, to whom he made his case known in so elegant Latin and Latin verse, that a friend of his, who was a scholar of the college, went to London, and there engaged in controversy with Sir Thomas More, publishing a tract on Puritans against Sir Thomas. His zeal led to his apprehension. While in the Tower he was examined, by the king's command, before the bishops; Brandt, Cranmer, Soffolk; Boleyn, earl of Wiltshire; Stokesley, bishop of London; Gardner, bishop of Winchester, and the chancellor Audley. The prisoner maintained that the dogma of transubstantiation was not de fade; at the same time, he did not condemn those who held the doctrine of a corporeal presence; he only reproved the prevalent notions respecting propitiatory masses and the worshiping of the sacramental elements. He denied also the doctrine of purgatory. At length he was brought before an episcopal commission at St. Paul's, where many efforts were made to induce him to recant, but in vain. At last the bishop of London pronounced sentence upon him as an obstinate heretic, and he was delivered to the secular power. A writ was issued for his execution, and he was burnt at Smithfield on the 4th of July, 1533, "maintaining his fortitude to the last, and cheerfully extending his time till to his digested pope priest, who endeavored to persuade the people that they ought no more to pray for him than for a dog." Firth was an excellent scholar. He wrote Treatise of Purgatory:—Antithesis between Christ and the Pope:—Mirror, or Glass to know thyself, written in the Tower, 1535:—Articles (for which he died) written in Newgate Prison, June 28, 1538:—Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogues concerning heresies:—Answer to John Parker, Bishop of London, etc. All of these treatises were reprinted at London (1767, fol.), with the works of Tyndale and Barnes. They may be found also in Russell, Works of the Reformers, vol. iii (Lond. 1838, 3 vols. 8vo). See Hook, Eccl. Biog., 235; Burnet, Hist. of the English Reformation, i, 283-277.

Fristathoel or Freestatool, literally the seat of peace; a seat or chair, usually made of stone, placed near the altar in some churches, and intended as the last and most sacred seat for those that claimed the privilege of the sanctuary. The violation of the freestatool was attended by the most severe punishment. According to Spelman, that all the seats had this inscription: 'Hece sedes lapidea freestatool dictur i.e. pacis cathedra, ad quam reus fugiendo perennius omniummodum habet securitatem.' Freistatools still exist in the church at Hexham and Beverley Minster, both in the north aisle of the chan- cels; the former of these has the seat hollowed out in a semicircle, and is slightly ornamented with patterns of Norman character, that at Beverley is very rude and plain.

Frittigl, a queen of the Marcomans in the 4th century. She was converted to Christianity, and applied to Ambrose for further religious instruction. She sent him a catechism composed expressly for the purpose. Through her influence the Marcomans were converted as a people, and remained at peace with Rome during the incessant wars of the time.

Fritz, Samuel, a German Jesuit and missionary, was born in 1650, and died in 1730. He was sent as missionary to South America, and established mission settlements between the Napo and Rio Negro, into which nearly 40,000 natives were gathered. The Portuguese from Brazil attacked and broke up these settlements, carrying many of the Indians to Para. Fritz, after vainly striving to obtain redress, retired to the village of Xeborno in Peru, where he died. His map of the Amazon, though superseded by the fuller and exacter works of more recent explorers, procured for him a long time a just renown as a geographer.—Hoefler, Nuovo Biog. Generale, xvii, 893-7.

Fritzsche, the name of a German family distinguished for learning. 1. Christian Friedrich, a theologian, was born at Nauendorf Aug. 17, 1776. He studied at the Orphan School of Halle, and afterwards theology at Leipzig. He became successively pastor of Steinbach in 1799, superintendent at Dobrilugk in 1809, professor of theology at Halle in 1809, and was in 1838 appointed censor for theological works. Besides a number of occasional articles, pamphlets, etc., collected in the Fritschiorum Opera Academica (Lpz. 1838), published by himself and two of his sons, he wrote Vorlesungen u. d. Abendmahl, etc.—De Annae mariae Jesu Christi (Halle, 1837-38).—In Revelationis Notiones biblica (Lpz. 1889).—Frier, Universal-Lexikon, vi, 754.

2. Karl Friedrich August, eldest son of Christian Fritzsche, also a distinguished theologian, was born at Steinbach December 16, 1801. After receiving his first instruction from his father, he entered his studies at the University of Leipzig, where he became professor extraordinary of theology in 1825. The year following he went to Rostock as ordinary professor, and in 1841 to Giessen, where he died Dec. 6, 1846. Besides some important exegetical essays published in the Fritschiorum Opera Academica, he

Fritzlar (properly from Fricti lare = domus pacis) is a city of Prussia, situated on the shores of the Eder, and one of the oldest seats of the Church in Central Germany. Here Boniface founded in 732 a church dedicated to St. Peter, and a small convent, with a school chiefly intended for the accommodation of clerical students. He first directed it himself, but afterwards gave up the charge to his countryman Wibert, who thus became the first regular abbot of the institution († 747). The second abbott was Tatian; the third, Wibert II. The school soon gained a great reputation. Storm, abbot of Fulda, and Megingoz, bishop of Wurzburg, were among its first scholars. The institution remained for centuries at the head of both clerical and secular education. Under Charlemagne, Fritzlar was in 744 burned down by the heathen Saxons, and the church alone escaped. As it stands at present, it is in the Roman style of the 12th century. Fritzlar was for a time a bishopric (in 786), but was soon joined to that of Mayence. See S. Schimanski, D. antiquitat. Fritzlarium, diss. (Marburg, 1715, 4to.).— Herzog, Real-Encyc. iv, 612.

Fritzlar, Hermann of. See Hermann.

Frog (27) "Ex. terpardo'a, a marsh-lepger [Geen- nius, Theb. 189, p. 1184], Bárpoa — Exod. viii, 2 et sq.; Psa. Ixxviii, 45; cv. 89; Rev. xvi, 13), the animal selected by God as an instrument for humiliating the pride of Pharaoh (Exod. viii, 2-14; Psa. Ixxviii, 45; cv. 30; Wad. xix, 10). Frogs came in prodigious numbers from the canals, the rivers, and the marshes; they filled the houses, and even entered the ovens and kneading-troughs; when, at the command of Moses, the frogs died, the people gathered them in heaps, and "the land stank" from the corruption of the bodies. There can be no doubt that the whole transaction was miraculous; frogs, it is true, if allowed to increase, can cause considerable damage; but these animals are considered to be injurious precisely because they are associated with the plagues of Egypt in the Bible. The appearance of frogs, therefore, was a clear indication of God's intervention in the events leading up to the Exodus from Egypt. The reference to the plagues of frogs is described in detail in the Bible, and is a significant event in the account of the Israelites' deliverance from bondage in Egypt. The plagues of frogs are also referred to in the New Testament, where they are associated with the coming of Jesus Christ and the end of the world. The reference to the plagues of frogs in the Bible is significant because it provides a clear example of how the Bible uses natural phenomena to convey religious messages and insights.
transverse bands, and is said to change its color when alarmed. It is lively, but no strong swimmer, the webs on the hinder toes extending only half their length: hence, perhaps, it is more a terrestrial animal than the common green frog, and, like the brown species, is well adapted to resist drought in moist weather. (See *Penny Cyclopedia*, s. v.)

Although it is very hazardous, in transactions of an absolutely miraculous nature, to attempt to point out the instruments that may have served to work out the phenomena, we may be sure that, in the plague of frogs, a species, the one perhaps we have just mentioned, was selected for its activity on land, and that, although the fact is not expressly mentioned, the awful visitation was rendered still more ominous by the presence of dark and rainy weather—an atmospheric condition not of very long duration on the coast of Egypt, and gradually more and more rare up the course of the river. Travellers have witnessed, during a storm of rain, frogs crowding into their cabins, in the low lands of Guiana, till they were packed up in the corners of the apartment, and eventually falling back in their attempts to ascend above their follow back; and the door could not be opened without others entering more rapidly than those within could be expelled (see Roberts, *Oriental Illustrations*, in loc.). Now, as the temples, palaces, and cities of Egypt stood, in general, above the level of the main current, and always above the level of the highest inundations, to be there visited by a continuation of immense number of frogs was assuredly a most distressing calamity; and as this phenomenon, in its ordinary occurrence within the tropics, is always accompanied by the storms of the monsoon or of the setting in of the rainy season, the dismay it must have caused may be judged of when we reflect that the plague occurred where rain seldom or never falls, where none of the houses are fitted to lead off the water, and that the animals appeared in large numbers, where they had never before been found, and where, at all other times, the ebbing sun would have destroyed them in a few moments. Nor was the selection of the frog as an instrument of God's displeasure without portentous meaning in the minds of the idolatrous Egyptians, who considered that animal a type of Pharaoh, their creative power (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.:* 851 sq.), as well as an indication of man in embryo. The magicians, indeed, appeared to make frogs come up out of the waters (Exod. viii, 7), but we must not understand that to them was given also the power of producing the animals. The effect which they claimed and which was a simple result of the propagation of the prodigy effected by Moses and Aaron; for that they had no real power is evident not only from their inability to stop the present plague, the control which even Pharaoh discovered to be solely in the hands of Moses, but also the utter failure of their enchantments in that of lice, where their artifices were incompetent to impose upon the king and his people. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations*, in loc.) See *Plague* (of Egypt).

Frossard de Broissia. CHARLES, a French Jesuit missionary, died Oct. 10, 1794, near Pekin, in China, where he was laboring in the missionary work of his order. In the bitter controversy between the Dominicans and Jesuits, (1) whether the Chinese terms *Tien* and *Chang-ti* meant the material heavens or the God of heaven, and (2) whether the ceremonial honors paid to ancestors and to Confucius were religious or only civil and political customs, he took an active part, and, in agreement with his colleagues, resolved these questions in the way most favorable to secure apparent success. The Jesuits, adopting the view that these terms meant the God of heaven, and that these ceremonies were simply commendable customs, not repugnant to the Catholic faith, employed *Tien* and *Chang-ti* to designate God in the Christian sense, and, following the doctrine of Escobar (q. v.), that intention gives character to the deed, allowed their converts to continue their ceremonial practices, provided they received baptism, took the name of Christians, and recognised the supremacy of their missionary teachers. The number of nominal conversions was, as might be expected, great. The doctrine of the exclusive rule of Christianity among the educated Chinese, was referred, on the one hand, to the Chinese emperor Kiang-hi, who decided in favor of the Jesuits, and, on the other, to pope Clement XI, who decided in favor of the Dominican as the orthodox view. Frossard left only some fragment of translations of important Chinese works.—Hoefler, *New Biogr. Génér.*, xviii, 920-21.

Fromage, PIERRE, a French Jesuit missionary and Orientalist, was born at Lyon May 12, 1678, and died in Syria Dec. 10 or 23, 1740. He went on his mission-work first to Egypt, where he remained some years, and then to Syria, where he passed the remainder of his life, mostly at Aleppo. He became superior of his order, and, in despite of great difficulties, established at the monastery of St. John the Baptist, near Antura, a printing-press, and published, mostly in the Arabic language, a great number of translations and imitations of religious and theological works. Fromage was present and made an opening discourse at the great synod of the Maronites, held Oct. 15, 1736, near Tripoli, in Syria.—Hoefler, *New Biogr. Génér.*, xviii, 393-2; Rose, *New Gen. Biogr. Dictionary*, vii, 456. (J. W. K.)

Froment. See *Froment*.

Froment, ANTOINE, one of the French and Swiss Reformers, was born near Grenoble in 1510. Of his early life little is known. A disciple of Farel, he passed with him into Switzerland, and labored especially in Neuchâtel and Vaud. When Farel was obliged to leave Geneva in 1532 (see *Farel*), he sent for Froment, who reached Geneva November 25 and began to task a fearful one. He began his work as a schoolmaster, promising to teach "reading and writing in a month" to all comers, and to charge nothing in case of failure. Many flocked to the school, and were taught not only reading and writing, but also the principles of the Reformation. On New Year's day, 1533, Froment preached in the fish-market against Romanism; a crowd of Roman Catholics broke up the meeting, and Froment was obliged to leave Geneva. He returned in 1534. A Dominican named Furtitz, preaching in the cathedral in favor of transubstantiation, challenged the Protestant minister to answer his propositions. Froment, who was in the audience, at once began to speak. A tumult arose, and again Froment was compelled to depart from the city. He went to Bern, accompanied by one of the burgesses of Geneva, and obtained the protection of the Bernese government, under which both Froment and Farel returned to Geneva. From 1537 to 1555 Froment was pastor of the quarter of St. Gervais. In 1552 he was deposed from the ministry on account of certain misconduct on the part of his wife, the rigid discipline of Geneva not allowing the husband to take such a wife as to remain a pastor. He became a notary, and in 1559 was made one of the council of Two Hundred. His own life becoming disorderly, he was banished in 1562, and was only allowed to return in 1572. He died in 1585. He wrote a history of the reform in Geneva, which has recently been edited and published; see the article *Les Actes et les Gesta merveilleux de la cité de Genève, faits du temps de la Réformation*, etc. (Geneva, 1854).—Ruchat, *Réformation en Suisse*, t. iii; Haas, *La France Protestante*, s. v.; Polenz, *Französ. Colonnement*, t. 814 q. v. H. *Biogr. Génér.*, xviii, 998; *London Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1857, 190 sq.

Fromond (Fromondus), a theologian of Liège, was born at Haccourt in 1587. He taught philosophy and theology at Louvain, and was, in 1638, appointed dean of the chapter of St. Peter, in that city. He appears
to have possessed some scientific knowledge, besides a pretty extensive acquaintance with theology and philology. Des Cartes was one of his friends. Fromm, however, defended Polien's system (of the immobility of the moon) in a discussion with the French philosopher, Philippe Lansberg. He was an intimate friend of Jansenius, and was one of the two theologians to whom the latter confided, when dying, his renowned Augma-
tinus. He died at Louvain in 1653. The best work of Fromond is a Commentario de Acta Apôteros (Paris, 1653, 8vo, fol.)—B. A. R. See Anti-Aristot-
elici eindes, contra Jacobum Lansbergiwm et Copernicanos (Antw. 1638, 4to) — Brevis Anatomia Hominum (Louv-
ain, 1654, 4to).—Hoefer, Nouv. Bioir. Génér. xviii, 918.

Front or Façade. In ancient descriptions of churches, the front of the church is spoken of as the east or altar end. In modern writings, when churches are "oriental" or located with reference to the points of the compass, the principal front or façade is the west end, the end away from the altar.

Frontier (περιοχή, katekh, end, as often rendered, comp. Jer. ii, 31; Isa. xvi, 11), the extremity or border of a country (Ezek. xxv, 9).

Frontlet (only in the plur. ροδέληδα, totemphth, prop. fillets, from an obsolete root ροδελεῖν, to bind about [Genesius, Theb. Heb. p. 548]; Sept. ασταλετών [v. r. άσταλέτων], apparently pointing ροδέληδα, i. e. incom-
moveable; Vulg. vagely appendix quid, movelantur, and collocat) occurs only in three passages (Exod. xiii, 16; Deut. vi, 8; xi, 18), and each time in the form of a proverbial similitude, "as frontlets between your eyes," and also so expressed with another (but similar) expression, "as a sign or (token) upon your hand" (comp. Exod. xiii, 9, "as a memorial between your eyes"), in connection with a command to observe the Mosaic law. In Exodus the expression is used more immediately with reference to the ordinance respecting the consec-
ration of the first-born and the Passover solemnity; but in the two passages of Deuteronomy it relates to the precepts and statutes of the old covenant generally.

The meaning in charging the Israelites to "bind them for a sign upon their hand, and have them as frontlets between your eyes," evidently is, that they should keep the law distinctly in view, and as carefully at-
tend to them, as if they had them legibly written on a tablet between their eyes, and bound in open char-
acters upon their hands; so that, wherever they looked, and whatever they did, they could not fail to have the statutes of the Lord before their eyes, and that actual and written memorial was intended to be enjoined upon the Israelites is clear from the nature of the case, since no writing to be worn either between the eyes or upon the hand could by possibility have served the purpose of legibly expressing all the statutes and ordinances of the law. It is clear, also, from the alternative phrases with which those in question are associated, such as, "That the Lord's law may be in thy mouth" (Exod. xiii, 9); "That these words shall be in thine heart;" "That ye shall lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul" (Deut. vi, 6; xi, 18), as well as from the parallel sayings of a later day (Prov. vi, 21; comp. iii, 8; iv, 21). But the Jews, some time after their return from Babylon (it is not known exactly when), gave the direction about having the precepts of the law as frontlets a literal turn, and had portions of it written out and worn as badges upon their per-
son. These are called by the modern Jews tephillim, תפילין (a word signifying prayers, but not found in the Bible; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1478). These were strips of parchment, on which were written four pas-
ages of Scripture (Exod. xiii, 2-10, 11-17; Deut. vi, 4-9, 13-22) in an ink prepared for the purpose. They

were then rolled up in a case of black calfskin, which was attached to a stiff piece of leather, having a thong one finger broad, and fastened again to the half cubits long. Those worn on the forehead were written on four strips of parchment (which might not be of any hide except cow's hide)—Nark, Baram, Ramah, and Rabla, p. 211, comp. Hesych. s. v. Σταυρίτις (προτοιαία), and put into four little cells within a square case, on which the letter ז was written; the three points of the ז being "an emblem of the heavenly Fathers, Jehovah our Lord Jehovah" (Zohar, fol. 64, col. 2). The square had two thongs (יָּרֶש), on which Hebrew letters were inscribed; these were passed round the head, and after making a loop, presented the shape of a "pass over the breast." This was called "the tehillah on the head," and was worn in the cen-
tre of the forehead (Leo of Modena, Ceremonies of the Jews, i, 11, n. 4; Calmet, s. v. Phylacteries; Otho, Lex. Rabbin. p. 656). The Karaites, on the contrary, ex-
declared Deut. vi, 8; Exod. xiii, 9, etc., as a figurative command, and the Hebrew law (Rabbin, ad loc., p. 182), in as similar passages (Prov. iii, 8; vi, 21; vii, 3; Cant. viii, 6, etc.), and appealing to the fact that in Exod. xiii, 9 the word is not יָּרֶש, but יָּרֶשׁ, "a memo-
rial" (Gerhardus on Deut. vi, 8; Edzardus on Ezech-
ch. i, 209; Heidelanus, De Orig. Erroris, vili, 6; Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. i, 198; Rosenmüller, ad loc.; Hengstenberg, Gesch. v. d. abendländ. l. p. 458). Considering, too, the na-	ure of the passages inscribed on the phylacteries (1 Cor. vii, 10), no means the most important in the Pentateuch—for the fathers are mistaken in saying that the Decalogue was used in this way, Jer. l. c. Chrysost. l. c. Theo-
phys. ad Matt. xxiii, 6), and the fact that we have no trace whatever of their use before the Exile (during which time the Jews probably learnt the practice of wearing them from the Babylonians), they were justi-
filed in claiming that the object of the precepts (Deut. vi, 8; Exod. xii, 9) was to impress on the minds of the people the necessity of remembering the law. But the figurative language in which this duty was urged upon the Jews was mistaken by the Talmudists for a literal command. An additional argument against the literal interpretation of the direction is the dangerous abuse to which it was immediately liable. Indeed, such an observance, as the Talmudists supposed the intended intention of it, by substituting an outward ceremony for an inward remembrance. Accordingly, these badges were turned into instruments of religious vanity and display, and abused for selfish purposes by those who sought, by a great procession of legal ritualism, to hide their defici-
cency of inward principle. They even came eventually to be employed as charms or amulets, having a divine virtue in them to preserve the wearer from sin or from damascenial agency; hence such sayings as those concerning them in the Talmudical writings:

"Whosoever has a tephillim upon his head ... is fortified against sin;" "They are a bandage for cutting off," i. e. from various kinds of danger or hostility (Spencer, iv, c. 5). Jerome (on Matt. xxiii, 5) speaks of them generally as worn by the Jews for guardianship and safety (ob custodiâm et muni-
mentum). The Talmudists considered that they were to be borne in the heart, not on the body. See PHYLAC-
TERY.

On the analogous practice alluded to in Rev. xiii, 16; xiv, 1, see FOREHEAD.

Fronton le Duc, or Fronto Ducensus. See Duc, Fronton de.

Frontisp., Justus Friedrich, a learned Oriental-
FRUIT

(properly "ānu, peri, "spōnicus"); an extensive term, denoting produce in general, whether vegetable or animal, and also used in a figurative sense (see Genesius's Heb. Lex. and Robinson's Greek Lex.). The Hebrews have three generic terms designating the three great classes of the fruits of the land, closely corresponding to what may be expressed in English as, 1. Corn-fruit, or field produce; 2. Vintage-fruit; 3. Orchard-fruit. The term "ānu, peri's, "summer-fruits," appears to denote those less important species of fruit which were adapted only to immediate consumption, and when conveniently brought in a state fit for winter use (Jer. xii. 10, 12). The three terms spoken of as being so frequently associated in the Scriptures, and expressive of a most comprehensive triad of blessings, are the following:

1. "ānu, dogn, "fruit of the field," or agricultural produce. Under this term the Hebrews classed almost every species of culture (see Alex. Bard, Mem. xiv. 186). Jahn says, "The word is of general signification, and comprehends in itself different kinds of grain and pulse, such as wheat, millet, spelt, wall-barley, barley, beans, lentils, meadow-cumin, pepper-wort, fax, cotton, various species of the cucumber, and perhaps rice" (Bib. Archæol., § 88). There is no now doubt among scholars that dogn comprehends the largest and most valuable species of vegetable produce, and therefore it will be allowed that the rendering of the word in the common version by "corn," and sometimes by "sheort," instead of "fruit," is a species of "corn" or field produce, tends to limit our conceptions of the divine bounty, as well as to impair the beauty of the passages where it occurs. See CORN.

2. "śamru, tirosh, "the fruit of the vine" in its natural or its solid state, comprehending grapes, moist or dried, and the fruit in general, whether in the early cluster or the mature and ripened condition (Isa. lxv. 8, which is rendered by Boriov, grape, in the Sept., refers to the young grape; while Judg. ix. 13, where "the wine said, Shall I leave my tirosh [fruit], which cheereth God and man?" as evidently refers to the ripened produce which was placed on the altar as a first-fruit offering in grateful acknowledgment of the divine goodness). Sometimes, says Jahn, "the grapes were dried in the sun, and preserved in masses, which were called, šamru, or, šamru, ushišim, and ushišim, teimukim" (1 Sam. xxv. 18; 1 Sam. xvi. 1; 1 Chron. xii. 40; Hos. iii. 1)" (Bib. Archæol. § 69). It is also distinctly referred to as the sīcher of wine, and therefore was not wine itself, but the raw material from which it was expressed or prepared, as is evident from its distinctive contrast with wine in Amos vi. 15, last clause. See WINE.

3. "yśkār, yśkār, "orchard-fruits," especially winter or keeping-fruits, as dates, figs, olives, pomegranates, citrons, nuts, etc. As we distinguish dognam from...
FRUIT

FRUIT-TREE

FRUIT, the product of the earth, as trees, plants, etc. 1. 'Blessed shall be the fruit of thy ground and cattle.' The fruit of the body signifies children: 'Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body.' By fruit is sometimes meant reward: 'They shall eat of the fruit of their own ways' (Prov. i, 31); they shall receive the reward of their bad conduct, and punishment answerable to their sins. The fruit of the lips is the sacrifice of praise and prayer (Heb. xii, 25). The fruit of the righteous—that is, the counsel, example, instruction, and reproof of the righteous—is a tree of life, is a means of much good, both temporal and eternal, and that not only to himself, but to others also (Prov. xi, 30). Solomon says, in Prov. xii, 14, 'A man shall be satisfied with the fruit of his mouth.' That he shall receive abundant blessings from God as the reward of that good he has done by his pious and profitable discourses. 'Fruits meet for repentance' (Matt. iii, 8) is such a conduct as befits the profession of penitence.

2. The fruits of the Spirit are those gracious habits which the Holy Spirit of God produces in those in whom he dwelleth and worketh, with those acts which flow from them, as naturally as the tree produces its fruit. The apostle enumerates these fruits in Galatians v, 22, 25. The same apostle, in Eph. v, 8, comprehends the fruits of the sanctifying Spirit in these three things, namely, goodness, righteousness, and truth. The fruits of righteousness are such good works and holy actions as spring from a gracious frame of heart: 'Being filled with the fruits of righteousness,' Phil. ii, 11.

It is for a charitable contribution, which is the fruit or effect of faith in love: 'When I have sealed unto them this fruit,' Rom. xv, 28; when I have safely delivered this contribution. When fruit is spoken of good men, then it is to be understood of the fruits or works of holiness and righteousness; but when on evil men, then they are meant the fruits of sin, immorality, and wickedness. This is our Saviour's doctrine, Matt. vii, 16-18.
FRUMENTIUS, Sr., called the apostle of Christianity in Ethiopia, was born in Tyre towards the beginning of the 3rd century. He was put to death by the uncle Meropius, whom he accompanied with his relative (Edesius) on a voyage of scientific discovery. They landed on the coast of Abyssinia or Ethiopia to procure water, but the natives murdered all on board except the two boys, whom they found sitting under a tree and reading. Edesius became cap-bearer and Frumentius private secretary to the prince. After the death of the prince, Frumentius was appointed tutor to the young prince Ezianes, and obtained great influence in state affairs. He succeeded in founding a church, and in 326 went to Alexandria, where Athanasius (recently made bishop of Alexandria) consecrated him bishop of Axum (Auxuma), the chief city of the Abyssinians, and an important mart of trade. His labors were rewarded by extraordinary success. He is supposed to have translated the Bible into Ethiopian. Through him Arabia visited “repaired” to the principal town, Axumia (Axum). Theophilus being an Arian, and Frumentius, the friend of Athanasius, professing in all probability the doctrines of the Council of Nice, it is possible a dispute may have arisen in their announcement here of their respective doctrines, which would necessarily be attended with unfavorable effects on the nascent church; but perhaps, too, Frumentius, who had not received a theological education, did not enter so deeply into theological questions. Still the emperor Constantius considered it necessary to persecute the disciples of the hated Athanasius even in these remote regions. After Athanasius had been banished from Alexandria, in the year 358, Constantius required the princes of the Abyssinian people to send Frumentius to Alexandria, in order that the Arian bishop Georgius, who had been set up in place of Athanasius, might establish orthodoxy, and into the regularity of his ordination’ (Nender, Church Hist. ii. 120). The princes refused, and Frumentius continued at work until his death, the date of which is uncertain (perhaps A.D. 380). He is called the ‘first bishop by the Latinists by the 27th, by the Greeks on November 30, and by the Abyssinians on December 18—Socrates, Hist. Eccl. i. 19; Theodoret, i. 22; Ludolf, Histor. Aethiop. iii, 7; Butler, Lives of Saints, Oct. 27.

FRUYTIER, Jacobus, a Dutch divine, was born June 5, 1599, at Middelburg. He was descended from Jan Frytier, a courtier of William, prince of Orange, and a zealous advocate of the Reformation. Jacobus was educated at Utrecht. His first settlement was at Aardenburg, where he remained seven years. In 1688 he accepted a call to Dirksland, in 1691 removed to Vlissingen (Flushing), and in 1695 to Middelburg. In 1700 he was called to Rotterdam. Here he was installed April 25, 1700, and labored zealously in the ministry till his death, May 28, 1718. He was one of the favorite preachers in that city. Frytier was a zealous Voetian, and became deeply involved in the controversy which at that time raged in the Reformed Church respecting the general resurrection of the dead. His first efforts were those of a pacificator. The violent attack on the Cocmejans made by Pierre de Joucourt, minister of the Walloon church at the Hague, was ably answered by Brauinus, Van Til, and D’Outrein. Frytier was so much pleased with the replies of the two former that the latter wrote him a letter expressing his gratitude, and designed to effect a reconciliation. The effort was premature and fruitless. D’Outrein replied, showing that things were not yet ripe for such a result, and declaring that Frytier himself was not prepared to make sufficient concessions to the opposing party. Frytier replied, but to this rejoinder D’Outrein made no public response. This is thought to have had an exasperating effect on Frytier, who is said to have been a man of choleric temperament. In 1718 he issued a work that included him in serious difficulties. Its title is, Sion’s vorstellingen, of historische Zaken, over de verschijenende en zeer bittere weder- waarde, etc. of Christus Kerke (Zion’s Struggles, or Historical Confessions respecting the various and very bitter conflicts of the Church of Christ’s Church). The work was especially directed against the Cocmejan Ceccisians, and such as were regarded as rationalistic, but it assailed also the Biblical Cocmejans and Ceccisians himself. Three speakers are introduced—Trut, Petry, and Naaktmane. The Ceccisians are accused of open or secret enemies to the truth. The charges brought against them by Trut are briefly the following: such a misinterpretation of the Scriptures as was intolerable to those who cordially loved the truth; such an undermining, on the part of others, of the principles of Christianity that they seemed to be designed to restate heathenism, or enthrone the blasphemies of Socinus; the vital truths of the Bible were misunderstood by some, not believed by others, and openly ridiculed by still another class in their writings, while they were excessively pleased with imaginary errors of truth; and, finally, all these things were palliated and defended by others. The following are the charges made by Petry: an attempt to introduce a heathenish morality as a substitute for spiritual religion; as a consequence of this, that worldly and natural men began to ridicule religion and to entertain atheistic views; and, finally, the power of religion was no longer visible in the lives of many who professed to love the truth, but who, under the pretext of Christian liberty, had become conformed to the world. Naaktmane is introduced as an unsuccessful apologist for the Ceccisians. The gravity of the charges and the acrimonious spirit pervading the work gave just offence, and the Classis of Schieland refused their approbation. Notwithstanding this, it was sent forth to the world with the stamp of Church authority affixed to its title-page. This rendered the Classis indignant, and some of the members of the Classis determined to deprive him of his seat in the Classis, until he should retract and submit. After persisting for seven years in his refusal, he finally, in the year 1754, confessed his fault and testified his sorrow. He was immediately restored. It is conceded that Frytier may have been actuated by zeal for what he regarded as truth in the publication of his work; but his piety, which is admitted to have been deep and fervent, was not free from the admixture of fanaticism, nor was his devoted attachment to the truth, as he viewed it, free from bigotry. A new edition of Sion’s Vorstellingen has just (1869) been issued at Utrecht. His controversy and, moreover, that Frytier himself was not the Son, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, may be reserved for the article on Lampe. His ministry was long and laborious, and he seems to have been influenced by a sincere desire to serve the people of God. He is still represented and honored by a respectable posterity. See Ypee and Dermot, Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerck, iii Deel, blz. 181, 187-191, 202-204; en Aanteekeningen (Breda 1824); Glins, Godgeleerd Nederland, i Deel, blz. 475 en verv. (J. P. W.)

FRY, Elizabeth, an eminent female philanthropist,
was the daughter of John Gurney, a rich banker near Norwich, and a member of the Society of Friends. She was born May 21, 1780, at Bramerton. "The benevolence of her disposition displayed itself by her habit, while yet a girl, of visiting the poor on her father's property, and forming a school for the education of their children. After her marriage to Joseph Savery, an American Friend, she was brought to the knowledge and love of the truth. Her character from that day was entirely changed, and she became a genuine and consistent Christian. In 1800 she was married to Joseph Frye, Esq., of London, and consequently settled in England. The future of the institution is in the habit of visiting the poor; and although she became the mother of a large family, who were most tenderly loved and assiduously trained, she yet found leisure, by a rigid economy of time and arrangement of domestic duties, to render her beneficent offices to her poor and suffering fellow-creatures. In 1810 she became a preacher among the Friends. Every day was she found visiting charity-schools, in the houses and lanes of the poor, and in the wards of sick hospitals, till at length, by a providential train of circumstances, she was once more enabled to visit the inmates of a prison and a lunatic asylum (1813). The accents of Christian love found entrance into the hearts of those wretched outcasts, and she became the honored instrument of remodeling the discipline and improving the state of our national prisons. At the commencement of her career there was no distinction of any sort, no separation between male and female prisoners; all criminals, parents and children, men and women, those who were comparatively innocent with the inextremely depraved, were indiscriminately hedged together, and in those circumstances many left the prison far more familiar with crime than when they entered it. It required no small resolution and faith to enter such a den of iniquity as a British jail at that period was, but Mrs. Frye attempted it and was successful. Her dignity, and at the same time her feminine gentleness, subdued their ferocity and won their attention. She told them that vice was the cause of all their misery; that if they would return to virtuous habits they might again be happy, and she proposed rules for their observance, of which they unanimously expressed their approval. Repeating her visit after a short interval, finding that attention to tractable and submissive, she proceeded with her contemplated measures. She appointed a teacher to those children who had been committed for petty offences, and many of whom were under seven years of age. Even their profligate mothers took an interest in this infant institution, and by paying the employment for the women, by teaching them to sew, and supplying them with work. For the accomplishment of this arduous undertaking she formed a ladies' committee (1817), some of whom made it a sacred duty to attend in the prison daily, so that there was not a moment when the females were not under the superintendence of some proper and efficient guide. A matron was at length appointed to live in the prison, and take the oversight of the female prisoners. But the ladies' committee still continued their attendance, one giving instruction in needlework, another in reading and writing, while a third read some good religious book, and spoke to them about the guilt and the wages of sin, duty and the superior happiness of a sober, chaste, and religious life. In a few weeks the most astonishing moral revolution was effected within the walls of the prison; not only the language of blasphemy, obscenity, and profanity, and fiendish discord entirely disappeared, but women of the most abandoned characters were reclaimed to established habits of sobriety, industry, and piety. The public interest was greatly excited by the intelligence. Various ladies of highest official rank visited the schools, and the most undoubted testimonies were borne to the excellent principles and efficient working of these benevolent schemes. Mrs. Frye, while she continued her inspection of the prisons, extended her benevolent regards to other classes, such as making provision for female convicts both during their voyage out and at their allotted stations. She also visited all the principal jails in Scotland and Ireland, and Demerara, Demerara. A last scheme of philanthropy was begun with a view to benefit British seamen, particularly to alleviate the miserable state of the coast guard; forming libraries and adopting means for circulating books and tracts in men-of-war ships. These anxious and multiform labors made her a deserving object of this excellent lady. After trying the waters of Bath in the spring of 1845, she returned home no way improved, and gradually sank till she expired at Ramsgate, October 12. Her death was lamented throughout Europe as a loss to humanity. She was, as she has often been called, 'the female Howard,' and, like her prototype, her benevolent exertions were the fruit of a lively and established faith in the Gospel of Christ."—Rich, *Cyclopedia of Biography; Memoirs of Elizabeth Frye,* by her daughters (London, 1848, 2 vols.; New York, 1850, 2 vols. 8vo); *Cordon, Mr. of Mrs. Frye (London, 1859); Methodist Quart. Review, April, 1851, art. ii; North Brit. Rev. ix, 136; Princeton Review, xx, 81.

**Frye, Joseph,** a Methodist Episcopal minister of the Baltimore Conference, was born in Winchester, Frederick Co., Va., in 1786, of Lutheran parents; was converted under Methodist preaching, and began to exhort while young, and entered the itineracy in 1809. He retired from the ministry in 1836, and died in Baltimore May 1845. Mr. Frye had remarkable powers as a preacher. Hundreds were converted through his preaching. The Rev. Alfred Griffith relates that on one occasion General Jackson (then President of the United States) heard Mr. Frye preach. "The tears ran down the President's face like a river; and, indeed, in this respect, he only showed himself like almost everybody around him. When the service was closed, he moved up towards the altar with his usual air of dignity and earnestness, and requested an introduction to the preacher. Mr. Frye stepped down to receive the hand of the illustrious chief magistrate; but the general, instead of merely giving him his hand, threw his arms around his neck, and, in no measured terms of gratitude and admiration, thanked him for his excellent discourse" (Sprague, *Annals, vii, 478*).—Minutes of Conference, iv, 9.

**Frying-pan** (ןַחָרָה, *marché s[t*]heth, prop. a boiler*), a pot for boiling meat, etc. (Lev. ii. 7; vi. 9). See POT. Jarchi says it was a deep vessel, so that the oil could not become ignited upon the fire. The Rabbins distinguish it from the רַחָרָה, *machakath*, iron *pan*, flat plate, or slice (Lev. ii. 5; Ezek. iv. 8), and say that the former was concave and deep, though both were used for the same purpose. The Bedouins, and some other Arab tribes, use a shallow earthen vessel, somewhat resembling a frying-pan, and which is employed both for frying and baking one sort of bread. See BEAK.

There is also used in Western Asia some modification of this pan, resembling the Eastern oven, which Jerome describes as a round vessel of copper, blackened and heated the sides by the surrounding fire which heats it. This baking-pan is also common enough in England and elsewhere, where the villagers bake large loaves of bread under inverted round iron pots, with embers and slow burning fuel heaped upon them. Sometimes it looks like a deep concave pan may be seen in the paintings of the tombs of Egypt, in their representations of the various processes of cookery [see COOK], which no doubt bears a resemblance to the one used by the Hebrews on this occasion. See PAN.

**Fryth, John.** See FARRH.

**FUEL** (גֶּפֶל, oklah, and פֶּלֶס, *mabek* leth, both...
general terms for anything consumed, whether by eating or combustion. From the extreme scarcity of wood in many places, the Orientals are forced to use almost every kind of combustible matter for fuel; even the withered stalks of herbs and flowers (Matt. vi, 28, 30), thorns (Ps. lxv. 9; Eccl. vii. 6), and animal excrement and dung (Ezek. iv. 3, 4; 2 Kings xxv. 15; Isa. lv. 13, 15). Prof. Hackett speaks of the inhabitants of Lebanon picking up died grass, roots and all, for fuel, and says that it even becomes an article of trade (Illustr. of Scripture, p. 131). The inhabitants of Baku, a port of the Caspian, are supplied with scarcely white coal, which they obtain by the agency of a man named Gorev, who works the soil and petroleum with which the neighboring country is highly impregnated. The Arabs in Egypt draw no considerable portion of their fuel, with which they cook their victuals, from the exhaustless mummy-pits so often described by travellers. Wood or charcoal is still, as it was anciently, chiefly employed in the towns of Egypt and Syria. The roots of the rotheum, a species of the broom-plant (called in the English Bible "juniper"), which abounds in the deserts, are regarded by the Arabs as yielding the best charcoal (Job xxx. 4; Psa. xxx. 5). Although the coal of the ancients was that obtained from syenite or felsite coal from Lurgia and Elis was occasionally used by smiths, Theophrastus, Frag. ii, 61, edit. Schneider; yet the inhabitants of Palestine now to some extent use anthracite coal, which crops out in some parts of Lower Lower Egypt (Ezek. vi. 67). Wood, however, is their chief article of fuel, especially at Jerusalem, and it is largely brought from the region of Hebron (Tobler, Denkblatter aus Jerusalem, p. 180). See Wood. As chimneyys are but little known in the East, apartments are warmed in cold weather by means of braziers, made of various kinds, and either of metal or earthen-ware, which are set in the middle of the room after the fire of wood which it contains has been allowed to burn for some time in the open air, till the flame and smoke have passed away. Charcoal is also extensively employed for the same purpose (Jer. xxvi. 21). Grates are not known even where chimneys are found, but the fuel is burnt on the hearth, or against the back of the chimney. In cottages, a fire of wood or animal dung is frequently burnt upon the floor, either in the middle of the room or against one of the walls, with an opening above for the escape of the smoke. It is also common to have a fire in a pit sunk in the floor, and covered with a mat or carpet, so as not to be distinguished from any other portion of the floor. In all cases where wood is scarce, animal dung is used for fuel. Combining wood is considered much preferable to any other, but all animal dung is considered valuable (Ezek. iv. 15). When collected it is made into thin cakes, which are stuck against the sunny side of the houses, giving them a curious and rather unsightly appearance. When it is quite dry and falls off, it is stored away in basins for future use. It is much used for baking, being considered preferable to any other fuel for that purpose. See Fire.

Fugitive is the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. terms: נָשִּׁיאֵה (na [wandering]), a roarer (Gen. iv. 12, 14; elsewhere "wander," etc.); בֵּשָׁל (beshal) (one that has escaped, as often rendered), a refugee (Judg. xii. 4); סְפָּחֵל (sophel) (falling, as usually rendered, i. e. away to the enemy), a deserter (2 Kings xxv. 11); פָּרָשָׁה (parashah), a breakaway, (i. e. flight), fugitives (only in the plural. and Ezek. xvii. 21); פָּרָשָׁה (parashah) (from the same root as the last, prop. a bolt, as often rendered, hence a prince; but here perhaps simply a breakaway, a fugitive (Isa. xv. 5).

Fuh-ho, sometimes spelled Foh, is not frequently confounded with Fo, the Chinese Buddha, from whom, however, he was separated by centuries, and with whose religious teachings those of Fuh-ho had nothing in common. Fuh-ho is the reputed founder of Chinese civilisation, having "established social order, instituted marriage, and taught the use of writing" among that people. He is alleged to have been born in the province of Shensi, and to have reigned B.C. 2932. It is not probable, however, that nature of the doctrine he ersoned his authority with were of anything but tolerable accuracy. According to Chinese tradition, the first man who was created was Pwan-ko, or Animated Chaos, who was "succeeded by three sovereigns, styled Heaven Emperor, Earth Emperor, and Man Emperor, or Heavenly, Earthly, and Human Napoleon. Hence in the napoleonic war against the Great Extreme, and the triplification of the Great Extreme, or Supreme Unit." This first creation was destroyed by a deluge. When this had subsided, the first man who reappeared was Fuh-ho. He issued with his wife and six children from the "sacred circle." "Fuh-ho," says the Chinese text, "is the first who appears at each opening and spreading out" [of the universe]. Thus Fuh-ho is but the reappearing of Pwan-ko, and, as he escaped from the deluge, he has many of the characteristics of Noah.

His Writings.—The Chinese were originally worshipers of the heavenly bodies. Fuh-ho reduced their worship to a higher form of religion, substituting a philosophy of natural phenomena. He is claimed by the author of the most ancient of the Chinese canonical books, called Yaj King, "The Book of Changes," an expanded form of ancient and recondite speculations on the nature of the universe in general, the harmonic and cosmological elements of creation." It is based on some eight peculiar diagrams called Kueh. In the hands of the commentators this "cosmological essay" became a "standard treatise on ethical philosophy." The following summary of the Yaj King, or Y King, is given by Faber, Origins of Pagan Idolatry, 1, 246; "Yaj King, or Y Y received its name from the mystery of which it treats, the mystery being hieroglyphically represented by a figure resembling the Greek Θ or Roman Y. It teaches that the heaven and the earth had a beginning, and therefore the human race; that of the heaven and earth all material things were formed, man male and female, then husband and wife. The Great Term (as they call it) is the Great Unity and the Great Y. Y has neither body nor figure, and all that has body and figure was made by which has neither body nor figure. The Great Term, or the Great Unity, contains two side walls, and thus the Two and the Three One. Tao is life. The first has produced the second, and the two have produced the third, and the three have produced all things. Whom the spirit perceiveth, and whom the eye cannot see, is called Y."—Morrison, Chinese Classical Literature, 209. Yaj King is also connected, especially by the Père de Chine; Journal de l'Association Sociale (1860), xiv, 403, 404; Faber, Origin of Pagan Idolatry, 1, 246; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, ii, 17, 18; Legge, Life and Teachings of Confucius (Philadelphia); Gutzlaff, Chinese History, i, 110. (J. T. G.)

Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, one of the most eminent and learned prelates of the 11th century. The place of his birth is unknown. He was probably born about A.D. 900, in Italy, but educated in France about A.D. 990 he commenced a school at Chartres, where he continued his instructions for some time, and with such success that his fame for learning spread to the most distant parts of the kingdom. Many of the best scholars of those times were Fulbert's pupils, and he contributed largely to the revival of literature. Berengar of Tours was one of his pupils, and king Robert was his intimate friend. His pupils always spoke of him with affection and veneration. He was not "satisfied with imparting to his scholars all possible knowledge, but he regarded it of the greatest moment to take care for the welfare of their souls. One of Berengar's fellow-students at that time was Abbot Adam, in a letter written at a later period, of which letter we shall have occasion to speak on a future page.
reminded him of those hearty conversations which they had at eventide, while walking solitarily with their preceptor in the garden, how he spoke to them of their heavenly country, and how sometimes, unmanned by his feelings, interrupting their song in thus tears, he ad- jured them by those tears to strive with all earnestness to reach that heavenly home, and for the sake of this to beware, above all things, of that which might lead them from the way of truth handed down from the fathers" (Neander, Church Hist., Torrey's transl., iii, 606, where the original quotation is cited). After 1847 he ordained bishop of Chartres, and died in 1029. It is said that he was the first who introduced the celebration of the festival of the Virgin's Nativity in France: it is certain that he was a zealous upholder of her honor, since he built the church of Chartres to her praise. His writings consist of 104 Epistles:--Tractatus contra Judaeos:--Sermones:--Carmina, etc. According to bishop Cosin, his doctrine on the Eucharist was alto- gether conformable to that of the primitive Church; but his first epistle (the fifth in Migne) to Adeodatus teaches transubstantiation. Yet his language on the Eucharist is sufficiently indefinite to have probably led his pupil Berengar (q.v.) to his more scriptural and spiritual views of that sacrament. His works were edited by Masson (Paris, 1856), by Villiers ("in bad faith," Mosheim, Par. 1808, 8vo), and in the Bib. Marc. Parisii, 1819, 8vo. There are many versions in Migne, PatroL Latina, t. 141, where also several biographies of Fulbert are collected. See Oudin, Script. Eccl. ii, 519; Cellier, Ant. Sacris (Paris, 1865), xxii, 78; Dupin, Eccl. Writs, i, 1 sq.; Mosheim, Church Hist. cent. xii. pt. ii, ch. ii, § 81, n. 65; Neander, Ch. Hist. iii, 470, 502; Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature.

Fulcherius, CAROLESCHIS (Foucher de Chartres), a medieval French priest and historian, was born at Chartres in 1059, and died in 1127 at Jerusalem, whilst he had gone on the first Crusade (1096) as chaplain to Baldwin, whom he followed in all his expedi- tions. His Histoire de Jerusalem, continued to the year of his death, embraces the greater part of the events of the Crusade from the council at Clermont (1095), and is especially important as being a record of such facts only as himself or other eye-witnesses could verify. It was published by Bongars in Recueil des Histoires de la Croisade, and in a fuller and cor- rected form by Duchesne in Histoires de France (vol. iv), and in the Histoires des Croisades published by the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres.-- Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 282-3; Histoire Litéraire de la France, t. xi. (J. W. M.)

Fulco (FOULQES, FULC) OF NEUILLY, one of the most popular preachers of the Middle Ages, was born in the second half of the 12th century. "He was one of the ordinary, ignorant, worldly-minded ecclesiastics, the priest and parson of a country town not far from Paris. Afterwards he experienced a change; and as he had before neglected his flock, and injured them by his bad example, so now he sought to build them up by his wise counsels, and held the flock with his lack of education for the ministry," he went on week-days to Paris, and attended the lectures of Peter Can- tor, a theologian distinguished for his peculiar scriptu- ral bent and his tendency to practical reform; and of the knowledge here acquired he availed himself by eloquent sermons in most churches on Sun- days to his flock. These sermons were not so much distinguished for profoundness of thought as for their adaptation to the common understanding and to the occasions of practical life. At first neighboring cler- gymen heard him, and later in larger congrega- tions. Next he was called to Paris, and he preached not only in churches, but also in the public places. Professors, students, people of all ranks and classes, flocked to hear him. In a coarse cowl, girt about with a thong of leather, he itinerated as a preacher of repentance through France, and fearless denounced the reigning vices of learned and unlearned, high and low. His words often wrought such deep compunc- tion on those he reproved that they fell on their knees, and sobbed on the ground before him, confessed their sins before all, and declared themselves ready to do anything he might direct in order to reform their lives, and to redress the wrongs which they had done. Users restored back the interest they had taken; those who had committed murder or theft, who, in this impious luxury, had wasted their substance, bought large quanti- ties of grain to sell again at a greatly advanced price, threw open their granaries. In such times he fre- quently exclaimed, 'Give food to him who is perishing with hunger, or else thou perishest thyself.' He an- nounced to the corn-dealers that before the coming harvest they would be forced to sell their store-up grain, and cheap it soon became in consequence of his own announcement. Multitudes of abandoned women, who lived on the wages of sin, were converted by him. For some he obtained husbands; for others he secured a means of life. He expected the impure a share of the clergy; and the latter, seeing the finger of ev- ery man pointed against them, were obliged to sepa- rate from their conculcines. A curse that fell from his lips spread alarm like a thunderbolt. People whom he so addressed were seen to fall like eulipses, and the women died of fear and shame. Such appearances promoted the faith in the supernat- ural power of his words. Sick persons were brought to him from all quarters, who expected to be healed by his touch—by his blessing; and wonderful stories were told of the miracles thus wrought. . . . The per- sonal influence of this man, who stood, renowned nei- ther by his talents nor his official station, gave birth to a new life of the clergy, a greater zeal in discharging the duties of the predicatorial office and of the care of souls, both in France and in England. Young men, who for many years had been studying a dialectic that the University of Paris, had forgotten the obligation to care for the salvation of souls, were touched by the discourses of this unlearned itinerant, and trained by his instrumentality into zealous preachers. He for- merly left him behind a peculiar school; he sent his disciples over to England, and his example and stimulating effect even on such as had never come into personal contact with him. 'Many,' says Jacob of Vitry, 'inflamed with the fire of love, and incited by his example, began to teach and to preach, and to lead not a few to repentance, and to snatch the souls of sin- ners from destruction.' (Neander, Church Hist. Tor- rey's transl., iv, 209). When Innocent III proclaimed the fourth Crusade, A.D. 1198, Fulco devoted himself wholly to preaching in its favor, and among all the "orators who blew the sacred trumpet" he was the most successful. "Richard of England was satiated with the glory and misfortunes of his first adventure, and he presumed to deride the exhortations of Fulco, who was not alarmed in the presence of kings. 'You advise me,' said Plantagenet, 'to dismiss my three daughters, pride, avarice, and incontinence. But I beleaue thenceforth that the soul succeeding him must, as the Knights Templars, my avance to the monks of Cis- teaux, and my incontinence to the prelates. ' But the preacher was heard and obeyed by the great vassals" (Gibson, Decline and Fall, Harper's edition, vi, 60). Fulco did not live to see the results of the Crusade; he died at the age of A.D. 1201. -- Villehardouin, Histoire de la Conquête de Constantinople (transl. by T. Smith. Lon- don, 1829, 8vo); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xviii, 308; Milman, Latin Christianity, bk. ix, ch. vii; Gieseler, Ch. History, per. iii, § 80; Hurter, Geschichte Pobal In- nocenti III (Hamburg, 1884), vol. i; Herzog, Real-En- cyclopad. xix, 808.

Fulda, MONASTERY OF, a celebrated convent, es- tablished in 744 by Boniface, and one of his pupils named Sturm. The latter, a young man of good fam-
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ily, having decided on becoming a hermit, was sent by Boniface to search out a spot in the forest of Buchina, secure from the inroads of the Saxons. Sturm set out with two companions, and finally selected a plot of land on the banks of the Fulda, which was given them by duke Karlmann. In January, 744, Sturm and seven companions took possession, and immediately commenced building a church. The convent was organized on the plan of Monte Cassino, after the rule of St. Benedict, and Sturm became its first abbot. In Nov. 4, 751, pope Zachariah exempted it from episcopal jurisdiction. The convent prospered rapidly, its inmates numbered 250 in 775; its prosperity still increased under Sturm’s successor, Bangulf. Both Pepin the Short and Charlemagne were very liberal towards this convent, which in its turn did great good in disseminating the knowledge of agriculture as well as literature throughout the surrounding country. Its celebrated theological school was particularly prosperous under Rabanus Maurus, who afterwards became abbot of Fulda. There were twelve seniors or sub-instructors, and the scholars were instructed in grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, theology, and the German language. Nor were either faculty, nor any other service, inferior to that of these scholars, which produced both clever artists and talented artisans. Under the abbots Werner (968 to 982), Fulda became the first among the abbeys of Germany and France. Otto I named its abbots arch-chancellors of the empire. When John of Trier led the citizens of Fulda to assault the convent, but the assailants were overpowered and their leaders put to death. The Reformation at first made an Impressio in the convent, but abbot Balthinus succeeded in 1573 in checking the progress of evangelical doctrines within its walls. In 1631 Fulda was subjected to Sweden, and an attempt was made to introduce Protestantism into the district, but, after the defeat of Nördlingen, the Roman Catholic abbots resumed their sway. In 1809, Fulda, which six years before had become a principality of the prince of Orange, was by Napoleon I annexed to the grand-duchy of Frankfurt, but Pius VII finally joined it in 1815 to the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, of which it remained a part until the incorporation of that country, in 1866, with Prussia. See Brower, Antiq. Fulda. lib. iv (Antwerp, 16); Dronke, Traditions et True de l’Église Catholique (Fulda, 1942); Neron, Zeit. f. hist. Theol. (1846); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. iv, 624; McLeay, Christian Missions in the Middle Ages, p. 214.

Fulda Manuscript (CODEC Fuldenensis), one of the finest copies of the early Latin version, containing the whole N. T., written by order of Victor, bishop of Capua, A.D. 546, and now in the Abbey of Fulda, in Hesse-Cassel. The Gospels are arranged in a kind of harmony. It was described by Schaunat (Vindemiae Literariae Collectio, 1723 p. 216), collated by Lachmann and Buttman in 1839 for the Latin portion of the N. T., and has been edited by Voss. Banke (Mab. 1867, 2d ed. 1875; Brunner, Intro. p. 264; Trutnew, in Horae introd. iv, 254). See Latin Versions.

Fulle (usually τοῦ, mięś, νηροῦ, to fill up), generally used with reference to the accomplishment of prophecy. It is used in the O. T. with respect to various kinds of prophecies, such as are imminent (e. g. the death of Jeroboam’s child, 1 Kings 14, 17), or distant (e. g. that referring to the rebuilding of Jericho, 1 Kings 15, 15). Those words were delivered in a near as well as in a remote event [see Daniel 9, 25; 11, 33, 36], those that relate to some similar typical occurrence, class, or character [see Type], proverbial expressions [see Proverb], and especially predictions relating to the Messiah. Several distinguished scholars consider that the form of the N. T. contains no allusion to the O. T. and introduced by the formula, “All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet (Matt. i. 22; ii. 15); “For thus is written by the prophet” (Matt. ii. 5); “Then was fulfilled that which was spoken” (Matt. ii. 17), may be mere allusions, without its being intended to declare that the literal fulfilment took place on the occasion described. Even if those passages could not be applied to certain events, otherwise than by accomodation of the language of the prophet, the event was necessarily intended to be ever so plain; and the reader will easily bend to that explanation; for it may be shown, by examples from the Rabbins and from the earliest Syriac writers, that in the East similar modes of speech have always been in use. See ACCOMMODATION. DATION. For the form of the N. T. see the formula "that it might be fulfilled," "then was fulfilled," etc., when used with reference to the fulfilment of prophecy in the New Testament, the events are not to be understood as happening merely for the purpose of making good the predictions, but rather that in or by this event was fulfilled the prophecy. The very ambiguity in the understanding of the first of these formulas arises from what are technically called the teile and the ecalatic uses of the Greek particle τον. It is also to be noted that the individuals or nations actually engaged in fulfilling prophecy often had no such intention, or, if they did, the event was conceived as fulfilling the formula "that it might be fulfilled," "then was fulfilled," and similar expressions in both the Heb. and Gr. Scriptures, always designate an intentional and definite fulfilment of an express prediction (Meth. Quart. Rev. April, 1867, p. 194). See Prophecy.

Fulentius, St., Fabius Claudius Gordianus, bishop of Rome, one of the 6th century, was born at Telepta (Leptis), in the province of Byzacena, North Africa, A.D. 468. His father dying in his childhood, the care of his education fell on his mother, who had him carefully instructed in the Greek language. It is said that when a boy he could repeat the whole of Homer. In early manhood he was made procurator of his native place, but, disgusted with the world, he threw up his office and devoted himself to the monastic life, against his mother’s will. He first entered a monastery at Byzacena, but in the disorders of his times he was compelled to abandon it, and retired to Africa, where he was seized by the Arians. Afterwards he resolved to go into Egypt, but was dissuaded by Eulalius, bishop of Syracuse, because the monks of the East had separated from the Catholic Church. He went from Sicily to Rome about A.D. 505, where he returned to Africa and founded a new monastery. The see of Ruspe becoming vacant, he was ordained bishop, much against his will, in the year 504. “Though become a bishop, he did not change either his habit or manner of living, but used the same austerities and abstinence as before. He defended his faith at once boldly and respectfully against his Arian sovereign. He speaks thus to the king in an apologetic treatise which the monarch himself had called for (Lib. iii ad Trajanum): ‘If I freely defend my faith, as far as God enabes me, no reproach of obstinacy should be made against me, since I am forgetful of my own life, and to a smallness, that is, and to the dignity; and I know well that I am to fear God and honor the king, according to Rom. xiii, 7; 1 Pet. ii. 17. He certainly pays you true honor who answers your questions as the true faith requires.[1][2][3] Having attained to the highest rank of a monarch of a yet uncivilized people, showed so much zeal for the knowledge of scriptural truth, he says: ‘You know well that he who seeks to know the truth strives for far higher good than he who seeks to extend the limits of a temporal kingdom.’ He was banished twice to Sardinia. There he was the spiritual guide of many other exiles, who united themselves to
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him. From hence he invited counsel, comfort, and confidence into the faith to his forlorn Christian friends in Africa, and to those from other countries who sought his advice in spiritual things and in perplexities of the heart'" (Neander, Light in Dark Places, N.Y. 1885, 31 sq.). After the death of Thraimund, he and all the other expelled bishops were recalled by Hilary in 364, and the latter, according to them, is most important are, against Arianism and Pelagianism. The most important are, against Arianism: Libri iii ad Thraimundum. De Trinitate Liber: Contra Sermonem Paschali Sermones; against Pelagianism: Libri Tris ad Monumenum. De Veritate Presbyteratissimo et gratia Dei. Liber de Presbyteratissimo et Gratia. Fugentius was led to write against Pelagianism by the writings of Faustus of Rhegium (q. v.), which were laid before him for his judgment. He explained "the system of Augustinie with logical consistency, but in doing this he carefully avoided the harsh points of the Presbyteratissimo view of the church, that severely condemned those who tasted of a presbyteratissimo to sin. He spoke, indeed, of a two-fold presbyteratissimo (presbyteratissimus duplex), but by this he understood either the election to eternal happiness of those who were good by the grace of God, or the presbyteratissimo of those who were simply "in their own choice to deserved punishment" (Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 650. See also Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, § 114). Editions of his writings: Basel, 1565, 1566, 1567, 1574, Antwerp, 1574; Cologne, 1614; Lyons, 1638, 1652, 1671; best, that of Paris, 1864, 4to; reprinted at Venice, 1742, fol., and in Migne, Patrologia Latina, t. ixv. See Herzog, Real-Enzyklop. iv, 627; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iv, 249; Ceillier, Autres Secrèts (Paris, 1682), xi, 1 sq.; Dupin, Eccles. Writers, v, 18 sq.; Fleury, Hist. Eccles. lib. XXX, XXXI.

FUGENTIUS, FERRANDUS, a friend and pupil of Fugentius of Rupse, who with him partook of exile in Sardinia. On his return to Carthage he became a deacon, A.D. 528. He died A.D. 561. He was one of the first to declare against the condemnation of the Three Chapters. He also took part in the controversy at that time agitating the Church whether it was orthodox to say, "One person of the Trinity has suffered. Fugentius defended this expression, but recommended a change in the form by which he had "used". Of his writings, we have a Brevario Canonicum (An Abridgment of the Ecclesiastical Canons), containing 222 canons of the councils of Anchry, Laodicea, Nice, Antioch, Gangra, and Sardica, the canons of which last council, he most probably, took from Dionysius Exiguus. It was published by the Jesuit Chifflet at Dijon (1649, 4to). He left also a number of Epistles, which, with the Canons, may be found in Bib. Max. Patr. ix, 475, and in Migne, Patrologia Latina, vols. ixxv, ixxvii, ixxviii. A work against the Arians and other heretics was first published by him. Mgr. Durand, sons of Fugentius, Real-Enzyklop. iv, 626; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. iv, 250; Cave, Hist. Liter.; Clarke, Succession of Sac. Lit.

FULCO, WILLIAM, D.D., a famous Puritan divine, was born in London, and went in 1556 to St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow in 1564. He spent six years at Clifford's Inn, studying law, but preferred letters, and especially theology. He was the style of a young man; but, being suspected of his intention, as he was the intimate friend of Cartwright, then professor of divinity, he was expelled from college. The earl of Leicester presented him in 1571 to the living of Warley, in Essex, and two years after to Kedington, in Suffolk. He afterwards took his degree of D.D. at Cambridge, and, as chaplain, accompanied the earl of Lincoln when he went as ambassador to France, and on his return he was made master of Pembroke Hall, and Margaret professor. He died in 1589. "It force of argument and criticism he was one of the ablest divines of his time, and one of the principal opponents of the Roman Church" (Darling). His writings, which were very numerous, both in Latin and English, were directed chiefly against Popery. The most important were, against the arguments of the New Testament, and the authorized English Version, with the Arguments of the Proofs, Chapters, and Annotations of the Rhemians, and Dr. Fuller's Conflation of all such Arguments, Glosse, and Annotationes (first edition, 1580; often reprinted; 8vo). A. Cam-bridge, 1848, 8vo; New York, 1843, 8vo) - Defense of the sincere and true Translation of the Scriptures, against Gregory Martin (new edit. by Parker Society, Camb., 1848, 8vo) - Answers to Stopford, Martialis, and Sanders (on the controversy with Rome, reprinted by the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1848, 8vo).

FUGENTIUS, BERNARDUS, was born in 1602. He pursued his collegiate course at the University of Frencnc. He devoted himself specially to the study of the Hebrew and mathematics. His proficiency in both studies was great. When only twenty-seven he was appointed to fill the chair made vacant by the death of an established Orientalist, Sixtus Ammianus. He accepted the appointment, and in 1630 he entered upon the discharge of its duties. For seven years he filled the office with fidelity and acceptance. The professorship of mathematics was then tendered to him, and the celebrated Cocceius appointed him his successor in the department of Oriental literature. He was one of the committee appointed by the Synod of Dort to revise the new translation of the New Testament. An edition of J. Drusius Commentaria ad librum Codicis Salomonis et Jobis was brought out under his editorial supervision, and with prefaces prepared by him. See Glavius, Godegeerter Nederland, i Decel, blz. 479; G. Brandt, Historie der Reformatie, etc., ii Decel, blz. 56 (Rotterdam, 1704). (J. P. W.)

Fuller (C22, kobet', from כֹּבֶץ, to tread [comp. Gesenius, Monum. Phoen. p. 181]; γαφετίς). The art of the fuller is beyond doubt of great antiquity, and seems to have reached at an early period a comparatively high degree of perfection. Very scanty materials, however, exist for tracing its progress, or for ascertaining exactly, in any particular age or country (see Pliny, vii, 57), what substances were employed in the art, and what methods were resorted to for the purpose of making them effectual. At the transfiguration our Saviour's question was, "Doth man have to be washed with so much water on fuller on earth could white them?" (Mark ix, 3). Elsewhere we read of "fullers' soap" (Mal. iii, 2), and of "the fullers' field" (2 Kings xviii, 17). Of the processes followed in the art of cleaning cloth and the various kinds of stuff among the Jews we have no direct knowledge. In an early part of the operation they seem to have trod the cloths with their feet (Gesenius, Thes. p. 1261), as the Hebrew Hiv-nogel, or En-nogel, literally Foot-fountain, has been rendered, on Rabbinical authority, Fullers' fountain," on the ground that the fullers trod the cloths there with their feet (comp. Hôst, Marabou, p. 116). They were also rubbed with the knockels, as in modern washing (Synes. Ep. 44; compare Euseb. Hist. Eccli. i, 2). A subsequent operation was probably that of rubbing the cloth on an inclined plane, in a mode which is figured in the Egyptian drawing of the time (G. Maspero, ii, 106, fig. 1), and still preserved in the East. It seems from the above notices that the trade of the fullers, as causing offensive smells, and also as requiring space for drying clothes, was carried on at Jerusalem outside the city (comp. Marial, vi, 93; Plut. Arab. v, 5, 3), and Aldermaston, a town (officina fultonis) is mentioned in the Talmudic writers (Midrash, Kokel. xcii, 2) by the name of הלקות ינדיב, "house of maceration." So far as it is
FULLER'S SOAP

Ancient Egyptian fullers, 1, 2, 4, 5. Inscribed labels 4, 5. The water running off into the trough below; 6. A stone used for rubbing the cloth; 7. Jars of soap.

mentioned in Scripture, fulling appears to have consisted chiefly in cleansing garments and whitening them (compare šăli'ān, Var. Hist., v. 5). The use of white garments, and also the feeling respecting their use for festal and religious purposes, may be gathered from various passages: Exod. ix. 8.; Dan. vii. 9.; Isa. xiv. 6.; Zech. iii. 5.; 2 Sam. vi. 14.; 1 Chron. xvii. 27.; Mark ix. 5.; Rev. iv. 4.; vi. 11.; vii. 9.; compare Mishna, Tammūt, iv. 8.; see also Statius, Silv. i. 2. 287.; Ovid, Fast. i. 79.; Claudian, De Bello, Sil. iii. 289.

This branch of the trade was perhaps exercised by other persons than those who carded the wool and smoothed the cloth when woven (Mishna, Babba Kama, i. x. 10). Applying the marks used to distinguish cloths sent to be cleaned, fullers were desired to be careful to avoid the mixtures forbidden by the law (Lev. xix. 29.; Deut. xxii. 11.; Mishna, Moed, Kilaim, ix. 10.). Colored cloth was likewise fullied (Mishna, Shabb. xix. 1.). See Schöttgen, Tricres et fuliones (2d edition, Lips. 1763). See Handicrafts.

FULLER’S SOAP (בְּרֶסֶת בְּרָס, bōrith mekabbeshinim), alluvial of those treading cloth, i. e. washers' potsail; Sept. υποφόροι τῆς ψιλοκυνής, some alkaline or saponaceous substance mixed with the water in the tubs used for stamping or beating cloth. Two substances of the nature are mentioned in Scripture: "neither nitre (αύριον, nitrum, Prov. xxv, 20; Jer. ii. 22.), and רְבִית, rabith, soap (voie, herba fulillum, herba borith, Mal. iii. 2.)." Nitre is found in Egypt and in Syria, and vegetable alkalai was also obtained there from the ashes of certain plants, probably Sahoukal kaii (Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. p. 266: Pliny, xxxvi. 10. 46; Hassenheister, p. 278) among others. The juice also of some saponaceous plant, perhaps Gymnosphaera struthium, or Saponaria officinalis, was sometimes mixed with the water for the like purpose, and may thus be regarded as representing the soap of Scripture. Other substances also are mentioned as being employed in cleansing, which, together with alkali, seem to identify the Jewish with the Roman process (Pliny, xxxvi. 57.), as urine and chalk (creta cinolia), and bean-water, i. e. bean-meal mixed with water (Mishna, Shabb. ix. 5; Niddah, x. 6.). Urine, both of men and of animals, was regularly collected at Rome for cleansing cloths (Plin. xxxvi. 26., 48; Athen. xii. p. 484; Mart. ix. 93; Plautus, Aeschin. v. 2, 57.), and it seems not improbable that its use in the fullers' trade at Jerusalem may have suggested the coarse taunt of Rabshakeh during his interview with the deputies of Hezekiah in the brayway of the fuller's field (2 Kings xviii. 27); but Schöttgen thinks it doubtful whether the Jews made use of it in fulling (Antiq. full. § 9.). The process of whitening garments was performed by rubbing them into chalk or earth of some kind (דְּשָׁן). Creta cinolia (ciniolite) was probably the earth most frequently used ("creta fulillum," Pliny, xvii. 4.; compare Theophrastus, Charact. 11.). The whitest sort of earth for this purpose is a white pot-
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the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, leading to Sille (Nely Samwel) and Gibson, and also the Serb of Arabian writers (Edrisi, about A.D. 1150, ed Jaubert, i, 814; "History of Jerusalem," in the Fundgr. des Orient, ii, 129). It seems to have derived its name from leading to the Fuller's Field (Isa. vii, 5).

FULLEN'S MONUMENT (μνημα το γερατος), a conspicuous object mentioned by Josephus in his account of the course of the third or outer wall of Jerusalem (War, v, 4, 2), as situated near "the tower of the corner," where the wall bent, after passing the sepulchres of the kings, to the valley of the Kidron; evidently, therefore, at the north-east angle of the ancient city (Strong's Harm, and Expos. of the Gospel, Append, p. 25). It does not follow, as Dr. Barclay supposes (City of the Great King, p. 22), that the monument in question was situated at the Fuller's Field. See Jerusalem.

Fuller, Andrew, perhaps the most eminent and influential of Baptist theologians, was born Feb. 6, 1754, at Wicken, Cambridgeshire, England. His opportunities for education were scanty, and his subsequent attainments and success to a great degree resulted from the activity of mind naturally vigorous working earnestly on no very ample materials. He was baptized in 1770, began preaching in 1774, and in 1775 became pastor of a church in Soham. His doctrinal system at this time was unsettled. The prevailing type of opinion then prevalent was the Baptist and moderate Calvinism, verging to an Antinomian and fatalistic extreme. It was deemed necessary to a consistent orthodoxy for a preacher to avoid offering freely to all men the invitation of the Gospel. Dr. Gill (q. v.) was the standard of doctrinal soundness. Fuller states that Gill and Bigney were authors to whom he was much indebted. He gradually found that they did not agree, and still more was he impressed with the practical difference between the accepted teaching and the New Testament. In 1776 he became acquainted with Mears, Ryland and Sutcliffe, names to be afterwards honorably associated with his in the foreign missionary work. The works of the New England theologians, particularly Edwards and Bellamy, confirmed him in the views to which his mind had been tending. The change in the spirit of his preaching awakened violent opposition. His congregation, however, increased, and the effects of his doctrine confirmed his faith in it. In 1782 he removed to Kettering, which was the scene of his labors to the close of life. Here, in 1784, he gave deliberate expression to his views in the tracts, The Gospel worthy of all Acceptation. In the same year he was associated with Sutcliffe in a meeting for united prayer for the revival of religion and the conversion of the world—the origin of the "Monthly Concert." Out of these counsels grew the missionary movement under the leadership of Carey (q. v.), in which, as secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, Fuller bore a laborious and responsible part. In 1793 he appeared his celebrated treatise, The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems compared. Princeton College in 1795, and Yale in 1805, conferred upon him the degree of D.D., which he moanently declined. He died July 7, 1815. His other works are: The Gospel's own Witness (1800);—4. Dialogues, Essays, and Letters:—5. Exposition of Genesis.—6. The Great Question answered (1806);—7. Structurae de Sonderamannium (1809);—8. Sermones on various Subjects.—9. Exposition of the Revelation.—10. Letters on Communion (1815). His writings are marked by the force of argument, plainness and simplicity of statement, and an ingenuous candor. In reference to his unaffected style, he has been called "the Franklin of theology." Without the opportunity to become a critical student of the Scripture, and with a better biblical theology in many whose scholarship he could not aspire to. For his theological position, see the article CALVINISM.—Works, with Life prefixed, 5 vols. London, 1831; also 1858, imp. 8vo; more complete edition, edited by Belcher, 3 vols. Philadel. (L. E. S.)

Fulcher, Thomas, divine, historian, genius, and wit, was a son of the Rev. T. Fuller, minister of Aldwinkle, in Northamptonshire, at which place he was born in June, 1608. He was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, and removed to Sidney College, of which he became fellow in 1611. In 1623 he was appointed minister of St. Bennet's parish, Cambridge, and acquired great popularity as a pulpit orator. He obtained, in the same year, the prebend of Salisbury, and afterwards the rectory of Broad Windsor, of both of which he was deprived during the Civil War, in consequence of his activity on the side of the Parliament. Between 1640 and 1656 he published nearly the whole of his works. In 1648 he obtained the living of Waltham, in Essex, in which he resided for that of Cranford, in Middlesex. At the Restoration he recovered the prebend of Salisbury, was made D.D. and king's chaplain, and was looking forward to a mitre, when his prospects were closed by death, August 15, 1661. Fuller possessed a remarkably tenacious memory. He had also a large share of wit and quaint humor, which he sometimes allowed to run riot in his writings. Among his chief works are: History of the Holy War (Camb. 1640, 2d edit. fol.):—The Church History of Britain (new edit. edited by Nichols, Lond. 1837, 8 vols. 8vo):—The History of the University of Cambridge (new edit. Lond. 1840, 8 vols. 8vo):—Francis Jennings, of Palay's History of the Old and New Test. (Lond. 1662, fol.). Coleridge says that "Fulcher was incomparably the most sensible, the least prejudiced great man of an age that boasted a galaxy of great men. He is a very voluminous writer, and yet, in all his numerous volumes on so many different subjects, it is scarcely too much to say that you will hardly find a page in which some one sentence out of every three does not deserve to be quoted for itself as a motto or as a maxim." See Russell, Memorials of the Life and Works of Fuller (Lond. 1844, 4 vols. 8vo); Huggins, Fuller's Life and Writings (Edinb. Rec. lxxiv, 326).

Fullerton, Hugh Stewart, a Presbyterian minister, was born near Green castle, Penn., Feb. 6, 1805. Not long after, his parents removed to Orange Co., N. Y., and in 1815 to Fayette Co., Ohio. He studied one year at the Ohio University, and was licensed to preach in 1830. In 1831 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church at Chillicothe, where he labored four years, and then resigned from ill health. In 1837 he removed to Salem, Ohio, where he remained until his death, Aug. 15, 1862.

—Wilson, Presbyterian Hist. Almanac, 1864.

Fulness, a term variously used in Scripture. (1.) "The fulness of time" is the time when the Messiah appeared, which was appointed by God, promised to the fathers, foretold by the prophets, and expected by the Jews themselves, and earnestly longed for by all the faithful: "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son," Gal. iv. 4. (2.) The fulness of Christ is the superabundance of grace with which he was filled: "Of his fulness have we all received," John i, 16. And whereas men are said to be filled with the Holy Ghost, as John the Baptist, Luke 1, 15; and Stephen, Acts vi, 5; this differs from the fulness of Christ in these three respects: (a) Grace in others is by participation, as the moon hath her light from the sun; but the grace of God is an incommunicable fulness in Christ all that perfection and influence which we include in that term is originally, naturally, and of himself. (b) The Spirit is in Christ infinitely and above measure, John iii, 34; but in the saints by measure according to the gift of God, Eph. iv. 16. (c) The saints can only communicate their graces to one another, whereas the gifts of the Spirit are in Christ as a head.
and fountain, to impart them to his members. "We have received of his fulness," John i. 16. (8.) It is said that "the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily," Col. ii. 9; that is, the whole nature and attributes of God are in Christ, and that really, essentially, or substantially; and also personally, by nearest union; as the soul dwells in the body, so that the same person who is man is God also. (4.) The Church is called the fulness of Christ, Eph. i. 23. It is the Church which makes him a complete and perfect head; for, though he has a natural and personal fulness as God, as Mediator he is not full and complete without his mystical body (as a king is not complete without his subjects), but receives an outward, relative, and mystical fulness from his members (Watson, Dictionary, s. v.). (5.) It is probable that the expression fulness of the Godhead, as applied to Christ (Col. i. 19; ii. 9), contains an allusion to the theories of some speculators, who taught that there were "certain distinct beings" (seems as they called them), "who were successive emanations from the Supreme Being himself," to whom they gave the title of the "Fulness." They pretended that one of these had assumed human nature in Jesus Christ, and was afterwards exalted to a place of exaltation above the Church. This pretence was in some respects not inconsistent with the Christian system, and others as comparatively nonessential. See Bengter, Dict. de Theologie, s. v. Fundamentalæ; Felt. Theol. Encyclop. art. 66; Dodd, On Parables, i. 14; Chillingworth, Religion of Protestants, pt. i, ch. iii; Hasting, Works, vol. i; Stillinger, Works, iv. 66. Turrellus, De articulis Fundamentali, 1719. Waterland treats the subject largely in his Discourse on Fundamentals (Works, Oxf. 1685, 6 vols., vol. v. p. 78 sq.). He remarks that when we apply "the epithet fundamental either to religion in general or to Christianity in particular, we are supposed to mean something essential to religion or Christianity, so necessary to its being, or at least, to its well-being, that it could not subsist, or maintain itself, without it." He holds that Scripture indicates this distinction of things more or less weighty: e. g. Paul, with regard to certain ordinances, distinguishes betwixt that to which he attributed something essential to religion, and that which was of less importance. (J. W. M.)

Fundiaries, "persons who are appointed to discharge any office. Thus the clergy are 'functionaries' in the particular church of which they are members, to fulfill an 'office' and administration in the 'name,' in that capacity deriving their station and power from Christ, by virtue of the sanction given by him to Christian communities. Thus the authority of the church comes directly from the superintendence so constituted, in whose name and behalf they act as its representatives, just to that extent to which it has empowered and directed them to act. In conformity with these views, each person about to be ordained as priest in the Church of England is asked whether he thinks he is 'truly called' both 'according to the will of Christ and the order of this Church of England.'"

Fundamentals. A distinction has been drawn, both in the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith.

I. Roman theologians understand by articulis fundamentaliæ those doctrines which every Christian is obliged to know, to believe, and to profess, on pain of damnation; and by articulis non-fundamentaliæ such doctrines as, however much they may be required of the ignorant of, without losing the name of Christian and the hope of salvation, it being taken for granted that he would believe them if made known to him by the Church. Substantially the Roman doctrine is that whatever the Church teaches is true.

II. In the Lutheran Church the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines was introduced by Hinni, and after him was further developed by Quenstedt. See Hinni, De fundamentaliæ disserunt doctrinæ Lutherimæ et Calviniæam (1628). According to this doctrine the Church is given in the Word of God as the seed of truth, etc. The latter theology has abandoned this distinction, so far as its scientific use is concerned. Practically, however, all Christians agree in regarding certain articles of faith as essential to the Christian system, and others as comparatively nonessential. See Bengter, Dict. de Theologie, s. v. Fundamentaliæ; Felt. Theol. Encyclop. art. 66; Dodd, On Parables, i. 14; Chillingworth, Religion of Protestants, pt. i, ch. iii; Hasting, Works, vol. i; Stillinger, Works, iv. 66. Turrellus, De articulis Fundamentalibus, 1719. Waterland treats the subject largely in his Discourse on Fundamentals (Works, Oxf. 1685, 6 vols., vol. v. p. 78 sq.). He remarks that when we apply "the epithet fundamental either to religion in general or to Christianity in particular, we are supposed to mean something essential to religion or Christianity, so necessary to its being, or at least, to its well-being, that it could not subsist, or maintain itself, without it." He holds that Scripture indicates this distinction of things more or less weighty: e. g. Paul, with regard to certain ordinances, distinguishes betwixt that to which he attributed something essential to religion, and that which was of less importance. (J. W. M.)

Functionaries, 'persons who are appointed to discharge any office. Thus the clergy are 'functionaries' in the particular church of which they are members, to fulfill an 'office' and administration in the 'name,' in that capacity deriving their station and power from Christ, by virtue of the sanction given by him to Christian communities. Thus the authority of the church comes directly from the superintendence so constituted, in whose name and behalf they act as its representatives, just to that extent to which it has empowered and directed them to act. In conformity with these views, each person about to be ordained as priest in the Church of England is asked whether he thinks he is 'truly called' both 'according to the will of Christ and the order of this Church of England.'"
modes of circumstances of living, different articles are, and have been, fundamental to different men. This is very plain from the different degrees of knowledge before and since the coming of Christ, for before his coming in the Spirit, truth, and knowledge of the necessity and death of Christ, and of that true nature of his kingdom; whereas he who now does not acknowledge, or perhaps denies, the necessity of Christ's death, is by all means to be considered as in a fundamental error. Therefore, as a man hath received of God greater or less natural abilities, so let the number of articles to which he shall give his assent be greater or smaller; and as revelation hath been made, or information hath been given, to a man more clearly or obscurely, in the same proportion is more or less required of him. Therefore, in our own case, we ought to be cautious of even the smallest errors, and to aim at the highest degree of knowledge in divine truths. In the case of others we ought to judge concerning them with the greatest prudence, mildness, and benevolence. Hence we see that a certain precise number of articles which shall be irremovable and fundamental to every man cannot be determined." (Edward, Works, N. Y. ed., 4 vols., vol. iii, p. 545).

After Cromwell came into power in England in 1668, a committee of divines was appointed by Parliament to draw up a catalogue of "fundamentals" to be presented to the House. "Archbishop Usher was nominated, but he declining, Mr. Baxter was appointed in his room; the rest who acted were Dr. Owen, Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Cheynel, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Reymen, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simpson, Mr. Vines, Mr. Manton, Mr. Jacobs. Mr. Baxter desired to offer the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments alone, as containing the fundamentals of religion; but it was objected that this would include Socinians and papists. Mr. Baxter replied that it was so much fitter for a centre of unity or concord, because it was impossible, in his opinion, to devise a form of words which heretics would not subscribe, when they had perverted them to their own sense. These arguments not prevailing, the following articles were presented to the House, under the title of 'The Principles of Faith, presented by Mr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simpson, Mr. Vines and Mr. Manton, to the Committee of Parliament for Religion, by way of Explanation to the Proposals for propagating the Gospel.' 1. That the Holy Scripture is that rule of knowing God and living unto him, which whoso does not believe cannot be saved. 2. That there is a God, who is the creator, governor, and judge of the world, which is to be received by faith, and every other way of the knowledge of him is insufficient. 3. That this God, who is the creator, is eternally distinct from all creatures in his being and blessedness. 4. That this God is one in three persons or subsistences. 5. That Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and man, without the knowledge of whom there is no salvation. 6. That this Jesus Christ is also true man. 7. That this Jesus Christ is also true man. 8. That this Jesus Christ is God and man in one person. 9. That this Jesus Christ is our Redeemer, who, by paying a ransom and bearing our sins, has made satisfaction for them. 10. That this same Lord Jesus Christ is he that was crucified at Jerusalem, and rose again, and ascended into heaven. 11. That this same Jesus being the only God and man in one person, remains forever a distinct person from all saints and angels, notwithstanding their union and communion with him. 12. That all men by nature are dead in sins and trespasses; and no man can be saved unless he be born again, repent, and believe. 13. That we are justified and saved by grace and faith in Jesus Christ, and not by works. 14. That to continue in any known sin, upon what pretence or principle soever, is damnable. 15. That God is to be worshipped according to his own will; and whatsoever shall forsake and despise all the duties of his worship, cannot be saved. 16. That the soul shall rise; and that there is a day of judgment, wherein all shall appear, some to go into everlasting life, and some into everlasting condemnation. Mr. Baxter (Life, p. 209) says Dr. Owen worded these articles; that Dr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, and Mr. Simpson were his assistants; that Dr. Cheynel was scribe; and that Mr. Marshall, a sober, worthy man, did something; but that the rest were little better than passive. It appears by these articles that these divines intended to exclude not only Deists, Socinians, and papists, but Arians, Antinomians, Quakers, and others" (Neal, History of the Puritans, Harper's ed., i, 131).

Funeral. Burying was (as generally, Cicero, Leg. ii, 22; Pliny, vii, 55) the oldest, as in all antiquity the customary, and among the Israelites the only mode of disposing of corpses (Gen. xxiii, 19; xxxv, 9; xxxvi, 9, 10; Judg. ii, 19, 21; Sam. xxi, 1, etc.; John xi, 17; Matt. xxvii, 60, etc.). So likewise among the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Persians (Lucian, Suet. 21; Curtius, iii, 12, 11 and 13), of which people ruins of necropolis and tombs still remain. Of burning (which among the Greeks was a well-known custom—although in no age altogether prevalent, see Becker, Charicles, ii, 181 sq.), the first trace occurs in 1 Sam. xxxi, 12, and even then as an extraordinary case (ver. 10). The practice has also been inferred from Amos vi, 10, where the term מְאָשָׁר, metasperho', "he that burneth him" (i.e. the nearest relative, who kindled the pyre; compare (Gen. xxxv, 9; xxxvi, 29; Judg. xxi, 31), occurs; but De Rossi, with several MSS., reads (so Hitzig, ad loc., although Rosenmüller, ad loc., otherwise explains) מְאָשָׁר, alluding to the different custom of burning—not the body itself, but—sweet spices at the funeral, as in Chron. xvi, 14; xxi, 19; Jer. xxxix, 5 (comp. Deut. xii, 31), as confirmed by Josephus (War, i, 53, 9; see Geier, De legatis, vi, 2 sq.; Kirchmann, De funeribus, p. 264 sq.; vgl. Censorius, H. a. d. ecle. i, 196 sq.). After the exile the burning of dead bodies was still less an Israelitarian custom, and the Talmud classes it with heathenish practices; hence even Tacitus (Hist. v, 5, 4) mentions burial as an altogether Jewish usage. The same conclusion is confirmed by the fact that combustion of the person is affected by the Mosaic law (Lev. xx, 14; xxii, 9) as a special penalty for certain crimes (see Michaelis who,
however, reaches a false result). De combustionine et humatione mortuorum ap. Hebraeos, in his Synagoga comm. i, 225 sq.). See Gravys. To leave the dead unburied was to the Hebrews a most dreadful thought (1 Kings xii, 22; xiv, 11; xvi, 4; xxii, 24; Jer. vii, 38; viii, 2; ix, 25; xiv, 16; xvi, 4; xxx, 83; Ezek. xxix, 5; Psal. lxxxix, 8), and was regarded by the ancients universally as one of the grossest insults (Sophocles, Ajax, 1166; Herod. viii, 5, 24; iii, 12, 25; Flutarch, Virt. mar. p. 226, ed. Tauchn.; Isocr. Panath. p. 638; see Massgrave, ad Soph. Antiq. 28); hence to inter the remains of the departed was a special work of affection (Tobit ii, 21; li, 8), and was an imperative duty of sons toward their parents (Gen. xxv, 9; xxxv, 29; 1 Macc. ii, 70; Tobit vi, 18; Matt. viii, 21; compare Demosth. Aristoi. p. 496; Val. Max. v, 4, ext. 5; see Kyros, Obscr. i, 65), and next devolved upon relatives and friends (Tobit xiv, 16). If the corpse remained uninhumed, it became a prey to the raving, hungry dogs and ravenous birds (1 Kings xiv, 11; xvi, 4; xxii, 24; Jer. vii, 38; 2 Sam. xxii, 10 [2 Kings ix, 85 sq.]; compare Homer, I. xxii, 41 sq.; Eurip. Herod. 1040). Nevertheless, that fate of the dead among the Israelites, except in consequence of the atrocities of war, since Deut. xxii, 29 (Josephus, War, vi, 27) was held to entitle even criminals to interment (Josephus, War, iv, 5, 2; comp. Matt. xxvii, 55); yet it was otherwise in Egypt (Gen. xli, 139). According to the Talmud (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 499) there were two especial burial-places at Jerusalem for executed persons. See Tomb.

What form or ceremonies of obsequies was observed by the ancient Hebrews is almost altogether unknown, except that in the earlier and simpler age the act of interment was performed by the relations (sons, brothers) with their own hands (Gen. xxxv, 9, xxxvi, 29; Judg. xvi, 31; the later passages, 1 Macc. ii, 70; Tobit xiv, 16, only indicate the attendance of the kindred at the rites; so also Matt. viii, 22). In later times the Jews left this to others, and in Amos v, 16 it is spoken of as something shocking that kinsmen should be obliged to carry the corpse to the grave (this pious care, however, was due from friends, e. g. from pupils towards their teacher, 1 Kings iii, 50; Mark vi, 20). Closing the eyes and giving the last kiss (Thilo, Apocr. i, 44) are mentioned (Gen. xvi, 17; Tobit xiv, 18) as natural expressions of farewell (the Talmud has a prescription concerning them, Shabb. xxiii, 5) from early antiquity (Homer, Il. xi, 452; Odys. xi, 425 sq.; xxvii, 226; Pindar. Hymn. ix, 487; Ovid. Fast. ii, 3, 43; iv, 3, 43 sq.; Val. Max. ii, 6, 5; Pliny, ii, 35; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vii, 22). Immediately after death (the sooner the better) the body was washed (Acts ii, 37), then wrapped in a large cloth (παντοκρατορ, Matt. xxvii, 59; Mark xv, 46; Luke xxiii, 56), or all its limbs wound with bands (ἐκμακρύνεται, see John xiii, 44; compare Chifflet, De lindeis sepulcral. Christi, Antr. 1624, 1668), between the folds of which, in the case of a person of distinction, aromatics were laid or sprinkled (John xix, 39 sq.; compare John xii, 7; the custom of anointing the corpse with spiced unguents was very prevalent amongly, Pliny, xiii, 1; Homer, Odys. xxiv, 45; 1 Eus. Hist. Eccl. vii, 22). Among the most ancient is the practice of giving the deceased a grave without a stone covering (Acts xix, 5; Luke v, 25, 47; Lucian, Lact. 11). See Dougat, Anaal. ii, 64 sq. At public funerals of princes sumptuous shrouds were usual, and there was a prodigious expense of odor (Josephus, Ant. xv, 8, 4; xvii, 8, 3; War, i, 83, 9). The speedy burial customary with the later Jews (Acts v, 6, 10; as a rule on the same day, before sundown) had its origin in the Levitical edictment (Numb. xix, 11 sq.); in earlier times it did not prevail (Gen. xxiii, 2 sq.; comp. Chardin, vi, 485). The removal (ἐκφορά) to the grave was done in a coffin (σάρια, Luke vii, 14; λόφον, Josephus, Ant. xv, 8, 2), which probably was usually open (7 Luke vii, 14; comp. Schulz, Leseimg. iv, 182; but see Josephus, Ant. xv, 1, 2); and on a bier (τρύγος).

Mohammedan Dier, for the Body of a Female or Boy (Lane).

2 Sam. iii, 31; Κλείσα, Josephus, Life, 62; Ant. xvii, 8, 8; of costly materials in the case of royal personages, even adorned with precious stones, Josephus, Ant. xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 8, 3; War, i, 38, 3), borne by men (Luke vii, 14; Acts v, 6, 10), with a retinue of the relatives and friends (2 Sam. iii, 31; Luke vii, 12; the Talmud speaks of funeral processions with horns (Parah, xii, 9; on royal funeral processions, see Josephus, Ant. xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 8, 3; War, i, 38, 3.), in a long train (Josh xxiii, 35), with loud weeping and wailing (2 Sam. iii, 32; compare Baruch vi, 31). Even in the house of grief, before the funeral, lamentation was kept up with accompaniment of mourning pipes (Matt. ix, 23; Mark v, 38; compare Jer. ix, 17; 2 Chron. xxxv, 25; Ovid, Fast. i, 650; see Hilliger, De tribus in Funer. addid. Vitub. 1717; Kirchmann, Fun. Roman. ii, 6); Female mourners, especially (Jer. i, 17), were hired for the purpose (Mishna, Mord Katon, iii, 8), who prolonged the lamentation several days (Wellsted, i, 150; Proskocie, Erinner. i, 98, 102, 130). After the burial a funeral meal was given (2 Sam. iii, 35; Jer. xvi, 5, 7; Hos. ix, 4; Ezek. xxvii, 24; Tobit iv, 18; Epist. Jer. 30; compare Homer, Il. xxiii, 28; xvii, 402; Lucian, Lact. 24; see Geiger, De lectu Eror. ch. vii; Hebenstreit, in the Miscell. Lips. ii, 730 sq.; vi, 83 sq.; Gar mann, in Iken's Theiscer. i, 1048 sq.;) and among the later Jews, in families of distinction, invitations were extended to the honorable as well as to the people, so that these entertainments eventually became scenes
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of luxurious display (Josephus, War, ii, 1, 1). Warriors were buried with their arms (Ezek. xxxii, 27; 1 Macc. xxi, 29; comp. Homer, Odyssey, xi, 74; xii, 18; Virgil, Aen. vii, 239; Dios. Sic. xxiii, 26; Curtius, x, 1, 51; see Tavernier, i. 294), and persons of rank or royalty with jewels and valuables (Josephus, Ant. xv, 8, 4; xvi, 7, 1). In later times, when the belief in the resurrection became generally distinct, a funeral sacrifice was made (2 Macc. xii, 45). See generally Weber, Oberrodt, sacr. circe funera populi orient. (Antent. 1767); Monbroton, Essai sur la litterature des Hébreux (Par. 1819), 111, i. 1, 253 sq.; also Meursius, De funere lib. sing., in his Opp. v. For the funeral customs of the ancient Egyptians, see Wilkinson, chap. x (abridgm.); for those of the modern Egyptians, see Lane, chap. xxviii. See Burial.

Modern Egyptian Funeral Procession (Lane).

Monographs on funerals in general have been written by Fuderic (Cen. 1755), Ingler [in Germ.] (Lube. 1757), Pompe (L. 1659); on burial in general, by Heidgger (Heidel. 1670), Nettelbladt (1729), Lunge (Holm. 1679); on ancient modes of burial, by Gyraldus (Heimat. 1670), Quenstedt (Vitell. 1660), Struick (Vitell. 1660), Cellarius (Heimat. 1683), Flortius (Aboe. 1689); among the Greeks, by Norberg (Opuscula, ii, 507—526); on the right and duty of sepulture, by Brückner (Jena, 1708), Böhmer (Halle, 1717), Burchard (Lips. 1700), Hofmann (Vitell. 1726), Horer (Vitell. 1661), Scheele (Regiom. 1710), Saulmann (Bremer 1737), Schlegel (Lips. 1769); in time of war, by Prisla (Vitell. 1660); in temples, by Allegreantia (Medico. 1779), Plattner (Lips. 1728), Winkler (Lips. 1784), Woken (Vitell. 1752), Lampe (Argent. 1776), Gundling (Obs. select. i, 137 sq.); on sepulchres, by Eckhard (Jena, 1726); on cenotaphs, by Bidermann (Frib. 1756); and cemeteries, by Bachon (Gott. 1725), Berger (Rost. 1689), Böhmer (Hal. 1716, 1726), Fuhrmann [in Germ.] (Hal. 1801), Spondanus (Par. 1638); and their sanctity, by Lederer (Vitell. 1661), Lichtwehr (Vitell. 1747), Niespen (L. B. 1723), Plaz (Lips. 1725), Schöpfcr (Bremer, 1747), Junius (Lips. 1747); on the catacombs, by Cyprian (Heimat. 1699); Fehm (Lips. 1710); on mourning, by Aëminia (Gyph. 1751), Nicolai (Marb. 1739), Geier (Lips. 1666), Kirchmann (Hamb. 1665, Lubeck, 1625), Sopranus (Lond. 1645); on funeral dresses, by Mayer (Hamb. 1665); on the expense of funerals, by Philipp (Lips. 1684); on placing money in the mouth of the corpse, by Seyffert (Lips. 1709); on lamps at the grave, by Ferrari (Patavium, 1764), Schützleich (Vitell. 1710), Willesch (Alt. 1710); and flowers, by Flügge (Hafn. 1704); on funeral feasts, by Janichen [in Germ.] (Lips. 1741), Schmidt (Lips. 1689), Tropanger (Vitell. 1710); on funeral sermons, by Brömel (Jen. 1687); on funeral orations, by Böhmer (Heimat. 1713, 1715), Mayer (Lips. 1670), Rosenberg (Badia. 1689), Senf (Lips. 1680), Wildvogel (Jen. 1701), Witte (1691); and as a Roman custom, by Fortlage (Osnb. 1729); on monuments, by Behnrauer [in Germ.] (Frib. 1755), Herforder (Hafn. 1722), Hottinger (Heidel. 1659); on cuttings for the dead, by Michaelis (F. ad V. 1794); on Christian burial, by Behnrauer (Budia, 1725), Greta (Ingolstadt, 1811), Joch (Jen. 1726), Kiesling (Vitell. 1730), Fransen (Lips. 1718), Larro- quanus (Advers. sacr. L. B. 1688, p. 187 sq.), Panvitus (Lond. 1672, Rom. 1681, Lips. 1717), Rosenberg (Budia, 1650), Samellius (Taurin. 1678), Schützleich (Canastr. 1687), the plague burial of the dead by Carpzov (Dissert. i. 1670 sq.), Semler (Halle, 1706), Zeilrich (Vitell. 1742); on Asa’s funeral, by Müller (Vitell. 1716); on the burial of animals, by Dassen (Vitell. 1607), Lange (Altorf. 1706), Casteaux [at Jer. xxii, 19] (Lips. 1716). See Graves; Cemetery; Dead, etc.

Funeral Discourses, (1) addresses delivered either at the house of mourning or the grave; (2) funeral sermons or panegyrics. I. We see, in Acts viii, 2, that certain ceremonies were observed in the early Church on the occasion of funerals. The apostolical constitution prescribed certain services in cases of Christian burial (bk. viii, cap. 41, 42, Celébretur dies tertius in psalmis, lectio nuncius et praecipua, o eum, qui tertius dies resurrectet; item dies nonus, eter.). But these services did not all take place at the time of the funeral, since the dead were not put to their place for three days in the East before burial. Of addresses delivered at funerals there is no mention made until after Basil, the two Gregorys, and Chrysostom had introduced Greek rhetoric into the Christian Church. The funeral addresses of that age are mostly panegyrics delivered on the persons of distinguished persons, such as martyrs, bishops, princes, etc. In the Middle Ages, funeral services were chiefly masses and prayers for the dead. The Reformation, while abolishing masses for the dead, instituted in its stead the practice of proclaiming the word of God by the side of the open grave. The objects of this practice were stated, as early as 1536, in the Church Discipline of Württemberg, to be (1) a public recognition of the Christian’s hope of resurrection; (2) a public testimony of Christian affection; (3) an earnest memoro mori. Since the introduction of Rationalism, the last has been lost much of their general religious character in Germany, and have become, to a certain extent, panegyrics of the deceased. In other Protestant countries usages vary: sometimes there is simply a liturgical service at the house or at the grave; sometimes simply the reading of the Scripture books and prayers; sometimes an address of consolation or warning is added. This latter is generally the usage of the churches which do not make use of forms of prayer.

11. Funeral Sermons.—These are generally delivered from the pulpit. The forms which they assume are the simple funeral address, inasmuch as instead of being, as the former originally was, a mere exhortation, or, as it afterwards became, a personal panegyric, it is a regular sermon, preached from a text, which, however adapted to the circumstances, reminds the officiating minister, as does also the place from whence it is delivered, that he addresses a congregation, not a mere circle of family or friendship, and that his whole discourse should consequently be more objective than personal. The funeral sermon proper, as contrasted with orations and panegyrics, may be considered as having originated with Protestantism, in the place of the Roman Catholic ceremonial, which was necessarily rejected with the doctrine of purgatory (see Klieforth, liturgische Abhandlungen (vol. i, p. 278 sq.). The earliest Protestant discipline made the principal part of the funeral ceremony the Word of God, either as a simple lesson, or as a regular sermon (see Balische Kirchenordnung, a.D. 1526; Richter, i, 47). “At the following church-service after the burial of the party he shall be remembered and his death announced; his friends shall be comforted by the Word of God, and others reminded to hold themselves in readiness, with strong faith and hope, to obey God’s call at any time and in any way.” The reformatio ecclesiasticarum Hassiae, 1526 (ib. p. 61), says: “Laudandum autem, si in funere habeatur aut incerta prodiectus verbis Dei, aut saltem Justus ipsum brevis admonitum.” In those days liturgy and homiletics were
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not so distinct from each other as they have become
since. In some places texts were prescribed for funeral
sermons, and even sermons were given as models for
similar productions. Luther himself gives two such in
his Hauppostelle. The sermon was gradually made
more like the panegyric. Hunnias says, in the pref-
ace of his twenty-seven funeral sermons: "Men are
no longer simply buried with the customary Christian
ceremonies, but by request of the survivors there are
sermons preached on the Word of God, and testimony
rendered of the life and especially of the end of the
dead, in what faith and hope they ended their life."
Added to these, comparison with similar persons, refer-
ence to other members of the family, etc., furnished
much material for discourses as acceptable to the hear-
er as to the preacher. From the middle of the 16th
century to the beginning of the 18th, funeral sermons
were either mere eulogies, or utterly objective and
speculative discourses. A. H. Francke gave in 1702 a
funeral sermon of 40 pages fol., with a long appendix.
In the Roman Church some of the most brilliant ser-
mons of the 16th and 17th centuries were funeral dis-
courses; e.g. the orationes funebres of Bossuet and oth-
er French orators. In modern Protestant churches
(England and America) funeral sermons are generally
preached in the presence of the dead, or in the dis-
scharge of some person distinguished
ed for piety or position. Still, in some parts of the
United States they are in more frequent use; some-
times they are even preached with regard to the de-
crease of children. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v.
Grabreden. See BURIAL; HOMILETICS.

Furlong (στρατός or στάδιον, a stadium), a Greek
measure of distance, equal to 606 feet 9 inches (Luke
xxiv, 19; John vi, 19; xi, 18; [1 Cor. ix, 24, "race," i.e. a course or list for running]; Rev. xiv, 20; xx, 16).
See Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Stadium.
See MEASURE; STADE.

Furman, Richard, D.D., a leading Baptist minister
in the Southern States, was born at Essexo, N. Y., in
1755. While he was a child, his father removed to
South Carolina. His education was carefully attended-
to by his father, who instructed him in English stud-
ies and in mathematics, and particularly in the Scrip-
tures. He began at the early age of eighteen to preach
in destitute places, and soon gained a wide influence.
Many churches were formed by his agency. During
the Revolutionary War he was an ardent supporter of
the cause of Independence, and his eloquence and pa-
triotsm attracted the attention of Patrick Henry and
other leading statesmen. In 1787 he became pastor
of a church in Charleston. He sat in the Convention
for ratifying the Constitution of the United States.
He received the degree of D.D. from Brown University
in 1801. He was elected in 1814 the first president of
the Baptist General Convention for missionary pur-
poses. He died Aug., 1825. He was a solemn and impres-
sive preacher, an able presiding officer in deliberative
assemblies, and in every relation an object of reverence
and affection. He published, 1. Rewards of Grace, a
Sermon on the Death of Rev. Oliver Hart (1792)—2.
An Oration at the Charleston Hospital (1796)—3. Ser-
mon Commemorative of General Washington (1800)—4.
A Sermon on the Death of the Rev. Edmund Botsford—
Sprague, Amusa, vii, 101. (L. E. S.)

Furnace is the rendering in the Eng. Vers. of the
following words. See BURNING.

1. ꜃SNS, oltus (a Chald. term, of uncertain, prob-
ably foreign derivation; Sept. σταθερον), a large furnace,
with a wide opening at the top to cast in the materials
(Dan. iii, 22, 23), and a door at the ground by which
the metal might be extracted (ver. 26). It was prob-
able built like the Roman kiln for burning pottery-ware
(Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Fornax). The Per-
sians were in the habit of using the furnace as a means
of inflicting capital punishment (Dan. iii.; comp. Jer.
xxix, 22; 2 Macc. vii, 6; Hos. v, 7; see Hoffmann, De
flamma fumei Babylonici, 1668). A parallel case
is mentioned by Chardin (Voyage en Perse, ii, 276), two
lovers having been kept ready heated for a whole
month to throw in any bakers who took advantage of
the death. See PUNISHMENT.

2. ꜃S=g, ūškan (so called from subhājan the stone
or ore), a smelting or calcining furnace (Gen. xix, 28),
perhaps also a brick-kiln (Exod. ix, 8, 10; xix, 18),
but especially a lime-kiln, the use of which was evi-
dently well known to the Hebrews (Isa. xxxiii, 12; Amos
i, 1). See BRICK; LIME.

3. ꜃S=g, kūr (so called from its bulling up), a refining
furnace (Prov. xvii, 3; xxvii, 21; Ezek. xxii, 18 sq.),
metaphorically applied to a state of trial (Deut. iv, 20;
1 Kings viii, 51; Isa. xlvi, 10; Jer. xi, 4). The form
of it was probably similar to the one used in Egypt
(Whiston, E.G. ii, 187, abridg.). The Jeweller
appears to have had a little portable furnace and blow-
pipe, which he carried about with him, as is still
the case in India. See METALLURGY.

xxix, 22; 2 Macc. vii, 6; Hos. v, 7; see Hoffmann, De
flamma fumei Babylonici, 1668). A parallel case
is mentioned by Chardin (Voyage en Perse, ii, 276), two
lovers having been kept ready heated for a whole
month to throw in any bakers who took advantage of
the death. See PUNISHMENT.

2. ꜃S=g, ūškan (so called from subhājan the stone
or ore), a smelting or calcining furnace (Gen. xix, 28),
perhaps also a brick-kiln (Exod. ix, 8, 10; xix, 18),
but especially a lime-kiln, the use of which was evi-
dently well known to the Hebrews (Isa. xxxiii, 12; Amos
i, 1). See BRICK; LIME.

3. ꜃S=g, kūr (so called from its bulling up), a refining
furnace (Prov. xvii, 3; xxvii, 21; Ezek. xxii, 18 sq.),
metaphorically applied to a state of trial (Deut. iv, 20;
1 Kings viii, 51; Isa. xlvi, 10; Jer. xi, 4). The form
of it was probably similar to the one used in Egypt
(Whiston, E.G. ii, 187, abridg.). The Jeweller
appears to have had a little portable furnace and blow-
pipe, which he carried about with him, as is still
the case in India. See METALLURGY.
making them cramp-irons: a specimen of these may be seen in the British Museum. In modern Palestine the plan is to fix nails or pins of wood in the walls, while they are still soft, in order to suspend such domestic articles as are required; since, consisting altogether of clay, they are too frail to admit of the operation of the hammer. To this custom there is an allusion in Ezek. xix, 10. 

On these, seven and chairs of state, or thrones with footstools (Exod. xxvii, 26, 27; Deut. xxiv, 12). The opulent had (as those in the East still have) fine carpets, couches, or divans and sofas, on which they sat, lay, and slept (2 Sam. xviii, 2; 2 Kings iv, 10). They have also a great variety of pillows and bolster, with which they surround themselves when they wish to take their ease, and there is an allusion to these in Ezek. xiii, 18. In later times these couches were splendid, and the frames inlaid with ivory (Amos vi, 4), which is plentiful in the East; they were also richly carved and perfumed (Prov. vii, 16, 17; 1 Kings vii, 17). On these sofas and chairs of state, in the later ages of the Jewish state, for before the time of Moses it appears to have been the custom to sit at table (Gen. xiii, 38), they universally reclined when taking their meals (Amos vi, 4; Luke vii, 36-38). See ACCOMMODATION.

FURNACE, an oven used by the Persian sovereigns and the palaces of the Eastern monarchs, embroidered with needle-work, and ample draperies were suspended over the openings in the sides of the apartments, for the twofold purpose of affording air, and of shielding them from the sun. Of this description were the costly hangings of the Persian sovereigns mentioned in Ezek. i, 6, which passage is confirmed by the statements of Quintus Curtius relating to their superb palace at Persepolis. See EMBROIDERY. In the more ancient periods other articles of necessary furniture were both few and simple. Among these were a hand-mill, a kneading-trough, and an oven. See BREAD. Besides kneading-troughs and ovens they must have had various kinds of earthen-ware vessels, especially pots to hold water for their several ablutions. In later times baskets formed an indispensable article of furniture to the Jews. See BASKET. The most ornate of these were the so-called "bazaar," which probably lay in that vicinity (Josephus, War i, 1, 1), as similar shrines still do (Barclay, City of the Great King, p. 484). See JERUSALEM.

FURNEOX, PHILIP, D.D., an English Nonconformist minister, was born at Totnes in 1726, and died in 1783. He was first an assistant to a dissenting congregation in Southwark, then lecturer at Salters' Hall, and in 1758 succeeded Moses Lowman (q.v.) at Clapham, in Surrey, where he remained twenty-three years. He died at the last six years of his life he was totally deranged. He published Sermons (1758-69), and Letters to Justice Blackstone on his Exposition of the Act of Toleration (1783, 8vo), which, it is said, induced that learned commentator to change some of his positions in the subsequent editions of his work. — Rose, New Gen. Br. Dict., vii, 492; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, s. v. (J. W. M.)

Furniture is the rendering in the Auth. Ver. in one passage of καρ, καρ, a camel's litter or canopied saddle, in which females are accustomed to travel in the East, Gen. xxxi, 34, elsewhere a lamb, etc.; also in a few passages of ἄλθεσις, κηθόν, a general term for vessels, utensils, or implements of any sort. The manufacture of all kinds of furniture is represented on the Egyptian monuments with great minuteness. The recent excavations among the Assyrian mounds have also disclosed a high degree of refinement among the people of that age. See Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt., Rossellini's Illustra., and Layard and Botta's works on ancient Nineveh and Babylon; also the various articles of household furniture in their alphabetical order. See CARPENTRY.

It appears that the furniture of Oriental dwellings, in the earliest ages, was generally very simple; that of the poorer classes consisted of but few articles, and those such only as were absolutely necessary. See HOUSE. The interior of the more common and useful apartments was furnished with sets of large nails with square heads, like dice, and bent at the head, so as to
rows likewise thereof complain," observes that similar proverbs are common among the Hindus. See Agriculture.

In Hose xi, 10, the text has יִשְׁרִי, i.e. יִשְׁרִי, their [seer] eyes, which the A. V. seems to have pointed יִשְׁרִי, and even thus it will hardly bear their rendering, "these [two] furies" (as if from צָאִיר, to ill, the same root as in the second Heb. word above); but the margin, with all the versions (Davidson's Hebrew Text, p. 120), has יִשְׁרִי, their [two] liquities, referring to the golden calves at Dan and Bethel (Henderson, Comment. ad loc.). See CALF, GOLDEN.

Furitor, a missionary and abbot in the British Isles, and the founder of the convent of Lagny, near Paris, was born in Ireland, where he founded also a convent, to which he gave very strict rules. He then went to West Anglia, and erected the abbey of Knobbersburg, which he afterwards resigned to his brother Follian, in order to withdraw into solitude. During the persecution of the Christians by Penda, king of the Mercians, he fled to France, where, under the protection of Chlodwig II, he founded the convent of Lagny. He is supposed to have died in 650-654. He had obtained particular consideration by his visions, in which he pretended to see and hear angels; they are related in Bollandus, vita S. Furiei ad 16 Jan. See Maubillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. B. I. ad 6, 469; Annual. Mag. Bolland. I. general, p. 731; Bela, Hist. gent. Angl. ecc., ii, 19-23; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 629.

Fury (וניה, charon), both signifying intense anger) is attributed to God like anger, metaphorically, or speaking after the manner of men, that is, God's providential actions are such as would be performed by a man in a state of anger; so that when he is said to pour out his fury on a person or on a people, it is a figurative expression for dispensing affirmative judgments (Lev. xxvi, 28; Job xx, 23; Isa. xlix, 8; Jer. iv, 4; Ezek. v, 13; Dan. ix, 18; Zech. viii, 2, et c.). See Anthropomorphism.

Future Life. See Eternal Life; Immortality; Intermediate State.

Future Punishment. See Punishment.

Fynse, Faschier de, was born Jan. 31, 1588, at Leyden. He was inducted into the ministerial office somewhat irregularly. His first charge was that of Jaarmeld. He was zealously attached to the cause of the Reformation. In consequence of his refusal to subscribe the Canons ofthe Synod of Dort, he was suspended from the ministry. This did not deter him from avowing his intention to exercise his gift as the opportunity should be afforded him. Refusing to subscribe the act, which imposed silence upon him, he was sentenced to be banished. Notwithstanding this sentence, he still persisted in preaching from place to place, and was successful in evading his persecutors. After enduring many hardships and privations in his itinerant ministry, he was in 1658 settled over a church in Haarlem. Here he was at first permitted to exercise his ministry without further annoyance. He labored here till his death, which took place in 1661. He was a man of natural shrewdness, of great impartiality, and full of zeal as a minister of the Gospel. The asperity of his language towards his opponents finds an apology in the treatment he received at their hands. His account of the Rijnburgeren is regarded as valuable, being the testimony of one personally acquainted with the facts. It is entitled Kort en waarschijnlijk verhaal van het eerste begin en opkomsten van de nieuwe secte der profeten van Rijnburgeren. See Brandt's Historie der Reformatie, etc., i, iv 4, Deelen, on verschiedene plaatsen; De Remonstrantsche Broederschap, etc., door J. Tideman, Phil. Theor. Mag. Lit. Hum. Dr., Predikant te Rotterdam, 1847; Glaser, Godegesch Nederlant, blz. 479 en verv. (J. P. W.)

Gaab, Johann Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Göppingen, in Württemberg, Oct. 10, 1761. In 1792 he became professor extraordinary, in 1798 professor ordinarius of philosophy at Tübingen; in 1814, librarian of the university; in 1822, general superintendent, in which office he remained till his death, March 2, 1832. He was a voluminous writer, chiefly in Biblical literature. Among his works are Observations ad histioriam Judaicam (Tub., 1787, 8vo); — Beitraege z. Erkliirung des 1, 2, 3. Buchen Mose (Tub., 1778, 8vo); — Das Buch Izaak (Tub., 1809, 8vo); — Erklirung schweber Stelien Jeremiaus (Tub., 1824, 8vo); — Handbuch zum philologischen Verzeichnir der Apocryphen Schriften des A. T. (1816-18, 5 parts); — Doogmengeschichte der all, griesch. Kirche (Jena, 1790, 8vo); — Programma de Judeo Marmoreo (Tub. 1815). — Migne, Bibl. Christ., n. v.

G'aal (Heb. id. גאל, looting; Sept. Γαλα, Josephus Παραγον), son of Ebed (Judg. ii, 26 sq.). He went to Shechem with his brothers when the inhabitants became discontented with Abimelech, and so engaged their confidence that they placed him at their head. He does not seem to have been a native of Shechem, nor specially interested in the revolution, but rather one of a class of condottieri, who at such a period of anarchy would be willing to sell their services to the highest bidder (compare Josephus, Ant. v, 7, 3 and 4). At the festival at which the Shechemites offered the first-fruits of their vintage in the temple of Baal, Gaal, by apparently drunken bravery, roused the valor of the people, and strove with them to avenge the absent Abimelech. It would seem as if the natives had been in some way intimately connected with, or descended from, the original inhabitants for Gaal endeavored to awaken their attachment to the ancient family of Hamor, the father of Shechem, which ruled the place in the time of Abraham (Gen. xxiv, 6, 6), and which seems to have been at this time represented by Gaal and his brothers. This appeal to ancient Israelitish traditions (Judg. ix, 28), together with the re-establishment of idolatry at Shechem, shows that the movement in which he took part was a reactionary one, and proceeded upon the principle of a combination of the aborigines with the idolatrous Israelites against the Shechemites. See Brann's Gesta Historiae de Israelitimonialibus, etc., i, iv 4, Deelen, on verschiedene plaatsen; — De Remonstrantsche Broederschap, etc., door J. Tideman, Phil. Theor. Mag. Lit. Hum. Dr., Predikant te Rotterdam, 1847; Glaser, Godegesch Nederlant, blz. 479 en verv. (J. P. W.)

For Gaal endeavored to awaken their attachment to the ancient family of Hamor, the father of Shechem, which ruled the place in the time of Abraham (Gen. xxiv, 6, 6), and which seems to have been at this time represented by Gaal and his brothers. This appeal to ancient Israelitish traditions (Judg. ix, 28), together with the re-establishment of idolatry at Shechem, shows that the movement in which he took part was a reactionary one, and proceeded upon the principle of a combination of the aborigines with the idolatrous Israelites against the Shechemites. See Brann's Gesta Historiae de Israelitimonialibus, etc., i, iv 4, Deelen, on verschiedene plaatsen; — De Remonstrantsche Broederschap, etc., door J. Tideman, Phil. Theor. Mag. Lit. Hum. Dr., Predikant te Rotterdam, 1847; Glaser, Godegesch Nederlant, blz. 479 en verv. (J. P. W.)
on the north side of which Joshua was buried (Josh. xxiv, 30; Sept. Παλαιον; Judg. ii, 9). Hence "the brooks of Gaash," i.e. the valleys or watercourses (משנה, וַאָדוֹ, Sept. נָאָרָה או נָאָרָה) around the mountain, which were the native place of Hildai or Hural, one of David's warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 30). The modern name seems to have been preserved by the inhabitants of the village which lay near the site of Joshua's tomb, and which was visited by Edward Robinson (Leter Bib. Res. p. 96 sq.).

Gabbatha (גָּבַבָּתָה), one of the summits of king Xerxes, the residence of whose plots by which the Mount of Olives led to their execution (Esth. xii. 1, Apoc.), evidently the Bighorn (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Esth. ii. 21).

Gabatha (גָּבַבָּתָה), a village ( afterEach) mentioned only by Eusebius and Jerome (Joseph. s. v. Γαβαθάι, Σαβαθι) as lying on the eastern part of the great plain Daroma (Ερασιδείον), near Diosmarea; a position compatible with that of the modern village Jebouth, north of the Kishon (Ritter, Erdk. xvi. 748), but not visited by Robinson (Researches, iii. 201). Euseb. and Jerome elsewhere (Θ. s. v. Γαβαθάι, Σαβαθι) mention a place of the same name as being twelve miles from Eleutheropolis, and containing the tomb of the prophet Hahakuk (a statement which Reland, Palest. p. 772, reconciles with their location of the same prophet's tomb at Keilah); but this seems to have been the Benjamite Gibeah (q. v.). For the Gabatha (Γαβάθα) of Joseph (Ant. xiii. 1, 4; comp. Reland, Palest. p. 772), see the Nadabatha (Νάδαβα) of the Acts (Acts xxv. 11). See also Gabaa.

Gabba (גָּבַבָּתָה), a chief of the tribe of Benjamin, who settled in Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. xi. 8). B.C. ante 536.

Gabathath (גָּבַבָּתָה, in some MSS. גָּבַבָּתָה), occurs John xix, 13, where the evangelist states that Pontius Pilate, alarmed at last in his attempts to save Jesus by the artful insinuation of the Jews, "If thou let this man go thou art not Caesar's friend," went into the praetorium again, and brought Jesus cut to them, and sat down once more upon the βηθύμ, or tribunal, in a place called Αἰθίστροφον, but in the Heb. Gabatha. The Greek word, signifying literally stoned, is an adjective, and is generally used as such by the Greek writers; but they also sometimes use it substantively for a stone pavement, when ἡβαστος may be understood. In the Sept. it answers to גֶּבָּתָו (2 Chron. vi. 1: 3: Esth. i. 6). Jerome reads, "Sedit pro tribunali in loco qui dicitur Lithostrotos." The Greek word, as well as the Latin, is frequently used to denote a pavement formed of ornamental stones of various colors, commonly called a tessellated or mosaic pavement. The partiality of the Romans for this kind of pavement is well known. It is stated by Pliny (Hist. Nat. xxxvi. 64) that, after the time of Sylla, the Romans decorated their houses with such pavements. They also introduced them into the provinces. Suetonius relates (Cæsar, 46) that Julius Caesar, in his military expeditions, took with him the materials of tessellated pavements, ready prepared, that wherever he encamped they might be laid down in the praetorium (Casabon, ad Sext. p. 58, etc., edition 1603). From these facts it has been inferred by many eminent writers that the word of the text should be rendered a tessellated or mosaic pavement, but this is not generally admitted. Some, indeed, have supposed that the text at this point is the result of a scribal error, and that the word of the text is the result of a scribal error, and that the word of the text is "outside" the praetorium; for Pilate is said to have "come out" to the Jews, who, for ceremonial reasons, did not go into it, on this as well as on other occasions (John xviii, 28, 29, 88; xix, 4, 15). Besides, the Roman governors, although they tried to serve the comfort of the people (Acts xxv. 12) within the praetorium, always pronounced sentence in the open air. May not then, this tessellated pavement, on which the tribunal was now placed, have been laid in on some part of the terrace.
etc., running along one side of the praetorium, and overlooking the area where the Jews were assembled, or upon a landing-place of the stairs, immediately before the grand entrance?

It has been conjectured that the pavement in question was no other than the one referred to in 2 Chron. vii, 3, and by Josephus (War, vi, 1, 9), as in the outer court of the temple, though it is not stated that Pilate sometimes sat upon his tribunal in different places, as in fact, in the open market-place (War, ii, 9, 3), yet the supposition that he would on this occasion, when the Jews were pressing for a speedy judgment, and when he was overawed with the crowd, and considering the whispers, the crying, and the clamoring of rulers of every grade, as well as the populace, to any other place, is very unlikely; and the supposition that such place was any part of the temple is encumbered with additional difficulties. It is suggested by Lightfoot (Exerc. on John, ad loc.) that the word is derived from 25, a surface, in which case Gabatha would be a mere translation of Aigion. There was a room in the temple in which the Sanhedrim sat, and which was called the place because it was paved with smooth and square flags; and Lightfoot conjectures that Pilate may have on this occasion have delivered his judgment in that room. But this is not consistent with the practice of John, who in other instances gives the Hebrew name, as properly belonging to the place, not as a mere translation of a Greek one (compare John xix, 17). Besides, Pilate evidently spoke from the bema—the regular seat of justice—and this, in an important place like Jerusalem, would be in a fixed spot. Nor in any case could the praetorium, a Roman residence with the various ornamental embellishments, have been within the temple. Yet it may be said that the names  and  are synonymous; and if the word Gabatha be derived, as is usual, from  , "to be high or elevated," it may refer chiefly to the terrace, or uppermost landing of the stairs, etc., which might have been inlaid with a tessellated pavement. Schleusner understands an elevated mosaic pavement, on which the  was placed, before the praetorium. The most natural inference from John's statement is that the word Gabatha is "Hebrew:" but it has been contended that the writers of the New Testament used this word by way of accommodation to denote the language of the Jews, or Syro-Chaldaic, (as it is said) which was commonly spoken in Judaea in their time, and that when John says  he means in the Syro-Chaldaic, but into the extensive controversy respecting the vernacular language of the Jews at Jerusalem in the time of our Saviour, this is not the place to enter. It may suffice for the present purpose to remark that the ancient Syriac version, instead of Gabatha, reads  .

Gab'ees (Ga/ba/ja; Vulg. Coeba), a man whose descendants (or rather a place whose natives) returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. v. 20); evidently the Gaba (v. q.) of the Heb. text (Ezra ii, 28).

Gab'bi (Ga/bji), a considerable place  mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Ga/bi,a,b,Gab enlist); Gabalton) as lying 16 miles from Carmel, in the range of the plain of Esdraelon; thought by Robinson to be the modern Jeba (i.e. Gilba), a large village on the slope of the range of hills N. of Nahal, containing an ancient town (Researches, iii, 151). It can hardly have been of sufficient importance to be commemorated by the coins found with the inscription of the Gabians (Gabian, Ireland, Paton, p. 799).

Gab'nius (Ga/bnius), Aulus, of un-
Gabriel, Heb. Gamaliel, champion of God; Sept. and N. T. Gamael, a word which is not in itself distinctive, but merely a description of the angelic office, used as a proper name or title to designate the heavenly messenger who was sent to Daniel to explain the vision of the ram and the he-goat (Dan. vii), and to communicate the prediction of the Seventy Weeks (Dan. ix, 21-27). Under the new dispensation he was employed to announce the birth of John the Baptist to his father Zechariah (Luke i, 13), and that of the Messiah to the Virgin Mary (Luke i, 26). See ANNUCLEATION. (It is also added in the Targum, as a gloss on some other passages of the O. T.). In the ordinary traditions, Jewish and Christian, Gabriel is spoken of as one of the archangels (q. v.). In Scripture he is set forth only as the representative of the angelic nature, not in its dignity or power of contending against the powers of darkness (Revelations xii), but in its manifestation of comfort and sympathy to man. His prominent character, therefore, is that of a "follower-servant" of the saints on earth; and there is a corresponding simplicity, and absence of all terror and mystery, in his communications to men; his own words, "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God" (Luke i, 19), are rather in favor of the notion of his superior dignity. See Angel.

In the Book of Enoch, "the four great archangels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Uriel, are described as representing the corrupt state of mankind to the Creator, and as having rescued several fallen angels. To Gabriel he says, "Go, Gabriel, against the giants, the sanguineous ones, the sons of fornication, and destroy the sons of the watchers from among the sons of men" (Greek Fragment of the Book of Enoch, preserved by Syriac and Arabic manuscripts, in Hebrew literature (Paris, 1616, 4to).—Hefner, Nouv. Biog. Gén., xii, 106.

Gabriel, St., Congregation of the name of two monastic congregations in the Roman Catholic Church. 1. The first Congregation of St. Gabriel was established at Bologna by Cesar Bianchetti, a senator of Bologna, who was born May 8, 1585, and after the death of his wife in 1608, devoted himself with great zeal to giving religious instruction to the youth and the ignorant. In order to obtain aid in his work he established a congregation of lay gentlemen, who, without living in common, pledged themselves to promote the cause of Christian instruction, and assembled on certain days for devotional exercises and for deliberation on their work. Subsequently a second congregation was organized of such laymen as preferred to live in common, and to devote their whole lives to the cause. The latter were called Convintici, the former Convini. The founder died in 1655. The congregation does not appear to have spread beyond Bologna. Members can be received from the eighteenth to the fiftieth year of age. The novitate lasts three years, after which the novices may be received into the congregation by a two-thirds vote. They have to wait three years more before they have the right to vote. They are elected annually. See Delprat, "Vita del Venerab. Servo di Dio Cesare Bianchetti" (Bologna, 1704). Helyot, Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieux, s. v. 2. Another "Congregation of the Brothers of St. Gabriel" has been established in the present century by Abbé Deshayes in France. The object of the congregation is to instruct the children, especially those of the country, in the Christian doctrine. Abbé Deshayes at first extended his congregation to several places, with Abbé Jean Marie Robert de Lamennais (q. v.), but subsequently they separated, Lamennais organizing the congregation of the "Brothers of the Christian Instruction" (q. v.). The congregation of which Deshayes

Gabriel de Chicon, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born towards the beginning of the 17th century. He became a Capuchin, and was sent as missionary to Persia about 1640. He settled at Isphah, in the heart of the Oriental languages, which enabled him to make a great number of proselytes. The favor he enjoyed at the court of Shah Abbas II excited the envy of the Armenian priests, who caused him great annoyance. Gabriel withdrew about 1660 to Tabriz (Taurus or Tehran, the capital of the province of Azerbaijan, in North Persia), where he founded a convent of Capuchins, and established missions in Kurdistan and at Tiflis. About 1670 he went on a mission to Malabar, where he died (at Tellicherry) June 27, 1670. He wrote observations on the countries he had resided in, which were afterwards published by Moréri, with a life of Gabriel, under the title Relations nouvelles du Levant, ou traité de la religion, du gouvernement, et des coutumes des Perses, des Arméniens et des Gueures (Lyons, 1671, 12mo). They contain some curious details on Persian customs and manners, but the greater part of the work is taken up with details concerning religious questions, Gabriel's order, and himself. See Niceron, Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire des hommes illustres, xxvii, 811; Hefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xix, 109.

Gabriel Sionita, a learned Maronite, was born at Eddin, on Mount Libanus, 1574. He came to Rome when seven years old, and studied at the Maronite College there. He was made professor of Oriental languages at Rome. In 1614 he accompanied the French ambassador (at Rome) to Paris, and was made professor of Arabic at the College of France. In 1620 he became doctor of theology. In 1630 he began to work on Le Jee's Polyglot Bible, for which he furnished the Syriac and Arabic versions. He died at Paris in 1648. Of his writings, we name Liber Psalmorum ex Arab. in Lat. translatus (Rome, 1614, 4to);—pm (see Grammaticum, in libera divina (Paris, 1616, 4to).—Hefner, Nouv. Biog. Gén., xii, 106.

Brother of St. Gabriel.
remained the superior assumed in 1835 the name of "Congregation of Brothers of St. Gabriel," after the patron saint of the founder. Abbé Deshayes died in 1841. In 1858 the congregations had 73 establishments and about 400 members. Every fifth year the congregation elects a superior general, who may be re-elected after the lapse of that term. The head establishment of the congregation is at St. Laurent de Sèvre. See Migeon, Dict. des Ordres Relig. vol. iv, s. v.

GABRIELITES. See Anabaptists.

Gaches, Raymond, a French Protestant divine, was born at Castres towards 1615. In 1649 he was appointed a native of his native city, and he soon became distinguished as a preacher. In 1654 he was called to Paris to supply the Protestant church of Charenton. He died at Paris in December, 1658. During his sojourn at Castres he contributed to the formation of an academy, which did not last long, but counted among its members many distinguished men. He published a number of separate sermons, sixteen of which have been collected under the title Œuvres, 4°. See Hug, La France Protestante, s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Œuv. Gen. xviii. 390; Vinet, Histoire de la Préfiguration (Paris, 1659, 8vo, § 7, p. 296–302).

Gad (Heb. גד, „fortune, Gen. xxx, 11, although another signification is allied to Gen. xxl, 19; Sept. and N.T. Τιτάν, the name of two men, and of the descendants of one of them; also of a heathen deity and of a plant. See also Baal-Gad; Migdal-Gad.

3. (Josephus Ιωάννης). Jacob's seventh son, the first-born of Zilpah, Leah's maid, and whole-brother to Asher (Gen. xxvii, 11–13; xlvii, 16), born autumn B.C. 1915. The following is a copious account of him and his posterity. See Jacob.

1. As to the name, there are several interpretations: (a) The passage in which the bestowal of the name of Gad is preserved—like the others, an exclamation on his birth—is more than usually obscure: "And Leah said, 'In fortune (be-gad, גָּד), and she called his name Gad'" (Gen. xxx, 11). Such is supposed to be the meaning of the old text of the passage (the Kethib); so it stood at the time of the Sept., which renders the key-word by ν χαίρεται, in which it is followed by Jerome in the Vulg. : Palmer. In his Quaest. in Genesis, Jerome has drifoura. ; Josephus (Ant. i, 18, 9) gives it still another different form—vayangados: fortuitous. But in the marginal emendations of the Masoretes (the Keri) the word is given ḡ ḡ, "Gad has come." This construction is adopted by the ancient versions of Onkelos, Aquila, (ξυρά χαίρετα), and Symmachus (ξυρά Τιτάν). (b) In the blessing of Jacob, however, we find the name played upon in a different manner: "Gad" is here taken as meaning a pastoral or troop (the term constantly used for which is g-dud, גַּדְדָּא), and the al- lusion—the turns of which is it impossible adequately to convey in English—would seem to lie to the irregular life of predatory war which should be pursued by the settlement on the borders of the Promised Land. "Gad, a pastoral troop (g-dud), shall plunder him (ye-gad-en-su), but he will plunder (ya-gad) [at the heel]" (Gen. xlix, 19). Jerome (De Benedict. Jacob) interprets this of the revenge taken by the warriors of the tribe on their return from the conquest of Western Palestine for the incursions of the desert tribes during their absence. (c) The force here lent to the name has been by some partially transferred to the narrative of Gen. xxx, e. g. the Samaritan version, the Veneto-Greek, and our own A.V. (uniting this with the preceding)—"a troop (of children) cometh." But if this be the explanation, it is not so clearly the word g-dud—by which it is here sought to interpret the g-dad of Gen. xxx, 11—possessed its own special signification of turbulence and fierceness, which makes it hardly applicable to children in the sense of a number or crowd, the image suggested by the A.V. Exactly as the turns of Jacob's language apply to the characteristics of the tribe, it does not appear that there is any connection between his allusions and those in the exclamation of Leah. The key to the latter is probably lost. To suppose that Leah was inspired by some ancient divinity, the god Fortune, who is conjectured to be once alluded to—and once only—in the latter part of the book of Isaiah, under the title of Gad (Isa. lxi, 11; A.V. "that troop;" Gesenius, "dem Glück"), is surely a poor explanation.

2. Of the childhood and life of the individual Gad nothing is preserved. At the time of the descent into Egypt seven sons are ascribed to him, remarkable from the fact that a majority of their names have plural terminations, as if those of families rather than persons (Gen. xlvii, 16). The list, with a slight variation, is again given on the occasion of the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num. xxvi, 15–18). See Arad; Ezor; Öeni.

Tribe of Gad. The position of Gad during the march on the march and was the territory of the tabernacle (Num. i, 14). The leader of the tribe at the time of the start from Sinai was Elissaph, son of Reuel or Deuel (ii, 14; x, 20). Gad is regularly named in the various enumerations of the tribes through the wanderings—at the dispatching of the spies (xili, 13), in the division in the plains of Moab (xxvi, 18), —but the only inference we can draw is an indication of a commencing alliance with the tribe which was subsequently to be his next neighbor. He has left the more closely-related tribe of Asher to take up his position next to Reuben. These two tribes also preserve a near equality in their numbers, not suffering from the fluctuations which were endured by the others. At the first census Gad had 45,650, and Reuben 46,500; at the last Gad had 40,650, and Reuben 43,350. This alliance was doubtless induced by the similarity of their pursuits. Of all the sons of Jacob, these two tribes were the first to return to the land which their forefathers had left five hundred years before with their occupations unchanged. "The trade of thy slaves hath been about cattle from our youth even till now"—"we are shepherds, both we and our fathers" (Gen. xlvii, 34; xlvii, 4) —such was the account which the patriarchs gave of themselves to Pharaoh. The civilization and the persecutions of Egypt had worked a change in the habits of most of the tribes, but Reuben and Gad remained faithful to the pastoral pursuits of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and at the halt on the east of Jordan we find them marching forward to Moses with a sentiment that they "have cattle"—"a great multitude of cattle," and the land where they now are is a "place for cattle." What should they do in the close precincts of the country west of Jordan with all their flocks and herds? Wherethrough let this land, they pray, be given them for a possession, and let them not be overthrown over Jordan (Num. xxxii, 1–5). They did not, however, attempt to evade taking their proper share of the difficulties of subduing the land of Canaan, and after that task had been effected, and the appoin- tment of Shechem (Gilgal) as the nigher place of assembly, "at the doorway of the tabernacle of the congregation in Shiloh, before Jehovah," they were dismissed by Joshua "to their tents," to their "wives, their little ones, and their cattle," which they had left behind their in Gilgal. To their tents went—they to the danger and to the To the danger and to the danger and to the danger and to the danger. The tribe of Joseph had elected to remain, and in which—a few partial glimpses excepted—the later history allows them to remain hidden from view.

The country allotted to Gad appears, speaking roughly, to lie in the middle of the territory of the land east of Jordan. The south of that district—from the Arnon (wady Mojel), about half way down the Dead Sea, to Heshbon, nearly due east of Jerusalem—
was occupied by Reuben, and at or about Hasbon the possessions of Gad commenced. They embraced half Gilead, as the oldest record specially states (Deut. iii, 12), or half the land of the children of Ammon (Josh. xiii, 25), probably the mountaneous district which is intersected by the torrent Jabbock—if the wady Zarka be the Jabbock—including as its most northern town the ancient sanctuary of Mahanaim. On the east the furthest landmark given is "Aser, that faces Rabab," the present Amman (Josh. xiii, 27). The Arabian desert thus appears to have been the eastern boundary. West was the Jordan (Josh. xiii, 27). The northern boundary is somewhat more difficult to define. Gad possessed the whole Jordan valley as far as the Sea of Galilee (xiii, 27), but among the mountains eastward the territory extended no farther north than the river Jabbock. The border seems to have run diagonally from that point across the mountains by Mahanaim to the southern extremity of the Sea of Galilee (Josh. xii, 1-6; xiii, 26, 30, 31; Deut. iii, 12, 13; see Porter's Damascus, ii, 292). The territory thus consisted of two comparatively separate and independent parts, (1) the high land on the general level of the country east of Jordan, and (2) the sunk valley of the Jordan itself; the former diminishing at the Jabbock, the latter occupying the whole of the great valley on the east side of the river, and extending up to the very Sea of Cinnereth or Gennesaret itself.

Of the structure and character of the land which thus belonged to the tribe—"the land of Gad and Gilead"—we have only vague information. From the western part of Palestine its aspect is that of a wall of purple mountain, with a singularly horizontal outline; here and there the surface is seamed by the ravines, through which the torrents find their way to the Jordan, but this does not much affect the vertical wall-like look of the range. But on a nearer approach in the Jordan valley, the horizontal outline becomes broken, and when the summits are attained a new scene is said to burst on the view. "A wide table-land appears, tossed about in wild confusion of undulating downs, clothed with rich grass throughout; in the southern part trees are thinly scattered here and there, aged trees covered with lichen, as if the relics of a primaeval forest long since cleared away; the northern parts still abound in magnificent woods of sycamore, beech, terebinth, ilex, and enormous fig-trees. These downs are broken by three deep defiles, through which the three main rivers of the East flow, the Jabbock, and the Arnon fall into the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea. On the east they melt away into the vast red plain, which by a gradual descent joins the level of the plain of the Hauran, and of the Assyrian desert" (Stanley, Pales. p. 290). It is a very picturesque country, it has not the "flat, open country" with "smooth and even turf" of the country round Hasbon (Irby, p. 142), the sheep-walks of Reuben and of the Moabites, but "most beautifully varied with hanging woods, mostly of the valonia oak, laurus, cedar, arbutus, arbutus andrachne, etc. At times the country had an appearance of a noble park" (ibid. p. 147), "graceful hills, rich vales, luxuriant herbage" (Porter, Handb. p. 310). See Gilead.

Such was the territory allotted to the Gadites; but there is no doubt that they soon extended themselves beyond these limits. The official records of the reign of Josiah of Judah (1 Chron. v, 11, 16) show them to have been at that time established over the whole of Gilead, and in possession of Bashan as far as Salcah—the modern Sukh, a town at the eastern extremity of the noble plain of the Hauran—and very far both to the north and the east of the border given them originally, while the Manassites were pushed still further northwards to Mount Hermon (1 Chron. v, 22). They soon became identified with Gilead, that name so memorable in the earliest history of the nation; and in many of the earlier records it superseded the name of Gad, as we have already remarked it did that of Bashan. In the song of Deborah, "Gilead" is said to have "abode beyond Jordan" (Judg. v, 17). Jephthah appears to have been a Gadite, a native of Mizpeh (Judg. xi, 64; compare 81, and Josh. xiii, 26), and yet he is always designated "the Gileadite," and so also with Barzillai of Mahanaim (2 Sam. xvii, 27; Ezra ii, 61; comp. Josh. xiii, 26).

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in this tribe, with their probable identifications:

| Abel-keram. | Town. | [Merj-Ekkels] |
| Abel-nititim. | do. | [On Wady B'inj] |
| Arar | do. | Atrak. |
| Ataroth-shaphan. | do. | [X. of Merj-Ekkels] |
| Beth-beshan (Beth-shan) | do. | [Oposite Beth-barah (2a)] |
| Beth-eram, or | do. | Mamaseh? |
| Beth-nimrah. | do. | Nimerin. |
| Monimim. | do. | Bethzur. |
| Carnon. | do. | Reimma. |
| Dubr. | do. | [Renma]. |
| German (Greek). | do. | Judea. |
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Holon, or Horonaim. Town.  do.  do.  do.
Jazer.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Jeabne.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Jabesh.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Jezer.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Ladah.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Madman.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Mahannah.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Mamre.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Nimrah, or Nimrim.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Pennek, or Peniel.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Ramath-Mibhar.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
or Ramoth-Gilead.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Es-Salt.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Sihon.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.
Succoth.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.  do.

The character of the tribe is throughout strongly marked by war and warlike men of war for the battle, that could handle shield and buckler, their faces the faces of lions, and like roes upon the mountains for swiftness." Such is the graphic description given of those eleven heroes of Gad—"the least of them more than a man and the greatest two a thousand"—who joined their fortunes to David at the time of his greatest dis- credit and embarrassment (1 Chron. xii. 8), undeterred by the natural difficulties of "flood and field" which stood in their way. Surrounded as they were by Ammonites, Midianites, Hagarites, and tribes of the heathen with all the other countless tribes, animated by a common hostility to the strangers whose coming had dispossessed them of their fairest districts, the warlike propensities of the tribe must have had many opportunities of exercise. One of its greatest engagements is related in 1 Chron. xv. 19-22. Here their opponents were the wandering Ishmaelitish tribes ofjetur, Nephe- shid, and Nobad (comp. Gen. xxv. 15), nomad people, possessed of an enormous wealth in camels, sheep, and asses, to this day the characteristic possessions of their Bedouin successors. This immense host came into the hands of the conqueror, who seem to have entered with it on the former mode of life of their victims: probably pushed their way further into the Eastern wilderness in the "steada" of these Hagarites. Another of these encounters is contained in the history of Jephthah, but this latter story develops elements of a differing nature and a higher order than the mere fierceness necessary to repel the attacks of the plunderers of the desert. In the behavior of Jephthah throughout that affecting history there are traces of a spirit which we may almost call chivalerosque: the high tone taken with the elders of Gilead, the noble but fruitless expostulation with the king of Ammon before the attack, the hasty vow, the overwhelming grief, and yet the persistent devotion of purpose, surely in all these there are marks of a great nobility of disposition, which must have been more or less characteristic of the Gadites in general. If to this we add the loyalty, the generosity, and the delicacy of Bar- zillai (2 Sam. xix. 32-39), we obtain a very high idea of the tribe at whose head such men as these. Nor must we, while enumerating the worthies of Gad, forget that in all probability Elijah the Tabbite, "who was of the inhabitants of Gilead," was one of them.

But, while exhibiting these high personal qualities, Gad appears to have been wanting in the powers necessary to enable him to take any active or leading part in the confederacy of the nation. The warriors, who rendered such signal service to the national honor, were all of them either from the tribe of Reuben or from the tribe of Simeon, and, when Jabez set up his court at Mahanaim as king of Israel, have done much towards affirmining his rights. Ilad Abner made choice of Schechem or Shiloah instead of Mahanaim—the quick, explosive Ephraim instead of the unready Gad—who could doubt that the troops of David's reign would have been immensely increased, perhaps the establishment of the northern kingdom anticipated by nearly a century? David's presence at the same city during his flight from Absa- lon produced no effect on the tribe, and they are not mentioned as having taken any part in the quarrels between David and Absalom.

Cut off as Gad was by position and circumstances from its brethren on the west of Jordan, it still retained some connection with them. We may infer that it was considered as belonging to the northern kingdom —"Know ye not," says Ahab in Samaria, "know ye not that the Gilead is ours, and we take it not out of the hand of the king of Syria?" (1 Kings xxii. 8). The territory of Gad was the battle- field on which the long and fierce struggles of Syria and Israel were fought out, and, as an agricultural pastoral country, it must have suffered severely in consequence (see 2 Kings, ch. xxii.).

Gad was carried into captivity by Tiglath Pileser (1 Chron. v. 26), and in the time of Jeremiah the cities of the tribe seem to have been inhabited by the Amo- nomites. "Hath Israel no sons? hath he no heir? why doth Malcham (i.e. Moloch) inherit Gad, and his people have his cities?" (xlix. 1). See Idolatry, Pa- lent., p. 162 sq.; Burchhardt, Trans. in Syria, p. 347 sq.

2. (Josephus Flade. Ant. vii. 18, 4.) "The seer (היהוה), or the king's seer," i.e. David's—such appears to have been his official title (1 Chron. xxix., 29; 2 Chron. xxix., 25; 2 Sam. xxiv., 11; 1 Chron. xxix., 9)—was a "prophet" (נביא), who appears to have joined David when in "the hold," and at whose advice he quitted it for the forest of Hareth (1 Sam. xxii., 5), B.C. 1061. Whether he remained with David during his wanderings is not to be ascertained: we do not again encounter him till late in the life of the king, when he reappears in connection with the punishment inflicted for the numbering of the people (2 Sam. xxiv., 11-19; 1 Chron. xxix., 9-19), B.C. cir. 1016. But he was evidently attached to the royal establishment, for he is mentioned in a book (see Chronicles, Book of) of the Acts of David (1 Chron. xxix., 29), and also assisted in settling the arrangements for the musical service of the "house of God," by which his name was handed down to times long after his own (2 Chron. xxxii., 25). In the abruptness of his introduction Gad has been compared with Elijah (Jerome, Qu. Hebr. on 1 Sam. xxix., 5), with whom he may have been of the same tribe, if his name can be taken as denoting his parentage, but this is unsupported by any evidence. Nor is there any apparent ground for Gregory's surmise (l.c. 118) that he was of the school of Samuel. If this could be made out, it would afford a natural reason for his joining David. See David.

3. The name Gad (with the art. הָגָד) Sept. ḥoμיו- νος v. t. ὥριον, or, according to the reading of Je- rome and some MSS., ἡγών is mentioned in Isa. xlv. 11 (A.V., "troop"). The word, by a combination with the Arabic, may be legitimately taken to denote fortune (see Pococke, Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 140). So Ge- senius, Hiitzig, and Ewald have taken Gad in their respective versions of Isaiah, rendering the clause, "who spread a tale to fortune."

In the general case, makes fortune in this passage to be an object of idolatrous worship. There is great dis- agreement, however, as to the power of nature which this name was intended to denote, and, from the scanty data, there is little else than mere opinion on the sub- ject. The majority, among whom are Pittoni, are the chief rabbinical commentators (see Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1094), as well as Gesenius, Münter, and Ewald, consider Gad to be the form under which the planet Ju- piter was worshipped as the greater star of good fortune (see especially Gesenius, Comm. über den sterne, ad loc.)."
have been the planet Venus (De Phénomènes, i, 650). See Bel. On the other hand, if God be derived from תִּלֵּל in the sense of to press, to crowd, it may mean a troop, a host (to which sense there is an allusion in Gen. xlix, 19); and Hobeisl, as cited in Rosenmüller's Scholia, ad loc., as well as Deyting, in his Oberwacht. Matthew 24:27 each attempted a mode by which the passage might be explained; if Gam and Meni were taken in the sense of troop and number (see further Dadv. Mill's diss. ad loc. in his Diss. Selecta, p. 81-123). See Meni.

Some have supposed that a trace of the Syrian worshipping God is to be found in the exclamation of Leah, when Zilphah bore a son (Gen. xxx, 11), 'בג-גא, ba-gad, or, as the Keri has it, 'בג-ןא, 'Bog, or good fortune cometh.' The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum both give 'gad' as 'their planet cometh,' but it is most probable that this is an ethnologists which grew out of the astrological beliefs of a later time, and we can infer nothing from it with respect to the idolatry of the inhabitants of Padan Aram in the age of Jacob. The tale in belief in a deity Fortune existed, and are many things mentioned by Ezera (Lex. Talai, s. v.) says that anciently it was a custom for each man to have in his house a splendid couch, which was not used, but was set apart for 'the prince of the house,' for 'the children of the house,' for 'the star or constellation Fortune, to render to it more portentous. This couch was called the couch of God, or good-luck (Talm. Bibl. Samked. f. 20 a; Nedarrim, f. 86 a). Again, in Bereshith Rabba, § 65, the words יָשָׁר בַּל, in Gen. xxvii, 81, are explained as an invocation to God or Fortune. Rabbi Moses the Priest, quoted by Aben-Ezra (on Gen. xxx, 11), says '"bog (Isa. lxv, 11) signifies the star of luck, which points to everything that is good, for thus the language of Kedar (Arabic); but he says that גא in Gen. xxx, 11 is not used in the same sense.' Illustrations of the ancient custom of placing a banquetting table in honor of gods will be found in the table spread for the sum among the Egyptians (Herod. iii, 17, 18), and in the feast made by the Babylonians for their god Bel, which is described in the apochryphal history of Bel and the Dragon (comp. also Herod. l, 181, 182), and in the temple of Belus is described by Diodorus Siculus (19. 29. 2). A beaten gold, 40 feet long, 15 wide, and weighing 500 talents. On it were placed two drinking-cups (κοίτατα) weighing 80 talents, two censers of 80 talents each, and three golden chalices, that of Jupiter or Bel weighing 1200 Babylonian talents. On this table of the god in the temple of Zeus Tryphonius at Paphos, in the island of Paphos, are mentioned by Diodorus (v. 46; comp. also Virgil, Æn., ii. 685). In addition to the opinions which have been referred to above, may be quoted that of Stephen le Moyné (Var. Sacror. p. 583), who says that God is the god of Mendes, worshipped by the Egyptians as an emblem of the sun; and of Le Clerc (Comm. in Isa.) and Lamkemacher (Obs. Phil., iv, 18, etc.), who identify God with Hecate. Macrobius (Sat. i, 15) tells us that in the later Egyptian mythology Τριγνωσθησία was worshipped as one of the greatest deities who presided over the moon. This will perhaps throw some light upon the rendering of the Sept. as given by Jerome. Traces of the worship of God remain in the proper names Baal Gad and Gid-derah (Deod. Num. iii, 6), the latter of which Gesenius (Mum. Phen., p. 407) renders בִּנְיָה יִתְבָּרָה, "favoring fortune" (comp. Wirth, De Gas et Mene Judaeorum habemorum dias, Altore, 1726). See Baal.

For the plant gad, see CORIANDER.

Gadara (躇 גָּדָרָה in Josephus, prob. from מַגְז, a well [see GENESIS]; only in N. T. in the Gentile חֲגָדָר, a strong city [Josephus, Ant. xiii, 18, 8], situated near the river Hermes [Flint, H. N. v, 16], east of the Sea of Galilee, over against Scythopolis and Tiberias (Eusebius, Onomasticon, s. v.), and 16 Roman miles distant from each of those places (Him. Ant. ed. Wess. p. 129, 198; Tab. Peut.), or 60 stadia from the latter (Joseph. Life, § 60). It stood on the top of a hill, at the foot of which, upon the banks of the Hirmomax, three miles distant, were warm springs and baths called Amathia (Onom. s. v. Etham and Gadara; Him. Ant. xxii, 8). Josephus calls it the capital of Persa (War, iv, 9), and Polybius says it was one of the most strongly fortified cities in the country (vii, 21, 3). A large district was attached to it, called by Josephus Gadarita (Γαδαρίτα, War, iii, 10, 10); Strabo also informs us that the warm healing springs were "in the environs of Gadara" (iv γ Ῥάδαριτα, Geog. xvi). They were termed Thermes Heli, and were reckoned inferior only to those of Baal (Euseb. Onomast.). According to Epiphanius ( Aph. Hist., 326), a yearly festival was held at these baths (Reid, p. 775). The caverns in the rocks are also mentioned by Epiphanius (I. c.) in terms which seem to show that they were in one of his days for dwellings as well as for tombs. Gadara itself is not mentioned in the Bible, but it is evidently identical with the "country of the Gadarenenses" (Ἰουσίων εἰς την Ἰερουσαλημ, Mark v, 1; Luke viii, 26, 87).

Gadara seems to have been founded and chiefly inhabited by Gemites, for Josephus says of it, in conjunction with Gaza and Hippos, that it was more proper for Gemites to settle there than for Greeks (i.e., for Hellenes) (Ant., xvii, 11, 4). The first historical notice of Gadara is its capture, along with Pella and other cities, by Antiochus the Great, in the year B.C. 218 (Joseph. Ant. xxii, 8, 8). About twenty years afterwards it was taken from the Syrians by Alex. Jannaeus, after a siege of ten months (Ant. xiii, 18, 8; War, i, 4, 2). The Jews retained possession of it for some time; but the place having been destroyed during their civil war, it was rebuilt by Pompey to gratify his freedman Demetrius, who was a Gadarene (War, i, 7, 7). When Gabinus, the proc Fuse of Syria, changed the government of Judae by dividing the country into five districts, and placing each under the authority of a council, Gadara was made the capital of one of these districts (War, i, 8, 5). The territory of Gadara, with the adjoining towns, was added by Augustus to the kingdom of Herod the Great (Ant., xxv, 7, 5), from which, on the death of the latter, it was succeeded, and joined to the province of Syria (Joseph. War, ii, 6, 8). According to the present text of the Jewish historian, Gadara was captured by Vespasian on the first outbreak of the war, the Jews, all its inhabitants massacred, and the town itself, with the surrounding villages, reduced to ashes (Joseph. War, iii, 7, 1); but there is good reason to believe (see Robinson, Later Bib. Res. p. 87, note) that the place there referred to is GABARA (q. v.). However that may have been, Gadara was at this time one of the most important cities east of the Jordan (Joseph. War, iv, 8, 8). Stephen of Byzantium (p. 254) reckoned it a part of Coele-Syria, and Pliny (Hist. Nat. v, 16) a part of the Decapolis (comp. William of Tyre, xvii, 13). At a later period it was the seat of an episcopal see in Palestina Secunda, whose bishops are named in the councils of Nice and Ephesus (Reland, Palust., p. 176, 215, 223, 295). Gadara is also mentioned in the Talmud (Reland, p. 775; Ritter, Erdk. xxvii, 318). For coins, see Eckhel (Doctr. Num. iii, 348). It fell to ruins soon after the Mohammedan conquest, and has now been deserted for centuries,
GADARA

with the exception of a few families of shepherds, who occasionally find a home in its rock-hewn tombs. Most modern authorities (Raumer, in his Palästina, Burckhardt, Seetzen) find Gadarah in the present village of Um-keis. Buckingham, however, identifies this with Qemala (Trav. ii, 202 sq.); though it may be added that his facts, if not his reasoning, lead to a conclusion in favor of the general opinion. On a partially isolated hill at the north-western extremity of the mountains of Gilead, about sixteen miles from Bethlehem and the ravine and terracible ruins of Um-Keis. Three miles northward, at the foot of the hill, is the deep bed of the Shariat el Mandhir, the ancient Hieromax; and here are still the warm springs of Amatha (see Irby and Mangles, p. 236; Lindsay, ii, 97, 98). On the west is the Jordan valley; and on the south is wady el Arab, running parallel to the Mandhir. Um-Keis occupies the crest of the ridge between the two latter wadys; and as this crest declines in elevation towards the east as well as the west, the situation is strong and commanding. The city formed nearly a square. The upper part of it stood on a level spot approximately in the middle of the city, the entire area of the city, and the acclivities of the hill being on all sides exceedingly steep. The eastern gate of entrance has its portals still remaining. The prevalent orders of architecture are the Ionic and the Corinthian. The whole space occupied by the ruins is about two miles in circumference, and the remains of columns are traces of two of the principal streets round, though now almost completely prostrate. These ruins bear testimony to the splendor of ancient Gadarah. On the northern side of the hill is a theatre, and not far from it are the remains of one of the city gates. At the eastern street, the most commodious of all, the principal theatre of the city, was laid down; and here and there the traces of the chariot-wheels are visible on the stones, reminding one of the thoroughfares of Pompeii. Buckingham speaks of several grottos, which formed the necropolis of the city, on the east all round the hill. The first two examined by him were plain chambers hewn down so as to present a perpendicular front. The third tomb had a stone door, as perfect as on the day of its being first hung. The last was an excavated chamber, twelve feet in height, twenty-five feet long, and ten broad; within it was a smaller room. Other tombs were discovered by Buckingham as he ascended the hill. He entered one in which were ten sepulchres, ranged along the inner wall of the chamber in a line, being pierced inward for their greatest length, and divided by a thin partition left in the rock, in each of which was cut a small niche for a lamp. Still more tombs were found, some containing sarcophagi, some without them; all, however, displaying more or less of architectural ornament. One of the ancient tombs was, when our traveller saw it, used as a carpenter's shop, the occupants of being employed in constructing a rude plough. A perfect sarcophagus remained within, in which was used by the family as a provision-chest. See Burckhardt, Syria, p. 270 sq.; Porter, in Journal of Sac. Lit., vi, 281 sq.; Hackett, Illust. of Script. p. 190; Traill's Journeys, 145.

Gadara derives its greatest interest from having been the scene of our Lord's miracle in healing the demoniacs (Matt. viii, 28-34; Mark v, 1-21; Luke viii, 26-40). "They were no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs." (Christ came across the lake from Capernaum, and landed on the shore of the city, and having set the demoniacs free, he went up the hill on the east, and at the time of the eastern plateau breaks down into the plain of the Jordan. The demoniacs met him a short distance from the shore; on the side of the adjoining declivity the "great herd of swine" were feeding; when the demons went among them the whole herd rushed down that "steep place" into the lake and perished; the keepers ran up to the city and told the news, and the excited populace came out in haste, and "besought Jesus that he would depart out of their coasts." The whole circumstances of the narrative are thus strikingly illustrated by the features of the country. Another thing is worthy of notice. The most interesting remains of Gadara are its tombs, which dot the cliffs for a considerable distance round the city, chiefly on the north-east declivity, but many beautifully-sculptured sarcophagi are scattered over the surrounding heights. They are excavated in the limestone rock, and consist of chambers of various dimensions, some more than 20 feet square, with recesses in the sides for bodies. The doors are slabs of stone, a few being ornamented with panels; some of them still remain in their places (Porter, Damascus, ii, 54). The present inhabitants of Um-Keis are all turbodysts, "dwelling in tombs," like the poor manics of old, and occasionally they are almost as dangerous to the unprotected traveller. In the above account, in the Gospel of Matt. (viii, 28), we have the word Gerasenes (Gerysenv, instead of Gargarom), which seems to be the same as the Hebrew גָּֽרֶאשָׁה (Sept. Πηγεσεᾶς) in Gen. xv. 21, and Deut. vii. 1 — the name of an old Canaanitish tribe [see Gergash-terræ], which Jerome (in Comm. ad Gen. xv) locates on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias. Origen also says (Opera, iv. 14) that a city called Gergesa anciently stood on the eastern side of the lake. Even these were true, still the other Gospels would be strictly accurate. Gadarah was a large city, and its district would include Gerasa. But it must be remembered that the most ancient MSS, give the word Gerasem, while others have Gargarom—the former reading is adopted by Griesbach and Lachmann, while Schultz prefers the latter; and either one or other of these seems preferable to Gerasem. See GADARA.

Gadaraænus (Gerasi'mus), an inhabitant of Gadarah (q. v.), occurring only in the account of the demoniacs cured by Christ (Mark v, 1; Luke viii, 26, 37), and perhaps to be read in the third Evangelist (Matt. viii, 28) instead of Geresene (q. v.).

Gaddah. See HAZAR-GADDAH.

Gaddi (Heb. Gaggi, yah, fortunatus; Sept. ἀγαθός), son of Sulis, of the tribe of Manasseh, sent by Moses as the representative of that tribe among the twelve 'spies,' on the exploring tour through Canaan (Num. xiii. 11), B.C. 1357.

Gaddiel (Heb. Gadiel, Gadiel, yah, fortunate [i.e. sent] of God; Sept. Γαδίης v. τ. Γαργάης), son of Sodi, of the tribe of Zebulon. He represented that tribe among the twelve 'spies' sent by Moses to explore Canaan (Num. xiii. 10), B.C. 1357.

Gader. See BETH-GADER.

Ga'eb (Heb. Ga'eb, yah, a Gadiite; Sept. ἀγαθός v. τ. Γαργάης and ἀγαθός, the father of the usurer Menahem, who slew Shalumm, king of Israel (2 Kings xv, 14, 17), B.C. ante 769.

Gad'te (Heb. Gad'te, mostly collect. and with the art.; Sept. ὁ τε, ἀγαθός, etc., the descendent of Gad (q. v.), son of Jacob (Num. xxxix, 14; Deut. iii, 12, 18; iv, 43; xxxii, 8; Josh. I, 12; XII, 6; xiii, 8; xxii, 1; 2 Sam. xxiii, 36; 2 Kings x, 33; 1 Chron. vii, 18, 26; vii, 8, 37; xxvi, 32).

Gadsdem, CHRISTOPHER EDWARDS, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of South Carolina, was born in 1765 in Charleston, South Carolina. He was educated partly Episcopal and partly Congregational. In 1840 he passed A.B. of Yale College, where he formed a lasting friendship with John C. Calhoun. He was ordained deacon
in 1807, and priest in 1810. In 1808 he took charge of St. John's, Berkley, and soon after became assistant minister of St. Philip's, Charleston, of which he became rector in 1814, and in connection with which he spent the residue of his life. In 1810 he founded the Presbyterian Baptist Sunday School in South Carolina, which has proved an important auxiliary to clerical education and missionary effort. In 1814 he became rector of St. Philip's, Charleston, and the following year was made D.D. by the College of S. C. He was elected bishop in 1840, and in the ensuing discharge of his duties gave particular attention to the spiritual interests of the colored people. He was distinguished for thorough learning and deep piety. He died in Charleston June 24, 1852. He published The Prayer-book; as it is; three charges to his clergy, entitled The Times morally considered, The Times ecclesiastically considered, and The Times theologically considered; and some Sermons.—Sprague, Annals, v, 510.

Gaëtanus. See CAJETAN.

Gaffarel, Jacques, a French mystic, was born at Mânes, in Provence, in 1601, and studied at Valence. He showed special aptitude for Oriental and cabalistic studies, and was made librarian at Paris to Cardinal Richelieu. In 1625 he published Histoire des cabalisimtes de la nature (4to); and got into trouble by Curiosites iconiques sur la sculpture talismanique des Persans (Paris, 1629-30, also 1631, 1637, and in Latin, Curiositates Insignium [Hamburg, 1706, 8vo]), which was condemned by the Sorbonne. In 1632 he went to Rome, and in 1634 he became a Jesuit. He travelled in Italy, Greece, and Asia; and on his return to Paris received several valuable church prebends. He devoted himself to reclaiming Protestants, but was himself charged with preaching against purgatory. Bayle hints that he did this by order, in order to seduce Protestants. He died in 1681. Among his writings, other than those mentioned, are Dialogi, sive de fine mundi, etc. (Paris, 1629, 12mo)—Index Codicum cabalisticiorum quibus usus est Joannes Miranda/us (Paris, 1651)—Histoire universelle du monde sottisin (1666, fol.).—Bayle, Dictionary, s. v.; Hoeffer, Nouv. Dict. Générale, xix, 116.

Gage, Thomas, an English divine, noted especially for his conversion from Roman Catholicism, was born in Haling, in Surrey, about 1597. He entered into the Dominican order in Spain, after which he was sent as a missionary to the Philippine Islands; but instead of going thither, he went to Mexico, and then to Guatamala, where he remained several years in the labour of the Indians. He returned to England in 1637, after an absence of twenty-four years, during which he had forgotten his native language. On examining into his domestic affairs, he found himself unnoticed in his father's will, forgotten by some of his relatives, and with difficulty acknowledged by others. While abroad he had imbibed doubts of Romanism, and now he resolved to take another journey to Italy, to "try what better satisfaction he could find for his conscience at Rome in that religion." At Loreto his conversion from Catholicism was completed by his discovery of the false miracles attributed to the picture of the Virgin there, and on his return home he preached a recantation sermon at St. Paul's, by order of the bishop of London. He continued above a year in London, but soon received from the parliamentary party the living of Deal, in Kent. His accounts of the West Indies and Spanish America gave rise to the expedition of admiral Penn against Jamaica in 1655. Page accompanied the fleet, and died of dysentery at Jamaica (1655). He published his Recantation Sermon (1642); a piece entitled A Duel fought between a Jesuit and a Dominican (4to); and Survey of the West Indies (1648, and again in 1655, fol.). This work was greatly admired, and was soon translated into most European languages. See Hook, Ecclis. Biogr. v, 243; Eichard, Script. Ord. Preisdctorum, vol. ii; Hoeffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xix, 151.

Gage, William, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Salem, Mass., Nov. 16, 1797. He graduated at Amherst College in 1826, then entered Andover Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1831. He was licensed to preach in the same year, and was ordained in 1832 pastor over the churches of Concord and Piscataqua, Ohio, where he remained until his death. He early espoused the anti-slavery views for which the presbytery of Chillicothe has been so long distinguished. Upon one occasion his house was pelted with eggs and stones, and he himself was threatened with tar and feathers if he would not desist from preaching and praying on the subject. He kept on in his course, however. He died July 9, 1863.—Wilson, 1st Presbyterian Almanac, vi, 150.

Gagelin, François Imodore, a French missionary and martyr, was born at Mont-Faucon (Doubs), May 5, 1799, and educated at Besançon, and at the seminary of Foreign Missions at Paris. Having been appointed subdeacon, he embarked at Bordeaux in Dec., 1820, for Cochín China, and in 1822 was consecrated priest by bishop Labartho. The Christian religion had been tolerated in Cochín China since April 9, 1774, but the example of Tonquin, where it was strictly prohibited, was not without influence. In 1820 Mijn-Meln ascended the throne, and soon gave evidences of his dislike towards the new religion, yet did not begin persecuting the Christians until 1836. At this time the zones and mandarins addressed a petition to the emperor, asking for the expulsion of the missionaries. The Jesuits, becoming alarmed, fled; but Gagelin, less fortunate than his colleagues, was arrested and brought back to Hue-Pho. He was, however, permitted to continue his missionary efforts, and in 1836 was allowed to settle in the province of Dong Nai; but a Strife between the different sects led to a general edict against the Christians, Jan. 6, 1838. Gagelin was again taken to Hue, and hanged, Oct. 11, 1838.—François Pérénnes, Vie de l'abbé Gagelin (Besançon, 1856, 12mo); Hoeffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xix, 154 sq. (G. N. P.)

Gagnier, Jean, a French divine and Orientalist, was born in Paris about 1670. He was bred a Roman Catholic, entered into holy orders, and became a canon in the abbey of St. Genevieve, but became a Protestant and settled in England. He was patronized by archbishop Sharp and other eminent persons, and received the degrees of bachelor, master, and doctor of civil and canon law. He obtained the Arabic professorship at Oxford in 1715, and died in 1740. He published an edition of Ben Gorion's History of the Jews, in Hebrew, with a Latin translation and notes (Oxford, 1706, 4to);—Vindiciae Avicennae (Oxford, 1718, fol.);—L'islam Romaine continué d'idéologie (La Haye, 1766, 8vo);—Vie de Maomet, traduite et compiée de l'Arabe (Amst., 1782, 2 vols.).—Hoeffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xix, 166.

Gaham (Heb. Gach'ah, גְּכַּא), מִשָּׁעָה, "in pause" Ga'cham, מִשָּׁעָה; perhaps, having flaming eyes; otherwise, swarthy; Sept. Geapha v. v. Taaph, one of the sons of Nahor by his concubine Reumah (Gen. xxii, 24), B.C. cir. 2200.

Gahar (Heb. Ga'har, גָּחַר, "in pause" Ga'kar, מִשָּׁעָה; a lurking-place; Sept. Geapha), one of the chief Nethinitheh whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel from the captivity to Jerusalem (Ezra ii, 47; Neh. vii, 49), B.C. cir. 530.

Gaianitze. A Monophysite sect of the 6th century, which derived its name from Gaianus, bishop of Alexandria, who denied that Jesus Christ, after the hypothetical union, was subject to any of the infirmities of human nature. See ECTYCHIANISM.

Galler of Kaisersburg. See GRIEZ.

Galliard, Jacques, a French Protestant theolo-
Gaisford, Thomas D.D., an English divine and eminent classical scholar, was born in Wiltshire, Dec. 22, 1779. He was educated at Winchester school, where he was noted for his proficiency in Greek. He was elected a student in 1800 by the unanimous suffrage of the college. He proceeded B.A. June 8, 1801, and M.A. April 11, 1804. He acted for several years as tutor in his college. His edition of the Eschilidion of Hippocras, published in 1806, established his reputation as an accurate and profound scholar. In 1811 he was made regius professor of Greek, and, after a number of valuable preferments, in 1831 he was made dean of Christ Church, which office he filled most ably till his death, June 2, 1855. So high was his reputation as a classical scholar that he was elected a member of the Institute of France and of the Royal Academy of Munich. In private life he "did justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly before God." The list of his classical publications is too great to be published here; among them were editions, in whole or in part, of Euripides, Plato, Aristotle, Herodotus, Sophocles. In theological literature he edited, besides other works, the following: "Chorobact Dictates in Theodosii Casonu, neum Epier uncomfortable in Paedagog (3 vols. 1842); "Eusebius Ecloga Prosfeas (1842); "Eusebius Preparato Evangelica (1848); Pharsaloi Averadischen (3 vols. 1848); "Hymnolog Cumchur (fol. 1841); "Vetus Testamentum et Versione LXX Interp. (3 vols. 12mo, 1848); "Stobaeus Ecloga Physico et Ethic (2 vols. 1850); "Eusebius contra Hieroclem et Marcellum (1832); "Eusebius Demonstratio Evangelicae (2 vols. 1852); "Theodoret Historia Antiquissima (1854); "Hardwick, Annual Biog. (Lond. 1859), 12mo.

Galactus, Dr. See Caius.

Gal, Saint. See Gall.

Galæad (Γαλαα, 1 Macc. v, 9, 55; Jud. i, 8; xv, 5) and the country of Galæad (Παλαατερις, Galæadites, 1 Macc. v, 17, 20, 25, 27, 36, 45; xiii, 22), a Geometricized form of the word Gilead (q. v.).

Galæa (Heb. Galæah, גָּלַאָה, perhaps weighty; Sept. Γαλάα, Γαλάα, Γαλαά), the name of two Levites after the exile.

1. A descendant of Jeduthun, and father of Shemai- ah or Shammua (1 Chron. ix, 16; Neh. xii, 17, B.C. 536). 2. One of those who dwelt in the villages of the Nethinathites and served at Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix, 15), A.D. 536.

Galanos, Demetrios, a Greek scholar, was born in Athens in 1760. He studied at Missolonghi, and subsequently at Patmos, where he remained six years perfecting himself in Greek learning. At the end of this time he was sent for by his uncle, one of the bishops of Cassodoris, who required him to enter the priesthood. But Demetrios was resolved to devote himself to letters, and went to Calcutta as tutor in the family of a wealthy Greek in 1786. "After remaining six years in Calcutta, pursuing the study of the English, and of the Sanscrit, Persian, and other Oriental languages, in addition to his duties as an instructor, he resolved to devote himself henceforth wholly to philosophy. Investing the property which he had acquired while there in a commercial establishment, he removed to Benares. Here he assumed the character of a Brahmin, and lived in retirement as a Grecian priest for forty years, respected alike by the native population and by European residents. He undertook the task of translating the most important portions of the Brahminical literature relating to philosophy into Greek. When he was seventy years old he began to think of returning to his native land, but he died with this wish unfulfilled, May 8, 1833. He bequeathed to the University of Oto, at Athens, all his library, consisting of Sanscrit books and MS. translations from them into Greek. Six or eight volumes of these translations have been published by the librarian of the university, and are found in the collection of modern Greek literature in the library of Harvard University. In this selection are included translations of the Vagavata Purana, the Gita, the Dourga, and a portion, or, rather, an epitome of the Mahabharata, the most extensive and the most celebrated of the Indian literatures."—Watchman and Reflector, Nov. 7, 1861.

Galante, Abraham ben-Mordecai, a Cabal- list and Jewish commentator of the 16th century. He was a disciple of the new-school Cabalist, Moses Cordovero, and is best known by his mystical commentary on the Lamentations (שָׁנָה לַעֲבָדִים, published, with additions, by Ibn-Shabir under the title לְעַבָּדִים (Venice, 1589; 2d ed. Prague, 1621). Galante wrote also a commentary on the Sohar (or Zohar), entitled מַעֲשֶׂה שָׁמָיִם, extended over the Pentateuch, but of which only the first part, on Genesis, was printed under the title לְעַבָּדִים (Venice, 1555). The MS. of the unpublished parts of this work remain unedited in the Oppenheim Library. Jost (p. 237) says that the name of Galante's father was originally Mordecai Anelo, but that he, on account of his beauty, was called Galante, or, rather, Galantemon, in Rome, where he lived, and whose sons, Abraham and Mos- sea, afterwards emigrated to Palestine, they retained the new name of their father.—Jost, Gesch. d. Juden- thums u. s. Sektien, iii, 150; Etheridge, Intro. to Hebr. Lit. p. 360, 418; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. i, 313. (J. H. W.)

Galante, Moses ben-Mordecai, brother of Abraham (see above), was president of the celebrated Jewish college for rabbis at Safed. His Panegyria, Index to Sohar (Zohar) (Venice, 1613; 2d ed. Frankfurt a. M. 1681), explains all the passages of the O.T., and the meaning of the Zohar (q. v.). This book exhibits the manner in which the Messianic passages of the Old Testament are treated in the Talmud and Cabala- ha. We have also from him a commentary on Eccle-
GALATIA

710

GALATIA

Galatia is the "Gallia" of the East. Roman writers call its inhabitants Gauli, just as Greek writers call the inhabitants of ancient France Gaulia (see Pritchard, Nat. Hist. of Man, iii, 95). From the intermixture of Gauls and Greeks (Pausan. i, 4), Galatia was also called Gallo-Grecia (Galagogrecia, Strabo, xii, 5), and its inhabitants Gallo-Graeci. But even in Jerome's time they had not lost their native language (Proc. Cant. Comment., in Eccl. xiv, 20; De Wette, Leben Jerom., 231). In 2 Tim. iv, 10, some commentators suppose Western Gaul to be meant, and several MSS. have Galatia instead of Galleria. In 1 Mac. vii, 2, where Judas Maccabaeus is boasting the story of the prowess of the Romans in conquering the Galatians, it is put that the Romans conquered the Eastern or Western Gauls; for the subjugation of Spain by the Romans, and the defeat of Antiocbus, king of Asia, are mentioned in the same context. Again, Galleria is the same word with Galatia; and the Galatians were in their origin a stream of that great Celtic torrent (apparently Kyrrhen, and not Gaits) which poured into Macedonia about B.C. 280 (Strabo, iv, 187; xii, 566; Livy, xxxviii, 16; Flor. ii, 11; Justin, xxxv, 2; Apian, Sgr. xxxii, 42). Some of these invaders moved on into Thrace, and appeared on the shores of the Hallespont and Bosporus, when Nicomedes I, king of Bithynia, being then engaged in a civil war, invited them across into Asia Minor to assist him against his brother, Zyzbeutas (Menonon, ap. Phot. Cod. 224, p. 574), B.C. cir. 270. Having accomplished this object, they were unwilling to retrace their steps; and, strengthened by the accession of fresh hordes from Europe, they overran Bithynia and the neighboring countries, and supported themselves by predatory excursions, or by impost taxes extracted from the native chiefs. Antiocbus I, king of Syria, took the title of Soter in consequence of his victory over them. After the death of Antiocbus I, the Galatians also, Antiocbus II, succeeded in checking their nomadic habits, and confined them to a fixed territory within the general geographical limits, to which the name of Galatia was permanently given. The Galatians still found vent for their restlessness and love of war by hiring themselves out as mercenaries soldiers. This is doubled by the explanation of 2 Mac. viii, 20, which refers to some struggle of the Seleucid princes in which both Jews and Galatians were engaged. In Josephus (War, i, 20, 5) we find some of the latter, who had been in Cappadocia, and who had then become the personal character for Herod the Great. Meanwhile the wars had been taking place which brought all the countries round the east of the Mediterranean within the range of the Roman power. The Galatians fought on the side of Antiocbus at Magnesia. In the Mithridatic war they fought on both sides. Of the three principal Galatian tribes (Strabo, xii, 429), the Troadom (Troagom) settled in the eastern part of Galatia, near the banks of the Halys; the Tectosages (aetopoigoi) in the country round An- crya; and the Tolstobogni (Tolstorignoi) in the south-eastern parts near Pessinus. They retained their independence till the year B.C. 189, when they were brought under the power of Rome by the pro-

The Roman province of Galatia may be roughly described as the central region of the peninsula of Asia Minor, with the provinces of Asia on the west, Cappadocia on the east, Pamphylia and Cilicia on the south, and Bithynia and Pontus on the north. The province stretches from the sea to the Sangarius and the Halys, the Galatians were still settled in their three tribes, the Tectosages, the Tolstobogi, and the Troagom, the first of which is identical in name with a tribe familiar to us in the history of Gaul, as distributed over the Cevennes near Toulouse (Cesar, Bell. Gall. iv, 24; comp. Jablonsky, De Lingua Lucumica, p. 25 sq.). The three capita were respectively Tavium, Pessinus, and An- spygia. Hence the Galatians were called Gallo-greci (Manlius in Livy, xxxvii, 27). The inscriptions found at Ancrya are Greek, and Paul wrote his epistle in Greek. (See Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Celtz, Gal- tia; Manner's Geographie der Griechen und Römer, vi, 3, ch. 4; Merleker's Lehrbuch der Historiochrono- graphie, iv, 1, p. 284.).

It is difficult at first sight, to determine in what sense the word Galatia is used by the writers of the N.T., or whether always in the same sense. In the Acts of the Apostles the journeys of Paul through the district are mentioned in very general terms. We are simply told (Acts xvi, 6) that on his second missionary circuit he went with Silas and Timothy through Phrygia and the region of Galatia (idōn τοῦ Φρυγίαν καὶ τούτου τοῦ).
GALATIAN

Γαλατιανῶν χώρων). From the Epistle, indeed, we have this supplementary information, that an attack of sickness prevented Paul from going to Galatia, although his mind was among the Galatians, and gave him the opportunity of preaching the Gospel to them, and also that he was received by them with extraordinary fervor (ib. 14, 15); but this does not inform us of the route which he took. So on the third circuit he is described (Acts xviii, 25) as "going to all the cities of Galatia and Phrygia in order" (διερχόμενος καθεύδες τῆς Γαλατείας καὶ Φρυγίας). We know from the first Epistle to the Corinthians that on this journey Paul was occupied with the collection for the poor Christians of Judæa, and that he received testimonies in Galatia on the subject (συμβολάσα ταῖς τοις Γαλατισίως, 1 Cor. xvi. 1): but here again we are in doubt as to the places which he had visited. We observe that the "churches" of Galatia are mentioned here in the plural, as in the opening of the Epistle to the Galatians themselves (Gal. i. 2). From this we should be inclined to infer that he visited several parts of the district, instead of residing a long time in one place, so as to form a great central church, as at Ephesus and Corinth. This is in harmony with the phrase ἐκ Γαλατείας χώρων, used in both instances. Since Phrygia is mentioned first in one instance, and in the second is supposed that the order of the journey was different on the two occasions. Phrygia also being not the name of a Roman province, but simply an ethnographical term, it is natural to conclude that Galatia is used here by Luke in a geographical way. A disconnection of his view, it is worth while to notice that in Acts ii. 9, 10, where the enumeration is ethnographical rather than political, Phrygia is mentioned, and not Galatia, while the exact contrary is the case in 1 Pet. i. 1, 2, where each geographical term is the name of a province that is narrated, and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, i. 245.

The Epistle to the Galatians was probably written very soon after Paul's second visit to them. Its abruptness and severity, and the sadness of its tone, are caused by their sudden perversion from the doctrine which the apostle had taught them, and which at first they had received so willingly. It is no fancy if we see in this sickness a specimen of that "inopportune, mobile, imperious spirit" which Thiersy marks as characteristic of the Gaulish race (Hist. des Gaules, Introd. iv. v.). From Josephus (Ant. vii. 6, 2) we know that mair Jews were settled in Galatia in the time of Augustus, and if Gal. iv. 8 would lead us to suppose that Paul's converts were mostly Gentiles. The view advocated by Böttger (Schausplata der Wirkamkeit des Apostels Paulus, p. 28-30, and the third of his Belfrage, p. 1-5) is that the Galatia of the Epistle is entirely limited to the district of Derbe and Colossae, i.e., the extreme southern frontier of the Roman province. On this view the visit alluded to by the apostle took place on his first missionary circuit, and the διαβίβασις of Gal. iv. 13 is identified with the effects of the storing at Lystra (Acts xiv. 19). Geographically this is not impossible, though it seems unlikely that regions called Pisidia and Lycaonia in one place should be called Galatia in another. Böttger's geography, however, is connected with a theory concerning the date of the Epistle (see Rückert, in his Megas. f. Erzec. i. 98 sq.), and for the determination of this point I must refer to the article on the GALATIANS, THE EPISTLE TO THE. (See Schmidt, De Galat. [Ufled. 1748, 1784]; Myntser, Kleine theol. Schrift. p. 60 sqq.; Cellarri Notit. ii. 173 sqq.; Forbiger, Allc Geog. ii. 561 sq.; Hofmann, De Galatia Antiqua [Lipa. 1792]; Wackernagel, Die romische Geschichte [Norimb. 1748]; Hamilton, Asia Minor, i. 579.)

Galat'ian (Γαλατικός), the patriotic designation (1 Macc. viii. 2; 2 Macc. viii. 20; Gal. iii. 1) of an inhabitant of Galatia (q. v.).

GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE, the fourth in order of the Pauline epistles of the N. T., entitled simply, according to the best MSS., (see Tischendorf, N. T. ad loc.) Galat. (See the Mercersburg Synopsis, Jan. 1861.)

I. Authorship.—With regard to the genuineness and authenticity of this epistle, no writer of any credit or respectability has expressed any doubts. Its Pauline origin is attested not only by the superscription which it bears (i. 1), if this be genuine, but also by the absence of allusions in the course of it to the great apostle of the Gentiles (comp. i. 13-28; ii. 1-14). It is corroborated also by the style, tone, and contents of the epistle, which are perfectly in keeping with those of the apostolic letters of Paul. The testimony of the Church on this subject is most decided and unanimous (see Lardner, Works, vol. ii.). Besides express references to the epistle (Irenæus, Her. iii. 7, 2; v. 21, 1; Tertullian, De Præser. ch. 60, al.), we have one or two direct citations found as early as the time of the apostolic fathers (Polyc. ad Phil. ch. 8), and several apparent allusions (see Davidson, Introd. ii. 318 sq.). The attempt of Bruno Bauer (Kritik der Paulin. Briefe. Berlin, 1850) to demonstrate that this epistle is a compilation of later times, and from those to the Romans and to the Corinthians, has been treated by Heyer with a contemptuous severity (Vindici, vii. 27) on which, it does not seem too much to say, are completely deserved.

II. Occasion, etc.—The parties to whom this characteristic letter was addressed are described in the epistle itself (Gal. i 1, 2, 3; iv. 21, 25), and the occasion on which Paul wrote it was the dispute among the Galatians about circumcision (Acts xvii. 11), who believed that they could be converted to Christ without the observance of the Jewish law (Gal. iv. 3, 26). The appeal was justified by the apostle in a manner which is productive of deep interest. (Strabo, l. c. Paustriana, iv. 5), could date an occupancy, though not an independence, extending to more than three hundred years; the first subject of Galatia to the Romans having taken place in B.C. 189 (Livy, xxxvii. 16 sq.), and its formal reduction (with territorial additions) to a regular Roman province in A.D. 26. See GALATIA. Into this district the Gospel was first introduced by Paul himself (Acts xvi. 6; Gal. i. 8; iv. 12, 17). Churches were then also probably formed, for on revisiting this district some time after his first visit he found that the churches were "forsaken, turned from the discipline' (Acts xxvii. 29). These churches seem to have been composed principally of converts directly from heathenism (ch. iv. 8), but partly also, of Jewish converts, both pure Jews and proselytes. Unhappily, the latter, not thoroughly emancipated from early prejudices, and conscious of the distrust of the Jewish teachers who had visited these churches, had been seized with a zealous desire to incorporate the rites and ceremonies of Judaism (especially circumcision, ch. v. 2, 12; vi. 12 sq.) with the spiritual truths and simple ordinances of Christianity. (See Cruse, De secta Galaterarum, etc. Hafn. 1722.) So active had this party been in disseminating their views on this head through the churches of Galatia, that the majority at least of the members had been seduced to adopt them (i, 6; iii. 1, etc.). To this result it is probable that the previous religious conceptions of the Galatians contributed; for, accustomed to the worship of Cybele, which they had learned from their neighbors the Phrygians, and to theosophic doctrines with which that worship was associated, they would be the more readily induced to believe that the fulness of Christianity could alone be developed through the symbolic adorations of an elaborate ceremonial (Nousner, Apostolisches Zeitalter, 2d ed. p. 400). It would seem clear from that on his last visit to this region, Paul found the heathen of Judaism beginning to work in the churches of Galatia, and that he then warned them against it in language of the most decided character (comp. i.
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9: v. 5). From some passages in this epistle (e.g., 1, 11-24; ii, 1-21) it would appear also that institutions had been divinely enjoined. See also Acts xvii, 1-12, the church, may be ascribed to the effect that Paul was not a divinely-commissioned apostle, but only a messenger of the church at Jerusalem; that Peter and he were at variance upon the subject of the relation of the Jewish rites to Christianity. The "word of grace" was to spread, and the church was strenuously opposed to those rites as he had chosen to be among the Galatians. Of this state of things intelligency having been conveyed to the apostle, he wrote this epistle for the purpose of vindicating his own pretensions and conduct, of countering the influence of the false teachers, and recalling the Galatians to the simplicity of the Gospel which they had received. The importance of the case was probably the reason why the apostle put himself to the great labor of writing this epistle with his own hand (vi, 11).

11. Time and Place of Writing. - On the date of this epistle great diversity of opinion prevails. (See Fische, De tempore quo op. ad G. scripta fuerit, Longae, 1608; Keil, De tempore, etc., in his Opusc. acad. p. 551 sq.; also Ueb. d. Zeit., etc., in Tischbein's Analecten, iii, 2, 55 sq.; Niemeyer, De tempore, etc., Göttingen, 1827; Ulrich, Ueber die Zeit, etc., in the Theol. Zeitschr., u. Kreis, 1856, p. 448 sq.). Marciol held this to be the earliest of Paul's letters (Epiphanius, adv. Haeres. xiii, 9); and Tertullian is generally supposed to favor the same opinion, from his speaking of Paul's zeal against Judaism displayed in this epistle as characteristic of his being of his times. (See iv, 8, in the Theol. Lexicon, u. Kreis, 1856, p. 448 sq.). Marciol held this to be the earliest of Paul's letters (Epiphanius, adv. Haeres. xiii, 9); and Tertullian is generally supposed to favor the same opinion, from his speaking of Paul's zeal against Judaism displayed in this epistle as characteristic of his being of his times. (See iv, 8, in the Theol. Lexicon, u. Kreis, 1856, p. 448 sq.). Marciol held this to be the earliest of Paul's letters (Epiphanius, adv. Haeres. xiii, 9); and Tertullian is generally supposed to favor the same opinion, from his speaking of Paul's zeal against Judaism displayed in this epistle as characteristic of his being of his times. (See iv, 8, in the Theol. Lexicon, u. Kreis, 1856, p. 448 sq.).

On these grounds it is probable that the apostle wrote and dispatched this epistle not long after he had left Galatia for the second time, and perhaps whilst he was residing at Ephesus (comp. Acts xviii, 23; xix, 1 sq.), in the A.D. 51. The apostle would in that city have been easily able to receive tidings of his Galatian converts; the dangers of Judaism, against which he personally warned them, would have been fresh in his thoughts; and when he found that these warnings were proving unavailing, and that even his apostolic authority was becoming undermined by a fresh arrival of Judaizing teachers, it is then that he would have written, as it were on the spur of the moment, in those terms of earnest and almost impassioned warning that so noticeably mark this epistle. The reasons which Michaelis urges for an earlier date are of no weight. He appears to base the first place in honour on his own conjecture, as the only evidence for the supposition whether Paul would have used the vague expression, "all the brethren," without naming them, had it not been that the parties in question were those by whom he had been accompanied on his first visit to Galatia, viz. Silas and Timothy, and, "perhaps, some others." The answer of the obvious question, that Paul would usually have used a name or names, reduced in this expression to these individuals, who were known to the Galatians, he was much more likely, on that very account, to have named them than otherwise; and besides, the expression "all the brethren that are with me" is much more naturally understood of a considerable number of persons, such as the elders of the church at Ephesus, than of two persons, and "perhaps some others." Again, he urges the fact that, about the time of Paul's first visit to Galatia, Asia Minor was full of zealots for the law, and that consequently it is easier to account for the presence of the apostle among the Galatians at this period than at a later. But the passage to which Michaelis refers in support of this assertion (Acts xv, 1) simply informs us that certain Judaizing teachers visited Antioch, and gives us no information whatever as to the time when such zealots entered Asia Minor. In fine, he lays great stress on the circumstance that Paul, in recapitulating the history of his own life in the first and second chapters, brings the narrative down only to the period of the conference at Jerusalem, the reason of which is to be found, he thinks, in the fact that this epistle was written so soon after that event that nothing of moment had sub-
sequently occurred in the apostle's history. But, even
admitting that the period referred to in this second
chapter was that of the conference mentioned Acts xv
(though this is much doubted by many writers of note),
the apostle's life was from the first he had claimed
the narrative of his life no further than this cannot be
admitted; for it overlooks the design of the apostle in
furnishing that narrative, which was certainly not to
deliver himself of a piece of mere autobiographical de-
tail, but to show from certain leading incidents in his
early apostolic life how from the first he had claimed
and exercised an independent apostolic authority, and
how his rights in this respect had been admitted by the
pillars of the Church, Peter, James, and John.
For this purpose it was not necessary that the narra-
tive should be brought down to a later date than the
period when Paul went forth as the apostle of the
Gentiles, formally recognised as such by the other
apostles of Christ.

Some of the advocates of a date earlier than A.D. 50
suppose that the persons addressed under the name of
Galatians were not the same as those whom Paul wrote
to in the Epistle to the Galatians proper, but of Lystra
and Derbe (Acts xiv, 6), since among the seven districts into which Asia Minor was divided by the
Romans the name of Lycaonia does not occur; the
latter therefore, with its cities of Derbe and Lys-
tra, must have been included in the province of Gal-
tia. In the former nothing is written in Acts xii, 12
thereof. (See Schmidt, De Galatia, etc., Hefeld. 1748.)
It is urged, in addition, that, whilecopious details are
given in Acts xiv respecting the founding of the Ly-
caonian churches, the first mention of Galatia (Acts
xvi, 6) is merely to the effect that Paul passed through
thereby.
On these grounds Paul, particularly if (Stud.
und Krit., 1836), Böttger, and others hold that under the
term ρηματοσφαλος, "the region round about" (Acts
xvi, 4), Galatia must be included; and therefore they
put back the composition of the epistle to a date ante-
terior to that at which the council of the apostles
(Acts xvi, 3) was held. However, that Luke did not
follow the Roman divi-
sion into provinces (which, moreover, was frequently
changed), because he specially mentions Lycaonia, which was no province, and distinguishes it from Ga-
latia. As to the latter point, no valid inferences can
be drawn from the common inscription of the letter,
history upon the details of Paul's labors in particular
places, provided his presence there is clearly record-
ed, although in brief terms. There seems, therefore,
no reason to depart from the common opinion that the
apostle's first visit is recorded in Acts xvi, 5; and con-
sequently the epistle must have been sent subse-
quently to the council (Acts xv).
With this, too, the
references in the epistle itself best agree. The visit to
Jerusalem alluded to in chap. ii, 1-10, is, on the
best grounds, supposed to be identical with that of Acts xv
(A.D. 42); and the apostle speaks of it as a thing of
the past. See Part.

IV. Contents.—The epistle consists of three parts.
In the first part (i, ii), which is apologistic, Paul vindi-
cates his own apostolic authority and independence as
a directly-commissioned ambassador of Christ to men,
and especially to the Gentile portion of the race. After
an address and salutation, in which his direct appoint-
ment by heaven is distinctly asserted (i, 1), and a brief
doxology (i, 5), the apostle expresses his astonishment
at the speedy lapse of his converts, and reminds them
how he had forewarned them that even if an angel
should preach from heaven (ii, 16, 17), he would be
another Jesus (ii, 18). The gospel he preached was not of
men, as his former course of life (i, 11-14), and as his actual
history subsequent to his conversion (i, 15-24), con-
vincingly proved. When he went up to Jerusalem it
was not so instructed by the v, for he speaks of going in a
special mission, which resulted in his being formally ac-
credited by them (ii, 1-10); nay, more, when Peter
dissembled in his communion with Gentiles, he re-
buffed him, and demonstrated the danger of such in-
consistency (ii, 11-21). In the second part (iii, iv),
which is polemical, having been led to refer to his zeal
for the great doctrine of salvation by the grace of God
through faith in Christ, the apostle now enters at large
upon the subject, and brings in a carrying of the
truth of Christianity.
He appeals to the former experience of the
Galatians, and urges specially the doctrine of
justification, as evinced by the gift of the Spirit (iii,
1-5), the case of Abraham (iii, 6-9), the fact of the law
involving a curse, from which Christ has freed us (iii,
10-14); the condemnation of the law (iii, 15-18), and
that preparatory character of the law (iii, 19-24) which ceased when faith in Christ and baptism into
him had fully come (iii, 22-29).
All this the apostle illustrates by a comparison of the
nonage of an heir with that of bondage under the
children of the flesh, they are now sons and inheritors
(iv, 1-7); why, then, were they now turning back to
bondage (iv, 8-11)? They once treated the apostle very differently (iv, 12-16); now they pay court to others, and awaken feelings of
serious mistrust (iv, 17-20); and yet, with all their ap-
proval of the law, they show that they do not under-
stand its deeper and more allegorical meanings (iv,
21-31).
In the third part (v, vi), which is hortatory and
ampulatory, the Galatians are exhorted to stand fast
in their freedom, and beware that they make not their
union with Christ (v, 6-8); their perverters, at any
cost (v, 9), but particularly in readiness (v, 10) to
work the law of love (v, 13-14): the works of the Spirit
are what no law condemns, the works of the flesh are
what exclude from the kingdom of God (v, 16-26).
The apostle further exhorts the spiritual to be forbear-
(vi, 1-5), the taught to be liberal to their teach-
ers, and to remember that as they sowed so would they
reap (vi, 6-10). Then, after a noticeable recapitula-
tion, and a contrast between his own conduct and
that of the false teachers (vi, 11-16), and an affecting
entreaty that they would trouble him no more (vi, 17),
the apostle concludes with his usual benediction (vi,
18).

V. Commentaries.—The following are special exe-
genetical helps on the whole of this epistle, the most
important being designated by an asterisk [*].

Victorinus, Commentarius (in Mai, Script. Pat., ii, 1);
Jerome, Commentarius (in Opp. vii, 367, 369); Augustine, Expositio (in Opp. iv, 1248);
Chrysostom, Commentarius (in Opp. x, 779; also Erasmi
Opp. viii, 267, 267, in Lib. de Fadere, Ox. 1840, vol. vi,
8vo); Crumen, Comm. (in Opp. x, 109, 140; also by
Augustine, Expositio (in Opp. iv, 1248); Chry-
sostom, Commentarius (in Opp. x, 779; also Erasmi
Opp. viii, 267, 267, in Lib. de Fadere, Ox. 1840, vol. vi,
8vo); Cramer, Catena (vol. vi); Claudianus Taur., Com-
mentarius (in Biblioth. Patr. xiv, 129); Aquinas, Sum-
ma (in Opp. iv, 1248); and S Basedow (Lips. 1519,
4to, and often since; also in Opp. iii, 1, etc.: tr.
London, 1807, 1835, 8vo); also his fuller Commentarius
(Vitember, and Hagi, 1835, 8vo, and later; both works
also in Germ. often); Bugenhagen, Annotationes (Bas.
1525, 8vo); Megender, Commentarius (Tigur, 1528,
8vo); Serpizandus, Commentarius (in his work on Ro-
mans, Lugd. 1541, 8vo; also separately, Antw. 1565,
8vo, and later); Calvin, Commentarius et Sermones
(both in Opp.: the former ed. Edinb. 1634, 8vo; the
latter, Lond. 1574, 4to; Meyer, Adnotationes (Benzien,
1526, Hannover, 1602, 8vo); also by Basedow (Lips.
1519, 4to, and often since; also in Opp. iii, 1, etc.: tr.
London, 1807, 1835, 8vo); also his fuller Commentarius
(Vitember, and Hagi, 1835, 8vo, and later; both works
also in Germ. often); Musculus, Commentarius (Basil. 1561,
1569, fol.); Cogeletus, Solutionis (Vitember. 1564, 8vo;
Clymara, Exsurrro (France, 1509, 8vo); Heshusius, Com-
madrid (Lips. 1578, 8vo); Scaliger, Commentarius
(Vitember. 1580; Lips. 1564, 8vo); Grynaeus, Analysis
(Basil. 1583, 8vo, 8vo); Cornus, Commentarius [after Luth.
(Heidelb. 1583, 8vo); Prime, Exposition (Oxford,
1587, 8vo); Heilbrunner, Commentarius (Leining. 1591,
8vo); Nurse, Commentarius (Lond. 1600, 8vo); Rollock, Analytis (London, 1602, Geneva, 1603, 8vo),
Hoe, Commentarius (Lips. 1605, 8vo); Winnkellmann,
Commentarius (Gieisa. 1688, 8vo); Sondarin, Expositio
III.—28*
was called by the natives Khasruk, and bore a very close resemblance to the Farsa _trudescena_, but belonging neither to the genus Galbanum nor to Opodes. It is believed that the Persian galbanum and that brought from the Levant are the produce of different plants. See AROMATICS.

Galbanum is in the present day imported into Europe both from the Levant and from India. That from the Levant is the most aromatic, having long ago been imported thither, probably from the Persian Gulf. It is therefore probable that it may be produced in the countries at the head of that gulf, that, in the northern parts of Arabia, or in Persia (portions of which, as is well known, were included in the Syrian province of Damascus), which region, which nearly corresponds with ancient Assyria. Galbanum, then, is either a natural exudation, or obtained by incisions from some umbelliferous plant. It occurs in commerce in the form either of tears or masses, commonly called lamp galbanum. The latter is of the consistence of wax, tenacious, of a brownish or brownish-yellow color, with white spots in the interior, which are the agglutinated tears. Its odor is strong and balsamic, but disagreeable, and its taste warm and bitter. It is composed of 66 per cent. of resin and 6 of volatile oil, with gum, etc., and impurities. It was formerly used as a medicine, and is still employed as such, and for external application to discuss indolent tumors. The ancients believed that when burnt the smoke of it was efficacious in driving away serpents and gnats (Pliny, Hist. Nat., xxi, 13; Virg. Geog. iii, 415; Calpurn. v, 99; Lucan, ix, 916). Galbanum was also employed in adulterating the opobalsamum, or gum of the balsam plant (Pliny, xii, 54). It is still more to our purpose that we learn from Dioscorides that, in preparing a fragrant ointment, galbanum was mixed with other aromatic substances (compare Pliny, xii, 5). The effect of such mixture must depend upon the proportion in which it or any other strong-smelling substance is intermixed, more than upon what is its peculiar odor when in a concentrated state. We need not, therefore, inquire into the reasons which have been assigned to account, for galbanum being intermixed with stacte and onycha as sweet spices (see Kallasch, ad loc.). We see that the same practice existed among the Greeks and Egyptians (Virgil, Georg. iv, 284; Colum. ix, 15, etc.). See Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. "Balsam," and Smith, Dict. of Suppl., iii, 738 sq.; Miller, "Hiropht.," p. 450. See ANOINTING OIL.

Gale, John, a Baptist divine and learned controvertist, was born at London in 1680. He studied at the University of Leyden, and at the age of nineteen graduated M.A., and doctor of philosophy. He studied also at Amsterdam under Limborch, and was intimate with Le Clore. The University of Leyden in 1708 offered him the degree of doctor of divinity if he would assent to the articles of the Synod of Dort. He became, in 1718, minister of the chapel in St. Paul's Al-ley, Baricin. But his ministrations was of short duration. He died in 1721, at the age of 41. In 1711 he published his "Reflections on Wall's Defence of Infant Baptism," and in 1719 held a dispute with the author. He was also the author of _Sermons on several Occasions_ (2d ed. 1726, 4 vols.). He was an able preacher, highly appreciated by the respectable congregation to which he ministered, and brought to the discussion of matters in controversy large, exact, and well-digested learning, with no small dialectical skill. (L. E. S.).

Gale, Theophilus, a learned nonconformist divine, was born in 1629, at King's Teignton, in Devonshire. He entered Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1647, and became fellow in 1650. In 1652 he passed A.M., and soon became an eminent tutor and a distinguished preacher in the university. In 1657 he was invited to Winchester, and became a stated preacher there, in which station he continued for several years. Having imbibed the principles of the nonconformists, on the re-establishment of episcopacy, at the restoration of Charles the Second, he refused to comply with the Act of Uniformity which passed in 1661. Deprived of his fellowship at Oxford, he was taken into the family of Philip, lord Wharton, in the capacity of tutor to his two sons. He was a diligent and multifarious student, and in 1669 he published the first part of his "Use of the Gentiles; or, a Discourse touching the Original of Human Literature, both Philosophy and Philology, from the Scriptures and Jewish Church" (Oxford and London, 5 vols. 4to). It was received with great applause, and was reprinted in 1672-1683. In the first part of this learned work, Mr. Gale endeavored to prove, that all languages have their origin and rise from the Hebrew. To this he adds a deduction, importing that the pagan theology, physical, political, poetry, history, rhetoric, are deduced from sacred names, persons, rites, and records; and showing, withal, how the Jewish traditions came to be corrupted and mistaken by papists. In the second part he tries to prove that philosophy also has its origin from the Jewish Church. In the third part, the vanity of pagan philosophy is demonstrated from its causes, parts, properties, and effects; namely, pagan idolatry, Judaic apostasy, Gnostic infusions, errors among the Greek fathers, especially Origenism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and the whole system of popery, or anti-Christianism, distributed into three parts, mystic, scholastic, and canonic theology. In the fourth part he treats of reformed philosophy, wherein Plato's, Aristotle's, and Polybius's ideas are compared or illustrated to useful forms or methods. He divides this, which is larger than any of the former parts, into three books, discoursing in the first of moral philosophy; in the second, of metaphysics; and in the third, of divine pre-determination. In 1671 he was chosen to succeed Mr. S. Rouse as master of the school. In 1676 he sides the "Court of the Gentiles," published in Latin an abridgment of it for the use of students, under the title of _Philosophia Generalis_, etc. (London, 1675, 8vo):—_Thespii_; or, a Discourse of the Saints' Unity with God in Christ (London, 1671, 8vo):—_The true Idea of Jansenism, both revealed and naturalistic_ (1669, 8vo):—_The Anatomy of Infidelity_ (1667, 8vo):—_A Discourse on the coming of Christ_ (1673, 8vo):—_An Idea Theologica_, etc. (12mo):—_And the Life and Death of Thomas Turquet_ (1671, 8vo).—_Jones, Christ._ Blog: _Sheed, Hist. of Dict., 1:205._

Gale, Thomas, D.D., a learned English divine and antiquarian, was born in 1636 at Scranton, in Yorkshire. He became fellow of Trinity, and was elected regius professor of Greek in 1666; was made prebendary of St. Paul's in 1676, and dean of York in 1697. He died April 8, 1702. He published _Oeconomia Mythologiae_, etc., Gr. and Lat. (Cumb. 1671, 8vo); _Historiae Petræi et multiscriptorum Graecarum et Latinæ._—_Herodotus Holocardamassinis Historiarii_, lib. ix:—_Historia Britannicae, Saxonicae, Anglo-Danicae, Scriptores, ex vestig. cod. MS. (Oxon. 1601, fol.). This work contains nearly all the original writers of English history.

Galeed (Hebr. Galeed, מָגְלֵד, vitamin), the sheep of the wise.
Galen or Galenus, MATTHEW VAN, D.D., was born about the year 1526, at West-Kapelle, on the island of Walcheren. As his parents were not in such circumstances as would enable them to give their son a liberal education, the expenses of his preparatory course at Ghent were born by two benevolent gentlemen of his native place. From Ghent he went to Louvain, where he studied philosophy and theology. After taking his bachelor's degree, he gave instructions in this institution in sacred eloquence. Being licensed, he was, on the recommendation of the noted Ruard Tapper, called to the professorship of theology in the recently founded university of Dillingen. This position he held from 1559 to 1563. Its duties were performed in such a way as to secure him high reputation. From Dillingen he was called to occupy the chair of theology at Douay. Here, in 1564, he received his degree of D.D. With zeal and fidelity he labored at this post till his death, which occurred in 1578. He was a man of eminent learning, possessing for his time a fund of knowledge which he lived an unassuming life. His familiarity with the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. He was a member of the Council of Trent and of the Synod of Cambray. He numbered among his friends some of the principal men of his time. Though a man of great learning, he is said to have been deficient in critical taste. As a writer he produced various works in Latin on practical and polemic theology. The substance of his lectures on pulpit eloquence was given to the public under the title of Paradigmena. He also wrote a Commentarius in Epistolam D. Pauli ad Hebreos et Syro Sermone in Latinam versionem (Ducat, 1578; Lovan, 1599). An Explication in Exeolam is still preserved in manuscript in the University library at Leyden. His greatest merit consists in the service rendered to Church history by original contributions in this department, and by the publication of medieval writings and documents. In his direction of these works and of others, S. Tho. de la lebrori, Frisorum apostoli — Oratio in exitum S. Georgii martyr — Areopagica seu oppuscula quaedam suarum kactens recus ab Chliduochi et Hilduochi de rebus geatc ac etyble B. Macucii Josiach Dioniem Areopagice (Coloniis; 1653, Paris, 1656).—Academia Rhetorica ad Caulem Epistulam D. Pauli (Ducat, 1568).—De origine rituum universorum in Missa sacra sacrificiorum — De sacerdotum et de primis Christianis Monarchiae origine commentarius (Dilling, 1564). See B. Glassius, Godgeaer Nederland, D. I, b. 485 in ver.; also J. N. Paquot, Memoire pour servir à l'histoire liturgique des diocèses de la France, Paris, 1725; P. Lacug, Acta et clementie Romanae et de principalitatis die Liège et de quelques contrées voisines (Louvain, 1783-1787, 18 vols, ser. iii, p. 301 suiv. (J. P. W.)

Galenists, a branch split off, in 1664, from the Waterlanderites, who were Mennonites, or Anabaptists. The founder of the Galenists was called Galen Abraham Wierix, who was a doctor of physic, and pastor of a Mennonite congregation at Amsterdam. He was celebrated as a man of great penetration and eloquence, and is supposed to have inclined to Socinian views. Assuming that the Christian system laid much more stress on practice than on faith, he was disposed to receive into the Mennonite Church all who acknowledged the divine origin of the books of the Old and New Testaments and led holy and virtuous lives. Such, in his judgment, were true Christians, and had an undoubted right to all the privileges that belong to that character. — Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. ii, ch. v, § 7. See Apostollic; Mennonites.

Galenis, HANS. See Galenists.

Galerius, VALENIUS MAXIMIANUS, Roman emperor, son of a shepherd, was born near Sardica, in Dacia, educated in the imperial army, and served in the wars of Aurelius and Probus. Diocletian (A.D. 292) conferred on him, along with Constantius Chlorus, the title of Caesar, and gave him his daughter Valeria to wife. On the abdication of Diocletian (A.D. 305), he and Constantius became co-emperors, or joint rulers of the Roman empire. On the death of Constantius (A.D. 306), the troops in Britain and Gaul immediately declared their allegiance to his son, Constantine (afterwards Constantine the Great), much to the chagrin of Galerius, who expected the entire sovereignty of Rome to fall into his hands. He died A.D. 311. Galerius hated the Christians bitterly, and is believed to have been the real author of Diocletian's persecutions. See Diocletian. "Brought to reflection by a terrible disease, he put an end to the slaughter shortly before his death by a remarkable edict of toleration, which he issued from Nicomedia in 311, in conjunction with Constantine and Licinius. In that document he declared that the purpose of reclaiming the Christians from their wildif innovation and the multitude of their sects to the laws and discipline of the Roman state was not accomplished, and that he would now grant them permission to hold religious assemblies; but that if they disturbed not the order of the state. To this he added, in conclusion, the remarkable instruction that the Christians, 'after this manifestation of grace, should pray to their God for the welfare of the emperors, of the state, and of themselves, that the state might prosper in every respect, and that they might live quietly in their homes.' This edict brought the period of persecution in the Roman empire to a close."—Schaaf, History of the Christian Church, vol. i, § 57.

Galfred, Gaffridus. See Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Gall'gala (Gá'gala; Vulg. Gagala), the ordinary equivalent in the Sept. for Galgala. In the A.V. it is named only in 1 Sam. i, 2, as designating the direction of the road taken by the army of Demetrius, when they attacked Masaloth in Arbel—"the way to Galgala" (וֹתֶגוֹ תּוֹ וֹאֶכוֹ). The army, as we learn from the statements of Josephus (Ant. xii, 11), was on its way from Antioch, and there is no reason to doubt that this is the meaning of the name of that name in Galilee now surviving as Iribid. Its ultimate destination was Jerusalem (1 Macc. ix, 8), and Galgala may therefore be either the upper Galgal, near Bethel (Robinson, Researches, iii, 8), as Ewald thinks (Jes. Greek, III, 1, 870, n.), or the lower one near Jericho, as Eusebius places it, and others, as the more probable route between the two points. The lower (the preferable) that through the Ghor, is chosen. Josephus omits the name in his version of the passage. It is a gratuitous supposition of Ewald's that the Galilee which Josephus introduces is a corruption of Galgala—a view, however, which is favored by the ending in the margin of the above text, and which is adopted by Michaelis. See Galgala 3.

Galicho or Gallico, ELISHA BEN-GABRIEL, a Jewish commentator, was born about the middle of the 16th century (15527). He was president of the Rabbinic college at Safed, over which Moses Galante (q. v.) at one time presided, and, like all the Safed men, was eminently pious. He wrote a work on Ecclesiastes (כְֹּלַל בִּנְֵאָנָה, Venice, 1578), which he divided into 27 sections, according to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, including the final. Ginsburg, in his Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes (London, 1861, p. 67, etc.), gives an analysis and specimen of this work. The most cabalistic work of Galicho is his commentary on the Song of Songs (כְֹּלַל בִּנְֵאָנָה, Venice, 1593). He wrote also a commentary on the "Song of Songs" (כְֹּלַל בִּנְֵאָנָה, Venice, 1593).
a special locality, it is first mentioned by Joshua, who describes Kedesah as "in Galilee in Mount Naphtali" (xx, 7). Its limited extent is indicated in 2 Kings xv. 29, where the historian, detailing the conquests of Tiglath-pileser, states that "he took Ijon, and Abel-beth- Maschach, and Riblah, and Izion, and Hazor and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali." Galilee, therefore, did not extend beyond the bounds of Naphtali; and a comparison with other passages shows that it embraced only the northern section of that tribe. At least the name of the district was first confined to that district (Josh. xx. 7; xxii. 52; Josephus, Ant. v. 1, 18). The region thus lay on the summit of a broad mountain ridge. Here were situated the towns which Solomon offered to Hiram as payment for his services in procuring timber and stones for the Temple. Not until the time of Josiah was there great progress in the cultivation of this part of the district, which was famous for his island city, and who doubtless expected a portion of some of the rich plains of central Palestine, could not conceal his disappointment when he saw the mountain towns and their rugged environs, and declined them as useless (1 Kings ix. 11, and 2 Chron. viii. 2). See CANA. At this period, Galilee, though within the allotted territory of Naphtali, does not appear to have been occupied by the Israelites. It was only after Hiram had declined the towns that Solomon rebuilt and colonized them (2 Chron. l. c.). Hazor, the greatest and most powerful city of the Gentiles, the capital of that portion of the territory of Naphtali, was a name, lay within or near Galilee; and, though Joshua had captured and burned it (Josh. xii. 17), yet during the rule of the judges it was possessed by a king, Jabin, whose general, Sisera, dwelt in the neighboring Harosheth of the Gentiles (Judg. iv.) and the presence of these powerful and warlike tribes, and the natural strength of the country, sufficiently account for the continued occupation of the old Gentile inhabitants. David subdued, but did not expel them. Solomon, as it has been seen, took some of their towns; but they remained among these rugged mountains in such numbers that the name of Isaiah the Deuteronomist is intimately known by the name of "Galilee of the Gentiles" (מגדיר הגליל, Isa. xi. 1; in Matt. iv. 15, Γαλαταί γεωργικοί; in 1 Macc. v. 15, Γαλαταί ἀλλοφόροι). It is probable that the strangers increased in number, and became during the captivity the great body of the inhabitants; extending themselves also over the surrounding country, they gave to their new territories the old name, until at length Galilee became one of the largest, if not the largest, of the countries of Palestine. In 2 Macc. xxiv. 14, Macabees, Galilee contained only a few Jews living in the midst of a large heathen population (1 Macc. v. 20-28); Strabo states that in his day it was chiefly inhabited by Syrians, Phenicians, and Arabs (xvi. p. 760); and Josephus says the Greeks also dwelt in its cities (Lives, 19). The name also occurs in Tobit i. 2; Judith xi. 5, etc.

In the time of our Lord, all Palestine was divided into three provinces, Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee (Acts x. 31; Luke xvii. 11; Josephus, War, iii. 5). The latter included the whole northern section of the country, comprising the ancient territory of Isreal, and Zebulun, Asier, and Naphtali. Josephus defines its boundaries, and gives a tolerably full description of its scenery, products, and population. He says the soil is rich and well cultivated; fruit and forest trees of all kinds abound; numerous large cities and populous villages, amounting in all to no less than two hundred and forty, thickly stud the whole face of the country; the inhabitants are industrious and warlike, being trained to arms from their infancy (War, iii. 8, 8; Life, 45). On the west it was bounded by the territory of Poelmas, which probably included the whole plain of the valley of Carmel. The southern boundary ran along the base of Carmel and of the hills of Samaria to Mount Gilboa, and then descended to the valley of Jezreel by Scythopolis to the Jordan. (Tid
Talmud, Gitin, vii, 7, gives a place called נָבִי מְרָה (Nabi Marra) as the southern limit. The River Jordan, the Sea of Galilee, and the Upper Jordan to the fountain at Dan, formed the eastern border (Bialostock, p. 161); and the border from Dan westward across the mountain ridge till it touched the territory of the Phoenicians (Josephus, War, iii, 8, 1; compare Lake viii, 26). See Palestine.

Galilee was divided into two sections (Cyril, c. Jul. ii, 20; Josephus, Ant. 19, 6; Ant. v, 1, 29). The Talmud has a threefold division, with reference to the Sabattical year (Shebi'ah, ix, 2; Upper Galilee [בניא עַבְרָי]), embraces all above Capharannanias, and does not produce sycamores; Lower [לְמָשַׁמֶּשׁ], all below C., and bears sycamores; the valley is the territory of Tiberias [בְּנֵי הָעָר]. A single glance at the country shows that the division was natural. Lower Galilee included the great plain of Esdrael, with its plain of Abnae, which runs down to the Jordan and the Lake of Tiberias; and the whole of the hill-country adjoining it on the north to the foot of the mountain range. The words of Josephus are clear and important (War, iii, 2, 1): "It extends from Tiberias to Zebulun, adjacent to the latter; and from Zebulun is Porter's well, which is believed to be the birthplace of the Messiah. It stretches from a village called Xaloth, lying in the Great Plain, to Bersabe." "The village of Xaloth" is evidently the Chesulloth of Josh. xix, 12, now called Iksal, and situated at the base of Mount Tabor, on the northern border of the Great Plain (Porter, Handbook, p. 450). But a comparison of Josephus, Ant. xx, 6, 4, with War, iii, 2, 4, proves that Lower Galilee extended as far as the village of Ginea, the modern Jenin, on the extreme southern side of the plain. The site of the northern border town, Bersabe, is not known. It was evidently that of the Abana and Jotapata were in Lower Galilee (Josephus, Life, 87; War, ii, 20, 6); and as the former was situated near the north-west angle of the Lake of Tiberias, and the latter about eight miles north of Nazareth (Porter, Handbook, p. 482, 577), we conclude that Lower Galilee included the whole range of extension from the plain of Akka, on the west, to the shores of the sea on the east. It was thus one of the richest and most beautiful sections of Palestine. The plain of Esdraelon presents an unbroken surface of fertile soil—soil so good that to enjoy it the tribe of Issachar descended to a second place in the division of the country, its "fruitfulness," its "abundance," its "abundance," its "fruitfulness," its "abundance," its "fruitfulness," its "abundance," its "fruitfulness," its "abundance," its "fruitfulness," its "abundance," its "fruitfulness," its "abundance," its "fruitfulness," its "abundance," its "fruitfulness," its "abundance., its "fruitfulness," its "abundance., its "fruitfulness., its "abundance., its "fruitfulness., its "abundance., its "fruitfulness.."

The blessings promised by Jacob and Moses to Zebulun and Asher seem to be here inscribed on the features of the country. Zebulun, nesting amid these hills, "offers sacrifices of righteousness" of the abundant rocks nourished by their rich pastures; he rejoices "in his going out" along the fertile plain of Esdraelon; "he sucks the abundance of the seas," his possessions skirting the Bay of Haifa at the base of Carmel; and he "sucks of treasures hid in the sand," possibly in allusion to the gulf which was first made won on the shores of the River Belus (Deut. xxxiii, 18; 19; Pliny, v, 19; Tacitus, Hist. v). Asher, dwelling amid the hills on the north-west of Zebulun, on the borders of Phoenicia, "dips his feet in oil," the produce of luxuriant olive groves, such as still distinguish this region; "his bread," the produce of the plain of Phoenicia, "is fat;" the fertile upland valleys "is fat;" the " yields royal dainties;" oil and wine from his olives and vineyards, and milk and butter from his pastures (Gen. xliv, 20; Deut, xxxii, 24, 25). The chief towns of Lower Galilee were Tiberias, Tarichaeia, at the southern end of the Sea of Galilee, and Sepphoris (Josephus, Life, 9, 28, 29, 37). The latter played an important part in the last days of the kingdom (Josephus, Ant. xil, 6, 3, 17; iv, 11, 12). It is now called Seferieh, and is situated about three miles north of Nazareth (Porter, Handbook, p. 358). There were, besides, two strong fortresses, Jotapata, now called Jefiat, and Mount Tabor (Josephus, War, iii, 7, 8 sqq. iv, 1, 0). The towns most celebrated in N.T. history are Tiberias, Cana, and Tiberias (Luke i, 26; John ii, 1; vi, 1).

Upper Galilee, according to Josephus, extended from Bersabe on the south to the village of Baca, on the borders of the territory of Tyre, and from Meloth on the west to Thellsa, a city near the Jordan (War, iii, 2, 1). None of these places are now known, but it is no difficulty in ascertaining the position and approximate extent of the province. It embraced the whole mountain range lying between the upper Jordan and Phoenicia. Its southern border ran along the foot of the Safed range from the north-west angle of the Sea of Galilee to the plain of Akka. To this region the name "Galilee of the Gentiles" is given in the O. and N. T. (Isa. ix, 1; Matt. iv, 15). So Eusebius states (Onom. s. v. Παλαια). The town of Capernaum, on the north shore of the lake, was in Upper Galilee (Onom. s. v. Capharnaum). The great part of this district is now included in the province how far the province extended southward, and as proving that it, as well as Lower Galilee, touched the lake. The mountain range of Upper Galilee is a southern prolongation of Lebanon, from which it is separated by the deep ravine of the Leontes. See Lebanon. The site of the summit of the range is tableland, part of which is beautifully wooded with dwarf oak, intermixed with tangled shrubbery of hawthorn and arbutus. The whole is varied by fertile upland plains, green forest glades, and wild picturesque glens breaking down to the east and south. The villages and inns are still scattered over the country, consisting chiefly of Metwilihe, a sect of Mohammedans. Safed is the principal town, and contains about 4000 souls, one third of whom are Jews. It is one of the four holy Jewish cities of Palestine, and has for centuries or more been celebrated for the sacredness of its tombs and the learning of its rabbinists. Safed seems to be the centre of an extensive volcanic district. Shocks of earthquake are felt every few years. One occurred in 1837 which killed about 5000 persons (Porter, Handbook, p. 438). On the table-land of Upper Galilee lie the ruins of Kedesh-Naphthali (Josh. xx, 7), a city now called Kedriss, and still holy to the Jews and to the Samaritans (Josephus, War, iii, 20, 6), and celebrated as the last place in Galilee that held out against the Romans (War, ii, 22, 6; iv, 1, 1; 2, 1-5).

Galilee was the scene of the greater part of our Lord's public life and public acts (see Mission of Jesus, De Galilæis, Viteb, 1711; Budeus, De Galilæis rebus gentis Christi clara, Jen. 1718 [Miscell. Sacri, cr. 1156 sqq.]; Less, De Gal. Serrat. mirac. theatr. Gott. 1775 [Opp. 1781, ii, 869 sqq.]). His early years were spent at Nazareth, and when he entered on his great work he made Capernaum his home (Matt. iv, 15; ix, 1). It is a remarkable fact that the first three Gospels are chiefly taken up with our Lord's ministrations in this province, while the Gospel of John dwells more upon those upon Judea (see Miller, De ordine rerum Christi in Galilœa gestarum, Hal. 1770). The nature of our Lord's parables and public acts, as known from our Gospels, is influenced by the peculiar features and products of the country. The vineyard, the fig-tree, the shepherd, and the desert in the parable of the Good Samaritan, were all appropriate in Judæa; while the corn-fields (Mark iv, 28), the fisheries (Matt. xiii, 47), the merchants (Matt. xxi, 46), and the flowers (Matt. vi, 26), are no less appropriate in Galilee. The apostles were all either Galileans by birth or residence (Acts i, 11), and as such they were despised, as their master had been, by the proud Jews (John i, 46; vii, 22; Acts ii, 7). It appears, also, that the pronunciation of those
GALILEE

Jews who resided in Galilee had become peculiar, probably from their contact with their Gentile neighbors (Matt. xxv. 78; Mark xiv. 70; see Lightfoot, Opp. ii, 77). On the death of Herod the Great the province of Galilee was given by Caesar to his son Antipas (Joseph. War, ii, 6, 3). After the destruction of Jerusalem Galilee became the chief seat of Jewish schools of learning, and the residence of their most celebrated rabbins. The National Council or Sanhedrim was taken for a time to Jabneh in Philistia, but was soon removed to Sepphoris, and afterwards to Tiberias (Lightfoot, Opp. ii, p. 141). The Mishna was here compiled by Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh (cir. A.D. 109-220), and a few years afterwards the Gemara was added (Buxtorf, Tiberiu, p. 19). Remains of splendid synagogues still exist in many of the old towns and villages, showing that from the 2d to the 7th century the Jews were as prosperous as they were numerous (Porter, Handbook, p. 427, 440). See Galilee.

GALILEE, SEA OF (ἡ Ἡλεία τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Matt. iv. 18; xv, 29; Mark i, 16; vii. 31; John vi, 1), called also the SEA OF TIBERIAS (John vi, 1; xxii. 1; hence its modern name Bahr el-Tiberiye), the Lake (Nepher) of Gennesaret (Luke vi. 1), or emphatically for water (ἡ Ἡλεία simpliciter, Matt. iv. 15); in the O. T.

mer says, "The Jordan discharges itself into a lake, by many writers known as Genesara, 15 miles long and 6 wide, which is skirted by the pleasant towns Julias and Hippo on the east, of Tarichaeum on the south (a name which is by many persons given to the lake itself), and of Tiberias on the west" (v. 15). Josephus refers to other features. "The Lake of Genesaret derives its appellation from the adjacent Julian and Hippo furlongs (five Roman miles) broad, by 140 (174 miles) long. Its waters are sweet, and extremely pleasant to drink, as they flow in a clearer stream than the muddy collections of marshes, and they can be drawn free from impurities, being throughout confined by abrupt and sandy shores. They are of a moderate temperature, milder than those of the river or the fountain, yet uniformly colder than might be expected from the expanse of the lake. . . . The kinds of fish found here differ from those elsewhere met with" (War, iii, 10, 7). Both these are so near the truth that they could scarcely have been more accurate. Its extreme length is 12½ geographical miles, and its breadth 6; equal to about 16 by 7¼ Roman miles. It is of an oval shape, or rather the form of an egg, with the large end to the north. The Sea of Galilee has none of those time-famed memories that have attached the Euphrates of Italy and Switzerland are justly celebrated; it has not even the stern grandeur of the Dead Sea. The shores are singularly uniform. There are no bold cliffs jutting far out into deep water; there are no winding bays running away into the open sea inland. The bed of the sea is like a huge basin. Along its eastern and western sides the banks rise steep, bare, and rugged, to the height of nearly 2000 feet; and their tops, especially those on the east, are as level as a wall. At the narrowest part, where the Jordan enters and passes out, there are wide openings, through which views are gained up and down the valley. Yet nature has not left this scene altogether destitute of ornament. The scenery is not quite so dreary, nor are the hues of the landscape so dead and sombre as Dr. Trall would have us imagine (Traill's Josephus, ii, p. cvii).

True, when the sun is high and the sky cloudless, and when the picturesque outline, from down from the top of the mountains, there is a dreariness in the landscape, and a uniformity of cold gray color, which wearsies the eye; but let him go down to the shore and wait till the sun declines, and he will be enchanted with the deep ethereal blue of the smooth water, and the tints, "rose-colored, pearl-gray, and purple, blended together," and thrown in soft shades over the sides of the encircling hills. The pale blue cone of Hermion, with its glittering crown of snow, forms a glorious background (Van de Velde, ii, 888; Robinson, ii, 880 sq.; Stanley, Palestine, p. 362; Porter, Handbook, p. 418). Round the whole shore, with only one or two short interlusions, there is a broad strand of white pebbles, mixed with little shells. The Jordan enters at the extreme northern end of the lake, and leaves again at the southern. In fact, the bed of the lake is just a lower section of the great Jordan valley. The utter loneliness and absolute stillness of the scene are exceedingly impressive. It seems as if all nature had gone to rest, languishing under that scorching heat. How different it was in the days of our Lord! Then all was life and bustle along the shores; the cities and villages that thickly stubbed
them resounded with the hum of a busy population, while from hill-side and cornfield come the cheerful cry of shepherd and ploughman. The lake, too, was dotted with dark fishing-boats, and spangled with white sails. Now, a mournful and solitary silence reigns alike over sea and shore. The cities are in ruins. Greek cities, Chios, Samos, Rhodes, and the two Ionian Islands, Ithaca, and Corcyra, are deserted. Tiberias and Madgala are the only inhabited spots; and for several miles inland in every direction the country looks waste and desolate. The inhabitants—merchants, fishermen, and peasant—were nearly all gone. The few who remain in the shatterd hamlets of Tiberias, and the mud hovels of Madgala, and the black tents of the wandering Bedouin, seem worn and wasted by poverty and sickness. In 1858 the Sea of Galilee could just boast of one small boat, and it was so rotten and leaky that it was not worth keeping. The fish, as are as abundant as ever; for though only little hand-nets are used, a considerable sum is paid to the government for the privilege of fishing (Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 382; Robinson, ii, 386). It was observed by Hasekistiat that some of the same species of fish found in the Sea of Galilee were also found in the Nile (Travels, p. 158): the same fact had been noted by Josephus (War, iii, 10, 8). The kinds referred to are Cyprianus Donni, Silurus, Mormyris, etc. (See Wilson’s Land of the Bible, ii, 113; Robinson, ii, 386). Two modes are now employed to catch the fish. One is a large fish-trap made of branches, in which the fish go and die. (Landscapes, in xxi, 7), stalks along the shore, and, watching his opportunity, throws it round the game with a jerk. The other mode is still more curious. Bread-crumbs are mixed up with bichlorid of mercury, and sown over the water; the fish swallow them up, and all the bodies float, are picked up, and taken to the market of Tiberias! (Porter, Hand-book, p. 432.) The water of the lake is sweet, cool, and transparent; and as the beach is everywhere pebbly, it has a beautiful sparkling look. This fact is somewhat strange, when we consider that it is exposed to the powerful rays of the sun, that many warm and briskish springs flow into it, and that it is supplied by the Jordan which rushes into its northern end, a turbid, muddy torrent. The most remarkable fact in the physical geography of the Sea of Galilee is its great depression. The surface of the sea is 645 feet below the level of the Mediterranean, below the level of the Jordan, and below the level of the Dead Sea by 28 feet. The lake stretches between the heights of 28 and 46 feet, but according to the trigonometrical survey of Liet. Symonds, R.E., in 1841, its depression is only 228 feet. In this Van de Velde thinks there must have been some mistake, and he adheres to the figures of Liet. Lynch, which give 66 feet, and refered to the Inquisition for defending and developing the Copernican system. The Inquisition found the views of Copernicus and Galileo irreconcilable with the letter of the Scripture. Galileo went himself to Rome to defend himself, but without effect. His astronomical views were examined by the theological qualifers, and declared to be absurd, false in philosophy, and contrary to the Holy Scriptures. In 1616 and 1620, decrees were issued allowing to set up the system of Copernicus as a hypothesis, but forbidding it to be defended as a theory. Galileo paid no attention to this demand, but six years later he published his "Dialogue on the two greatest cosmic systems, that of Ptolemy and that of Copernicus," in which the two systems are compared, and, to satisfy the Inquisition, the victory is awarded to the champion of the system of Ptolemy; but, in fact, the arguments used in its behalf are so well adapted to manifestly inferior to those adduced in favor of the Copernican system, as to leave no doubt as to the real opinions of Galileo. His enemies found it easy to cause new measures to be taken against him by the Inquisition. Galileo was in 1633 again summoned to the Inquisition. On 18th of May, 1633, the famous sentence of "A large stone, and the king of the Medici; subsequently he was some time detained as a prisoner in the buildings of the Inquisition; finally he
was sent back to the Villa Medici. The result of the investigation was that Galilee was found guilty of having adhered to and of having supported heretical opinions; and he had to abjure his errors in a kneeling posture, and to sign the minutes of the proceedings against him. He was condemned to be imprisoned at the Inquisition during pleasure, and to recite once a week for three years the avowal of his poisonous plant. Gala-
lee submitted to the judgment, and, kneeling and in sackcloth, swore upon the Gospels never again to teach the earth's motion and the sun's stability.

When rising from the ground, he is reported to have said: “I only recite, and it does not remove, for all that”); but the authenticity of this report is doubted. After four days' confinement, he was allowed to remove to the residence of the Tuscan ambas-
dassador, but he was kept under surveillance during the whole remainder of his life. In 1534 he asked permission to visit Florence for medical assistance, but the permission was not granted until 1638. The severity of the Inquisition was somewhat relaxed in 1637, when he became almost totally blind. During the latter years of his life he seems to have paid less attention to astronomy, but the works of this period of most attention show that his genius was as great as

ever. He died January 8, 1612. The city of Pisie erected a statue in his honor. The complete list of works of Galileo is Le Opere di Galileo Galilei (Florence, 1634-46, 15 vols.). The most important of his later works is a daughter's testament (Lay-
den, 1638). Biographies of Galileo were written by B. Ghislandi, Viviani (1650), F. Livorno, 1757), Jagen-
mann (Weimar, 1788), Nuell (Lausanne, 1789), Venturi (Milan, 1818-21), Libri (Milan, 1841), Brewer (Lon-
don, 1841), Cattaro (Milan, 1840), Caspar (Stuttgart, 1834), Charles (Paris, 1861). On the trial of Galileo by the Inquisition, there are special works and essays by Marini (Galilei e l'Inquisizione, Rome, 1850); Mad-
en (Galilei e l'Inquisizione, London, 1868); Vossen (G. und die Röm. Verurteilung des copernicanischen Systems, Frankf. 1885); The Catholic World (Jan. and Feb. 1869) (A. J. S.)

Galatin. See GALATIA.

Gall, the representative of the A.V. in two Hebrew words and one Greek.

1. Merorah or merorah (מֶרְוָרָה or מֶרְוָרָה; Sept. γολο, κακό, διαρρού; Vulg. fel, amaritudo, visco mors) denotes etymologically bitterness: see Job xii, 26, "Thou writest bitter things against me." Hence the term is applied to the "bile" or "gall" from its in-
tent (Job xii, 13). The metaphors in this verse are taken from the practice of the ancients and of the Hebrew men, who first surround the beast, then shoot it, and next take out the entrails. The term also stands for the gall-bladder or vitals (Job xx, 25). It is also used of the "poison" of serpents (Job xx, 14), which the ancients erroneously believed was their gall: see Plien, III. N. xi, 87, "No one should be astonished that it is the gall which constitutes the poison of serpents" (comp. Heb. xii, 15, "root of bitterness"). See LIVER.

2. Rosh (רָשָׁה or under:; Sept. χολή, περίκρατος) Vulg. fel, amaritudo, caput), generally translated "gall" by the A.V., but in Hos. x, 4 rendered "hem-
ble" (περίκρατος, Gen. xxvi, 15), and Job xx, 12, it denotes the "poison" or "venom" of serpents. From Deut. xxix, 18, "a root that beareth rosh" (margin "a poisonous herb") and Lam. iii, 19, "the wormwood and the rosh," compared with Hos. v, 4, "judgment springeth up as rosh," it is evident that the Heb. term denotes some bitter, and possibly poisonous plant, though it may also be used, as in Psa. lxix, 21, in the general sense of "something very bitter." Celsus (Hierob.
li, 46-52) thinks "hemlock," (Conium maculatum) is in-
tended, and quotes Jerome on Hosea in support of his opinion, though it seems that this commentator had in view the cough-grass (Triscium repens) rather than the henshock." Rosenmüller (Bib. Bot. p. 118) is in-
clined to think that the Loliurn temulentum least agrees with the passage in Hosea where the rosh is said to crown "in the furrows of the field." Other writers have supposed, and with some reason (from Deut. xxxii, 62, "their grapes are grapes of rosh"), that some berry-bearing plant must be intended: "prickly" (Thes. p. 189). Michaelis (Gall. Lex. Heb. p. 2290) is of opinion that rosh may be either the Loliurn temulentum or the Solarum ("nightshade"). Oedmann (Verm. Samml. pt. iv, c. 10) argues in favor of the Coleogyph. The most probable conjecture, for proof there is a whole chapter of Galatians (Galatians, xii, 18). Pliny refers to the use of the same substance for dis-
cases of the eye (Nat. Hist. XXVII, 10); also speak-
ing of the fish callimopsis, he says it has a similar cu-
rative virtue (xxvii, 4, 7). Galen and other writers praise the use of the liver of the silurus in cases of dim-
ness of sight. See also Bitterness.

The passages in the Gospels which relate the circum-
stance of the Roman soldiers offering our Lord, just before his crucifixion, "vaccine mingled with gall," according to Matthew (xxvii, 34), and "wine mingled with gall," according to Mark (xv, 23), require some consideration. The first-named evangelist uses χολή, which is the Sept. rendering of the Heb. rosh in the Psalm (xix, 21) that foretells the Lord's sufferings. Mark explains the bitter ingredient in the sour vinegar to be "myrrh" (οἴνος εὐ-
νυχῆριον), for we cannot regard the transactions as different. "Matthew, in his usual way," as Hengsten-
berg (Comment. in Psa. xxix, 21) remarks, "designates the drink theologically: always keeping his eye on the prophecies of the O.T., he speaks of gall and vinegar for the purpose of rendering the fulfillment of the Psalmic prophecy complete." Mark again states it and fol-
lowing to his way, looks rather at the outward quality of the drink." Bengel takes quite a different view; he thinks both myrrh and gall were added to the sour wine (Gnom. Nov. Text. Matt. I. c.). Hengstenberg's view is still more "gall" (χολή) to be un-
derstood in any other sense than as expressing the bit-
ter nature of the draught. So as to the intent of the proffered drink, it is generally supposed that it was for the purpose of deadening pain. It was customary to give criminals just before their execution a cup of wine with frankincense in it, to which reference is made, it is believed, by the ωἶνος σκαρφῆριος of Psa.

ix, 8, see also Prov. xxxii, 6. This the Talmud states was given in order to alleviate the pain. See Buxtorf (Lex. Talm. col. 2103), who quotes from the Talmud that "wine effec-
tively very bitter." Rosenmüller (Bib. Bot. p. 168) is of opinion that the myrrh was added to our Lord, not for the purpose of alleviating his suffer-
ings, but in order that he might be sustained until the punishment was completed. He quotes from Apuleius (Metamorph. viii), who relates that a certain priest "dis-
figured himself with a multitude of blows, having pre-
iously strengthened himself by taking myrrh." How far the frankincense in the cup, as mentioned in the Talmud, was supposed to possess soporific properties, or in any way to induce an alleviation of pain, it is difficult to determine. The same must be said of the ωἶνος περικρατοῦς of Mark, for it is quite certain
that neither of these two drugs in question, both of which are the produce of the same natural order of plants (Apocynaceae), is ranked among the hypotonic
tonic, blenchoptic drugs. It is true that Dioscorides (i, 77) ascribes a soporific property to myrrh, but it does not seem to have been so regarded by any other author. Notwithstanding, therefore, the almost concurrent opinion of ancient and modern commentators, that the "wine mingled with myrrh" was offered to our Lord at the Last Supper, we cannot, in the light of the same conclusion. Had the soldiers intended a mit-
ification of suffering, they would doubtless have offered a draught drugged with some substance having narcotic properties. The drink in question was probably a mead or a customary beverage of the Romans, who were in the habit of seasoning their various wines which, as they contained little alcohol, soon turned sour, with various spices, drugs, and perfumes, such as myrrh, cassia, myrtle, pepper, etc. (Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Vinum). See MYRRH.

Gall, Nikolaus. See Gallus.

Gall, St., monastery of, one of the most celebrated monasteries of Europe, at St. Gall, in Switzerland. It was founded in the 7th century. Its wealth and reput-
ation became very great under Otthmar, its first abbott (729–760), who founded a hospital for lepers in connec-
tion, and the improvement in the 8th century which it be-
came distinguished for learning, especially under ab-
bot Gosbert (815–837). "The abbey of St. Gall gradu-
ally became one of the masterpieces of medieval ar-
chitecture; and the genius and skill which were lav-
ished on its construction, and on the decoration of its 
halls and cloisters, had a large share in developing, 
the Christian art of the period. The monks of St. 
Gall, too, may be reckoned among the best friends and 

preservers of ancient literature. They were indefatig-
able in the collection and transcription of MSS.—Biblical, patristic, sacred and profane history, classical, liturgical, and legendary. Several of the classics, especially Quintilian, Silius Italicus, and Ammianus Marcellinus, have been preserved solely through the MSS. of St. Gall. For a time the abbey was sub-
ject to the bishop of Constance, and an ani-
mated dispute was for a long time main-
tained between that prelate and the monks as to the 
right of electing the abbot. It ended, however, in the 
reconquest of the right of free election; and 
ultimately, from the growth of the monastic pos-
ses-
sions, and the importance which the abbots held, the monastic domain, which comprised a great part of northern Switzerland, became a distinct juris-
diction, within which the abbot, like many of his brethren in the great Benedictine monasteries, exercised all the rights of a suzerain. For several centuries the abbey of St. Gall held one of the highest places in 
the order. Its schools enjoyed wide reputation. Its members held a distinguished place among the scholars of mediæval Germany; and many of them, as, for example, Nozer, are known to have cultivated not only the ordinary learning of the schools, but also 

physic, mathematics, and astronomy. The school of St. Gall, too, was one of the most eminent for the cul-
tivation of music, and its MSS., preserved in its libra-

ry, have been extensively made use of by the restorers of ancient ecclesiastical music. A town of considera-

ble importance grew up around the monastery, and was called by the same name; and as the wealth and influence which attached to the dignity of the abbot began to make it an object of ambition to rich and powerful families, we find the succession of abbots, in the 12th and 13th centuries, sank down below that of their plios and learned predecessors in the office. A stringent reform was enforced about the time of the Council of Constance; but the burghefs of St. Gall had grown dissatisfied under this rule, and on the out-

break of the Reformation in 1525 they throw off their 
subjedtion, and embraced the new doctrines. At 
the close, however, of the religious war in 1532, the Catho-
lic religion was not reinstated, though with diminished authority, in his house of dignity. At the French Revolution, the abbey of St. 
Gall was secularized (1798), and its revenues were so 
soon afterwards sequestrated (1805). By a later ecle-

siastical arrangement, the abbey of St. Gall was 
raised to the dignity of a bishopric, which in 1823 
was united to that of Chur. They were afterwards, 
however, separated, and in 1847 St. Gall was erected 
to an archbishopric, with a distinct jurisdiction."—Cham-
bers, Encyclopaedia, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encylopädie, iv, 468.

Gall, St. Manuscript (Codex Sangallensis), usually designated as Δ of the Gospels, one of the most important of the later uncial MSS., containing the four Gospels (with only a single hiatus, John xix, 17–55) and an interlined Latin version, rudely written on coarse vellum in a very peculiar character. It comprises 197 leaves, 40 to 40 inches by 8 in size, with 20 to 26 (usually 21) lines of text on each page. 

Before Matthew are placed prologues, Latin verses, the Eusebian canons in Roman letters, tables of the κεφα-
λαια in Greek and Lat., etc. The text is divided into regular σειρας. There are also πισεθαι, and the Ammo-
niatic section which has so much value, but the Codex Boernerianus (G of Paul's epistles), as to show that they both once belonged together. See Boerner 
MANUSCRIPT. The Gospel of Mark seems to represent a text different from that of the other evangelists. It agrees in general with the older MSS. There are scarcely any breathings or accents; the words are often 

wrongly divided, with dots at the end of almost every Greek word, and marks >> inserted to fill up vacant spaces.

This MS. is preserved in the monastery of St. Gall, 
Switzerland, where it was probably transcribed original-
ly. It was first inspected by Gerbert in 1773, was named by him (in his N. 7. 1830), and has been pub-
lished in a full Latin facsimile edition by Retting (Zürich, 1836), with Prolegomena. It seems to have been written by Latin (perhaps Irish) monks in the 9th century.—Schulz, Einleitung, p. 122 sqq.: Tri-
gelles in Horne's Introduction, iv, 156 sq. See MANU-
SCHRIFTEN, BIBLICAL.

Galland, Andrea, or Gallandus, Andreas, an 
Italian priest and abbot of the Oratorian congregation, 
was born at Venice Dec. 6, 1720, and died in the same 
city Jan. 12, 1779. He rendered great service to lit-
erature by his edition of the fathers, entitled Bibliotheca 
Vetorum Patrum, antiquorum que scriptorum et. — 
et. Lat. (Venet. 1765–1781, 14 vols. fol.). It comprises 
in all 980 writers, and is considered to be one of the most accurate and useful of all the libraries of the fa-
thers. He left in MSS. Theologiae antiquissimae Ecclesi-

Gallas ("invaders"), a race inhabiting the south 
and east of Asia Minor. "The general name by which the tribes designate themselves is Oroma (orina, men). Although this is to be understood literally, it can be secondary not purely negroes, but form with the Fulahs, Mandingoos, and Nebas, as it were, the transition to the Shemitic variety, and seem to belong to that great family inhabiting the east of Africa, from the frontiers
of the Cape land to Abyssinia, and usually denomi-
nated the Kaffirs. They are a vigorous, well-formed
people, of a dark-brown color, with hair frizzled,
but not quite woolly, round faces, and small, sharp eyes,
and are distinguished not less by their energy and
warlike spirit than by their mental capacities. They
first appear to the notice of the 16th century as a bar-
barous people, extending their conquests from the in-
terior of Africa, lying waste, by constant incursions,
the countries of Eastern Africa to the mountains of
Abyssinia, gradually subduing or expelling the orig-
inal inhabitants (hence their name), occupying great
part of Abyssinia, and in time taking an active part
in the contest for the right to the Red Sea and the Gulf
of Aden. It is only of late years that their power in
Abyssinia, and their incursions into that country,
have been partially checked, chiefly by the vigorous
government of the king of Shoa, who has subdued
some of the Gallas tribes, and induced them to
profess such Christianity as exists in Abyssinia.
They still, however, occupy many districts of Ab-
byssinia, and extend their power to an indefinite extent
over the countries situated south and south-west of it.
Politically, the Gallas do not form a single nation.
but are divided into numerous tribes forming separ-
ate kingdoms and states, which are frequently at
war with each other. Most of the Gallas follow pas-
toral avocations. Some, however, through intercourse
with the semi-Christian, semi-civilized Abyssinquins,
have become tillers of the soil. The wandering
Gallas are the only inhabitants in the slave
trade. The larger number of the Gallas are still hea-
thens, though Mohammedanism has lately made great
progress among them. Their religion bears a resem-
bance to that of the Kaffirs. Compare Jamaal, No-
tices sur la Gailie (Paris, 1859); Beke, On the Origin
of the Gallas (London, 1847); Howland, Abyssinia and
the Galla Country (London, 1868). Behm (Geograph.
Jahrbuch, vol. i., Gotha, 1864) assigns to the Gallas a
territory of about 280,000 sq. miles and 7,000,000
people. The Roman Catholic Church has a mission
among the Gallas, which in 1841 was erected into a
vicariate apostolic. The letters of the vicariate
apostolic, Massaia, in the Annales de la Proposat, de Fo,
are among the chief sources of our information on
the Gallas. Massaia was the founder of the mission, and
was in 1869 still at its head. (A. J. S.)

Gallaudet, Thomas Hopkins, L.L.D., an emi-
nent Congregational minister and philanthropist, was
born Dec. 10, 1787, in Philadelphia. He graduated at
Yale College in 1805, and was chosen tutor in 1806,
which office he held two years, after which he was en-
gaged in mercantile business until 1811, when he en-
tered upon the study of theology and law. In 1816,
he received his license, and became pastor at Portsmouth.
Here he became interested in a little deaf and dumb girl,
Alice Cogswell, and instructed her with success. Her
father, Dr. Cogswell, became the founder of an associ-
ation for the aid of deaf mutes; and funds being pro-
vided, Mr. Gallaudet resigned his ministry, and went
to Europe in 1815 to study the existing deaf and dumb
institutions. At the London Deaf and Dumb Asyl-
um he was refused admission except as Junior assist-
ent. He then went to Edinburgh, but there the teach-
er had learnt his system from the Mesmer, Braidwood,
and had been compelled to sign an engagement not to
impart the method to any other person intending to
become a teacher. He then betook himself to Paris,
and was warmly received by the abbe Sicard. Every-
things was laid freely open to him. He was able to
return to America before the close of 1816. And Sicard
allowed Laurent le Clerc, a deaf-mute, who was one of
the best teachers of the institution, to accompany him
to America. During his absence in Europe the
society had been incorporated; Mr. Gallaudet was then
appoointed its principal, le Clerc being his head assist-
ant, and on the 15th of April, 1817, The American
Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb, at Hartford, Conn., was
formally opened. Mr. Gallaudet remained head of the
asylum until 1830, when he resigned from failing
health. The system which he established was found-
ed on that of Sicard, with modifications. "It is known
as the American system. The main principle with
Mr. Gallaudet was to call out the intelligence of the
pupils as far as possible, and to treat them as in de-
scribing things for himself, and to discard the mere
learning by rote; and the result was to stimulate the
mind of the teacher, as well as of the pupil, in no ordi-
nary degree. Mr. Gallaudet's exertions were by no
means confined to the deaf and dumb asylum. His
vigorous and active mind induced him to improve,
and extension of common schools, and in the raising
up of a superior body of teachers, and wrote several
pamphlets on the subject. He also zealously advoca-
ted the adoption of means of imparting moral and
religious training to prisoners, and was an earnest pro-
moter of the movement for improving the manage-
ment of the insane. So strongly did he feel on this
matter, that, though in but feeble health, he accepted
in 1858 the office of chaplain of the state Retreat for
the Insane at Hartford, where, it is stated, 'the expe-
rience of each successive year furnished accumulating
evidence of the uselessness of his labors, and the effica-
cy of kind moral treatment and a wise religious
influence in the melioration and care of the insane.'"
He died Sept. 10, 1851. Besides a number of tracts and
essays on the education of the deaf and dumb, and on
the treatment of the insane, he wrote "Various Points of
Christian Faith and Practice" (London, 1818, 8vo); — Mrs. Teachers' Seminaries" (1826); —
The Child's Book on the Soul (1830, often reprinted,
and translated into most European languages); —Scripture
Biography (5 vols. 1834-44). See Humphrey,
Life and Labors of Gallaudet (N. Y. 1857, 12mo); Eng-
ish Cyclopedia; Sprague, Annales, ii, 609.

Gallure, an architectural term describing the por-
ticoes or verandahs which are not uncommon in
Eastern houses. See House. It is doubtful, however,
whether two of the three Hebrew words so translated
have any reference to such an object. See Archi-
tecture.

1. פְּרָטֵף, artik' (Ezek. xii, 15 [where the text has פְּרָטֵף, akath]); 16; Sept. פְּרָטֲאָה; xiii, 3, 5, Sept.
πετριδος; according to Gesenius, from פְּרָט', to cut
off; according to Fürst, from an obsolete פְּרִט, to set
off); by some thought to mean (as in xlii, 6) pillar
or columns (so (Villalpandus, Coecus); by others a de-
crement of פְּרַט (so Gesenius. Fürst. Häckel. Ha-
zig), as the context requires (Böttcher, Proben, p. 350).
See Temple. The ancient interpreters are wholly at
fault; the Sept. renders ambiguously, the Talmud
"corners," the Syr. "abal stature," and the Jewish in-
terpreter "lacks their ignorance" (Kimchi, Jarchi).

2. פְּרָטַח, račhît' (Cant. i. 17; either, with Fürst,
from an obsolete root פְּרַט, to trim, or, with Gesenius,
for פְּרַח, rachy, as in the margin, prob. "panelwork or
freted ceiling (so Sept. פְּרַטָהּ, Vulg., laquea-
In the case of the var. read in the Masoretic text
(q. d. ambulatoire or place of exercise), this term haseen confounded with

3. פְּרָטָה, raht' (from פְּרָטַח, to flow down; spoken
of watering-troughs, Gen. x. 43; Exod. xi, 16);
curled locks or rings of a maiden (Cant. vii. 6; Sept.

Gallure, originally a languishing hall. The word is
now applied, in ecclesiastical architecture, to any
floor elevated above the floor of a main audience room
of a church, and built to contain hearers. Galleries
of this kind date from the time of the Reformation,
though somewhat similar galleries existed in the By-
zantine churches. Narrow covered passage-ways,
within or without a church, especially in Romanesque churches, are also termed galleries. (G. F. C.)

Galley is the rendering in the A. V. in one passage (Isa. xxxiii, 21) of "\text{yn} out", a ship or fleet, elsewhere rendered "navy." See Ship.

Ancient Assyrian Galley.

Gallican Church, a name often given to the Roman Catholic Church of France. The peculiar spirit of that Church, especially with regard to its relations to Rome, is called Gallicanism. The term is especially used with reference to the principles of the French Church, in opposition to Ultramontanism (the extreme papal view of Church polity), as embodied in the four articles of 1682 (see below). But it is historically certain that from a very early period the national Church of France had a character and spirit of freedom peculiar to itself, and that the roots of the so-called modern Gallicanism are to be traced far back into antiquity (see Bossuet's sermon at the opening of the Assembly of 1682, and his \textit{Défense des Déclarations,} and our article \textit{France}).

The Frankish Church, in the time of Charlemagne, assumed a form and gave evidence of a spirit marked by the national temper, and obviously different from the Italian ideal of the Church as organized under the pope. In almost every century thereafter the monarchs and bishops of France resisted what they held to be unauthorized claims on the part of Rome. Nevertheless, the Gallican spirit often yielded, and not unfrequently the French bishops were themselves, in part at least, ultramontane. The French Parlements were generally on the side, naturally, of the Gallican spirit. Hinmar, bishop of Rheims (†882), morally obeyed his king, Charles the Bald, when pope Adrian II attempted to drive him from the throne. Charles himself, in an epistle to Adrian, "argues respecting the distinction between the temporal and the spiritual power, and also alleges the peculiar supremacy of the kings of France. To prove these and similar points, he refers not only to the archives of the Roman Church, but to the writings of St. Gelasius, St. Leo, St. Gregory, and even St. Augustine himself. (See \textit{Hist. Littéraire de la France}, Flère, i, iii, x, 28, 82.) Hinmar wrote many of that king's letters, and may probably have been the author of this." (Waddington, \textit{History of the Church}, chap. xiv.) But no formal attempt to fix the position of the Church in France on a basis of independence was made by any of the monarchs of the country before Louis IX (St. Louis, †1270). His "Pragmatic Sanction" (A.D. 1268) was directed chiefly against the penitential claims and extortions of Rome. It is comprised in six articles: (1) The churches, the prelates, the patrons, and the ordinary collators of benefices, shall enjoy their rights to their full extent, and each shall be sustained in his jurisdiction. (2) The cathedral and other churches shall possess the liberties of elections, which shall be carried into complete effect. (3) We will that simony, the pest of the Church, be wholly banished from our kingdom. (4) Promotions, collations, provisions and dispensions of prelacies, dignities, and other ecclesiastical benefices and offices, whatsoever they may be, shall be made according to the institutions of common law, of the councils, and of our ancient fathers. (5) We renew and approve of the liberties and franchises, privileges, and privileges granted by the kings of our predecessors, and by ourselves, to churches, monasteries, and other places of piety, as well as to ecclesiastical persons. (6) We prohibit any one from in any manner levying and collecting the pecuniary exactions and heavy charges which the bishopric of Rome has as imposed, or may hereafter impose, upon the Church of our kingdom, and by which it has been miserably impoverished—unless it be for a reasonable and very urgent cause, or by inevitable necessity, and with the free and express consent of the king and of the Church. See \textit{Ordinations des Roys de France de la troisième race recueillies par M. de Lournier} (Paris, 1728, folio), i, 97. In the Latin text, "the chief points are: statutum et ordinam primus ut ecclesiastici regni nostri prelati, patroni, et beneficiorum collatores ordinarii jus sumum planarius in ea, ut pons inequinuque su jus in domino restituetur. II. Item ecclesiam cathedralis et alia regni nostri libera eleciones et carum effectum integraliter habeant.—V. Item exactiones et onera gravissima pecuniarum per Curiam Romanam ecclesiastici regni nostri impoionas vel impoisonas, quibus regnum nostrum miserabiliter atque impudentius extinxerit, vel impoisonas, vel uniponenda, levari aut colligi nullatenus volumus, nisi duxat pro rationali, pia et urgentissimae causa, et inevitabili necessitate, ac de spontaneo et expresso consento nostro et ipsius ecclesiae regni nostri. The Gallican spirit is again tenore universi justitiae, officiis et subditis nostris—mandamus, quatuor coniunx et singular praecipua diligentie et atente servent—utque servarent—inaviolabilitatem faciant: nec aliquid in contrarium quovis modo faciant vel attentent, seu fieri vel attinenti permittant: transgressores aut contra facientes—ut salus pleniora, quæ cedat in exemplum. The genuineness of this document, which is questioned chiefly by P. Daniel, is shown by E. Richer, \textit{Hist. concil. general}, ii, iii, p. 189; \textit{Liberté de Légales Gallicane}, edit. ann. 1771, t. iii, p. 638, 667; \textit{Vellay, Hist. de France}, t. iii, p. 239" (Gieseler, \textit{Chur Urkunden}, et iii, § 62).

The "liberties" of the Gallican Church, according to Bossuet, were substantially set forth in these ordinances. The Gallican spirit was also strongly shown in the disputes between Philip Le Bel and Boniface VIII from the twelfth to the thirteenth century, which disputes culminated in the bull \textit{Unam sanctam} of Boniface VIII, and the abduction and death of the pope, A.D. 1303. See BONIFACE VIII. The questions involved in these disputes were vital ones: the authority of the pope in temporalities, the royal prerogative, and the power of the episcopacy as related to the supremacy of the pope. The Gallican writers vindicated the rights of the Church and the supremacy of councils over the pope with brilliant talents and solid learning. The Roman writers nevertheless maintained the papal claims unwaveringly, but with little success, in France. In 1455 the bishop of Nantes undertook to appeal from a royal ordinance to the pope, but the Parliament of Paris decided that he had violated the privileges of the French Church, as well as the fundamental laws of the kingdom. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, called the "great bulwark of the Gallican Church against Rome," was adopted at the Synod of Bourges in 1438, and confirmed by the Parliament July 13, 1439. It involved two great principles: 1. That the pope has no authority in the kingdom of France over anything concerning temporalities. 2. That, though the pope is authorized as the sovereign lord in spirituals, his power even in these is restricted and controlled by the canons and regulations of the ancient councils of the Church received in the kingdom. (For details, see Bourges, Pragmatic Sanction.
or. Louis XI himself strongly repressed all ultramontane reaction against the decisions of the French assembly, or against the immunities of the national church. The ultramontanists obtained a temporary success in the revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1512 by the Council of Lateran, with the renunciation of it by Francis I (1516), with the understanding that it was to be confirmed by a council but in substantially the same terms. This act was instigated by private aims of the king's, and by the hope of his chancellor, Duprat, obtaining the dignity of cardinal. But this revocation gave rise to a long resistance by the Parliament and the Sorbonne, and even by turbulent spirits among the French people. The effects of the revocation were practically insignificant, and Gallicanism only showed itself the more energetic and active afterwards. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges was, it is true, abrogated, but the fundamental principles established at the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, which secured that sanction, remained intact as a guide for the opinions of the nation and of the clergy, while the antipathy of the Parlements against ultramontanism became still more deeply rooted. The decrees of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) were, indeed, intended to support those of the Sorbonne, but from among them France admitted only such as agreed with her own policy, with the privileges of the king, and with the customs and usages of her Church. Gallicanism was greatly advanced, in fact, by the issue of the bull Exsurge, and by papal bulls and the concordats to which they gave rise. The numerous writings of Pitton (q. v.; † 1596) on the canon law gave true scientific and ecclesiastical expression to the tenets of Gallicanism. What Pitton advances in behalf of the Gallican Church in his Corpus Juris Canonicorum, in his Codex Conciliorum, and in his Gallican Doctrina in scholasticam status, were by him collected in eighty-three articles, in 1594, in the Libertatis eglise gallicane (1633, 2 vols. fol.), by the aid of which it became easy both for the Lity and the clergy to see how far the questions involved were questions of order and organization, and how little they applied to religion or dogmas. Without himself condemned the eighty-three articles into two: (1.) That the pope has no right of interference with the king's prerogative in temporal; (2.) That he cannot enforce a decision in spirituals in contradiction with those of the council, or in contradiction with the decisions of Ultramontanism, however, continued to assert its claims with the usual persistence of Rome. Cardinal Duperon, and the two preceding cardinals and prime ministers of Louis XIII and Louis XIV, Richelieu and Mazarin, maintained the Concordat. But, in spite of the concordat, the Sorbonne presented the six celebrated Declarations following to the king, May 8, 1663: 1. The pope has no authority over the king's temporal power. 2. In temporals the king has no superior but God. 3. The subjects of the king cannot be released from their fealty and obedience under any pretexas whatsoever. 4. It is inconsistent with the king's prerogative, and with the freedom of the Gallican Church, that the pope should depose bishops contrary to the decrees of councils. 5. It is not the doctrine of the Church that the pope is superior to general councils. 6. It is a matter of dogma that the pope is infallible, apart from the concurrence of the general council. As Pitton was the legal pillar of Gallicanism, so Bossuet became its ecclesiastical champion. Under his guidance, the Assemblee du clerge of 1692 assented the Gallican liberties, in the celebrated Declaration du clerge et de la nation françoise, which was up and by all the state authorities. It runs as follows: "I. St. Peter and his successors, vicars of Jesus Christ, and the whole Church itself, have received power from God only over things spiritual, and which concern salvation, and not over things temporal and civil; Jesus Christ teaching us himself that his kingdom is not of this world; and in another place, that we must render to Caesar the things of Caesar, and to God the things of God; and thus that papal power is nothing befaltered or overthrown. Let every person be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but comes from God, and it is he who ordains those that are on the earth. He, then, who opposes himself to the power of God, that is to say, to the king, obeys not the word of God, and is absolved from the oath of fidelity; and that this doctrine, necessary for the public peace, and not less advantageous to the Church than the state, ought to be inviolably followed, as conformable to the word of God, the tradition of the holy fathers, and the examples of the saints. II. The plenitude of power which the holy apostolic see and the successors of St. Peter, vicars of Jesus Christ, have over spiritual is such, that nevertheless the decrees of the holy General Council of Constance, contained in the fourth and fifth sessions, approved by the holy apostolic see, confirmed by the practice of the Church, and observed and religiously observed at all times by the Gallican Church, remain in all their force and virtue; and that the Church of France does not approve the opinion of those who attack these decrees, or who enfeebles them by any law or by any authority, and by just decisions to which they are not approved, or that they are in force only in time of schism. III. That thus the use of the apostolic power must be regulated in following the canons made by the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the general respect of all the world, that the rules, the manners, and the customs established in the said kingdom and in the Gallican Church ought to be maintained, and the usages of our fathers remain unassailable; and that the greatness of the holy apostolic see itself requires that the laws and customs established with the consent of that respectable see and the churches remain in force. IV. Although the pope has the chief poet in the questions of faith, and his decrees regard all the churches, and each church in particular, yet his judgment is still not unalterable, until the consent of the Church intervene. We have reason to reject all the contrary. V. Ultramontanism, the bishops who preside in them by the authority of the Holy Ghost, these maxims which we have received from our fathers, in order that we may all say the same thing, and that we may all be in the same mind, and that we may all follow the same doctrine." The Declaration du clerge de France en 1692, was sent to the pope, with an address from Bossuet. Alexander VIII annulled the declaration, but the clergy maintained their ground, although Louis XIV himself descendened to a step which was by some considered as a retraction. In consequence of this difficulty with Rome, the French Church found itself in 1621 with this five bishops vacant; the king allowed the twelve signers of the declaration, whom he had nominated as bishops, but whom the pope had for ten years refused to recognize as such, to retract all which had displeased the pontiff. The king himself stated that he was driven orders so as to make an edict of March 22, 1628, which had been promulgated in view of the then existing circumstances, should no longer have effect. But that he did not abandon the Gallican maxims is proved in his letter of July 7, 1718, directed to cardinal La Tremouille, that he, in the name of the king, had enforced the recognition, as bishop of Beauvais, of the abbot of St. Aignan, who had defended the four propositions in a thesis in 1705. The position of the question was still more clearly defined by the decision of the Conseil de Régence of 1718, that the bishops could dispense with the papal inauguration bull as, "the Sc-
Gallienus, a Roman emperor, became sole sovereign A.D. 260, and was assassinated at Milan in 268. His reign is memorable in Church History, as he gave the Christians by an edict in which he recognised the Church as a civil corporation. —Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vii, 13; Hase, Ch. Hist. § 48.

Gall‘im (Heb. Gallim, גַּלְאִים, 7, 77; Arabic, gaba, or perhaps festuana), a place which is twice mentioned in the Bible: (1.) As the native place of the man to whom Michael, David’s wife, was given—“Phalti, the son of Laish, who was from Gallim” (Gen. 35, 22; 1 Sam. xxv, 44; Sept. Pseudo-Josephus 3, Ant. vi, 38, 8); but there is no clue to the situation of the place. In 2 Sam. iii, 15, 16, when Michal returned to David at Hebron, her husband is represented as following her as far as Bahurim, i.e. on the road between the Mount of Olives and Jericho (comp. 2 Sam. xvi, 1). But even this does not necessarily point to the direction of Gallim, because Phalti may have been at the time with Ishboseth at Mahanaim, the road from which would naturally lead past Bahurim. (2.) The name occurs...
again in the catalogue of places terrified at the approach of Sennacherib (Isa. x. 30; Sept. Γαλλοίς): "Lift up thy voice, O daughter of J e h o v a h !" The other towns in this passage—Alaith, Michmash, Ramah, Gibea of Saul—are all, like Alathoth, in the tribe of Benjamin. They are in the north of Jerusalem. It would not be overlooked that in both these passages the names Laish and Gallim are mentioned in connection. Possibly the Ben-Lasi in the former implies that Phalti was a native of Laish, that being dependent on Gallim. Its site was probably in Eusebius and Josephus (Ant., i. 9; Gallim, v. Γαλλίς, Gallin), although from hearsay (ἡγεμόν) they place a village of a similar name (Γαλλαία) near Accaron (Ekron). Schwarz (Palest. p. 131) reports a Beit-Djallim between Ramleh and Joppa, but by other explorers the name is given as Beit-Djas. Porter suggests the little village of Himach as a suitable locality (Handb. for Syria, p. 214); but there are no ruins there, as at Khirbet el-Ma’ayek (Ruins of the Serpents), on a low tell, a little farther N.E., containing the remains of an ordinary village, with a cistern in the middle (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 298).

Among the names of towns added by the Sept. to those of Judah in Josh. xv, 59, Gallim (Γαλλίς v. Γαλλίς) occurs between Karem and Thebcr. In Isa. xv, 8, the Vulgate has Gallim for Ephgim, among the towns of Moab.

Gal'lio (Greeked Γάλλιος), a son of the rhetorician M. Annus Seneca, and elder brother of Seneca the orator. His name was originally M. Annus Novus, but changed to Junius Annus (or Annicus) Gallio, in consequence of his adoption by L. Junius Gallio the rhetorician (Pliny, Hist. Nat. xiii, 38; Tacitus, Annal. xvi, 17; Quintilian, Inst. Orat. iii, 21, 4, 2, 91). Seneca dedicated to him his treatise De Vita Beata, in the preface to the fourth book of his Naturalis Questions describes him as a man universally beloved (comp. Stat. Silv. i, 7, 82); and who, while exempt from all other vices, especially abhorred flattery. Dion Cassius (ix, 53) mentions a witty but bitter joke which he made in reference to the persons put to death by Claudia. According to Eusebius, he committed suicide before the death of Seneca (Tacit. Tempor. p. 161, Amstel. 1638), but Tacitus speaks of him as alive after that event (Annal. xv, 73), and Dion Cassius states that he was put to death by order of Nero (see Antonil Bühl, Is. 131 sq.). Another writer (Gelpe, De familiari. Pauli c. Senec. Lips. 1813, p. 18) thinks that Seneca was converted through the instrumentality of Paul. He was Proconsul (ἀρχηγός, a. rec. ἀρχηγός, ἀρχηγός, Tischendorf) of Athens (Acts xxviii, 12) under the emperor Claudius, when Paul first visited Corinth, and no less refused to abet the persecution raised by the Jews against the apostle (see Dunnahuer, De Galliismone, Argent. 1664; also in his Disp. theolog. p. 175 sqq.), A.D. 49. See Achaia. Dr. Lainer has noticed the strict accuracy of Luke in giving him this designation, which is obscured in the Auth. Ver. by the use of the term deput (Credibility, pt. i, uk, i, ch. i; Works, iii, 84). See Proconsul. He is said to have resigned the government of Achaia on account of the climate not agreeing with his health (see Seneca, Ep. 101). See Paul.

Gal'litze, or Gal'itzin, Dmitri Augustin, son of the Russian princess Amalie of Gallitzin, was born at the Hague Dec. 22, 1770. His mother was an enthusiastic Roman Catholic convert, and under her influence he joined the Roman Church at seventeen. He entered the Austrian army, and served with it in the American Revolution. He followed the army, for a journey in America, and on the voyage was led by the counsels of a missionary named Broxius to turn his mind to the priesthood. He was ordained March 18, 1795, and devoted his life to missionary labors. In 1799 he selected a spot among the Alleghenies as the seat of a Roman Catholic town, and founded Loretto, now a town of several thousand inhabitants, with Roman Catholic schools for boys and girls in the neighborhood. Father Smith's zeal in the wild region of the Alleghenies, and left enduring marks of his energy, faith, and devotion throughout that country. His death at Loretto May 6, 1840. He published a Defense of Catholic Principles (Pittsburg, 1816; new ed. Dublin, 1867).—Appeal to the Protestant Public (Pittsburg, 1819), and other small works.

Gallows (γαλλόσ, éta, a tree or wood), a post or gibbet, rendered in Esth. 6, 4, 6 "gallows," but in Gen. xl, 19, and Deut. xxi, 22, "tree." Hanging appears to have been a punishment practised among the Egyptians and other ancient nations, as well as among the Hebrews. See Punishment.

Gal'uppi, Pascale, an Italian philosopher, was born at Tropes, in Calabria, in Italy, April 2, 1770, and died at Naples in November, 1846. The groundwork of his education was laid at Tropes under the instructions of J. A. Ruffs, and he afterwards completed his studies at the University of Naples, in which institution he subsequently became professor of philosophy. In his L'elusato he carried the philosophical doctrines in vogue in the 18th century, and strove to reestablish Italian philosophy on its old bases, recognizing in man's nature a double element, the spiritual and material, in accord with the philosophy of the Church fathers. His first work, a pamphlet, dated 1807, on Analysis and Synthesis, sets forth his philosophical method. Shortly after it he published his Essay on Knowledge, in four books, treating (1) of knowledge, (2) of the analysis of the faculties of the human mind, (3) of the analysis of ideas, and (4) of the legitimate reasons of our judgments and our errors. His Stagio Fisico sulla critica della conoscenza (Naples, 1819, 6 vols. 8vo) contains an examination of the principal doctrines of ideology, Kantianism, and the transcendental philosophy. His Elements of Philosophy (Elementi di Filosofia, Messina, 1832) treats successively of pure logic, metaphysics, mathematics, morals, and has been often reprinted. In 1827 Galuppi published twelve Letters on Philosophy (Lettere filosofiche sulla Vicenda della Filosofia, etc.), of which a 2d edition appeared in 1828, and a French translation by Poise in 1844. His other works are, Filosofia della Volontà (Naples, 1818), and Milan, 1841; and Milan, 1842; and Milan, 1841, 5 vols. ;—Storia della Filosofia (Naples, 1842):—Elementi di Teologia Naturale (Naples, 1844, 4 vols.).—Hoefer, Nouv. diction. générale, x, 284-5. (J. W. M.)

Gallus, Caestius (Greeked Κιστίος Γάλλος), son of Cestius Gallus Camerinus, a Roman senator of consular rank, was president ("legatus"), Suetonius, Vesp. 4) of Syria, A.D. 64, 65, at the time of the final Jewish war (Tacitus, Hist. v. 10). Maddened by the tyrannies of Cassius Flosus (q. v.), the Jews applied to Galus for protection; but, though he sent Nepotianus, one of his officers, to investigate the case, and received from him a report favorable to the Jews, he took no effectual steps either to redress their injuries, or to prepare for any outbreak into which their discontent might drive them. When at last he found it necessary to act, he marched from Antioch, and, having taken Ptolemais and Lydda, advanced on Jerusalem. There he drove the Jews into the upper part of the city and the precincts of the Temple, and he might, according to Josephus, have, in this second instance, had he not been dissuaded by some of his officers from pressing his advantage. Soon after he unaccountably drew off his forces (leaving an interval of which the
GALLUS

Christians availed themselves to escape, according to our Saviour’s direction, Luke xxi, 21, 22, and was much harassed by the Jews, who took from him a quantity of spices, among which was thyme, of Achaea, and Galatian messengers to him to give an account of his affairs, and to represent them as favorably as possible for himself. The emperor, much exasperated, commissioned Vespasian to conduct the war; and the words of Tacitus (*ab sup.) seem to imply that Gallus died in the battle, and the steep and successively high seats of the fortress then being probably hastened by vexation (Josephs, *It. 43; War, ii, 14, 3; 16, 1, 2; 18, 9, 10, 19, 1-9; 20, 1; iii, 1).—Smith, *Dict. of Oss. Biog. s. v. See Governor.

Gallus, C. Vibia Trebonianus, Roman emperor (early history unknown), was elected to the throne A.D. 251. His reign was disgraced by concessions of the Christians. See Persecution. He was assassinated A.D. 253 or 254.

Gallus, St. Gal, St. Gillian, or St. Gall, was a native of Ireland, born about 560, and a disciple of Columban (q. v.). He founded the celebrated abbey of St. Gall (q. v.), in Switzerland, of which he was made A.D. 545. He died in 646, Oct. 16, which is his day in the Roman Calendar. There is no writing of his except a sermon in Cassianus, *Lectiones Antiqu. i, 781, in Galland, *Bib. Patr. xii, 721, and in Migne, *Patrologia Latina, vol. lxxviii.

Gallus (or Gallo), Thomas, a French theologian, who died Dec. 5, 1244, was a member of the regular Augustines, canon of the congregation of St. Victor of Paris. In 1225 this position was appointed to by St. Andrew of Vercelli, by which latter title he is frequently exclusively designated. The name Gallus is regarded by some as only the Latinized form of his real name, Coq; by others as indicating his nationality; while others suppose that he was of Italian origin. Gallus taught at the university of Paris, was a favorite Augustinian exponent, and, when abbot of Vercelli, drew around him the best professors of Northern Italy, achieving for himself and his monastery a European reputation in theology and ecclesiastical learning. J. Gerson (q. v.), in the preface to his Commentary on the Canticles, praises highly Gallus’s *Explanations of the Canticles des Comptes (published, with commentary, by Halgrin, Paris, 1521, and Lyons, 1571, fol.). This work was published at Rome in 1666 under the care of J. Magloire, together with a decree of the Congregation of the Index forbidding its publication. The preface of the book of Scota, showing that he had been attributed to the celebrated Irish philosopher.

Another work of Gallus’s (*Traduction paraphrase des livres sur la hierarchie et la theologique mystique attribu du St. Denis l’Arpoigny) is found in the *Theologia Mystica of J. Eckhust (Ingolstadt, 1919), and in the *Commentarius in St. Dionysii Areopagiti Opera of Dionysius of Carthage (Cologne, 1856). Léon Alaczi (*Apot urbano) erroneously attributes to Gallus some sermons (*Speeches) which belong to John, abbot of Vincelles.—Hoefer, *Novae Biblioth. Generale, xix, 849; Oudin, *Comment. de scriptingis ecclesiasticis, iii, 9. (J. W. M. M. T.)

Gamin* (Gama* v. r. Gama*), given (1 Esdr. viii, 29) as the name of one of the chief Levites who returned from the captivity, instead of the *Daniel (q. v.) of the Heb. text ( Ezra viii, 2).

Gamel. See CAMEL; GEMALI.

Gamelis (red Gaman), so called from its situation on a ridge like a camel’s hump, Josephus, War, iv, 1, 1., a town of trans-Jordanian Palestine, in the district of Gamalitis (Josephus, War, iii, 3, 5; or Lower Galantia (ib. iv, 1, 1.)), first mentioned as a fortress reduced by Alexander Jannaeus (ib. i, 4, 8); it retained its allegiance to Rome on the first outbreak of the final hostilities (Josephus, *It. 11), but afterwards revolted, and was so strongly fortified by Josephus (ib. 37), as to be only taken after a siege of seven months by a desperate assault (War, iv, 1, 2). It was situated on the Lake of Tiberias, opposite Tarichee (ib. iv, 1, 1). Schwartz is inclined, from a notice in the Talmud and certain hints in the Midrash, to place it between Harius and Kedesh in Naphtali ( *Palest., p. 190); and Pliny speaks of a Galillean town of the same name (*Hist. Nat. v, 13); but this position is not to be thought of (see *Palest., p. 794). Lord Lindsay found the site in a small area of waste south of the steep and successful fortress, between the village of Fik and the shore, “having extensive ruins of buildings, walls, and columns on its top” (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 278). This identification is confirmed by Thomson, who gives a detailed description of the site ( *Lands and Book, ii, 47 sq.;); though Ridley Robinson, on account of Josephus’s mention of a large place back of the fortress, we should rather locate it at Khan el-Akabab, as described by Seetzen ( *Erkundige, xv, 360). See Caphar-Gamala.

Gamaliel (Heb. Gamaliel), *2 Macc. 5, 23, reward of God; Sept. and N. T. *Gama* (i.e., the name of two men in Scripture.

1. Son of Pedahzur, and chief (9002) of the tribe of Manasseh at the census at Sinai (Numm. i, 10; ii, 20; vii, 54, 59), and at starting on the march through the wilderness (x, 28). B.C. 1657.

2. A Pharisee and celebrated doctor of the law, who gave prudent and humane advice in the Sanhedrin respecting the treatment of the followers of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 4, 24 sq.), A.D. 29. We read of Acts xxiii, 3 that he was the preceptor of the apostle Paul. He is generally identified with the very celebrated Jewish doctor Gamaliel, who is known by the title of “the glory of the law,” and was the first to whom the title “Rabbi,” “our master,” was given. The time agrees, and there is every reason to suppose the assumption to be correct. He bears in the Talmud the surname of *Titi, “the elder” (to distinguish him from a later rabbin of the same name), and is represented as the son of Rabbi Simeon, and grandson of the famous Hillel: he is said to have occupied a seat, if not the presidency, in the Sanhedrin during the reigns of Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius, and had died eighteen years after the destruction of Jerusalem (see Lightfoot, *Commentaria hebraica Talmudicae praemissia, ch. xxv). But, as this statement would give him an extreme old age, it may perhaps refer to the former and later Gamaliel, showing that he had been attributed to the celebrated Irish philosopher.

Another work of Gallus’s (*Traduction paraphrase des livres sur la hierarchie et la theologique mystique attribu du St. Denis l’Arpoigny) is found in the *Theologia Mystica of J. Eckhust (Ingolstadt, 1919), and in the *Commentarius in St. Dionysii Areopagiti Opera of Dionysius of Carthage (Cologne, 1856). Léon Alaczi (*Apot urbano) erroneously attributes to Gallus some sermons (*Speeches) which belong to John, abbot of Vincelles.—Hoefer, *Novae Biblioth. Generale, xix, 849; Oudin, *Comment. de scriptingis ecclesiasticis, iii, 9. (J. W. M. M. T.)

Gamin* (Gama* v. r. Gama*), given (1 Esdr. viii, 29) as the name of one of the chief Levites who returned from the captivity, instead of the *Daniel (q. v.) of the Heb. text ( Ezra viii, 2).

Gamel. See CAMEL; GEMALI.

Gamelis (red Gaman), so called from its situation on a ridge like a camel’s hump, Josephus, War, iv, 1, 1., a town of trans-Jordanian Palestine, in the district of Gamalitis (Josephus, War, iii, 3, 5; or Lower Galantia (ib. iv, 1, 1.)), first mentioned as a fortress reduced by Alexander Jannaeus (ib. i, 4, 8); it retained its allegiance to Rome on the first outbreak of the final hostilities (Josephus, *It. 11), but afterwards revolted, and was so strongly fortified by Josephus (ib. 37), as
GAMALIEL
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Gambold, John, a pious bishop of the Moravians, was born April 10, 1771, at Puncheonst, South Wales, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1798 he became chaplain to Stonington Harcourt, in Oxfordshire; but in 1742 he joined the Moravians, and was consecrated bishop in 1754. 'And certainly few, in any age of the Church, ever possessed, in a higher degree, the spiritual qualifications which the apostle specified as distinguishing a good bishop—fervor of devotion, humility of mind, disinterestedness of spirit, a disposition to universal benevolence, and a willingness to undertake any labor, or submit to any privation, in order to promote the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of men. From the time of his consecration, he resided for ten years, performing all the duties of a primitive bishop over a small congregation; in his episcopacy, he was a zealot for the simplicity of the faith, and at the same time maintaining an active oversight by correspondence with all the ministers of his communion throughout England.' He died Sept. 18, 1771. Among his writings are A Memoir of Count Zinzendorf; and Discipline and Discipline of the United Brethren—Historie of the Greenland Mission of the United Brethren—Memo (1748);—Summary of Christian Doctrine (1767, 12mo). His Works were edited, with an introductory essay, by Thos. Erskine, Esq. (Glasg. 1822, 12mo). See Tyerman, Oxf. Methodists, p. 155-200.

Games are so natural to man, especially in the period of childhood, that no nation has been or can be entirely without them. (1.) Accordingly, a few traces are found in the early Hebrew history of at least private and childish diversions. The heat of the climate in Syria would indispose the mature to more bodily exertion than the duties of life imposed, while the gravity which is characteristic of the Oriental character might easily be compromised by any gaming as sports. Dignified ease, therefore, corresponds with the idea which we form of Oriental recreation. The father of the family sits at the door of his tent, or reclines on the house-top, or appears at the city gate, and there tranquilly enjoys repose, broken by conversation, under the shade and amidst the warm sunlight of the bright and breezy heavens, in the cool of the retiring day, or before the sun has assumed his burning ardors (Deut. vi, 14; Lam. v, 14). Of the three classes into which games may be arranged, juvenile, manly, and public, the first two alone belong to the Hebrew life; the latter, as noticed in the Bible, being either foreign introductions into Palestine, or the customs of other countries.

1. With regard to juvenile games, the notices are very few. It must not, however, be inferred from this that the games of the Hebrew were without an adaptation of their toys and sports of childhood claim a remote antiquity; and if the children of the ancient Egyptians had their dolls of ingenious construction, and played at ball (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. abridgm., i, 157), and if the children of the Romans among whom much of those of modern days (Horace, Sat. iii, 247), we may imagine the Hebrew children doing the same, as they played in the streets of Jerusalem (Zech. viii, 5; comp. Jer. xxxix, 19). The only recorded sports, however, are keeping tame birds (Job xii, 5; comp. Cattal. 3, 170) and the proceedings of marriage or feasts (Matt. 21).
16. Commenting on Zech. xii, 3, Jerome mentions an amusement of the young which is seen practised in more than one part of the north of England. "It is customary," he says, "in the cities of Palestine, and has been so from ancient times, to place up and down large stones to serve for exercise for the young, who, according in each case to their degree of strength, lift these stones, some as high as their knees, others to their middle, others above their heads, the hands being kept horizontal and joined under the stone." A similar mode of exercise prevailed in ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, i, 207). See CHILDREN.

Music, song, and dancing were recreations reserved mostly for the young or for festive occasions. From Lam. v, 16, "the crown is fallen from our head" (see the entire passage on the subject of games), it might be inferred that, as among the Greeks and Latins, chaplets of flowers were sometimes worn during festivity. To the amusements just mentioned frequent allusions are found in holy writ, among which may be given Ps. xxx, 11; Jer. xxxi, 13; Luke xv, 25. In Isa. xxx, 29, a passage is found which serves to show how much of festivity and mirth was mingled with religious observances; the journey on festival occasions up to Jerusalem was enlivened by music, if not by dancing. Some of the chief objects aimed at in the Greek and other games were gained among the Hebrews by their three great national festivals—the Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles. At the recurrence of these festivals the nation was brought together in honor of the true God; and in times of religious feeling these great meetings were looked forward to and were celebrated with perhaps not less joy, though joy of a somewhat different kind, from that with which the Greeks looked forward to and celebrated their Olympic, Isthmian, and Nemean games. The public games of the Hebrews seem to have been exclusively connected with military sports and exercises, and even of these the notices are few and brief. It was probably in this way that the Jewish youth were instructed in the use of the bow and of the sling (1 Sam. xx, 20, 30-35; Jude xx, 16; 1 Chron. xii, 2). Allusion to what would seem to have been a kind of variance, such as we read of in different countries, seems to be made in 2 Sam. ii, 14, where Abner proposes that the young men should arise and "play" before the two armies. The Hebrew נֵקַע (nakah), for "play," is frequently used for dancing (2 Sam. vi, 21; Jer. xxxii, 4); and Abner seems here to refer to a sport of this kind, not now to be used as an amusement, but turned into stern real-
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In their favorite sport appears to have been the more世俗 game of draughts, which even royalty did not disdain to share (Wilkinson, i, 189 sq.). See PLAY.

3. Public games were also, together foreign to the spirit of Hebrew institutions; the great religious festivals supplied the pleasurable excitement and the feelings of national union which rendered the games of Greece so popular, and at the same time inspired the persuasion that such amusements should be exclusively connected with religious duties. Accordingly, the erection of a gymnasion by Jason, in which the discus was chiefly practised, was looked upon as a heathenish proceeding (1 Macc. i, 14; 2 Macc. iv, 12-14), and the subsequent erection by Herod of a theatre and amphitheatre at Jerusalem, Josephus, Ant. xv, 8, 1), as well as at Cesarea (Ant. xvi, 9, 6; War, i, 21, 8) and at Berytos (Ant. xix, 7, 5), in each of which a quinquennial festival in honor of Caesar was celebrated with the usual contests in gymnastics, chariot-races, music, and with wild beasts—which was viewed with the deepest aversion by the general body of the Jews (Ant. xvi, 9, 1). In the Old Testament two passages contain a clear reference to games: Psa. xix, 5, "Rejoice as a strong man to run a race;" Eccl. ix, 11, "I said that the race is not to the swift." The entire absence of verbal or historical mention to this subject, however, in the Gospels shows how little it entered into the life of the Jews. Some of the foreign Jews, indeed, imbibed a taste for theatrical representations; Josephus (J.J. 3) speaks of one Alluritas, an actor of farces (μοσαικος), who was in high favor with Nero. (See Eichh. de Jud. m. re scens., in the Comment. Grec.)

(II.) Among the Greeks, on the other hand, and subsequently among the Romans likewise, the rage for theatrical exhibitions was such that every city of any size possessed its theatre and stadium. At Ephesus an annual contest (διαινοικες διαινοικες) was held in honor of Diana, which was superintended by officers named Αμφιδιας (Acts xix, 81; A.V. "chief of Asia"). See ASIARCH. It is possible that Paul was present when these games were proceeding, as they were celebrated in the month of May (see the general body of the Jews (Ant. xvi, 9, 1); but this hardly agrees with the notes of time in Acts xx, 1-3, 16.

1. Roman Beast-fights and Gladiatorial Shows.—(1.) A direct reference to the exhibitions that took place on such occasions is made in the phrase ορκομακαρία, "I fought with beasts" (1 Cor. xv, 32). The θυγατία or beast-fight (venatio in Latin) constituted among the Romans a part of the amusements of the circus or amphitheatre. It consisted in the combat of human beings with animals. The persons destined to this barbarous kind of amusement were termed θυγατία, bestiarii. They were generally of two classes; 1. Voluntary, that is, persons who fought either for amusement or for pay: they were clothed and provided with offensive and defensive weapons. 2. Condemned persons, who were mostly exposed to the fury of the animals unclothed, unarmed, and sometimes bound (Cicero, Pro Sest. 64; Ep. ad Quint. Frat. ii, 6; Seneca, De Benef. ii, 19; Tertull. Apol. 9). Political offenders especially were so treated, and Josephus (War, vii, 9, 1) records that no less than 5000 Jews were destroyed in the theatre at Cesarea by this and similar methods. The expression as used by Paul is usually taken in a metaphorical, both on the qualifying word κατ' αρχήν, "after the manner of a man," the absence of all reference to the occurrence in the Acts, and the rights of citizenship which he enjoyed: none of these arguments can be held to be absolutely conclusive, while, on the other hand, the absence of any specification in the apostolic epistles (Ignatius, ad Eph. 1; ad Trall. 10; Mart. Polyc. 3; comp. Euseb. E.H. ii, 15), and, where metaphorically used (Ignatius, ad Rom. 5), an explanation is added which implies that it would otherwise have been taken literally. Certainly Paul was exposed to some extraordinary suffering at Ephesus, which he describes in language borrowed from, if not descriptive of, a real case of θυγατία for he speaks of himself as a criminal condemned to death (διακαταλαμβάνομαι; 1 Cor. iv, 9; ἄξονα τοῦ θανάτου ἐν ζωήν; 2 Cor. i, 9), exhibited previously to the execution of the sentence (dichaidy; 1 Cor. iv. c.), reserved to the conclusion of the games (ἐξεκατερον), as was usual with the theriomachia ("novissimos elegit, velut bestiariis," Tertull. De Pass. 14), and thus made a spectacle (σκηνών ισγυρισθησαν). Lightfoot (Exercit. 1 Cor. iv, 18; 2 Cor. i, 42; 1 Tim. i, 12), 10,000 lions, which were butchered by beings wearing the human shape. Pompey caused the destruction in this way of 600 lions. On the same occasion there perished nearly twenty elephants. These numbers, however, are small compared with the butchery which took place in later periods. Under Titus, 5000 wild and 4000 tame animals, and in the reign of Trajan, 11,000 animals, are said to have been destroyed. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Bestiarii.

(2.) The fights of the gladiators with one another was also a common practice at Rome. It began B.C. 264, and increased to such a fearful extent that on a single occasion, in honor of the triumph of the emperor Trajan over the Deciani, 10,000 gladiators fought for the amusement of the people. They were at first composed of captives or
condemned malefactors, but afterwards, as the passion for blood grew stronger, free-born citizens, men of noble birth, and even women, fought after this fashion. The spectators betted on their favorite gladiators with much the same feelings as they betted on the favorite horses which ran before them in the circus. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Gladiators.

The games and theatrical exhibitions of the heathen were regarded by the early Christians with strong disapprobation as they were by the Jews generally, and for better reasons (Neander's Church Hist. i, 265, § iii). National antagonism to everything foreign as such had much effect in producing Jewish opposition to the games. It was as ministering in themselves and by their attendant circumstances to the lusts of the flesh and of the eye, as producing almost of necessity a cruel temper in the beholders, and running counter to the moral feeling, modesty, and sobriety of the Christian character, that the public spectacles and games of the heathen were ranked among those pomps and vanities which the Christians were obliged to renounce by their baptismal vow. Even the better-minded among the heathen condemned games with disapproval. Pliny the consul speaks with approval of Junius Mauricius, who expressed an earnest wish that they could be abolished at Rome (Pliny's Letters, iv, 22); nor does Tacitus appear to treat them with much greater respect (Hist. iii, 85). Rome added to the Greek examples features of cruelty which were unknown in the original Grecian games; and there was one feature of difference between the Grecian and Roman games which rendered the former a much more fitting illustration of the Christian life than the latter were, namely, that in the Grecian games the most eminent men in the land came forward and contested personally for victory, while in Rome the most eminent men were merely spectators of the contests of their inferiors (Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chap. xi, p. 11). Diomede and Menelaus, Antilochus and Ajax, and Ulysses, the kings, great warriors, and wise men of the Grecian states, deemed it an honor to contend for victory in their countries' games, and even old Nestor, the Homerite type of perfection in the qualities of mind and body, regretted that his years prevented him from joining in the glorious strife (Iliad, xxiii, 654) but "a senator, or even a citizen, conscious of his dignity, would have blushed to expose his person or his horses in the circus of Rome." See Smith's Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Ludi.

2. Grecian Prize or Gymnastic Contests. — The scriptural allusions (Gal. ii, 2; v, 7; Phil. ii, 16; iii, 14; 1 Tim. vi, 12; 2 Tim. ii, 5; Heb. xii, 1, 4, 12) are the more appropriate, because the Grecian games were in their origin and in their best days intimately connected with religion. Games in Greece were very numerous. They are traceable by tradition back to the earliest periods of Grecian civilization. Indeed, much of the obscenity which rests on their origin is a consequence and a sign of their high and even mythic antiquity. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Athlete.

(1.) Four of these games stood far above the rest, bearing the appellation of Iepis, "sacred," and deriving their support from the great Hellenic family at large, though each one had special honor in its own locality: these four were the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian. The first were held in the highest honor. The victors at the Olympic games were accounted the noblest and happiest of mortals, and every means was taken that could show the respect in which they were held. These games were celebrated every five years at Olympia, in Elis, on the west side of the Peloponnesus. Hence the epoch called the Olympiad.

The gymnastic exercises were laid down in a well-planned systematic series, beginning with the easier (korga), and proceeding on to the more difficult (kopia). Some of these were specially fitted to give strength, others agility; some educated the hands, others the feet. Among the lighter exercises was reckoned running (piroue), leaping (duma), quoiting (zipa), hurling the javelin (korevos). When skill had been obtained in these, and the consequent strength, then followed a severer course of discipline. This was twofold — simple; compound. The simple consisted of wrestling (kallin), boxing (kypus); the compound...
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Besides the athletic games above described, there were others, consisting of racing in chariots, on horseback, or with torches; and still others, in which the parties strove to excel one another in skill in playing upon various instruments. See RACE.

At the Olympic games the prize was simply a chaplet made of olive. The crown was later put on a tripod, and placed in the middle of the course, so as to be seen by all. On the same table there were also exposed to view palm-branches, one of which was given into the hand of each conqueror at the same time with the chaplet. The victors, having been summoned by proclamation, were presented with the ensigns of victory, and conducted along the stadium, preceded by a herald, who proclaimed their honors, and announced their name, parentage, and country. The real reward, however, was in the fame which ensued. A chaplet won in the chariot-races at Olympia was the highest of earthly honors. What congratulations from friends; how was the public eye directed to the fortunate conqueror; what honor had he conferred on his native city, and for what office was such a one not fit! With what intense and deep delight must his bosom have been filled when the full acclamation of assembled Greece fell upon his ear, coming in loud salutations and applause from every part of the crowded course? Then came the more private attentions of individual friends. One brought a chaplet of flowers; another bound his head with ribbons. Afterwards came the triumphal sacrifice before the temple-gods, and next day sumptuous feasting. The poet now began his office, gaining in some cases, both for himself and the happy victor, an unexpected immortality. Music also lent her aid, and his name was sung wherever the noble accents of the Greek tongue asserted their supremacy. In order to perpetuate the memory of these great men, their names and achievements were entered into a public register, which was under the care of suitable officers. A no less privilege was that of having a statue of themselves placed, either at the expense of their country or their friends, in the sacred grove of Jupiter. A perhaps still greater honor awaited the victor on his return home. The conquerors at the Isthmian games were wont to be received in their chariots, superbly attired, amid thronging and jubilant multitudes. One or two other privileges belonged to these victors, such as immunity from public offices, and a certain yearly stipend. At the Isthmian games the prize was ivy during the mythic periods. In later ages the victor was usually crowned with a chaplet of pine-leaves. If the conqueror had come off victorious in the three great divisions—music, gymnastics, and racing—he was invested, in a way, as well as in the other sacred games, presented also with a palm-branch. See Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Isthmian, Olympian, Nemean, Pythian Games severally. See CROWN.

Corinthian Coin of Antoninus, with Isthmian Crowns.

(2.) Paul's epistles (as above) abound with allusions to the Greek contests, borrowed probably from the Isthmian games, at which he may well have been present during his first visit to Corinth (1 Cor. 15:47; 1 Thess. 4:13). These contests (σάμπον—word of general import, applied by Paul, not to the sight, as in the A.V., but in the race. 1 Tim. 6:12) are minutely illustrated by his references, in which they are used as a figure of the Christian's
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course of duty and struggle with opposing influences.

The competitors (οἱ αγωνιζόμενοι, 1 Cor. ix. 25; ἦν ἄῤῥητος 3 Tim. ii. 5) required a long and severe course of previous training (καὶ σωματικὸς γυμνασία, 1 Cor. ix. 30), their joy at the performance of an act enforced (ἡ παρέμεινα, 1 Cor. ix. 25, 27).

In the Olympic contests these preparatory exercises (προγυμνασία) extended over a period of ten years, during which most of the competitors were conducted under the supervision of appointed officers. The contests took place in a stadium which was surrounded by a circle of spectators (περιμενῶν γυμνός μαρτυρεῖ, Hebl. xii. 1), the competitors being the spectacle (ὁδηγός = παρα, 1 Cor. iv. 9; θεοβόλος, Hebl. x, 33).

The games were opened by the proclamation of a herald (εὐσήμενος, 1 Cor. ix. 27), whose office it was to proclaim the name and country of each candidate, and especially to announce the name of the victor before the assembled multitude, as well as to signify the other crises of the game. Certain conditions and rules were laid down for the different contests, as that no bribe be offered to a competitor; that in both the combats the combatants should not lay hold of one another; etc.; any infringement of these rules (αἱ μὲν νομίμως ἀθώους, 2 Tim. ii. 5) involved a loss of the prize, the competitor being pronounced disqualified (ἀδικομένος, 1 Cor. ix. 27; "cast away," a term that seems to picture the condition of one so disqualified and to be excluded from the lists or rejected after the game was over). The judge was selected for his spotless integrity (οἱ δίκαιοι κρίτες, 2 Tim. iv. 8); his office was to decide any disputes (ῥήματα, Col. iii. 13; A.V. "rule") and to give the prize (τὸ βραβείον, 1 Cor. iv. 24; Phil. iii. 14), consisting of a crown (διάκεφαλος, 1 Tim. ii. 5); it was made of leaves of wild olive at the Olympic games, and of pine, or, at one period, i.e., at the Athenian games. These crowns, though perishable (βραχεῖς, 1 Cor. ix. 25; comp. 1 Pet. v. 4), were always regarded as a source of unfailing exultation (Phil. iv. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 15-16). Prizes were also placed in the hands of the victors (Rev. vii. 9). Paul alludes to two only out of five contests, boxing and running, most frequently to the latter. In boxing (πυγμῆ; compare πυγμαῖος, 1 Cor. ix. 26), the hands and arms were bound with the cinctus, a band of leather, so studied with nails, which very much increased the severity of the blow, and rendered a bruise inevitable (ὑπόπηρεξα, 1 Cor. l. c.; ὑπέτακτα = ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμάδων τῶν σπάγων Ἰερου, Polliux, Onom. ii, 4, 52). The skill of the combatant was shown in avoiding the blows of his adversary, so that some of this leather was worn away (玙 χαλκοῦ, 1 Cor. l. c.), or the phrase may allude to the preludial trials of competitive strength (comp. Statius, Theb. vi, 487; Virgil, Aeneid, iv, 870). The foot-race (αγόμος, 2 Tim. iv. 7, i word peculiar to Paul; comp. Acts xxii, 50; xx, 24) was run in the stadium (ἐν σταδίῳ; A.V. "race," 1 Cor. ix. 24), an oblong area, open at one end and rounded in a semicircular form at the other, along the sides of which were the raised tiers of seats on which the spectators sat. The race was either from one end of the stadium to the other, or, in the διάδρομος, to be the starting-point. There may be a latent reference to the διάδρομος in the expression ἄρχων καὶ τελευταίων (Hebl. xii, 2). Jesus being, as it were, the starting-point and the goal, the locus a quo and the locus ad quem of the Christian's course. The judge was stationed by the goal (ἐν σταδίῳ; comp. Acts xxii, 14), which was made at one end of the stadium to the other, so that the runner could make straight for it (οὐ σὲ ἄῤῥητος, 1 Cor. ix, 26). Paul brings vividly before our minds the earnestness of the competitor, having cast off every encumbrance (σφαίρα ἀπολογίμων παρεyears), and setting his affections on any distant goal (αἵματες, ἀετίλαμφος, Hebl. xii, 2; x, 25), unmindful of the space already past (πατὲ ἄνω κυνηγανόμοι, Phil. i, c.), and stretching forward with bent body (τοῖς δὲ ἐμφραγμένοις κινητοὺς), his perseverance (ἐκ νυμφών, Hebl. xii, 12), his joy at the part (περιστεράω, Λουκ. xvi. 24), his exaltation as he not only received (ταῦτα, Phil. iii, 12), but actually grasps (καταβαίνω, not "apprehend," as A.V. Phil.; ἀνοιγόμενοι, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13) the crown which had been set apart (ἀπονέατον, 2 Tim. iv. 8) for the victor. The lengths of the bounds (κατάμαχος) are left for the profession of the office of the apostle in the trial, and serve to illustrate the meaning of the apostle when he speaks of running with patience the race set before him (ὑπόμονα, sustained effort). Indeed, one Ladas, a victor of the Olympic games, in the διάδρομος, or race set before him, so exhausted was his efforts that, immediately on gaining the honor and being crowned, he yielded up his breath: a fact which also serves to throw light on scriptural language, as showing with what intense eagerness these aspirants (ἐνδυρομένοι, long-runners) strive for perishing chalices (ποτήριον ἐκείνου). See Run-

On the subject here treated of, see West's Odes of Pindar, 2d ed.; Potter's Antiquities of Greece, bk. ii, ch. xx-xvi; and Adam's Roman Antiquities, p. 224-234. By far the best work, however, is Krause's Die Gym-
nenkunst und das Wettkampfleben in Griechenland und Römern (Leipzig, 1897). See also Nagel, Die Pythionen, Nemeien and Isthmien (Leipzig, 1841).

Gamm'dim (Heb. גַּמְדִּים, Gāmdīm; Sept. φίλαικας, Vulg. Pugmæri, A.V. "Gammadim") is the name of a class of men mentioned in Ezek. xxvii, 11, as defenders of the towers of Tyre in connection with the mercenaries from Arad. See Tyre. A variety of explanations of the term have been offered.

(1.) Some (e.g. Forster, Dict. Ebr. Nos. s. v.) suppose a connection with צִדְקָה, go'med, a cubit, q. d. cubi-
hig mens, whence the Vulg. has pignemies (so Rahil, Kim-
chi, and others). Michaelis (Supplement, p. 326) thinks that the apparent height alone is referred to, with the intention of conveying an idea of the great height of the towers (Hebr. הַצִּדְקָה, Ezk. xxvii, 17, 19). He, in De Lecce, explains it as small images of the tutelar gods, like the Lares of the Romans (see also his Dei agr. de Gammadim, in Ugolini Theaurus, xxiii, 18). This view seems to be refuted by Antingth, Disserat. de subiecta τῶν τιμίων per Fumano interpretatione (Vitenum, 1710).

(2.) Others (e.g. Pfeiffer, Bib. Zeits. p. 768; Ludolf, Comment. hist. Theb. p. 273, 274) treat it as a geographical or local term; Grotius holds Gam'dim to be a He-
braized form (בִּינְמוֹ for δίαν) of the name Anemos, a Phoenician town; the Chaldean paraphrase has Cappa-
docianae, as though reading בָּנָם (Fuller, Miscellaneous, p. 688) identifies them as the inhabitants of Gamdo (Plin. v, 14); and again the word has been broken up into בָּנָם = also the Medes. Rosenmüller (Schol. ad loc.) thinks it is the name of some obscure Phoenician town, not elsewhere mentioned. But these etymologies are equally without foundation (see Harduin, ad loc.; Reland, Polyaes, p. 794).

(3.) Most later interpreters give a more general military sense to the word. Gesenius (Theaurus, p. 299) connects it with בָּנָם, a bough, whence the sense of brave warriors. Lee renders short-swordsmen, from the same Arabic root. Havernick (ad loc.) understands
It is considered sacred by many Hindus, and is a site of pilgrimage. The river is also significant in Buddhist and Jain traditions. Its banks are adorned with temples and shrines, and the river itself is revered in various ways. The Ganges flows through the states of Uttarakhand, Bihar, West Bengal, and Jharkhand, before emptying into the Bay of Bengal.

The Ganges is also a crucial source of water for agriculture in the region, supporting a large number of farming communities. The river is also important for fishing, and many species of fish can be found in its waters.

The Ganges is not only a river of water and life but also a river of rituals, beliefs, and practices. Its banks are dotted with ghats, where people perform various rituals and ceremonies. The river is also significant in the Hindu calendar, with several festivals and events celebrated along its banks.

In conclusion, the Ganges is a river that is as significant in its physical manifestation as it is in the spiritual and cultural life of the people who live along its banks. Its presence is a source of life, prosperity, and devotion, and it continues to inspire and revered by many generations.
after a hundred years' severe austerities, Bhrigu, the saint, became favorable to his wishes, and granted him posterity. Kesini bore him a son, who was named Asanmanja, and Sumati brought forth a gourd, whose sprouts were born, who in time became as many heroes as the stars. Asanmanja, however, in growing up, was addicted to cruel practices, and was therefore banished by his father from the kingdom. His son was Anasumata, who thus became heir to the throne of Ayodya. Now it happened that Sagara resolved to perform a great and glorious sacrifice; and, in accordance with the sacred law, chose for this purpose a beautiful horse, which he confided to the care of Anasumata. But while the latter was engaged in the initiatory rites of the sacrifice, a huge serpent emerged from the soil, and carried off sixty thousand of the sacred horses. The省级 regions of Sagaras's empire were alarmed, and sent word to the king that the sacrifice was in danger. Anasumata, being informed of the obstruction which had fallen upon his undertaking, ordered his sixty thousand sacrificial horses to return the horse from the subterranean robber. These then set to work, digging the earth, and striking terror into all creation. Having explored, for many years, the infernal regions, they at last found his lost horse, the sacred horse grazing, and watched by a fiery saint, in whom they recognised the serpent, the cause of their troubles. Enraged, they attacked him; but the saint, who was no other being than Vishnu, at once reduced them to ashes. Waiting in vain for the return of his sixty thousand horses, the king of Sumati, in search of them and the sacred horse, Anasumata went, and soon ascertained the fate of his relatives; but when—mindful of his duties—he wished to sprinkle consecrated water on their ashes, so as to enable their souls to ascend to the realms of heaven, the sacrifice of the sixty thousand horses was performed, and the sacred sacrifice being achieved, Sagara strove to cause the descent of the Gangâ, but all his devices remained fruitless; and, after thirty thousand years, he went to heaven. Nor was Anasumata more successful in his attempt with the austerities he performed for the same purpose, nor his son Dwijip, who, obeying the law of time, after thirty thousand years, went to the heaven of Indra. Dwijip had obtained a son, named Bhagiratha. He, too, was eager to obtain the descent of the Gangâ; and having completed a course of severe austerities, he obtained the favor of Brahman, who told him he must yield to his father. At this answer, Bhagiratha provided that Siva consented to receive the sacred river on his head, as the earth would be too feeble to bear its fall when coming from heaven. And now Bhagiratha recommended his penance, until Siva consented, and told the Gangâ to descend from heaven. The river obeyed; but, enraged at his command, he assumed a form of immense size, and increased his celerity, thinking thus to carry him off to the infernal regions. Yet the god, becoming aware of her intentions, caught and entangled her in his matted hair, out of which she could find no means of extricating herself, though lingering there for many years. Nor would she have been released had not Bhagiratha, by his renewed penance, appeased the god, who then allowed her to descend from his head in seven streams—Hâdin, Pîlvin, and Nalini, which went eastwards; and Sêth, Suchakshu, and Sindsu, which went westwards, which were four. Bhagiratha then followed Bhishma wherever he proceeded. But it so happened that the king, on his journey, passed by the hermitage of an irascible saint, whose name was Jahnâ. The latter, seeing the Gangâ foaming in her arrogance the precursors of his sacrifice, was enraged by this, and, seeing her destined to descend, became impatient, and drank up all her waters; thereupon all the gods became terrified, and promised him that, in future, the Gangâ would pay him filial respect, and become his daughter, if he would restore her again to existence. Quieted by this promise, Jahnâ then allowed her to flow out from his ear, and therefore she is still called Jahnâvi, or the daughter of Jahnâ. But, because Bhagiratha, by dint of his exertions, enabled his ancestor who now sported the name of Gangâ to ascend to heaven, Brahman allowed him to consider her as his daughter, whence she is called Bâhirâ. And she also is called the river of 'the three paths,' because her waters flow in heaven, on earth, and pestilence plagues the infernal regions. Such is the account of the Râmâyana, and its substance is repeated by the Mahâbhârata and several of the Purânas, though they differ in the names of the streams formed in her descent by the Gangâ, some (for instance, the Vishnû and Vayu-Pûrânas) restricting their number from seven to four, called the Vishnû, Siva Sîkâ, Alakanandâ, Chakshu, and Bhadrâ. A further deviation may be seen in that, while in the Râmâyana the Gangâ springs from the Himavat (Himalaya), whose daughter she is, the Vishnû-Pûrânas assign her source to the naiì of the great toe of Vishnu's left foot, and allow Siva to have merely to receive her thereon. The following passage from this Purânâ will show the ideas on the history and the properties of this river: From that third region of the atmosphere, or seat of Vishnu, proceed the streams that wash away all sin, the river Gangâ, embrowned with the unguents of the nymphs of the naiî of heaven, which, having first received her source in the naiî of the great toe of Vishnu's left foot, Dhrûva (Siva) reverses her, and sustains her day and night devoutly on his head, and thence the seven Vishnu practices the exercises of austerity in her waters, and having often washed in his naked body, the orb of the moon, encompassed by her accumulated current, derives augmented lustre from her contact. This applies to the heavenly Gangâs. Falling from on high, as she issues from the moon she alights on the summit of Meru, and thence flows to the four quarters of the earth, and is purifying with her movement the Sagaras, the Vahusâla, and Bhadrâ, are four branches of but one river, divided according to the regions towards which it proceeds. The branch that is known as Alakanandâ was born affectionately by Siva upon his head for more than a hundred years, and was the river which raised to heaven the sinful Sêth, by his desire to receive the river. The offences of any man who bathes in this river are immediately expiated, and unprecedented virtue is engendered. Its waters, offered by sons to their ancestors in faith for three years, yield to the latter rarely attainable wealth and decoration. As respects the orders, who offer sacrifice in this river to the lord of sacrifice, Punnottama, obtain whatever they desire, either here or in heaven. Saints who are purified from all evil by bathing in its waters, and whose minds are intent on Kesava (Vishnu), acquire thereby final liberation. This sacred stream, heard of, desired, ten, touched, bathed in, or hymned day by day, sanctifies all beings; and those who, even at a distance of a hundred leagues, exclaim "Gangâ, Gangâ," atone for the sins committed during three previous lives' (Chambers, e. v.).

The Ceremonies. — The following is taken from Ward's Hinduism: "Crowds of people assemble from the different towns and villages near the river, especially at the most sacred places of the river, bringing their offerings of fruit, rice, flowers, cloth, sweetmeats, etc., and hang bundles of rushes to the branches of the river, even where it is very wide. After the people have bathed, the officiating Brahman ascends the banks of the river with them; and, after repeating religious texts, places before him a jar of water, and, sitting with his face to the north or east, performs the various rites in that order. After this, the Brahman performs other ceremonies; then the worship of the five gods, of the nine planets, of the regions of the ten quarters, etc. To this succeeds meditation. The priest next presents the offerings, which may be
teaching the Hindus almost universally throw into the river the bodies of those who had died at some distance from its banks, and by the first of these there is no burnt. Some part of the body, generally the part surrounding the navel, is thrown into the river. Those who are too poor to burn their dead bodies are sprinkled with the ashes of the funeral fire, and the sick and dying is as follows. When the patient seems to be beyond recovery, the relatives make preparations to ‘give him to Gangā.’ This is a stronger duty than seeking his recovery. ‘Life and death are in the hands of God, but the carrying of the sick to the river of its own free will is our duty.’ A coffin is procured, called the khal, for the dead, a number of torches if it be night, and notice is given throughout the neighborhood. On the way the attendants repeat loudly the names of the gods and goddesses. At the ghāt they lay him close to the water, and cause him to say that he has come to see the Mother Gangā. He is laid in a miserably hut, amid dirt and nuisance, and multitudes of dying sickness, whose shrieks and groans fill the air. A few minutes before his death he is again brought down on the bank of the river, hailed, and the corpse is set up in domestic temples and worshipped, and the next day thrown into the river. In some places clay images of this goddess are preserved in clay temples, and worshipped daily. Persons escaping dangers on water present offerings to Gangā, as well as to Varoṇa, the god of the waves, and also invoke the benevolence of the gods who protect the dangers of the sea, used to offer a sacrifice to Venus. On the thirteenth of the decrease of the moon in Chōtra, the people descend into the water, and, with their hands joined, immerse themselves, after which the officiating Brahman reads a portion of the Shastras, describing the benefits arising from this act of bathing. The people repeat after the priest certain significant words, as the day of the month, the name of Vishnu, etc., and then immerse themselves again. Gifts of rice, fruits, and money are offered to the poor, the Brahman, and the priests. On this occasion groups of ten or twelve persons stand in the water in one spot, for whom one Brahman reads the formulas. These groups are to be seen extending themselves very far along the river. At the moment of the conjunction of the moon (on the thirteenth of its decrease) with the sun, the river bursts into its banks and overflows the banks and Va- roṇa. The merit arising from bathing at this lucky moment is supposed to be very great. The people fast till the bathing is over. When there is a conjunction as above, and the day falls on Saturday, the fast is called the Great Vasara. The exposure of sick and dying on the banks of the Gangā is of uncertain date. The following summary is from the Cālcuttā Review, No. xx, vol. x, 1848: ‘The Karma Purāṇa says, ‘Those that consciously die on the banks of the Gangā shall be absorbed into the essence of Brahmā; and those who die unconsciously shall surely go to heaven of Brahmā.’ The Agni Purāṇa says, ‘Those who die when half their body is immersed in Gangā water, shall be happy thousands of ages, and resemble Brahmā.’ In the Śvetāśvatā Purāṇa, Shiva says, ‘To him who dies in Gangā I give him the sky.’ There are many traditionary stories concerning Gangā believed by the majority of Hindus. The following is a specimen:

‘On the banks of the Bhagirathi there grew a stately banana-tree, in whose ample folds a paddy-bird has constantly nested. One day the tree was torn up by the roots by the violence of a storm. The bird was destroyed, and its bones buried in the deep channel of the Gangā. The paddy-bird, in the next transmigration, was taken up into heaven simply because her bones had accidentally been deposited in the river. After that she became one of Indra’s queens in his heaven.’ In consequence of this sort of
Gap (gap), pe'ret, a breach, as elsewhere rendered, a rent or opening in a wall (Exek. xxii. 3; comp. Amos iv, 3). The Jewish false prophets did not stand in the gap (Exek. xxiii. 30); they did nothing upon the course of wickedness which opened a door for the vengeance of God to break in upon their nation. See PEREZ.

Gar (GER, Vulg. Sura), a man whose "sons" are named in the Apocalypse among the "sons of the servants of Solomon" (1 Esdr. v, 84). They are not in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah any names corresponding to the two preceding and the six succeeding this name.

Garasse, FRANÇOIS, a French Jesuit, was born at Angoulême in 1556. In 1600 he entered the society, and after teaching for a while took the vows in 1618. He subsequently wrote books of controversy (mostly under false names, and of which he repeatedly denied being the author). Their sarcastic tone, violent outburst of passion, and wholesale abuse of all whom he considered as enemies of his order, provoked the censure of Roman Catholics themselves. The expressions foul, cot, ass, etc., abound in his writings against the Protestants. The expressions Modernes, effectuantes, tumultuantes, supra modum amabilis, applied to him by the historian of his order, will always appear to any one acquainted with his works as a bitter jest rather than a compliment. When the plague broke out at Poitiers, where he had been exiled by his superiors for writing a Somme theologique (1625, fol.), which was condemned by the Sorbonne, he asked permission to devote himself to the care of the sick, and fell a victim to his devotion June 14, 1631. Among his other works we notice Exercice Colossalius (1615, 4to), under the name of Andrew Scipolius:—Oraison funèbre d'André de Némond (1666)—Le Rabelais réformé par les ministres (1619, 2mo), a violent attack against Protestant ministers and society. The place of the Recherches d'Etienne Pasquier (1652, 8vo), the full title of which assures a good example of Garasse's style: "Inscribed to Etienne Pasquier, wherever he may be; for never having been able to recognise your religion, I do not know the way and route you have taken on leaving this life, and therefore I am obliged to write you to hazard, and to address this bundle, wherever you may be . . . . " etc. See Niceron, Mém. moires, vol. xxxii; Bayle, Dictionnaire; Alemagne, Bib. th. Scritor. Soc. Jesu; Hoefer, Nouv. Bk. Générale, xiii, 426; Mém. du Père Garasse, de la Société de Jésus, publ. by C. Niesse, Paris, 1841, 1860, etc.

Garcia, D. Francisco, a Portuguese Jesuit, joined the order at the age of eighteen, and went to the East Indies with fifty-eight other Jesuit missionaries. He resided successively at Goa and Cochin, and was appointed coadjutor of the archbishop of the mountain region inhabited by the Christians of St. Thomas (q. v.). The archbishop dying in 1641, Garcia succeeded him, and exerted great influence over the people by his knowledge of the native dialects. He had many disputes with the Christians of St. Thomas. He died Sept. 3, 1655. He left a MS. entitled Recit dos sectarios da India, in which he relates the subjects written in the language of the Christians de Serra, which is said to contain valuable information on the tribes of the East.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Général, xiii, 461.

Garcia or Garzia, Gregorio, a Spanish missionary, was born at Cazor, Andalusia, about the latter half of the 16th century. He died in 1634. He was the first of his name to attain to the title of the Indians of the New World. He published many theological works in Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, and Latin, and died in 1634. He was the first of his name to obtain the title of the Indians of the New World. He published many theological works in Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, and Latin, and died in 1634.
work contains a great deal of information which has been made use of by subsequent historians. The author's theory is that America was successively settled by emigration from diverse races coming from other parts of the world. He thus attempts to uphold the text of Scripture, which gives but three sons to Noah, one of whom populated Europe, the second Asia, and the third Africa; and argues in favor of this opinion on the ground that, before the arrival of the Spaniards, the Mexicans possessed the tradition of the creation of the world, the flood, the confusion of tongues, and the dispersal of nations, as is proved by some sculptures he saw which represented these various events in a symbolic manner. He also wrote Predicaciones del Evangelio en el Nuevo Mundo viviendo los Apóstoles (Baeza, 1625, 8vo.), in which he attempts to prove that it is impossible that any of the immediate disciples of Christ ever went to preach the Christian faith to America.—Hoefer, Neue. Biog. Generale, xix, 406 sq.; see also Echard, Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum, ii, 437; Nicolas Antonio, Bibliotheca Nova Hispanica, i, 544.

Garden (γαρδήν, γαρδῆν, γαρδόν, αμπαράδεστος, N. T. εἰρήνος.) See FIELD; ORCHARD, etc.

1. Several gardens are mentioned in the Scriptures as the garden of Eden (Gen. ii, 8, 9, 10, 15), Ahab's garden of herbs (1 Kings xxv. 2), the royal garden near the fortress of Zion (2 Kings xxvii, 18; xxxv. 4), the royal garden of the Persian kings at Susa (Esther i. 5; vii. 7, 8), the garden of Joseph of Arimathea (John xix. 41), and the garden of Gethsemane (John xviii. 1). It is clear, from Josh. v. 2, and Lam. ii. 6, that gardens were generally hedged or walled, as indeed Josephus expressly states respecting the gardens near Jerusalem (War, v. 7). In Neh. ii. 5, and John xxv. 15, gardeners and keepers of gardens by occupation are indicated. See GARDENER.

The traditional gardens and pools of Solomon, supposed to be alluded to in Eccl. ii. 5, 6, are shown in the wady Urtas (i.e. Hortus), about an hour and a quarter to the south of Bethlehem (compare Josephus, Ant. viii. 7, 8). The Arabs perpetuate the tradition in the name of a neighboring hill, which they call "Jabel-el-Fureidis," or "Mountain of the Paradise" (Stanley, Sin. and Pal. p. 160). Maundrell is sceptical on the subject of the gardens (Early Trav. in Pal. p. 457), but they find a champion in Van de Velde, who asserts that they were not confined to the wady Urtas; the hill-slopes to the left and right also, with their heights and hollows, must have been covered with trees and plants, as is shown by the names they still bear, as peach-hill, 'nut-vale,' 'fig-vale,' etc. (Syria and Pal. ii, 27).

See Solomon's Pool.

The "king's garden," mentioned in 2 Kings xxv. 4; Neh. iii. 15; Jer. xxxix. 4; iii. 7, was near the Pool of Siloam, at the mouth of the Tyropoeon, north of Sir Eyub, and was formed by the meeting of the valleys of Jehoshaphat and Ben-Hinnom (Wilson, Lands of the Bible, i, 498). Josephus places the scene of the feast of Adonijah at Enrogel, "beside the fountain that is in the royal paradise" (Ant. vii. 14, 4; comp. also ix, 10, 4). See KING'S DANE.

Strabo (xvi, 763), alluding to one of the rose-gardens near Jericho, calls ἤ τον βασιλείου παραδρέα. The rose-garden in Jerusalem, mentioned in the Mishna (Maaseroth, ii, 5), and said to have been situated westward of the Temple mount, is remarkable as having been one of the few gardens which, from the time of the prophets, existed within the city walls (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. on Matt. xxvi. 56). They were usually planted without the gates, according to the gloss quoted by Lightfoot, on account of the sweet smell arising from the weeds thrown out from them, or from the manure employed in their cultivation. See ROSE.

The gate Gennath, mentioned by Josephus (War, v, 4, 2), is supposed to have derived its name from the rose-garden already mentioned, or from the fact of its leading to the gardens without the city. It was near the garden-ground by the Gate of the Women that Titus...
was surprised by the Jews while reconnoitering the city. The trench by which it was surrounded cut off his retreat (Joseph. War, v, 2). See GEMATH.

But of all the gardens of Palestine none is possessed of associations more sacred and imperishable than the garden of Gethsemane, beside the oil-presses on the slopes of Olivet. Eight aged olive-trees mark the site which tradition has connected with that memorable garden, and their gnarled stems and almost leafless branches attest an antiquity as venerable as that which is claimed for them. See GETHSEMANE.

The orange, lemon, and mulberry groves which lie around and behind Jaffa supply, perhaps, the most striking peculiarities of Oriental gardens—gardens which Maundrell describes as being "a confused miscellany of trees jumbled together, without either posts, walks, arbors, or anything of art or design, so that they seem like thickets rather than gardens" (Early Trav., to Pal. p. 416). The Persian wheels, which are kept ever working, day and night, by mules, to supply the gardens with water, leave upon the traveller's ear a most enduring impression (Lynch, Exp. to Jordan, p. 441; Siddon's Memoir, 187). The gardens near Shechem, containing orange and citron trees (Schubert, Reise, ii, 116), are described by Dr. Olies (Travels in, 350). See FOREST.

2. Gardens are frequently represented in the tombs of Thebes and other parts of Egypt, many of which are remarkable for their extent. The one here introduced is shown to have been surrounded by an embattled wall, with a canal of water passing in front of it, connected with the river. Between the canal and the wall, and parallel with them both, was a shady avenue of various trees; and about the centre was the entrance, through a lofty door, whose lintel and jambs were decorated with hieroglyphic inscriptions, containing the name of the owner of the grounds, who, in this instance, was the king himself. In the gateway were rooms for the porter, and other persons employed about the garden, and probably the receiving-room for visitors, with the dom and other trees along the whole length of the exterior wall; four tanks of water, bordered by a grass-plot, where geese were kept, and the delicate flower of the lotus was encouraged to grow, served for the irrigation of the grounds; and small knolls or summer-houses, shaded with trees, stood near the water, and overLooked beds of flowers. The spaces containing the tanks, and the adjoining portions of the garden, were each inclosed by their respective walls, and a small subdivision on either side, between the large and small tanks, seems to have been reserved for the growth of particular trees, which either required peculiar care, or bore fruit of superior quality (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. i, 38-40, abridg.).

One interesting but much defaced representation of a similar kind has been found on the Assyrian sculptures. Gardens and orchards, with various kinds of trees, appeared to be watered with canals similar to those which once spread fertility over the plains of Babylonia, and of which the choked-up beds still remain. A man, suspended by a rope, was being lowered into the water. Upon the corner of a slab, almost destroyed, was a hanging garden, supported upon columns, whose capitals were not unlike those of the Corinthian order (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 198 sq.).

Ancient Assyrian Gardens.

8. Gardens in the East, as the Hebrew word indicates, are inclosures on the outskirts of towns, planted with various trees and shrubs. From the allusions in the Bible we learn that they were surrounded by hedges of thorn (Isa. v, 5) or walls of stone (Prov. xxi, 31). For further protection, lodges (Isa. i, 8; Lam. ii, 6) or watch-towers (Mark xii, 1) were built in them, in which sat the keeper (I Sam. xxvii, 18), to drive away the wild beasts and robbers, as is the case to this day. Layard (Nineveh and Babylon, p. 360) gives the following description of a scene which he witnessed: "The broad silver river wound through the plain, the
great ruin cast its dark shadows in the moonlight, the lights of "the lodges in the gardens of cucumbers" flickered at our feet, and the deep silence was only broken by the sharp report of a rifle fired by the watchful guards to frighten away the wild beasts that lurked in the moon-light. The scarceow also was an invention not unknown (προβασαίνον, Var. vi, 70). See LODGE.

In a climate like that of Palestine the neighborhood of water was an important consideration in selecting the site of a garden. The nomenclature of the country based this fact in the following jargon—"the fountain of gardens"—the modern Jesus (comp. Cant. iv, 15). To the old Hebrew poets a "well-watered garden," or "a tree planted by the waters," was an emblem of luxuriant fertility and material prosperity (Isa. viii, 11; Jer. xvi, 6; xxii, 12); there was no figure more graphically conveyed the idea of dreary barrenness or misery than "a garden that hath no water" (Isa. i, 30).

From a neighboring stream or cistern were supplied the channels or conduits by which the gardens were irrigated, and the water was thus conveyed to all parts (Ps. i, 5; Eccl. ii, 6; Ecclus. xiv, xvi, xx). It is a matter of doubt what is the exact meaning of the expression "to water with the foot" in Deut. xi, 10. Nebuhru (Descr. de l'Aрабie, p. 138) describes a wheel which is employed for irrigating gardens where the water is not deep, and which is worked by the men who, after the mill has been operated by these, pull the upper part towards them with their hands, and pushing with their feet upon the lower part" (Robinson, ii, 226). This mode of irrigation might be described as "watering with the foot." But the method practised by the agriculturists in Oman, as described by Wallis (Trav. in Arabia, 381), may answer to this description, and serves to illustrate Prov. xxii, 1: "After ploughing, they form the ground with a spade into small squares with ledges on either side, along which the water is conducted. . . . When one of the hollows is filled, the peasant stops the supply by turning up the earth with his foot, and thus opens a channel into another." See IRRIGATION.

4. Gardens were dedicated to various uses among the Hebrews, such as we still find prevailing in the East. One most essential difference between them and our own is that they are not attached to or in any way connected with the house, but are situated in the suburbs, sometimes from half a mile to a mile distant from the houses of the persons to whom they belong. It is manifest that all the gardens mentioned in Scripture were outside the several towns. This is to be understood of gardens, for shrubs and flowers were often planted in the open courts of the dwelling-houses. People repair to their suburban gardens to take the air, to walk, and to refresh and solace themselves in various ways. For their use there is mostly in each garden a kind of summer-house or pavilion, fitted up with much neatness, gayly painted, and furnished with seats, where the visitants may sit and enjoy themselves. Here sometimes banquets were and are still given, attended by singing and music (Isa. ii, 3; Ecclus. v, 3). See GARDEN-HOUSE.

The kings and nobles had their country houses surrounded by gardens (1 Kings v. xi, 1; 2 Kings ix, 27), and these were used on festivals (Cant. v, 13). So intimately, indeed, were gardens associated with festivity, that horticulture and conviviality are, in the Talmud, denoted by the same term (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s. v. בָּהֵרָה). It is possible, however, that this may be a merely accidental coincidence. The garden of Ahasuerus was in a court of the palace (Esth. i, 5), adjoining that of the king, which was the vast expanse of the court of the city, which is in Josephus, the gardens and orchards were inclosed by the city walls (Layard, Nis. ii, 246). Attached to the house of Joash was a garden or orchard (S. 4)—"a garden inclosed" (Cant. iv, 12)—provided with baths and other appliances of luxury (S. 15; comp. 2 Sam. xi, 2). See PALACE.

It would seem that the Jews were much in the habit of performing their devotions in gardens, on account of their love of flowers, fruits, and flowers. Ilan (Jews, iv, 36; xxvi, 36; John ii, 48; xvii, 1, 2). This interesting practice, however, was idly miraculous; and the worship of idols in these study seclusions was not of frequent occurrence, and is often mentioned in Scripture (1 Kings xiv, 23; 2 Kings xiv, 4; xvii, 10; 2 Chron. xv, 17; xxix, 3; iv, 22; Matt. xxiii, 25; John vii, 14; Jer. ii, 20; iil, 6; Ezek. xx, 28). See GROVE.

The custom of burying the dead in gardens is indicated in Gen. xxiii, 19, 20; 2 Kings xi, 21, 22; 1 Sam. xxv., 11; Mark xv, 46; John xix, 41, and still occurs in Egypt in the East, but is not very prevalent. We find it also among the Greeks (Hellenodorus, Ethip. t. 2, p. 55), and the Romans (Suétionius, Gaius, 20). See GRAVE.

5. Gardens were planted not only with fragrant and beautiful plants (Cant. vi, 2; iv, 16), but with various fruits and berries and other greens (Gen. ii, 5; Exod. xxii, 11; Jer. xxix, 5; Amos ix, 14). Thus we find mention of nut-gardens (Cant. vi, 11, 14), pomegranate-gardens (Cant. iv, 13), olive-gardens (Deut. viii, 8; 1 Chron. xxvii, 28), vine-gardens (Cant. iv, 2; viii, 8). Here, however, we are not to suppose that these were ever cultivated for these fruits, but that they were severally predominant in the gardens to which they gave the name. The distinction, for instance, between a vine-garden and a vineyard would be that, in the latter, the vine was cultivated solely for use, whereas in the former it was planted for ornamental, to cover walls, and to be trained in arbors and on trellises. The quince, medlar, citrus, almond, and service trees are among those enumerated in the Mishna as cultivated in Palestine (Kilaim, i, 4). Gardens of herbs, or kitchen-gardens, are mentioned in Deut. xi, 8; 2 Kings xxix, 23; 2 Chronicles xxxvi, 1 (Isa. i, 8; 8, 17; Dan. vi, 9), and probably also melons, leeks, onions, and garlic, which are spoken of (Num. xi, 5) as the productions of a neighboring country. In addition to these, the lettuce, mustard-plant (Luke xiii, 19), coriander, endive, one of the bitter herbs eaten with the paschal lamb, and rue, are particularly in the precepts of the Mishna, though it is not certain that they were all, strictly speaking, cultivated in the gardens of Palestine (Kilaim, i, 8). It is well known that, in the time of the Romans, the art of gardening was carried to great perfection in Syria, Egypt, and Syria, and was practised pell-mell elaborately, and again (xii, 54) he describes the balsam plant as growing in Judaea alone, and there only in two royal gardens. It is evident that the gardens of the Hebrews were in a very considerable degree devoted to the culture of medicinal herbs, the preparation of which in various ways was a matter of much solicitude with them (Jer. viii, 22). This is still the case in the East, where vegetable simples are employed in medicine. See MEDICINE. In addition to the ordinary productions of the country, we are tempted to infer from Isa. xlix, 10, that in some gardens some use was bestowed in the rearing of exotics. To this conclusion the description of the gardens of Solomon in the Targum on Eccl. ii, 5, 6 seems to point. "I made me well-watered gardens and paradies, and sowed there all kinds of plants, some for use of eating, and some for use of oil, and for use of spices of medicine; all kinds of plants of spices. I planted in them trees of emptiness (i. e. not fruit-bearing), and all trees of spices which the spectres and demons brought me from India, and every tree which produces fruit; and its borders was from Babylon, the waters of Siloah. I chose reservoirs of water, which, behold! are for watering the trees and the plants, and I made me fish-ponds of water, some of them also for the plantation which rears the trees to water it." In
large gardens the orchard ( WATER, καρποθείον) was probably, as in Egypt, the inclosure set apart for the cultivation of date and sycamore trees, and trees of various kinds (Cant. iv. 13; Eccles. ii. 5). Schroeder, in the preface to his Thesaurus Linguæ Armenicæ, asserts that the word 'parde' is of Armenian origin, and denotes a garden near a house, planted with herbs, trees, and flowers. It is applied by Diodorus Siculus (ii, 10) and Berosus (quoted by Josephus, Ant. x, 2, 1) to the famous hanging gardens of Babylon. Xenophon (Anab. i, 3, 7) describes the "parde" at Seleucia in Phrygia, where Cyrus had a palace, as a large preserve full of wild beasts; and Aulus Gellius (ii, 20) gives "perioche" as the equivalent of καρποθείον (comp. Philostratus, Vit. Apol. Temn. i. 88). The officer in charge of such a domain was called "the keeper of the paradise" (Neh. ii. 8). See PARADISE.

The law against the propagation of mixed species (Lev. xix, 19; Deut. xxii, 9, 11) gave rise to numerous enactments in the Mishna to insure its observance. The portions of the field or garden, in which the various plants were sown, were separated by light fences of reed, ten palms in height, the distance between the reeds being not more than three palms, so that a kid could not enter (Kia'it, iv, 3, 4). See DIVANAH.

See Schröder, De Hortis Hierosol. (Marburg, 1729); Bradley, Descript. acconum. et hortic. vett. (Lond. 1725); Van Goens, De cyprisq. (Utr. 1783). See AGRICULTURE.

GARDENER (γυναικός), a class of women alluded to in Job xxi, 18, and mentioned in John xx. 15; but how far the art of gardening was carried among the Hebrews we have few means of ascertaining. That they were acquainted with the process of grafting is evident from Rom. xi, 17, 24, as well as from the minute prohibitions of the Mishna; and the method of propagating plants by layers or cuttings was not unknown (Isa. xlii, 10). Buxtorf says that לארין, artin (Mishna, Bikkurim, i, 9) or, rather, לארין לבר, were gardeners who tended and looked after gardens on consideration of receiving some portion of the fruit (Lez. Talm. s. v.); but that gardening was a special means of livelihood is clear from a proverb which contains a warning against rash speculations: "Who hires a garden eats the birds; who hires gardens, him the birds eat" (Dukes, Robin. Blumenl. p. 141). See GARDEN.

GARDEN-HOUSE is the rendering of the A. V. at 2 Kings ix, 27, of הים יבש; where, however, a place is rather denoted. See BETHT-HAGAN.

GARDNER are usual in the East, especially among the guns of kings and wealthy persons. In Cant. iv. 16, the bride, looking out from her boudoir into the gayly-planted court-yard, acknowledges the taste and affection of her beloved as she spies the summer-house, all shaded with verdure, and containing the dicas (இத்து), that invited to the luxurious repose of which Orientals are so fond. See GARDEN.

Gardiner, James, Colonel, son of captain Patrick Gardiner, of the British service, was born at Car- riden, Lintilboghshire, Scotland, Jan. 11, 1688, and at fourteen became ensign in a Scotch regiment in the Dutch service. In 1702 he obtained a commission in the English army, and was severely wounded at the battle of Ramilies in 1706. In several other battles he gave distinguished proofs of capacity and courage. His last campaign was one of his most successful adventures in gallantry, gained for him among his disolute companions the distinction of the "happy rake." But he was not happy. Passages of the Bible which were still imprinted on his memory, and the thought of his mother's pious character and early instructions, often were of little moment to him in war; and at one time, while entertaining a party of profi- gate young men by his licentious wit, he felt so degraded in his own estimation, and so inwardly wretched that a dog lying at his feet, the wish involuntarily rose in his breast, "Would I were as happy as that dog!"

1771 he became the subject of profound religious impressions. The circumstances, as narrated by Dr. Doddridge, contain much that is marvellous, if not supernatural. "Doddridge himself hints at the possibility of the whole being a dream instead of a visible representation of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross, surrounded on all sides with a glory," etc. He also mentions that Gardiner "did not seem very confident" whether the voice which came to him was really an audible voice, or only a strong impression on his mind equally striking. Considerable doubt has recently been cast on the whole story by the publica- tion of the Autobiography of Dr. Alexander Carlyle, edited by John Hill Burton (Edinb., Blackwood and Sons, 1869), in which Carlyle denies altogether the truth of Doddridge's version of the story, at least of the supernatural portion of it. The attendant circum- stances, however, are of little moment in one or another; the great fact is the conversion of the brave but wicked soldier into a pious and excellent Christian, and regarding this there has never been any doubt. In 1724 Gardiner was raised to the rank of major, and in 1726 he married lady Frances Erskine, daughter of the fourth earl of Buchan, by whom he had thirteen children, only five of whom survived him. "On his becoming the head of a family he commenced the practice of domestic worship—the presence of no guest, the intervention of no engagement, was ever allowed to interfere with its daily performance. He was also regular in attendance on public worship on the Sabbath, and established a system according to which all the servants accompanied him to church. In 1730 he became lieutenant-colonel of dragoons, and in 1748 colonel of a new regiment of dragoons. He was killed at the battle of Preston Pans in 1745. Chambers, Encyclopedia, s. v.; Doddridge, Life of Col. Gardiner; Jamieson, Religious Biography, s. v.

Gardiner, Stephen, bishop of Winchester, was born at Bury St. Edmund's, Suffolk, in 1488. He was the illegitimate son of Dr. Woodville, bishop of Salisbury, the brother of Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge; and in 1520 took the degree of LL.D. Having thoroughly studied the civil and canon law, he became Wolsely's secretary, and rose to the highest posts under Henry VIII, whom he served diligently in the matter of the divorce. At first he sided with the Reformers, but, being unwilling to be second to Cranmer, he took the
Roman Catholic side during Henry's lifetime. Gardiner drew up articles accusing Henry VIII's last queen, Catharine Parr, of heresy; but the queen avoided the storm, and he fell into disgrace. At Henry's death Gardiner experienced a still greater reverse. The young king began to stress religious changes, to which Gardiner set himself in opposition. The council appointed him to the fleet. "Here he was confined until the act of general amnesty, which passed in the December after the accession of Edward, released him. As soon as he was free he went down to London, where he remained un molested; but on his return to London, on account of a certain sermon which he preached on St. Peter's day, he was seized and committed to the Tower (1546). Various conferences were held with him, and his release was promised him on condition that he express his contrition for the past, promise obedience for the future, subscribe the new settlement in religion, acknowledge the royal supremacy, and the abrogation of the six articles. With the first of these conditions alone did he absolutely refuse to comply. The terms of liberation were at last after a long and tedious delay, more difficult. The number of articles that he was called upon to subscribe was considerably increased. On his refusal to sign them his bishopric was sequestered, and he was soon afterwards deprived. For more than five years he suffered close imprisonment, and it was not until the beginning of the reign of Mary that his liberty was restored (1553). If his fall from power at the conclusion of Henry's reign had been sudden, still more sudden was the rapidity of his reinstatement. A Roman Catholic queen was on the throne, and he who had been ever the foremost of his parti and must necessarily be raised to be one of her first advisers. The chancellorship was conferred upon him. His bishopric was restored, and the conduct of affairs placed in his hands. The management of the queen's marriage-treaty was intrusted to him. He was chosen to officiate at her marriage, as he had also done at her coronation, and became her most confidential adviser. No matters, whatever they might be, could be proceeded in without his privity and concurrence; and he had his full share in the persecutions of this reign. The horrors which were not committed by his actual orders were, at all events, his work. In October, Gardiner may be said in a few words. He was a man of great ability; his general knowledge was more remarkable than his learning as a divine. He was ambitious and revengeful, and wholly unscrupulous. His first object was his own preservation and advancement, and his next the promotion of his party interest. He saw deep into the characters of those with whom he dealt, dealt with them with remarkable tact, and had an accurate foresight of affairs." (English Cyclopedia, s. v.). See Burnet, Hist. of English Reformation, passim; Hook, Eccles. Biography, v. 256; Collier, Eccles. History of Great Britain, v. 125.

Gar' coyle (Hob. Garb'), گَراَکویل, scabbly; Sept. Παπαί essay. (G) 1. A thrite (q. v.), i.e. descendant of Jethro or Jether, and one of David's thirty heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 38; 1 Chron. x, 40). B.C. 1046. See DAVID.

2. A hill (گَراَکویل) near Jerusalem, apparently on the north-west (Jer. xxxi, 39). See Jerusalem. According to Dr. Barclay, it is "the ridge running from the north to the city in the lowest valley of West Bank, the گَراَکویل (City of the Great King, p. 76). See GATH. He thinks it may have been so called because Garb the thrite once owned it, or because it contained quarries for the seclusion of the lepers.

Gargoyles, a projecting spout, used in Gothic architecture to throw water from the gutter of a building, so as not to drop down the wall. Gargoyles have been carved into the resemblance of the human figure or of grotesque animals, real or imaginary. They are placed on cornices and on buttresses, and form salient features in many buildings of the early English and decorated styles of the Gothic architecture. (G. F. C.)

Garissaole, Antoine, a French Protestant minister, was born at Montauban in 1587. He was ordained and appointed pastor at Puylaurens in 1610. In 1620 he was sent to Montauban. In 1627, he was made professor of theology at that place. In 1645 he presided at the Synod of Charenton, and distinguished himself by his firmness in resisting demands made by the government which would have destroyed the Protestant liberties. He attacked at this synod the theory of mediate imputation as held by Placeus (q. v.). When the Protestant schools were disorganized, owing to the irregularity with which they received their subsidies, he remanied at his post, with no hope of remuneration, and by teaching all branches of theology supplied the places of his absent colleagues as well as his own. He died at Montauban July, 1651. Among his works are La voie du Salut, exposée en huit sermons (Montauban, 1637; 8vo): —Descrip. synodici Carentonensiae de imputatione primi peccati Adae explicatio et defensio (Montauban, 1648, 8vo): —Theses theologicae de religionem et cultu sine obviis (Montauban, 1648, 4to): —Dignitates elenchico ex capitis uel inter reformatos et pontificios controversiarum in acad. Montalb., habita sub praesidio Ani Garissiole et Ioanne Verderisi (Montauban, 1650, 8vo): —Cittaschea ecclesiastica in Gallia et aliis reformatis explicatio, opus a F. Cardo Coreto thomaeus et. Ab. Ant. Garissiole continuato et abutum (Genève, 1655, 4to):


Gar'sim (گِرّصیم v. r. گِرّصیم), a Grimelized form (2 Macce. v. 23; vi. 5) of Mount Gerizim (q. v.).

Garland (گَراَنل), Acts xiv, 13. See WREATH. It was customary in heathen sacrifices to adorn victims with fillets and garlands; but commentators are not agreed as to the purpose to which the "garlands" mentioned in the above passage are to be applied. As the idolaters used to put garlands on the head of their idol before they offered sacrifices, it has been thought by others that they were intended to be set on the heads of the apostles. They were generally composed of such trees or plants as were esteemed most agreeable to the god who was the immediate object of worship (see Kulnul and others, in loc.). See Rose, De στέφανοι (Jena, 1659); Schmid, De Coromio (Ips. 1701); Gerhard, id. (Jen. 1646); Schmeitzel, ed. (ib.
GARLANDS

1718) Paschallis, id. (L. B., 1671); Grece, De coronis equitum (Lips. 1670). See CROWN; WEDDING.

Garlands in the marriage service. It was usual in the early Church to crown persons contracted in marriage with garlands (Chrysostom, Hom. xx in 1 Tim.). This practice was derived from the heathen ceremonies; but, as it was deemed innocent, the Christians made no scruple to adopt it. It is still practised in the Greek Church. At funerals, however, the custom of crowning the corpse and the coffin was rejected as a vestige of idolatry (Tertullian, De Corona Militis, c. x). It was usual to strewe flowers on the grave.—Riddle, Christian Antiquities, bk. vii, ch. iii.

Garlic (גָּרָל, akum, so called from its odor; Sept. αὐκόρον, Vulg. alium, A.V. "garlick") occurs only once in Scripture, and that in the plural, Numb. xi, 5, where the Israelites are described as murmuring, among other things, for the leeks, the onions, and the garlic of Egypt. There can be no doubt of its being correctly so translated, as the same Arabic word (أَكَم) still signifies a species of garlic which is cultivated and esteemed throughout Eastern countries (Celsius Hierobot. ii, 58). Ancient authors mention that garlic was cultivated in Egypt (Pliny, xix, 82). Herodotus (ii, 125) enumerates it as one of the substances upon which a large sum (1600 talents) was spent for feeding laborers employed in building the Pyramids, although Hasselequart expresses a doubt whether it was cultivated in that country (Prosp. p. 582). The species considered to have been thus referred to is Allium Ascalonicum, which is the most common in Eastern countries, and obtains its specific name from having been brought into Europe from Ascalon (see Jac. de Vitriaco, in the Gest. Francor. iii, 1142). It is now usually known in the kitchen garden by the name of "eschalot" or "shallot." Its ranker congener is the common garlic (Allium sativum). See the Penny Cyclopaedia, s. v. Allium. Rosellini, however, thinks he has discovered it upon a painting in Beni Hassan. The Talmudists frequently mention the use of this plant among the Jews, and their fondness of it (Kidd. i, 8; vi, 10; Massek. v, 8; Terum. vii, 7; Ned. vii, 6, etc.). It formed a favorite viand with the common people among the Greeks and Romans (Pliny, xx, 28; Plutus, Mostell. i, i, 38; Horace, Ep. iii, 38; Suetonius, Vesp. 8). See BOTANY.

Garment (represented by several Heb. and Greek words) [see APPAREL; CLOTHING; DRESS; RAIMENT, VESTURE, etc.]. For a list of these garments, see Thomson, Land and Book, i, 167 sq. In 2 Kings xi, 13, it is said, "Then they hasted and took every man his garment, and put it under him on the top of the stairs, and blew with trumpets, saying, Jehu is king." Here they laid down their garments in stead of carpets. The use of carpets was common in the East in the remoter ages. The kings of Persia always walked upon carpets in their palaces. Xenophon reproaches the degenerate Persians of his time that they placed their carpets upon carpets to reduce more at their ease. The spreading of garments in the street before persons to whom it was intended to show particular honor was an ancient and very general custom. Thus the people spread their garments in the way before a dwelling (Matt. xxii, 8), when some also strewwed branches. In the Agamemnon of Aeschylus, the hypocritical Clytemnestra commands the maids to spread out carpets before her returning husband, that, on descending from his chariot, he may place his foot "on a purple-covered path." We also find this custom adopted by the Romans. When Cato of Utica left the Macedonian army, where he had become legiminary tribune, the soldiers spread their clothes in the way. The hanging out of carpets, and strewning of flowers and branches in modern times, are remnants of ancient custom. See RENDING; SEWING.

A number of sumptuous and magnificent habits was, in ancient times, regarded as an indispensable part of the treasures of a rich man. Thus the patriarch Job, speaking of the riches of the wicked, says, "Though he heap up silver as the dust, and prepare raiment as the clay" (Job xxii, 24). Joseph prided himself on these changes of raiment, but to Benjamin he gave "three hundred pieces of silver, and five changes of raiment" (Gen. xlv, 22). Naaman carried for a present to the prophet Elisha ten changes of raiment (2 Kings v, 6). In allusion to this custom, our Lord, when describing the short duration and perishing nature of earthly treasures, represents them as subject to the depredations of the moth, from which the inhabitants of the East find it exceedingly difficult to preserve their stores of garments: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt" (Matt. vi, 19). Paul, when appealing to the integrity and fidelity with which he had discharged his sacred office, mentions apparel with other treasures: he says, "I have coveted no man's gold, or silver, or apparel" (Acts xx, 23). The apostle James likewise (as do the Greek and Roman writers, when they particularize the opulence of those times) specifies gold, silver, and garments as the constituents of riches: "Go to now, ye rich men; weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments moth-eaten" (James v, 2, 3). We find that the custom of wearing splendid dresses still exists in Palestine and the East. It appears that even Solo- mon received raiment as presents (2 Chron. ix, 24). Asiatic princes and grandees keep changes of raiment ready made, for presents to persons of distinction whom they wish particularly to honor. The simple and uniform shape of the clothes makes this custom practic- able, and accounts also for the change of one person's dress for another's, which is mentioned in sacred history. This will, perhaps, apply to the parable of the wedding garment, and to the behavior of the king, who expected to have found all his guests clad in robes of honor (Gen. xxvii, 15; Deut. xxii, 5; 1 Sam. xviii, 4; 2 Kings v, 5; 22; Matt. xxii, 11; Luke xv, 22). The "changeable suit of apparel" in Isa. iii, 22, should be properly "embroidered robes." See BANQUET, etc.

Women were forbidden to wear male garments, and the reverse derived from the garments upon carpets, to reverence the wives of patriarchs (after the Targum, ad loc.) as a proper name: the form

Allium Ascalonicum.
GARNER

like that of the associated soubrickites is pastoral, as if from a town, Gereses; but no such place is elsewhere mentioned, unless it be the Beth-Garem (ܒܝܬܓܪܐ) of the Talmud (Erbolin, fol. 19, a), and the Manual De Genere of Astori, east of Gaza, referred to by Schwarz (Palæst. p. 118) as now unknown.

Garnet is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following words: סיזן, olar, a treasure, as it is usually rendered, a store or stock of goods laid up, hence the place where they are deposited (Joel i. 17; "treasury," 2 Chron. xxvii. 29; xxi. 21; Prov. xxiv. 28, see note); סזונין, a respository, a cell or store-room (Psa. xlix. 13; Proclus, a respository, a place for storing away anything, especially a granary (Matt. iii. 12; Luke iii. 17; elsewhere "barn"). See BARN.

Cisterns (q. v.) are often used for this purpose in the East (Thomson, Land and Book, ii. 262 sq.). The structures of the ancient Egyptians for the storage of grain were above ground, and of great importance in so eminently a grain-growing country. See AGRICULTURE.

Ancient Egyptians Storing Grain.

This cut shows the section of a granary, in which the grain is in the act of being transferred after it has been threshed. The clerk, seated on the heap, written down the number of the measure of corn sent to the granary, seemingly from the oral report of the man who stands on the ground with raised hands.

Garnet. See SARDUCUS.

Garnet, Henry, an English Jesuit, was born in Nottingham in 1555. He was educated as a Protestant at Winchester College; but, having turned Romanist, he travelled in Spain, and afterwards studied at Rome, and gained distinction for his skill in mathematics. He was made provincial of the Jesuits in England in 1586, and served with great astuteness and fidelity the Roman Church in that country. He was tried in 1606 for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot (q. v.), and was executed May 3. A good account of him is given in Riba, Celebrated Jesuits—Munich, Church History, book iv, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, chap. i, § 10; Hume, History of England, ch. xlv.

Garnett, John, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1677. He became fellow of Sidney College, Cambridge, and afterwards Lady Margaret's preacher. He was made bishop of Ferns in 1712, and bishop of Clonfert in 1716. He died in 1729. His principal work is A Dissertation on the Book of Job, its Nature, Argument, Age, and Author, wherein the celebrated Text, xxxiv, 25, is occasionally considered and discussed; to which are added four Sermons (London, 1749, 4to). He contends "that the book of Job is an allegorical drama, designed to represent the fall and restoration of a captive Jew, and with a view to recommend the virtue of patience. The author he supposes to have been Ezekiel, and the period of its production subsequent to the Babylonish captivity."—Orme, Bibliotheca Biblica, p. 209; Kitto, Cyclopaedia, s. v.

Garnier, Jean, a French Jesuit, was born at Paris in 1612. He joined the order in 1628, and soon displayed great talent and aptness for study and teaching. As usual, this gift was fostered by the society, and for forty years Garnier held different professorships of theology and literature. He died at Bologna, on his way to Rome, Oct. 16, 1661. His most important works are on the Pelagian controversy, his editions of Juliana Egid, episcopi libellus, notis illustrat, 1668, and also of Marci Mercatoris opera cum notis, etc. (1678, fol.). The dissertations appended to this edition are still valuable to the history of Pelagianism. In 1675 he published the Brevarium sive historia controversiarum Notioriae et Euthychiae of the archdeacon Liberatus. After his death, father Hardouin published his Supplement to the Works of Thoerichus, at the beginning of which he gives a eulogy of Garnier's labors and talents.—Feller, Dict. Biog.; Hoefler, Noua Biog. Generale, xix, 510.

Garnier, Julien, de Coenfere, an eminent Benedictine of St. Maurit, was born about 1670, and died at Paris June 9, 1725. He enjoyed great reputation for learning, and was highly esteemed both as a man and a priest. His superiors intrusted him with the preparation of a new edition of St. Basil, and the result of his labors was one of the best ever produced at St. Maurit: Sci. Patris nostri Basilii Opera (Paris, Coignard). The preface is a remarkable production. Garnier, however, was able to complete but two volumes. Marin, who continued the work after the death of Garnier, brought out the third and last in 1730. See Histoire littér. de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, p. 470; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 662.

Garnish: עַנּוּר, ushparah", in Piel, to overlay (as usually rendered), e. g. with stones, 2 Chron. iii. 6; in a similar sense, coulours, to adorn, Rev. xxvi, 19, which is used of deckin garlands, Matt. xxi. 29, or of a furnished apartment, Matt. xii. 44; Luke xi. 23. In Job xiii. 16, the term is peculiar, עַנּוּר, ushparah", which Gesenius regards as a noun denoting brightness, with which the heavens are clothed; although Fürst, with many others, pointing ענור, regards it as a Piel form of עניר, in the sense of arch, referring to the vaulted form of the sky. See ASTRONOMY.

Garrettson, Freeborn, a distinguished pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Maryland August 15, 1752, was converted in 1778, and entered the Conference in the same year. In December, 1784, he was ordained elder by Dr. Coke, and volunteered as missionary to Nova Scotia. In 1788, with twelve young ministers, he opened the work of evangelizing Eastern New York and Western New England. From 1818 to his death, Sept. 26, 1827, he mostly had the relation of Conference missionary. Mr. Garrettson was a very widely-useful minister. "He was among the earliest Methodist preachers of American birth, and, being active and zealous from the commencement of his ministerial career, his life and labors are intimately connected with the rise and progress of Methodism in this country." He preached in almost all the Eastern States, from Nova Scotia to the Gulf of Mexico, and on all his appointments many souls were converted and many churches built up. Although not a man of great learning, Mr. Garrettson was a man of vigorous mind and power of speech. He was imbued with fervor and zeal; and during fifty-two years he was one of the most laborious and efficient evangelists of the age. He died greatly honored III.—24④
Country in the Light of History, delivered before the alumni of Pennsylvania College, 1861; and The Suld- den Death of Henry J. McMillan, pronounced in the Luth- eran Church, Greensburg, 1894. (M. L. S.)

Gary, George, a Methodist Episcopal minister and missionary to the Indians, was born at Middlefield, Osage Co., N. Y., Dec. 8, 1738; entered the New England Conference in 1809; in 1818 was transferred to Gen- esee Conference; in 1818 was made presiding elder; in 1825 was Conference missionary; in 1834, mission- ary to the Oneida Indians; in 1836 was transferred to Black River Conference; and in 1844 was appointed missionary superintendent of Oregon, where he re- mained four years. After his return he labored on until 1851, when his health entirely failed. He died March 28, 1855. Mr. Gary was an eminently holy and useful minister. He was six times delegate to the General Conference, and was deeply engaged in all the ecclesiastical, religious, and educational interests of the Church. He was a wise and safe counsellor, and his influence in his Conference was very great. As a preacher he was widely known for "true, persua- sive, and sanctified eloquence," which "mightily moved his hearers."—Minutes of Conferences, v. 560; Peck, Early Methodists (N. York, 1860, 12mo), p. 452; Sprague, Annals, vii, 478. (G. L. T.)

Gash'mu (Hebrew Gashe'mu), גָּשָׁמְעָה; Sept. omits, Vulg. Gassem, prob. a prolonged form (Neh. vi. 6) of the name Geziem (q. v.).

Gassendi or Gassend, Pierre, an eminent French philosopher and scholar, was born of humble parentage Dec. 24, 1586, at Champagnier, a village near Digne, in Provence. He died at Paris Oct. 24, 1655. From his earliest years he was noted for sweetness of disposition, quickness of apprehension, keenness of obser- vation, and precocity of genius. As a child he would wander in the fields on clear nights to admire the beauty of the sky, and once, on the street of a town, he would thus excite the anxieties of his family, till his habits and occupations became familiar to them. At four years of age he made sermons for the entertain- ment of his childish companions, at ten he delivered a Latin address to the bishop of his diocese, and at sixteen he had already adopted the motto of his life—aspera aude—dare to be wise. He was early sent to school, and, fortunately, fell at Digne into the hands of a teacher able to appreciate and develop his won- derful powers. His father was with difficulty induced to permit him to return to the University of Aix, along with the sons of a relative, and at that relative's expense. He was required to return after a two-years' course. At Aix he was under the care of Fesaye, a learned Minorite, who introduced him into the thorny labyrinths of philosophy. At the expiration of the appointed time Gassendi returned to the plough, but left it to teach rhetoric at the age of sixteen in the academy of Digne. At nineteen he was appointed, on the death of Fesaye, to give instructions in philosophy at the University of Aix; but he devoted himself chiefly to the study of theology, as he had se- lected that as the career for his life. In 1610, when he was simultaneously elected to the chairs of theology and philosophy, and he accepted the latter. The au- thority of Aristotle had been long declining among the learned, and, in common with many of his precur- sors and contemporaries, Gassendi regarded himself in the confutation of the peripatetic dogmas. The controversial views thus promulgated were systematized in his Exercitationum Paradoxicarum adversus Aristoteles liber septem. Before publishing the work he submitted it to the judgment of Nicholas Peiresc and the prior of Aletas. Gassendi persuaded himself to complete his design of entering the Church; and, after receiving his doctorate of divinity, was through their influence presented to a canonry at Digne. A portion of the Paradoxa was published in 1624, but the
GASSENDI

Last five books were withheld by the advice of his friends, and his labors in this direction were arrested by the discovery that the subject had been sufficiently discussed by Francesco Patrizii. These writings, petulant in character, and full of youthful cavils and supercilious objections, provoked opposition, which was not mitigated by Gassendi's manifest predilection for the opinions of Epicurus. The young philosopher had long been held to measure of the religious views of France, and had entered upon life amid the turmoil and strife of the regency of Anne of Austria, during a period when many speculative minds sought relief from controversy, and from the agitation of religious and political disturbances, in the contemplation of nature. The sect of atomic materialism had been rendered attractive by Montaigne. Ecclesiastical duties having summoned him to Paris, he profited by the occasion to augment his multifarious learning, and to form the acquaintance of the learned in the capital. It was probably at this time that he was brought into intimacy with Des Cartes, an intimacy which was interrupted and shaken by his observations on the philosophical Meditations, and by the disingenuous conduct of Des Cartes in regard to them. Gassendi was induced to accept in 1643 the professorship of mathematics in the University of France for the purpose of lecturing, in conjunction with his other studious avocations, undermind his health, and compelled him to seek its restoration by a return to his native air. During this period he gave to the world the treatise De Vapori et Specie Epicuri (Lugduni, 1647), and his edition of the Tenth Book of De Dies Lentis at Ecaterinburg (1649), with copious annotations, in which he collected and arranged the abundant literary materials which he had gathered for the illustration of the philosophy and the philosopher of the Garden. In 1653 Gassendi returned to Paris, and, after publishing the lives of Tycho Brahe, Copernicus, Purbach, Regiomontanus, and Poi- rescus, devoted himself assiduously to the completion and perfection of his scheme of speculation, though these last results of his labors did not appear till after his death in the Symmagonia Philosophica Epicurea. His health finally gave way in 1654, and, after much suffering from pulmonary disease, he died, having survived his illustrious rival Des Cartes five years.

The complete works of Gassendi were collected and published in 1658, in 6 vols. fol., by his friends Louis de Mortemart and Francois Henry, with a biography by Sorbiere preceded. The most important of these works have been already mentioned, but they were accompanied by numerous essays on various topics of mathematics, astronomy, natural history, etc. These it is unnecessary to notice, though all branches of contemporary science are treated, and this is especially the case, and happiness is identified with pleasure when pleasure ceases to be identical with happiness. Pleasure, in its vulgar sense, thus becomes at once the aim of life and the means of securing that aim; and pleasure is the goal of all human desires. No conception of happiness, of desire with duty, is totally forgotten or ignored. Thus all the vices of the Epicurean style are introduced. But it is as unscientific as it is uncharacteristic to stigmatize the philosopher instead of the philosophy for the perverseness or the perversity tendency of his doctrine. In the most defeated Epicureanism there is assuredly an intricate confusion which eventsuate in grievous error. Violence is habitually done to words, and a greater violence is done to thoughts. There is a continual paranoia and perversion—

Philosophy of Gassendi.—Neither the desire nor the design of founding a sect was entertained by Gassendi. He left no school, though he made his mark on the scientific and speculative development of Europe. He was distinguished by quickness of intellect and by an insatiable curiosity, by remarkable penetration and discrimination, by various research, and manifold accomplishment. He was enthusiastic in the discovery of new facts, eager in the discovery of new facts, eager in the discovery of new facts, eager in the discovery of new facts, eager in the discovery of new facts, eager in the exposure of erroneous error, but he had no taste for systemmongering, and was free from the weaknesses of personal ambition. He aimed rather at rejuvenating ancient knowledge than at inaugurating new fancies. The cardinal principle of Epicurus was accepted and expounded by Gassendi in such a manner as to harmonize with the simplicity, temperance, and purity of his life. The great end of human action, the crown of human aspirations; but this pleasure is the pleasure of the good man; the perfect state of the pagan; the present and eternal bliss of the Christian. It is neither to be attained nor sought by personal indulgences, nor by concession to appetite; but only by the punctilious discharge of every duty, in expectation of that serenity of a conscience at ease, which is the most abiding and the most assuring reward of virtue. Such a theory is liable to great abuses, and is certain to be ultimately abused. An easy conscience safely mistake for a conscience of ease, and happiness is identified with pleasure when pleasure ceases to be identical with happiness. Pleasure, in its vulgar sense, thus becomes at once the aim of life and the means of securing that aim; and pleasure is the goal of all human desires. No conception of happiness, of desire with duty, is totally forgotten or ignored. Thus all the vices of the Epicurean style are introduced. But it is as unscientific as it is uncharacteristic to stigmatize the philosopher instead of the philosophy for the perverseness or the perversity tendency of his doctrine. In the most defeated Epicureanism there is assuredly an intricate confusion which eventsuate in grievous error. Violence is habitually done to words, and a greater violence is done to thoughts. There is a continual paranoia and perversion— a play upon terms and upon concepts which dazzles, bewilders, and misleads; but the peripatetic thesis may be held in conjunction with the purest intentions and the most rigorous observance of moral rectitude. So it was held by Gassendi. It must be admitted that the Heclican theory is not more incompatible with a Christian philosophy. It is an elaborate subject; some of the elaborate essays, in which he repudiated and refuted the infidel tenets ascribed to Epicurus. This late defence, however consonant with the whole tenor of his own life, was inadequate to prevent unfavorable suspicions, particularly on the part of those predisposed to welcome them. Nor was his intimate association with Hobbes, La Mothe le Vayer, and other notable scien- tists of the time, calculated to inspire confidence in his orthodoxy or sincerity. The secret of Gassendi was less sincere than it was habitual, or that he ever questioned the validity of the religion which he professed. It was an age of paradox, and of promiscuous and vague, but earnest, inquiry. His early resistance to the Aristotelians may have at least his intellectual and moral, and physical scheme which was most strongly contrasted with the positions of the peripatetic school. The temper of the period, too, after long theological controversy and a century of religious war, desired the conciliation or the relegation of polemical aspersities, and the cherished dogma of mortality which had been rendered attractive by Montaigne. Gassendi was contemplated by Gassendi in their original innocence and purity, divested of the corruptions which vitiated them in their later and more familiar applications, and adorned with that chaste simplicity which won the earnest and repeated commendations of the Stoic Seneca.

...
Gassendi, Johann Joseph, a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Brans, near Pludenz, August 20, 1727, studied theology at Innsbruck and Prague, was ordained priest in 1730, and in 1758 was settled as pastor at Klosterle. After filling that station for some fifteen years he was driven from it by the cruelty and casuistical character of the phenomena commented on. There was a similar inconsequence in the physical system of Gassendi. He received from Epicurus, or, rather, from Lucretius, the doctrine of atoms, of a vacuum, and of the regular operation of natural forces; but he did not admit the indissolubility and casual insubstantiality of the primary particles, nor did he exclude the divine will and the divine intelligence from the order of creation. In his separate tenets as in his general intellectual habit, he presented a strong contrast to his more magnificent and more aims were chiefly scientific, Descartes. Positions apparently materialistic were maintained by him in conjunction with a faithful adherence to both natural and revealed religion; and he offered the strange spectacle of a sincere and preposterous Epicurean who was equally sincere as a Christian and as a natural philosopher. In one case he was on the other hand, with principles essentially idealistic, combined the postulates of the infinite tenuity and divisibility of matter, of a plement, and of the vertiginous evolution of the universe, with practical but unavowed Pyrrhonism. There was point, but there was also a perplexing contradiction in the speculations of Gassendi, and Baumer was himself possessed by the devil. Although an official person kept a continued record of his cures, in which the most extraordinary things were testified, yet it was found only too soon that Gassendi very often made persons in health play the part of those in sickness, and that the cures of real sufferers were successful only so long as their imagination remained heated by the persuasions of the conjuror" (Chambers, from Conversations, s. v.). Finally, the emperor, Joseph II, forbade his exorcism, and the archbishops Anton Peter of Prague and Hieronymus of Salzburg declared themselves against him (see Acta Eruditorum, xcvii, 331). Pope Pius VI expressed his disapprobation both of Gassendi's deeds and writings. He died in retirement April 4, 1779. Lavater (q. v.) believed in the reality of many of the cures ascribed to Gassendi, and regarded them as the result of some extraordinary power of faith. Among his works, the most remarkable are Weise, von sind und grund zu leben, und richtig und gut zu studien, etc. (Kempten, 1774; Augsburg, 1775, 8d ed.), and J. J. Gassendi's Artikel auf d. Ammerungen oder seine Gründe u. Weise u. exorcismen (Augsburg, 1774).—Harvey, P. N. (1658) and J. N. D. B. P. (19th cent.), Nouveaux Biographes, xix, 595; Storzinger, Die aufgelesenen Gassenschen Wunderkurven (1775); Sammlung von Briefen u. Aufsitzen über die Gassensche Geister-beschwörung (Halle, 1776).

Gaston, see Anthony, St., Orders of (vol. i, p. 202).

Gastrell, Francis, bishop of Chester, was born at Stapleton, near Tewkesbury, about 1689, and was educated at Westminster School and at Christ Church College, Oxford. He became preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Boyle lecturer. In 1700 he took the degree of D.D., and in 1702 he was appointed canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In 1711 he was made chaplain to the queen, and in 1714 bishop of Chester, with permission to retain his canonry, but he resigned his prebendal at Lincoln's Inn. Though not friendly to bishop Atterbury's politics, he stood by him in Parliament when the Bill of Pains and Penalties was brought in against him, and voted against his bill. He survived that event but a few years. The great put an end to his life, Nov. 24, 1725. His most important writings are, The Certainty of Religion in General, Boyle lecture (Lond. 1697, 8vo):—The Certainty of the Christian Revelation (Lond. 1689, 8vo):—The Christian Institutions (Lond. 1717, 32mo, 8d ed.):—La Institutiones Christianae (1717, 24mo):—De Deis (Lond. 1722, 8vo):—Remarks on Clarke's Doctrine of the Trinity (Lond. 1714, 8vo,—Hook, Biog. Eccles. vol. v: Chalmers, Biog. Dictionary, s. v.7. Gataker, Charles, son of Thomas Gataker (see...
GATCH, PHILIP, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland March 2, 1751; was converted in 1772; entered the Philadelphia Conference as a travelling preacher in 1774; labored in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland for some years, and in Virginia for about twenty years. He then emigrated to the Northwestern Territory in 1796, and settled near the village of Cincinnati, where, after a useful career as a citizen and minister in that new country, he died, December 28, 1835. See McLean, Sketch of Philip Gatch (Cincinnati, 1854); Minutes of Conferences, ii, 405; Sprague, Annals, vii, 60.

Gate (prop. גַּגְ, vāšār, πύλη; which are also used [spec. the Heb. word] for door [q. v.], although this latter is more properly designated by בַּֽעַ, yāqḥ, or thūch, an opening, of which בַּֽעַ, lešār, was the easier, Gr. θύρα; there also occur ἡ σύνεθες, 1 Chron. ix. 19, 21, a residue or "threshold," as usually elsewhere rendered; and the Chald. בַּֽעַ, tērā, an entrance, only in Ezra and Dan.), the entrance of the high grounds, buildings, dwelling-houses, towns, etc. (see Thomson, Land and Book, i, 29 sq.). Thus we find mentioned—

1. Gates of Cities, as of Jerusalem, its sheep-gate, fish-gate, etc. (Jer. xxxiii. 13; Neh. iii. 3; iv. 8; v. 3; of Sodom (Gen. xix. 1); of Gaza (Judges xvi. 3).

2. Gates of royal palaces (Neh. iii. 36; 8 Gates of the Temple. The temple of Ezekiel had two gates, one towards the north, the other towards the east; the latter closed (Ezek. xlv. 1, 2), the other must have been open. The gates of Solomon's Temple were very massive and costly, being overlaid with gold and silver; in the outer courts of Herod's temple, nine were covered with gold and silver, as well as the posts and lintels; but the middle one, the Beautiful Gate (Acts iii. 2), was made entirely of Corinthian brass, and was considered to surpass the others far in costliness (Joseph. War, v, 5, 3). This gate, which was so heavy as to require twenty men to close it, was unexpectedly found open on one occasion shortly before the close of the Jewish war. Joseph. War, vi, 5, 3; Ap. ii, 9).


4. Gates of prisons. In Acts xii, 10, mention is made of the iron gate of Peter's prison (xvi, 27).


7. Gates of camps (Exod. xxxi, 12; see Heb. xii, 12). The camps of the Romans generally had four gates, of which the first was called porta praetoria, the second decumanus, the third principala, the fourth quinta (Rosin, Antiq. Rom. x, 12). The camp of the Trojans is also described as having had gates (Virgil, Æn. ix, 724). The camp of the Israelites in the desert appears to have been closed by gates (Exod. xxxii, 27). We do not know of what materials the incloures and gates of the temporary camps of the Hebrews were formed. In Egyptian monuments such incloures are indicated by lines of indefinite length, with gates apparently of wicker, defended by a strong guard. In later Egyptian times, the gates of the temples seem to have

Ancient Egyptian Camp gate guarded.
been intended as places of defence, if not the principal fortifications (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg., i, 409, abridg.).

The gateways of Assyrian cities were arched or square-headed entrances in the wall, sometimes flanked by towers (Layard, Nineveh, ii, 288, 293; Nin. and Babil., p. 231; Mon. of Nin., pt. ii, pl. 49; see also Assyrian bas-reliefs in Brit. Mus. Nos. 49, 25, 26). The entrances to their own royal mansions were a simple passage between two colossal human-headed bulls or lions. See Palace.

As the gates of towns served the ancients as places of security [see Fourieration], a durable material was required for them, and accordingly we find mentioned—1. Gates of iron and brass (Psa. xlv, 16; Isa. xlv, 2; Acts xii, 10). It is probable that gates thus described were, in fact, only sheeted with plates of copper or iron (Faber, Archæol., p. 297), and it is probably in this sense that we are to interpret the hundred brazen gates ascribed to the ancient Babylon. There were described (Voyage, p. 268) describes the six gates of Jerusalem as covered with iron, which is probably still the case with the four gates now open. Other iron-cover-
ed gates are mentioned by travelers, such as some of the town gates of Algiers (Pitt's Letter, viii, 10), and of the towers of the so-called iron bridge at Antioch (Foscoche, vol. ii, pt. i., p. 172). Gates of iron are also mentioned by Heriod (Thucyd., 722), by Virgil (Æneid, i, 482; vii, 690), and by Ovid (Metamorphoses, vii, 126).

2. Gates of stone, and of pearls, are mentioned in Isa. liv, 12, and Rev. xxi, 12, which, it has justly been supposed, refer to such doors, cut out of a single slab, as are occasionally discovered in ancient countries (Shaw, p. 210; Burchhardt, Syria, p. 58, 74; Porter, Damascus, ii, 22, 192; Ray, Coll. of Trop. ii, 429). At Esmaw (Syene), in Upper Egypt, there is a granite gateway bearing the name of Alexander, the son of Alexander the Great (Wilkinson, iii, 405). The doors leading to the several chambers of the so-called "Tombs of the Kings," near Jerusalem, were each formed of a single stone seven inches thick, sculptured so as to resemble four panels: the stiles, muntins, and other parts were cut with great art, and exactly resembled those of a door made by a carpenter at the present day—the whole being completely smooth and polished, and most accurate in its proportions. The doors turned on pivots, of the same stone of which the rest of them were composed, which were inserted in corresponding sockets above and below, the lower tenon being of course short. This is one of the methods in which heavy doors of wood are now hung in the East. One of these doors was still hanging in Maundrell's time, and "did not touch its lightel by at least three inches." But all these doors are now thrown down and broken (Monceyns, p. 386; Thevenot, p. 201; Foscoche, ii, 21; Maundrell, and Mar. 29; Wilde, ii, 299; Robinson, i, 530). Similar doors are described by Dr. Clarke (Transact., pt. ii, vol. i, p. 252) in the remarkable excavated sepulchres at Telmeasus, on the southern coast of Asia Minor; and others were noticed by Irby and Mangles (Transact., p. 592) in the sepulchres near Byzas (Bithynia). These are stone doors to the houses in the Haun, beyond the Jordan (Burchhardt, p. 58); and in the north of Persia the street doors of superior houses are often composed of a single slab of a kind of slate. In the ancient sepulchre recently discovered, as described by Dr. Whitle (Narratives, iii, 343), the outer door is formed by a single slab, and moves on horizontal pivots that run into sockets cut in the pilasters at the top, in the manner of a swinging hinge. 3. Gates of wood. Of this kind were probably the gates of Gaza (Judg. xvi, 8). They had generally two valves, which, according to Faber's description (Archæol., p. 300), had sometimes smaller doors, or wickets, to afford a passage when the principal gate was closed—a fact which he applies to the illustration of Matt. vii, 13. The parts of the doorway were the threshold (υς, Judg. xix, 27; Sept. πρόπον, Vulg. limen), the side-posts (στήθος; στήθος πάντων), and the lintel (υγινός). It was on the lintel and side-posts that the blood of the Pasover lamb was sprinkled (Exod. xii, 7). It was on the lintel and side-posts that the blood of the Pasover lamb was sprinkled (Exod. xii, 7, 22). A trace of some similar practice in Assyrian worship seems to have been discovered at Nineveh (Layard, Nin., ii, 256). Gates were generally protected by some works against the surprizes of enemies (1 Chr. xxix, 4). Sometimes two gates were constructed—one behind the other, and outer one, or there were turrets on both sides (2 Sam. xlviii, 24, 33; see Faber's Archæology, p. 801). The gates of the ancients were generally secured with
strong, heavy bolts and locks of brass or iron (Deut. iii. 5; 1 Sam. xxiii. 7; 1 Kings iv. 13; 2 Chron. viii. 5; Jer. xlv. 2; xlix. 31; Psa. cxlvii. 18). This was probably done with a view to the safety of the town, and to prevent hostile inroads (Harmer's Observations, i., 188). The keys of gates, as well as of doors, were generally of wood; and there were clauses in the covenants which might be opened even with the finger put into the keyhole—from which Harmer elucidates the passage in the Song of Solomon, v. 4. The doors themselves of the larger gates mentioned in Scripture were two-leaved, plated with metal (Judg. xvi. 5; Neh. iii. 15; Psa. cxxvii. 16; Isa. xlv. 1, 2). Gates not defended by iron were of course liable to be set on fire by an enemy (Judg. ix. 52).

The gates of towns were kept open or shut according to circumstances: in time of war they were closed against the enemy (Judg. ii. 5), but they were opened when the enemy had been conquered. On festive occasions they were also thrown wide open, to which Psa. xxiv. 7 alludes. This opening of the gates, as well as closing them, was done by means of keys. That near the gates towers were often constructed, serving for defence against attacks by the enemy, may be inferred from Deut. iii. 5; 2 Sam. xviii. 24; Judg. ix. 55, comp. with 52. So Juvenal (Sat. vi. 290) puts the towers of the gates for the gates themselves. Virgil (Aen. vi. 550) represents the infernal gate as having a tower. Enemies, therefore, in seeking to enter by these gates, or to place the key in the lock, were subjected to the power of death, and to death alone. The keys of the gates were thus made as quick as possible (Deut. xviii. 52; Judg. ix. 40; 2 Sam. x. 8; xi. 33; 1 Kings viii. 57; Job vi. 4; Isa. xxvi. 7; xxviii. 6); and generally the town was conquered when its gates were occupied by the invading troops (Deut. xxviii. 57; Judg. v. 3). This observation is made also by several Greek and Roman authors (Herodian, Histori. i., 12, § 14; Virgil, Aen. ii, 802 sqq.). In or near the gates, therefore, they placed watchmen, and a sufficiently strong guard, to keep an eye on the movements of the enemy, and to defend them against attacks by the enemy. They contained chambers over the gateway, and probably also chambers or recesses at the sides for the various purposes to which they were applied (2 Sam. xviii. 24; Layard, Asia and Bab., p. 57, and note). In the Temple, Levites, and in houses of wealthier classes, and in palaces, persons were especially appointed to keep the gates (Jer. xxxiv. 4; 2 Kings xi. 9; xxvii. 18; 1 Chron. ix. 18, 19; Esth. ii. 21; אֵלַיָּהוּ, הַמִּצְלָיָהוּ; Sept., διάκονος, το χώρον του.; Vulg. portarius, junctores). In the A. V. these are frequently called "porters," a word which has now acquired a different meaning. The chief steward of the household in the palace of the shah of Persia was called chief of the guardians of the gate (Chardin, vii, 369).

We read that some portions of the law were to be written on the gates of towns, as well as on the doors of houses (Deut. vi. 9; xi. 20); and if this is to be literally understood (comp. Isa. liv. 12; Rev. xxi. 21), it receives illustration from the practice of the Moslems in painting passages of the Koran on their public and private gates (Maunder, E. T. p. 488; Lane, Mod. Eg. i. 29; Rauwolf, Travels, pt. iii., chap. 10; Ray, ii, 378). Various artificial figures and inscriptions were engraved on their gates by the Romans (Virgili, Georg. iii. 26.).

Gates are often mentioned in Scripture as places at which were held courts of justice, to administer the law and determine points in dispute: hence judges in the gate are spoken of (Deut. xvi. 18; xviii. 6; xx. 19; xxvi. 6; Josh. xx. 4; Ruth iv. 1; 2 Sam. xv. 2; xix. 4; 1 Kings xxii. 10; Job xxix. 7; Prov. xiii. 25; xxiv. 7; Lam. v. 14; Amos v. 12; Zech. viii. 16). The reason of this custom is apparent; for the gates being places of great concourse and resort, the courts held at them were of easy access to all the people; witnesses and suits to all transactions were secured (a matter of much importance in the absence or scanty use of written documents); and confidence in the integrity of the magistrate was insured by the publicity of the proceedings (comp. Polyb. xv. 31). There was within the gate a particular place, where the judges sat on chairs. The word "judge" is understood as referred to when we read that courts were held under the gates, as may be proved from 1 Kings xxii. 10; 2 Chron. xvii. 9. Apart from the holding of courts of justice, the gate served for reading the law, and for proclaiming ordinances, etc. (2 Chron. xxxii. 6; Neh. vi. 16). See We see from Prov. xxii. 28; Lam. v. 14, that the inferior magistrates held a court in the gates, as well as the superior judges (Jer. xxxvi. 10); and even kings, at least occasionally, did the same (1 Kings xxii. 10, comp. with Psa. xcvii. 5). The gates at Jerusalem served the same purpose; but for the great number of its inhabitants, many places of justice were required. Thus we find that Nehemiah (iii. 32) calls a particular gate of this city the counsel-gate, or justice-gate, which seems to have had a preference, though not exclusive, since courts must have been held in the other gates also. At the erection of the second Temple, the celebrated great Sanhedrim, indeed, assembled in the so-called concilium caesareum of the Temple; but we find that one of the Synedria of Jerusalem, consisting of twenty-three members, assembled in the east gate, leading to the court of Israel, the other in the gate leading to the Temple Mount. The same custom prevails to the present day among other Oriental nations, as in the kingdom of Morocco, where courts of justice are held in the gate of the capital town (Djoper, Theatrum penennarium, p. 9 sq.). Hence came the usage of the word "Porto" in speaking of the governor of Constantinople (Early Trac. p. 349). Respecting the Abyssinians and inhabitants of Hindostan, we are likewise assured that they employed their gates for courts of justice. Homer (Il. 1, 198 sq.) states of the Trojans that their elders assembled in the gates of the town to determine causes, and Virgil (Aen. i. 569 sq.) says the same. From Juvenal (Satir. iii. 11) it appears that with the Romans the porta Capena was used for this purpose (Graevii Thesaurus antiquit. Roman. x. 179). We may refer to J. D. Jacob's Dissert. de foro in porta, Leipzig, 1714, where the custom of holding courts in the gates of towns is explained at large. See Trial. The
Egyptian and Assyrian monuments represent the king as giving an audience, especially to prisoners, at his tent-door. In Palestinian gates were, moreover, the places where, sometimes at least, the priests delivered their sacred addresses and discourses to the people; and we find that the prophets often proclaimed their warnings and prophecies in the gates (Prov. i. 21; viii. 8; Isa. xxii. 21; Jer. xvii. 19, 20; xxvi. 10; xxxvi. 10).

Gates were also used with sacrifices, which were offered in their immediate vicinity; in which respect the hills near the gate are mentioned (2 Kings xxiii. 8). In Acts xiv. 13, the gates of Lystra are referred to, near which sacrifice was offered; in which passage Camerarius, Dodden, and Heinsohn take warning to mean the temple. The principal gate of the royal palace at Ithabban was in Chardin's time held sacred, and served as a sanctuary for criminals (Chardin, vii. 388, and petitions were presented to the sovereign at the gate. See Esth. iv. 2, and Herod. iii. 120, 140).

The gate was, further, a public place of meeting and conversation, where the people assembled in large numbers to learn the news of the day, and by various talk to while away the too tedious hours (Psa. lxxxix. 18). It was probably with this view that Lot sat under the gate of Sodom (Gen. xvii. 1). There was a higher probability than the Jewish notion that he sat there as one of the judges of the city (comp. Gen. xxv. 10, 18; xxxiv. 20; 1 Sam. iv. 18; 2 Sam. xviii. 24; see Shaw, Trav., p. 267).

Under the gates they sold various merchandise, provisions, victuals, e. g. at Samaria (2 Kings vii. 1); and for this purpose there were generally recesses in the space under them (see Herodian, vii. 6, § 6). The same is stated by Aristophanes (Egyp., 1244, ed. Dind. of the gates of the Greeks. But the commerce in the gates are almost exclusively country produce, animal or vegetable, for the supply of the city, and not manufactured goods, which are invariably sold in the bazaars in the heart of the town. The gate-markets also are only held for a few hours early in the morning. See BAZAR.

On an uproot having broken out at Jerusalem, the heads of the people met under the New-gate (Jer. xxix. 26), where they were sure to find insurgents. The town-gates were to the ancient Orientals what the coffee-houses, exchanges, markets, and courts of law are in our large towns; and such is still the case in a great measure, though the introduction of coffee-houses has in this, and other respects, caused some alteration of Eastern manners. In capital towns the quinodines occasionally sat with the same views near the gate of the royal palace, where also the officers and messengers of the palace lounged about; and where persons having suits to offer, favors to beg, or wishing to recommend themselves to favorable notice, would wait day after day, in the hope of attracting the notice of the prince or great man at his entrance or coming forth (Esth. ii. 19; civ. ii. 2).

Criminals were punished without the gates (1 Kings xxi. 12, 13; Acts vii. 59), which explains the passage in Heb. xii. 12. The same custom existed among the Romans (see Plaut. Mili. Glorios. act ii, sc. iv. 6, 7). At Rome executions took place without the Porta Metia or Esquilina. As to the gate through which Christ was crucified, it is not decided; which is more, his crucifixion opinions differ; some taking it to have been the Dung-gate (Lamy, Apparat. Geograph. ch. xiii. § 3, p. 821); others, following Hottinger (Cenn. Hebr. p. 10) and Godwyn, understand it of the Gate of Judgment. But for all that concerns the gates of Jerusalem, we must refer to the article JERUSALEM.

Gates are put figuratively for public places of towns and palaces. The gates of a town are also put instead of the town itself (Gen. xxv. 17; xxiv. 60; Judg. v. 8; Ruth iv. 10; Deut. xil. 12; Psa. lxxxvii. 2; cxvii. 2). By gates of righteousness (Psa. cxviii. 19) those of the Temple are no doubt meant. The gates of death and of hell occur in Job xxxviii. 17; Psa. ix. 14; Mic. ii. 13. Doors and gates of hell are especially introduced, Rev. xiv. 10; xvi. 18; Matt. xxv. 19; and the Jews go so far in their writings as to ascribe real gates to hell (Wagenseil, Sota, p. 220). Virgil (Aen. vi, 126) also speaks of infernal gates. The origin of this metaphorical expression is not difficult to explain; for it was very common to use the word gate as an image of large empires (Psa. xxiv. 7); and in pagan authors the abode of departed souls is represented as the residence of Pluto (see Virgil, Aen. vi, 417 sq.). In the passage, then, Matt. xvi. 19, by "gates of hell" must be understood all aggressions by the infernal empire upon the Christian Church. See CERR.

Gath (Heb. id. R,' a wine-cist, as in Isa. lixii. 2, etc. Sept. usually ΙΙΙ; Josephus ΙΙΙ' or ΙV, i., one of the five royal cities of the Philistines (Josh. xiii. 8). It was one of the cities upon which the ark is said to have brought calamity (1 Sam. vi. 9, 9), and which offered in connection therewith a treasurses-offering, each one a golden emerald (1 Sam. vi. 17). Goliath, the champion of the family of Gath (Josh. x. 12, 22), of which some fragments may be found mentioned in Scripture (1 Chron. xxii. 5-8; 2 Sam. xxi. 19-22), has rendered Gath a word familiar from our childhood; but it is not certain whether Goliath was a native or merely a resident of Gath (1 Sam. xviii. 4). To Achish, king of Gath, Saul was twice addressed for fear of David (1 Sam. xxi. 10; xxvii. 2-7; Psa. lxi.). At his own entrance David received from Achish the city of Ziklag. David dwelt in the country of the Philistines "a full year and four months." David's connection with Gath throws light on the feelings which dictated the words (2 Sam. i. 20). "Tell it the death of 'Saul and (as 'than his son') not in Gath." Micah also (i. 10) says, "Declare it (the wound come unto Judah, ver. 9) not at Gath." It was conquered by David, and fortified both by him and by Rehoboam (2 Sam. vii. 1; 1 Chron. viii. 1; 2 Chron. i. 8). From 2 Sam. xv. 18, it appears that David had a band (600 men) of Gittites in his service at the time of the rebellion of Ahab. Their devotion to him under Itai their leader forms a beautiful episode in the history of David's varied fortune (2 Sam. xv. 19 sq.). Shimhi's visit to Gath and its fate is referred to himself and his companions (1 Kin. ii. 46). In the reign of Solomon mention is made of a king of Gath (1 Kings iv. 21), who was doubtless a tributary prince, but powerful enough to cause apprehension to Solomon, as appears from the punishment he inflicted on Shime. Under Jehoshaph, Hazael, king of Syria, took Gath (2 Kings xi. 17); and from his successor, Benhadad, the place was recovered (2 Kings xiii. 24). It must, however, have soon re- volted; for Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 6), finding it necessary to war against the Philistines, "broke down the wall of Gath." Presumably the conquest was not of long duration. This constant withstanding the power of Jerusalem shows that Gath was a place of great resources and high eminence—a conclusion which is confirmed by the language employed by the prophets (Amos vi. 2; Micah i. 10). The ravages of war to which Gath was subjected it is more than probable that Gath was destroyed it at a comparatively early period, as it is not mentioned among the other royal cities by the later prophets (Zeph. ii. 4; Zech. ix. 5, 6).

Gath occupied a strong position (2 Chron. xi. 6) on the border of Judah and Philistia (1 Sam. xi. 10, 1, 2 Chron. xvi. 4). It was near Shocho and Adullam (2 Chron. xii. 8), and it appears to have stood on the way leading from the former to Ekron; for when the Philistines fled on the death of Goliath, they went "by the way of Shaaraim, even unto Gath and unto Ekron" (1 Sam. xvi. 1, 52). Yet, with all these indications,
there has been great uncertainty as to the site (Nolanda, Palest. p. 788 sqq.). Josephus places it in the tribe of Dan (Ant. v. i, 32; in Ant. viii, 10, 1, he calls it Ispan, E'irav, by an error of the copyist, Reland, p. 747). The accounts of Eusebius and Jerome are confused. In the Onomast. (s. v. Ισπάν) they both say, "Gath, from which the Anakim and Philistines were not exterminated, was long seen by some traces come from Eleutheropolis to Diospolis, at about the fifth milestone." Yet in the same connection Eusebius mentions another Gath (or Ισπάν), a large village between Antipatris and Jamnia, which he considered to be that to which the ark was carried (1 Sam. v. 9); but such a Crusader-identified Gath with Jamnia (Geeta Deri, p. 886). On the other hand, Jerome says (on Micah, i), "Gath is one of the five Philistine cities lying near the confines of Judah, on the road from Eleutheropolis to Gaza; now it is a very large village." On der xxv, the same authority declares that Gath was not far from Azotus. Yet in his preface to Jonah he says that Gath, in Ophir, the native place of the prophet, is to be distinguished. Bonfôre suggests (in the Onomast. s. v.) that there were several places of the same name, and this may account for the discrepancies. Dr. Robinson sought in vain for some traces come from site (Researches, ii, 421); yet Schwarz (Palest. p. 121) says it still remains in "a village by the name of Gatha, three English miles south of Jaffa, on the shore of the Mediterranean"—a statement confirmed by no other traveler. Thomson and the Asiatic Researches and Biblical and Oriental Book, ii (1860) contends for Beth-Tibbath or Eleutheropolis as the true site; but Mr. Porter, who made a special visit to Philistia in 1857 for the purpose of discovering the spot, argues for its identification with the conspicuous hill now called Tell es-Sifka. This hill stands upon the side of the plain of Philistia, at the foot of the mountains of Judah, ten miles east of Ashdod, and about the same distance south by east of Ekron. It is irregular in form, and about 200 feet high. On the top are the foundations of an old castle; and great numbers of hewn stones are built up in the walls of the terraces that run along the declivities. On the north-east is a projecting shoulder, whose sides appear to have been scarped. Here, too, are traces of ancient buildings; and here stands the modern village, extending along the whole northern face of the hill. In the northern part of the manouchehres, and at its western extremity two columns still remain on their pedestals. Round the sides of the hill, especially on the south, are large cisterns excavated in the rock (Hand-book for Syria and Pal. p. 292). See Mizpah.

The inhabitants are called Gittites (Poss, Sept. Γιττιοι). See also Gath-Hepher; Gath-Rimmon; Morehsheth-Gath.

Gath-hepher (Heb. with the art. Gath ha-Hepher, גת היהר, wine-press of the west; Sept. Γαθηερ, Vulg. Geth gua est in Ophir), a town in Galilee, the birthplace of the prophet Jonah (2 Kings xiv, 25). It is stated by Eusebius and Jerome to have been in the tribe of Zebulun (Onomast. s. v. Γαθηερ, Gathheher). The latter (Pref. ad Jon.) speaks of it as a small place two miles from Sephoris, on the way to Tiberias, and says that the sepulchre of Jonah was shown in his day. Benjamin of Tudela, in the 12th century, says that the tomb of Jonah was still shown on a hill near Sephoris (Itinerary in Pal. p. 89). It was doubtless the same as Gittites-Hepher, situated in the east of Zebulun (Josh. xix, 13). The position corresponds well to that of el-Moshah, a village on the top of a rocky hill, in which is still shown a Muslim tomb of the prophet Jonah (Robinson, Researches, iii, 292, note; De Saulcy, Notices, ii, 818; Thomas, Land and Sea ii, 129; Schwarz, Palest. p. 89; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 312). See Gefta.

Gath-rimmon (Heb. Gath-Rimmon, גתידרמון, press of the pomegranates; Sept. Γαθηερομών, Vulg. Gath Rhammon), a town in the tribe of Dan (Josh. xii, 45), and a Levitical city (Josh. xxi, 24; 1 Chron. vi, 69). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome it was a very large village, "twelve miles from Diospolis as you go hence to Eleutheropolis" (Onomast. s. v. Γαθηερομών; Gath Rhammon); but the same distance is towards Diospolis (s. v. Γαθ, Geth). Dr. Robinson thinks them to be one place, and that the site is found in Deir Dabbin, where are some remarkable excavations (Researches, ii, 421). In that case, however, it could not stand behind the temple, since the south wall of Gath passed at a point between the two positions. The first-mentioned distance would correspond to that of the modern site Rafa', containing wide-spread ruins (Robinson, Researches, iii, 20).

The Gath-rimmon mentioned in Josh. xxii, 35 as being in the tribe of Manasseh, Baaner (Palestina, p. 175) supposes to be another Levitical city; but Winer (Rasselworterbuch, s. v. Gath) ascribes its origin to a mistake of the transcriber, who repeated the word from the preceding verse. The Sept. has Ισπάν (v. r. Baaov), probably intended for the Israel (q. v.) of Josh. vii, 21.

Gaubil, Antoine, a Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Gaillac (Languedoc) July 14, 1689. He joined the Jesuits in 1704, and was sent to China as a missionary in 1728. He arrived in China just after the accession of the emperor Young-Tsing, who was bent on banishing the Jesuits, but the skilful management of Gaubil, most of the members of the order kept their positions. When the son of Young-Tsing, Kiang-Luong, ascended the throne in 1736, Gaubil, who had become thoroughly acquainted with the Chinese and Manchouch languages, was appointed chief director of the imperial college, as where the children of the nobility were educated. He thus managed to remain in high standing at the Chinese court until his death, which took place at Pekin July 24, 1759. He was a correspondent of the Academy of Sciences of Paris, and a member of that of St. Petersburg. He wrote Le Chou-King, trad. du Chinois (Paris, 1771, 4to; the oldest and most important historical book of the Chinese, compiled by Confucius, and giving the basis of the Chinese government and law):—Histoire de Genéchichan et de toute la dynastie des Manouches, ses successeurs, conquis du Morin, la Chine (Paris, 1790, 4to);—Traité de Chronologie chinoise (publ. by De Sacy, Paris, 1814, 4to);—Traité historique et critique de l'Astronomie chinoise;—Traité de Chronologie chinoise (Mémoires concernant les Chinois, vol. xv);—Histoire de la Dynastie des Tang (Mémoires concernant les Chinois, tols. xv and xvi);—Journées de la Voyage de Canton à Pekin (Prévost, Hist. des voyages, vol. v);—Notices et description sur la Chine, le Thibet, etc. (in Lettres édifiantes). Abel de Rémuat considers him also as the author of the Description de la ville de Pekin (Paris, 1788, 4to), published under the names of Delisle and Pingre. Abel de Rémuat, Nouvelles Mémoriges Asiatiques.—Hoefler, Nouvelle Biog. Générale, xix, 636.

Gauden, John, D.D., bishop of Worcester, was born at Mayfield, Essex, in 1605. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and subsequently obtained the rectorship of Brightwell, Berkshire, and the deanery of Bocking. In 1660 he became bishop of Exeter, and was translated to Worcester in 1662, "much disappointed at missing the lucrative see of Winchester." He died in the same year. He was a man of great talents; but ambitious and avaricious. He was the publisher of king Charles I's Eikon Basilike, of which some have considered him as the
GAUDENTIUS


**GAUDENTIUS**, bishop of Breccia, succeeded Philippus in the see of Breccia in the 4th century. He was chosen while away upon his travels, and extraordinary means were used that he might be induced to assume the office. He was ordained by St. Ambrose about 367. He does not appear to have interfered in the disturbances of the times except in being one of the deputies sent to Constantinople in 404 or 405 by the bishops of the West for the reinstatement of St. Chrysostom in his see of Constantinople. When he died is unknown; some fix the date at 410, others at 427. His name is mentioned among the sermons of his are still extant, given by a preface to Benevolus, which may be found in Ebd. Muz. Patrol. vol. v.; in Migne’s *Œuvres tres complètes des ecrits des cœlus. du vi siècle* (Paris, 1849, 4to); and in Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae, vol. xx.* — Clarke, *Succ. Suec. Lit. vol. i.; Cave, Hist. Lit. i., 189; Ceillier, *Antiquit. S. Pauli, 1867, viii., 54.*

**Gaul.** See FRANCE.

**Gaulois.** See GOLAN.

Gaultier or Gautier, FRANÇOIS DE, of St. Blan- card, a Protestant writer and divine, was born in the first half of the 17th century at Gallargues, in the department of Gard, and died at Berlin in 1703. He was minister at Montpellier, and presided over the last synod of Bas-Languedoc, held at Uzes in 1681; but, having compromised his safety through his zeal for Protestant interests, he withdrew to Switzerland with his family in 1688, and afterwards to Holland. The prince of Orange esteemed him highly, and employed him in several important affairs; among others, on a confidential mission to the elector of Brandenburg, who retained Gaultier at his court, and named him his chaplain. We have from his pen a *Histoire de la rive droite* (1688), etc. (on Bossuet’s Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine, Berlin, 1685, 12mo). — *Histoire Apologetique ou defense des Églises des États reformés de France* (Amst. 1688, 2 vols. 12mo). — *Sermons* (Berlin, 1896, 8vo). — *Hoeven Nouveau* (Paris, 1694, 8vo). — *La France Protestante, s. v.* (J. W. M.)

**Guame, Jean**, a Roman Catholic theologian of France. He was a prolific writer of the strictest ultramontane school, and in 1852, while vicar general of the diocese of Nevers, kindled a great literary controversy by his pamphlet *Ver Rongeur*, in which he commended the study of the Latin and Greek classics, and advocated the substitution for them of the Church fathers in the course of classical education. The leading organ of the ultramontane party in France, the *Univers*, and several bishops, sided with Gaume; but many others declared against his views, and his own diocesan, the bishop of Nevers, censured him for the publication of the pamphlet. In consequence of this censure, Gaume resigned at the close of the year 1852. He died in 1869. Among his other numerous writings are, *Du Catilinisme dans l'éducation* (1836). — *Minuel des écrivains catholiques modernes* (5th ed. 1849). — *Le Dictionnaire des Personnages* (1838). — *Tableau de l'histoire de la religion*; *Histoire de la Société domestique* (1844). — *Credo ou refuge du Chrétiens dans les temps actuels* (Paris, 1867). (A. J. S.)

**Gaume, supposed descendants of the Parsees, still subsisting in different parts of the East. See PARSEES.**

**Gauze**, Étienne, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Nimes in the early part of the 17th century, and died at Saumur in 1675. In 1651 he was made professor of philosophy in the Protestant Academy of Saumur, and in 1655 succeeded Jouas de la Place in the chair of theology. He was really a disciple of Place that the study of philosophy was useful to the theologian, and strongly urged it upon his pupils. His works are marked by vigor and depth of thought, and enjoyed for a long time a high reputation in the Protestant Seminaries of France and Germany. The titles are, *Theses inaugurales de Verbo Dei* (Saumur, 1655); *De Consensu Gravitum cum Nature* (ib. 1659, 4to); *De Ratio Studii Theologiae*; *De Ratione Conventionis*; *De Utilitate Philosophiae ad theologiam, quibus accedunt breves scripturum de recto usu Christiani regni agrostomastica* (ib. 1670, 4to); this collection, regarded by Bayle as the best guide for the study of the theology of the time, has passed through numerous editions; — *Theses theologica, altera de natura theologica, altera de die inveni Scripturae Sacrae* (ib. 1768, 4to). — *Hoefner, Noue. Bog. Générale*, xix, 690, 691; *Haag, La France Protestant, s. v.* (J. W. M.)

**Gauze, Louis**, a Swiss divine, was born in Geneva August 17, 1816, because of his family’s loyalty to Saui- tigny, near Geneva. Here he came under the influence of pastor Cellier, who had retained his Christian fidelity and simple faith amid the general falling away of the Swiss clergy. The revival of religion in Switzerland about that time, due largely to the labors of the brothers Hanvill (q. v.), was odious to the majority of the Geneva clergy, and the *Vénérable Compagnie des Pasteurs* passed some ordinances infringing strongly upon Christian liberty. Gauze and Cellier protested against the proceeding by republishing the *Helvetic Confession of Faith*, with a preface addressing the need and utility of confessions of faith. Gauze continued to labor faithfully in Sauginy for twelve years, and his name became known throughout Switzerland as an earnest upholder of evangelical Christianity. His aim was not to divide the national Church, but to rekindle the spirit of Christian life. His energy and orthodoxy were alike displeasing to the Rationalists, and he was involved in long disputes with the *Vénérable Compagnie*. They ordered him to use the emasculated and Rationalistic Catechism which had been substituted in Geneva for Calvin’s; he refused, and was cashiered from the *lettres de Pasteur*. — *La Vénérable Compagnie et Senon au Vénérable Compagnie, etc.* (1831); and, on the other side, *Exposé des accusations entre la Compagnie et M. Gauze*, 1831. He kept on his way, and, in union with Merle (d’Aubigné) and Galland, formed the "Evangelical Society" for the distribution of Bibles, tracts, etc. The Consistory at last succeeded him, so low had orthodox Christianity sunk in Geneva, the home of Calvin. In 1846 he took the chair of theology in the newly-founded evangelical school of Geneva, where he taught a strictly orthodox doctrine, perhaps without sufficient knowledge of the condition of modern thought. In his *Théogénaisie* (1840; translated in England and America) he maintained, in its strongest form, the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. In 1860 he published his *Canon des Écritures Saintes* (translated, *Canon of Holy Scripture*, 1862), in which he vindicated his theory of inerrancy against the attacks of Scherer and others. His *Logos sur Daniel* contained the substance of his lectures and catechetical lessons on Daniel. He died June 18, 1883.

We have translations of several of his writings besides those already mentioned, those among them being *Geneva and Rome, a d'acourse* (1844). — *It is written, Scripture proved to be from God* (1856). — *Leonna for the Young on the six Days of Creation* (1860). — *Herszog, Real-Encyklop. xix, 588.*
Gautama. See Gotama.

Gautbert, also called Astbert or Gauthbert, one of the earliest missionaries of Sweden. He was a nephew of archbishop Ebbo (q. v.), and was appointed bishop of Sweden by St. Ansgar. Accompanied by his nephew Nithard and several other priests, he set out in 884 for Sweden, and at once began to preach the Gospel. He was the first Christian church of Sweden at Birka. A large number of pagans were soon converted, and the prospects of the mission appeared to be brilliant, but the pagan priests raised a tumult against the missionaries, in which Nithard was killed, while Gautbert had a narrow escape, being chained and imprisoned with his companions across the frontier. All of them repaired to the monastery of Welenu (now Münsterdorf, in Holstein), in order to await there a favorable occasion for returning to Sweden. As, however, no new opening seemed to present itself, he accepted, in 845, the see of Osnabruick, which he administered until April 11, 880, when he resigned. He died three or four years afterwards. (A. J. S.)

Gavant, Bartolome, an Italian ecclesiastic, was born at Monza in 1569, and died in Milan in 1658. He was consultant of the Congregation of Rites and general of the Barnabites (q. v.). His most important work, Thesaurus, is the most important work on the rubrics of the Missal and the Roman Breviary, more learned than critical. The best edition of this is the one that contains the observations of Murat (Turin, 1786-90, 4 vols. fol.; another, in 2 vols. fol., was published at Venice in 1762. Gavant wrote also a destroys of the Gregorian Breviary, and a calendar of the Masses (Rome, 1629, 4to), and Musaeale Episcoporum (Paris, 1647, 4to).—Hoefcr, Now. Bicy. Gén. et Modr., x1, 735.

Gay, Ernest, a Unitarian clergyman, was born in Dedham, Mass., Aug. 15, 1846. He graduated at Harvard College in 1874, was admitted into the ministry in 1878, and installed as pastor of the church in Hingham, which position he held till his death. While quite a young man he gained a high reputation for scholarship, and he received many testimonials of public respect, both in his earlier and later days. He was opposed to all creeds and confessions of faith considered as binding, and is often mentioned as the father of American Unitarianism. He had no sympathy with the 'great revival' of 1740. His name is signed to a paper entitled 'The Sentiments and Resolutions of an Association of Ministers, convened at Westminster January 15, 1745,' in which they bear testimony against Whitefield's 'enthusiastic spirit.' In 1871 he delivered a sermon on his eighty-fifth birthday, which was published under the title of 'The Old Man's Calendar.' It has passed through several editions in this country, been reprinted in England, and translated into the Dutch language and published in Holland. He died March 8, 1877. He printed a number of occasional sermons.—Sprague, Annals, v1, 11.

Gay de Vernon, Léonard, a French priest and politician, was born at St. Léonard (Limousin) in 1748. When the French Revolution broke out he was curate of a parish near Limoges, and took part at once with the people, he was the first to place the Domine salvum fac gemen before the Domine salvum fac regem, and, in consequence, was appointed constitutional bishop of Haute-Vienne, March 13, 1791. Sent as deputy to the Legislature, he sided with Torné, metropolitan of Cler, in demanding that the clergy should be permitted to lay aside their peculiar dress. Having been re-elected to the Convention, he joined the extreme Republicans, and from the midst of "La Montagne" cast his vote for the death of Louis XVI, and caused the arrest of some of the Girondists. In the Council of Five Hundred, of which he was a member, he maintained the same opinions. The Directory, to get rid of him, appointed him, June 9, 1798, on a commercial mission to Tripoli, in Syria. He afterwards became general secretary of the Roman republic at Rome, but was deposed by Barras, and even forbidden to enter France. He nevertheless secretly came back, and remained hidden in the department of Doubs until June 18, 1799, when a change of government enabled him to obtain the repeal of the sentence of exile. About 1802 he founded a school in Paris, in connection with several other learned men, but was again exiled in consequence of the law of Jan. 12, 1816. In 1819 he finally obtained leave to return, and died at Vernon, near Ligny-le-Sec, Oct. 9, 1822. See Mabre, Annaler historique (1822, p. 99); Thiess, Hist. de la Révolution.—Hoefcr, Now. Bicy. Gén. et Modr., x1, 766.

Gayley, Samuel Maxwell, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Co. Tyrone, Ireland, June 4, 1802. He came to this country in 1828, studied in Philadelphia, and was licensed to preach in 1828. In 1832 he was installed pastor in Wilmington, Del., where he also established the Wilmington Classical School, which he conducted with great success until July 4, 1854, when his house was burnt to the ground. In Oct., 1854, he removed to Media, Pa., and established the Media Classical Institute, which he conducted successfully until his death, Dec. 13, 1862. As an educator of youth Mr. Gayley did a great work. He was most thorough and conscientious in his instructions, aiming to make solid thinkers rather than conceited coxcombs. He had more than one hundred youths under his care. They were from twenty different states, and from Canada, Cuba, Ireland, England, Mexico, Poland, Barbadoes, India.—Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1884.

Gaza (Heb. Azzah, 1775, strong, q. d. fortress or Valencia, or fem. of gaza, Sept. and other Greek writers Iza, sometimes confounded with Gazara [q. v.]; "Azzah" in Deut. ii, 23), a city remarkable for its early importance and continuous existence, lying along the Mediterranean sea-coast, in latitude 31° 22′, longitudinal 24° 29′ (Robinson), on the great thoroughfare between the head of the Persian Gulf and Hebron, as well as between Egypt and Palestine, of which it was indeed the frontier town (Arrian, Exp. Alex. ii, 26). It is chiefly noted as having been one of the cities of the Philistine pentarchy (Josh. xvi, 47). It is mentioned in Gen. xix, 19 as one of the border-cities of the Canaanites. Its earliest inhabitants of whom we find any mention, though probably not the aborigines, are the Arim, who appear to have lived in a semi-nomadic state, roving over the neighboring plain and desert. They were attacked and driven out by "the Caphtorim, who came forth out of Caphtor, and they dwelt in their stead" (Deut. ii, 23, with Josh. xiii, 2, 8; see Keil's note on the latter passage). The Caphtorim and Philistines were identical, or at least different families of the same tribe who afterwards amalgamated and formed the powerful nation of whom we read so much in the Bible (comp. Deut. ii, 23; Amos ix, 7; Gen. x, 14; Jer. xliv. 4). See CAPHTORIM; PHILISTINES. The time of the conquest of Gaza by the Philistines is not known. It must have been long before the time of David, as there was a city of that name already well established in the country, and possessed of great power (Gen. xxii, 32). Gaza was from the first their principal stronghold. Joshua smote the Canaanites as far as Gaza (Josh. x, 41), but spared the Anakim (giants) that dwelt there (Josh. xii, 21, 22). In the division of the land they fell to the lot of Judah (Josh. xvi, 47), and was taken by them with the coast thereof (Judg. i, 18), but its inhabitants ("Gazites," Judg. xvi, 2); "Gazathites," Josh. xiii, 8) were not exterminated (Judg. iii, 3). Gaza was one of the five Philistine cities which gathered each a golden ephod, and delivered the Lord (Sam. vi, 17). Gaza is celebrated for the exploit recorded of Samson (Judg. xvi, 1-18), who "took the doors of the gate of the city,
and the two posts, and went away with them, bar and all, and put them on his shoulders, and carried them up to the top of a hill that is before Hebron." The Philistines afterwards took Samson, and put out his eyes, and brought him to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass, and he was in the prison house: but he, however, pulled down the temple of Dagon, god of the Philistines, and slew, together with himself, "all the lords of the Philistines," besides men and women (Judg. xvi. 21-30). Solomon's kingdom extends as far as Gaza in Kings iv. 30. But the place always appears as a Philistine city in Scripture (Judg. iii. 8; xvi. 1; 1 Sam. vi. 17; 2 Kings xviii. 8). Hezekiah smote the Philistines as far as Gaza (2 Kings xviii. 8). Gaza fell into the hands of the Egyptians, probably Pharaoh-Necho, as a diversion of Necho's forces of 605 B.C. (2 Chron. xxxv. 20). After Necho's withdrawal from Gaza, it became Tyre it sustained a siege of two (Quint. Curt. iv. 6, 7, says five) months against Alexander the Great (Josephus, Ant. xi, 8, 4), a fact that illustrates the propriety of its name and its military importance. As Van de Velde says (p. 187), it was the key of the country. So vigorous, it was defending the eastern side of the command of the eunuch Batis, and of such massive strength were its walls, that the engineers of Alexander's army found themselves completely baffled in their attempts to effect a breach. They were obliged to erect an enormous mound 450 feet in height, and about a quarter of a mile in width, on the south side of the town; and even with this advantage, and the use also of the engines that had been employed at the siege of Tyre, thebesigers were frequently repulsed, and Alexander himself sustained no slight bodily injury. It was at last carried by escalade, and the garrison gave out to the sword. The town itself was not destroyed, but most of the inhabitants that remained were sold into slavery, and a fresh Arab population settled in their stead (Arrian, ii, 27). What had happened in the times of the Pharaohs (Jer. xviii. 1) and Cambyses (2 Kings v. 19) had now been repeated in the struggles between the Ptolemies and the Seleucide (Polybius, v. 68; xvi. 40). Jonathan Maccabaeus (1 Macc. xi, 61) destroyed its suburbs; Simon Maccabaeus (1 Macc. xiii, 43) took the city itself, though not without extraordinary efforts. Alexander Janneus spent a year (B.C. cir. 96) in besieging it and punishing its inhabitants (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 15, 3). The place was rebuilt by Gabinius (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 5, 8), and it was among the cities given by Augustus to Herodes (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 7, 5), after whose death it was given to the emperor Tiberius (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 11, 4). It was near Gaza—on the road from Jerusalem to that place—that Philip baptized the eunuch "of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians" (Acts viii, 26 sq.). As Gaza lay some distance from the sea (Arrian, ii, 28), it had a port on the sea. (7 Poit. v. 10, 'Ey Coro). The city was on the sea; called also Mojanm (Μομανγας), which Constantine called Comacantia, from the name of his son, giving it, at the same time, municipal rights. Julian took away this name, and ordered it to be called the port of Gaza. Subsequent emperors restored the name and the port to the place. It was afterwards called the sea-coast of Gaza. Further particulars may be read in Reland (Palestina, p. 792 sq.), where mention is made, from Pausanias, of something like a parallel to the feast of Samson; and where, as well as in Kuinoel (in loc.) and in Winer (Realebrörbuch in voc.), explanatory circumstances may be found of the words in Acts viii, 26—"Gaza, which is desert," an expansion that appears to refer rather to the road ("from Jerusalem," Acts viii, 26) than to Gaza itself (see Robinson, Researches, ii, 640). Besides the ordinary road from Jerusalem by Ramele to Gaza, there was another, more favorable for carriages (Acts viii, 26), further to the south, through Hebron, and thence through a district compatiaratively without towns, and much exposed to the incursions of people from the desert. The matter is discussed by Robinson in one of his Beiträge, incorporated in the last edition of his Palästina ; also by Robinson in the Appendix to his second volume. The latter writer suggests a very probable place for the baptism, viz. at the water in the wady el-Hang, between Eleutheropolis and Gaza, not far from the old sites of Lachish and Eglon. The legendary scene of the baptism is at Beel-sir, between Jerusalem and Hebron; the tradition having arisen apparently from the opinion that Philip himself was travelling southwards from Jerusalem. But there is no need to suppose that he went to Jerusalem at all. Lange (Apost. Zeitalt, ii, 108) gives a spiritual sense to the word ignac. About A.D. 63 Gaza was laid in ruins by the Jews, in revenge for the murder of John, the son of Zedouara (Josephus, War, ii, 18, 1). It soon recovered again; and it was one of the chief cities of Syria during the reigns of Titus and Adrian (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr. s. v.). Though Christianity was early intro-

Roman Imperial Coin of Gaza.
the sand and the hills the ground is very fertile, and resembles the town with abundance of orchards and vegetables. The climate of the place is almost tropical, but it has deep wells of excellent water.

There are a few palm-trees in the town, and its fruit-orchards are very productive. But the chief feature of the neighborhood is the wide-spread olive-grove to the north, and E. and S. of it is often mentioned in the authentic manuscripts of soap, which Ghuzzes export in large quantities. It has also an active trade in corn. For a full account of nearly all that has been written concerning the topographical and historical relations of Gaza, see Bitter's * Erdkunde*, xvi, 46-90. Among the travellers who have described the place we may mention especially Robinson (Biblical Researches, ii, 575 sq.) and Van de Velde (*Syria* and *Palestine*, ii, 179-188); also Thomson (Land and Book, ii, 381 sq.). The last writer speaks of the great extent of corn-land near Gaza, and of the sound of mill-stones in the city. Even now its bazaars are better than those of Jerusalem. "Those travelling towards Egypt naturally lay in here a stock of provisions and necessary for the desert, while those coming from Egypt arrive at Gaza exhausted, and must of course supply themselves anew." (Robinson, *Israel*, 1839, p. 568."

Gaza may be identified with the modern village Youur, 34 miles E. of Joppa; though as a coast town and a place of strength in the time of the Maccabees it is unlikely that it should have so entirely lost its importance as *Palestine*, i, 605 n.). It must be remembered, however, that names sometimes linger in the neighborhood of sites.

Gaza, a town of Dalmatia. They were particularly distinguished by this tenet—that no human government had any right to sentence men to death for any crime whatever. See PAULICIANs.

Gaz'athite [usually *Ga'shit*] (Heb. with the article *ha-*Azuzi), q.v. (see *Gaza*).

Gazelle (Antilope dorcas), an animal of the genus *Antilope*, probably designated by the Gr. term *kopias* (comp. Acts i, 86) and the Heb. *’ez* tseb. (*reph* in 2 Sam. ii, 18; 1 Chron. xxi, 8; Prov. vi, 5; Cant. ii, 7, 17; iii, 5; viii, 14; Isa. xiii, 14; and *rebeck* in Deut. xii, 15, 22; xiv, 1; 1 Kings iv, 28), or in the feminine form *’izzik, tsebathah* (*"roe* in Cant. iv, 5; viii, 8); both terms, however, being applicable to the whole genus; Timotheus, being a handsome animal of dainty nature and not measuring more than two feet in height at the shoulder, and the least, the corinna, not more than about twenty inches. They are graceful and elegant in form, with limbs exceedingly slender, and have large and soft eyes, lyrated horns, black, wrinkled, and striped—most robust in *subgutturosa* and *kettellii*, most slender in *corinna*, and smallest in *tunica*. Their livery is more or less buff and dun, white beneath, with small tufts of hair or brushes on the fore-knees; they have all a dark streak passing from each ear through the thick, curling, tufts of hair on the sides of the face, the elbow of the fore-leg along the sides to the flank, excepting the corinna, whose markings are more rufous and general colors lighter. Most, if not all, have a feeble bleating voice, seldom uttered, are unsurpassable in graceful timidity, gregarious in habit, and reside on the open deserts, where they are, not peculiarly watchful, and prepared to flee with such speed that greyhounds are liable to be killed by over-exertion in the chase. They roam over the plains of Syria sometimes in herds of a thousand (Russell, Apell. pr. i, 14). Their flesh is lean, but highly prized (Prov. xvi, 45, 47). They are often
made the symbol of female beauty (Cant. ii, 9; 17; viii, 14) by Orientalists (Seth, ad ben Zohair, p. 98 sq.; Döpke, Comment. in Hesych. p. 97; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. iv, 129). See Thomson, Land and Book, i, 251 sq.; Kelly's Syria, p. 88 sq. See ANTELOPE; DEER.

Arile (Gazella Arabica).

Gazer (2 Sam. v, 25; 1 Chron. xiv, 16). See Gaza.

Gaze'ra, the name of a place and also of a man in the Apocrypha.

1. (ר ו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו ג ז ר רו Gaza, town of Palestine (1 Mac. iv, 18; vii, 45), elsewhere called Gazzæa (q. v.).

2. (א ג ז ר רו Gaza, town of Palestine). One of the Temple-servants whose "sons" returned from Babylon (1 Esdr. v, 81); evidently the Gazzæa (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra ii, 48).

Gazet (Latinized Gazeus), Guillaume, a French ecclesiastical historian and theologian, was born at Arras in 1554, and died in the same city Aug. 25, 1611. He was for a time professor of belles-lettres at Louvain, quitting that position about 1580. He was also canon of the collegiate Church of St. Peter of Aire, and subsequently curé of the parish of St. Marie Madeleine of Arras. Gazez was an ardent student, especially of hagiography, and his works are by some regarded as credulous and inexact in giving the results of his investigations, though the Flemish historians and litterateurs, who have treated of his epoch, bestow high praise upon him. His most noted work, the Ecclesiastical History of the Low Countries, published after his death under the care of his nephew, G. Montecarre, contains much of the material found in his other writings bearing on the subject, only recast to suit it. Among his works are, Histoire de la vie, mort, passion et miracles des Saints domestiques de l'Eglise catholique fait et mémoire, etc. (i. A. Arras, 1684, 12mo; t. ii, Rouen, 1600, less carefully printed than the i.; a 2d ed. Rouen, 1619, 4to) — Magdeiæ, tragodia Sacra (Douay, 1589, 8vo) — La Somme des Péchés et le remède d'iceurs, etc. (ibid. 1592, 8vo) — Hymnorum Lóri septem in Christi Jésu etc. gloriam (ib. 1592, sm. 4to) — the poems of Robert Obrius, with epistolary dedication and laudatory verses) — L’Ordre et Suite des Erasures et Archevèques de Cambrai, etc. (ibid. 1597, 12mo) — Theoræm. Precum et Lytianar. Script. Sacrae, etc. (ibid. 1602, 18mo) — Idiota de Vita et Mirabili Religiosorum, etc. (ibid. 1606, 18mo) — Tabellæ terræ de la Graue Belgœ (ibid. 1610, 8vo, of which the Bibliothe. Sacriæ forms the second part) — Briœ cœt. de la sacrée Manne, et de la scène Chambelle, etc. (ibid. 1612, 16mo; new editions 1625, 1682, 1710, 1738, Arras, 12mo) — and the following posthumous works: Les Vies des Saints, avec des exhortations Morales (Iheims, 1618, 2 vols. 8vo) — Histoire ecclesiastique des Pays-Bas, etc. (Arras and Valenciennes, 1614, 4to) — Le Consulatour des Ams Scrupuleuses, etc.

Arras, 1617, 18mo) — Les Règles et Constitutions des Ordres reformés, etc. (ibid. 1629, 18mo). Gazez wrote also Le Sacré Bouquet: — Exercices spirituâlits, avec Litanies pour toute la semaine, and some ascetic tracts, for the consolation and instruction of the people Christian. — Hoefner, Nouv. Bûlog. Généralis, x, 781-784.

Gaz'ees (Heb. Gázzë, Hâzzer; Sept. Γαζης), the name of two men, supposed by some to have been identical.


2. A grandson of the same Caleb, through another of his sons Haran (1 Chron. ii, 46). B.C. post 1856.

Gâ'zite (Heb. in the pl. with the art. xa-Asçâzitham, Παζίτης; Sept. Παζίτων, Vulg. Philippikus A. V. "the Gazites"), the designation (Judg. xvii, 2) of the inhabitants of Gazzæa (q. v.); elsewhere rendered "Gazathites" (q. v.).

Gaz'sam (Heb. Gázzam', Παζί, demoung [comp. LOCUST], or [Pyrrh.] הוגהגר); Sept. Παζίμου and Παζίζων, Vulg. Gazum and Gazem), the progenitor of one of the families of Nethinim that returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 48; Neh. vii, 51). B.C. ante 536.

Geb. See LOCUST.

Ge'bah, the name of at least two places in Central Palestine.

1. (Heb. Ge'ba, Γάβα, often with the art. l. e. the hill, in pause "Gaba"); Josh. xviii, 24; Ezra ii, 26; Neh. vii, 80; yet this form is also Anglicized as "Geba" in 2 Sam. v, 25; 2 Kings xxii, 3; Neh. xi, 31), a city of Benjamin with "villages" (Josh. xviii, 24; on its settlement, see 1 Chron. viii, 6), hence more fully "Geba of Benjamin" (1 Kings xv, 22; 1 Sam. xiii, 16 Josephus Gisba, Fl. i, vi, 6, n.; for which, perhaps, compare 1 Chron. vii, 29; ix, 20), situated on the northern border of the kingdom of Judah (2 Kings xxii, 8; Zech. xiv, 10), near to Gibeah, apparently towards the east or north-east (Isa. x. 29; Josh. xvi, 24, 28). It is often asserted that Geba and Gibeão were names of the same place; the A. V. in at least 1 Sam. xiii, 15, 16, confounds them; the Sept. and Vulg. render both indifferently ly Gaiwsa and Gaba; and in two passages (Judg. xx, 10, 33) the same error has crept into the original. Schwartz's identification of these places (Phys. Descrip. of Palestine, p. 162) is full of errors in locality. The two names are indeed only masculine and feminine forms of the same word, signifying "hill;" but that they were two different places is evident from Josh. xviii, 24, compare 28; 1 Sam. xiii, 2, compare 8; Isa. x. 29. In 2 Sam. xx, 8, the name "Geba" stands erroneously for Gideon (compare 1 Chron. xiv, 16). Geba, with its "suburbs," was assigned to the priests (Josh. xxi, 17; 1 Chron. vi, 60). The Philistines were smitten from Geba unto Gazer by David (2 Sam. v, 25). As it lay on the frontiers of Judah and Israel, Ass rebuilt Geba and Mizpah with the stones of Ramah (1 Kings xv, 22; 2 Chron. xvi, 6). "From Geba (in the north) to Beersheba" (in the south) the two cities (2 Kings xxi, 8) expressed the whole extent of the separate kingdom of Judah, just as "from Dan to Beersheba" expressed the whole length of Palestine. It would seem, from the manner in which Geba (Geba, and Remon) is coupled in Neh. vii, 30, that they were very near each other. Reeland (Palest., p. 239) thinks it the Gerbat (Γεραβᾶ) or Gibatohn (Γεβαθων) mentioned by Talmudical writers in connection with Antipatris (comp. 2 Sam. v, 25). During the wars of the earlier part of the reign of Saul, Geba was held as a garrison by the Philistines (1 Sam. xiii, 3), but they were ejected by Jonathan with ease. It is far from his renown, exasperated them to a more overwhelming invasion. Later in the same campaign we find it re-
ferred to in defining the position of the two rocks which stood in the ravine below the garden of Michmash, in terms which fix Geba on the south and Michmash on the north of the ravine (1 Sam. xiv. 5; the A.V. has here Gilbeah). Exactly in accordance with this is the position of the modern village of Jaba, which stands picturesquely on the top of its steep terraced hill, on the north-western slope of the great wady Suweinit, looking northwards to the opposite village, which also retains its old name of Makkamas. (See Stanley, *Palæst.,* p. 210, 489; Porter, *Hand-book for Syrii,* p. 215.) The names, and the agreement of the situation with th: requirements of the story of Jonathan, make it impossible to suppose that the two were not both mentioned by the same Hebrews of Benjamin towns visited by the Assyrian army on their road through the country southward to Jerusalem, which we have in *Isa.* x. 28-32, where the minute details—the stoppage of the heavy baggage (A.V. "carriages"), which could not be got across the broken ground of the wady at Michmash; then the passage of the ravine by the lighter portion of the army, and the subsequent bivouac ("lodging," מְבָשָׂר for the night) on Geba on the opposite side—are in exact accordance with the nature of the spot. Standing as it does on the south bank of this important watercourse, one of the most striking and most noticeable features of this part of the country—the mountain of Geba as the northern boundary of the lower kingdom is very significant. Thus commanding the pass, its fortifications by Asa (1 Kings xv, 22; 2 Chron. xvi. 6) is also quite intelligible. It continues to be named with Michmash to the very last (Neh. xi. 31). Geba is probably intended by the "Gilbeah-in-the-field" of Judg. xx. 31, to which its position is very applicable. The "fields" are mentioned again as late as Neh. xii. 29. The town was occupied by the Benjamites after the captivity (Ezra ii. 26). It appears to have been unknown to Eusebius (Hier., *Onom.* s. v. *Palaia, Gobal,* comp. Welles, *Palæst.,* p. 786), the village of Geba beside, in which the people are generally distinguished from their Gibeons. By the end of the first century B.C. the town was called Gebal by the Arabs, thus reviving the old Biblical name. It is seated on a rising ground near the sea, at the foot of Lebanon, which here approaches close to the coast. It is walled on the three sides towards the land, and open on the west towards the sea. It is about half a mile in circuit. Within the wall, which seems to be of the age of the Crusades, the chief building is an old castle, which has received modern repairs, and is now used as the abode of the sheik or commander. There are three or four open and lofty buildings belonging to the chief people of the place, a mosque with a low minaret, and an old Maronite church of good masonry; but the houses generally are of poor construction, and nearly half the space within the walls is occupied with the gardens of the inhabitants. The population is estimated at 1,000, mostly Maronites. (Maundrell, *Early Travellers in Palestine,* ed. Wight, p. 135; Byblis, *Dizionario di Geografia,* p. 45; Burckhardt's *Syria,* p. 180; *Bucharest's Arab Tribes,* p. 455; *Fouquet, Travels,* ii. 98; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible,* ii. 40). Its antiquity is attested by multitudes of granite columns which are built into the walls and castles, chosen from the small harbor, and scattered over the fields. The substratum of the old castle are of bevelled masonry, and some of the stones are nearly twenty feet long. Beautiful sarcophagi are frequently dug out of the ruins. The columns are, like those of the other cities of ancient Phoenicia (*Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1848, p. 7.) See Byblis.

2. (Heb. Gebal, גֶּבָֽל, pl. גֶּבָּל, Gebal; Vulg. Gebal, Gess. lxxxiii, 7), a district, or perhaps sovereignty, south of Judea, in the land of Edom. Gebal signifies a mountain, apparently belongs not to the most ancient times, as it does not occur when the Israelites were actually in this quarter, but is first found in Ps. lxxxiii, which was probably written in the time of Jehoshaphat. That king had, in the beginning of his reign, subdued the Philistines and Arabians (2 Chron. xvii, 9, 10), and still more recently had assisted Ahab against the Syrians (ib. ch. xvii). Now, according to the prophet Elisha, the Psalmist, the Prophet, the 'symptoms of a general rising against him: on the south, besides these Gebalites, the other Edomites, the Ishmaelites, and the Hagarenes; on the south-east, Moab and Ammon; along the whole line of the south-west coast (and, with Jehoshaphat's maritime projects, this
would naturally disturb him most; see 2 Chron. xx. 86, the Amalekites, Philistines, and Phoenicians, or inhabitants of Tyre; with the aid and comfort even of Assur, i. e. the Syrians, or Assyrians, from the more distant north. The country south of the Dead Sea, and the east of the shallow and salt lake of the Jordan valley, bears the same name (ジェビル) at the present time (Burckhardt, p. 401 sq.), and is doubtless the same as the Jebel of Scripture, the Gebalite (or, rather, Gebu-
litite) of Josephus (Ἰουδαία, Ant. ii. 2; iii. 2, 1; Γαβαλωοκλέαρ, Ant. ix. 9, 1) and the Gebalite of the Ro-
mans (Euseb. and Steph. Byz. have ᾿Ιουδαία, ᾿Λακώ-νη, ᾿Γαβαλωοκλέαρ, ᾿Γαβάλη). Josephus says, indeed, that the sons of Eliphaz, son of Esau, settled in that part of Idumaea which was called Gebalitite, and that denominated from Amalek Amalekitis: "For Idumaea," he adds, "was the name of a large country, which in its sev-
eral parts retained the names of its peculiar inhabit-
ants" (Ant. ii. 2, 1). We may therefore take Gebal as the name of the northernmost portion of Idumaea, which was nearest to Palestine. In Judith iii, 1, Lat-
vers, and also in the writing of the Crusaders, it is
called Syria Sobel (q. v.). The Jerusalem Targums generally read Mount Gebal (גבעה ים תיכא) instead of Mount Seir; so also the Samar. in Deut. xxxii, 2.
Seir, however, was the ancient name of Edom, where-
as Gebal was only a part of it. (See Reland, Palaest.
p. 84; Michalowski, Supplement, i. 281 sq.; Robinson, Re-
sources, iii. 522.) See Iдумaea.

Gebal. See Gebal, 2.

Gebat. See Gebal, 1.

Geber (Heb. id. יִבֶּר, a valiant man; often: Sept. וְיִבֶּר, Josephus וְיִבֶּרֶנ, Ant. viii, 2, 8), the son of Uvi, and one of Solomon's purveyors, hav-
ing sole (i. e. supreme) jurisdiction (בּיִבֶּר) over Gilead (1 Kings iv. 19); from which fact he appears to have been the same as בּנֵי-גּבֶּר ("son of Geber") mentioned in ver. 18 as having charge of the same region, unless, indeed, the latter were a deputy or assistant to his father. B.C. 1018. See also Ezion-
Gebzer.

Gebelin. See Court, Antoine.

Gebeb, Trechessa, archbishop of Cologne, was
born at Waldenburg Nov. 10, 1547; was made prebendary of Augsburg in 1569, of Strasburg in 1567, of Col-
ogne in 1570, and in 1577 elected archbishop and archbishop of Cologne. In 1582 he became a Protestant, and in the following year he married the princess Charlotte von Manfeld. He proclaimed unrestricted religious li-
iberty, and intended to convert his spiritual into a tem-
poral electorate. His plan was highly approved by the people and the nobility, but the cathedral chapter opposed it, and killed it in the air. The pope humiliated him against him, and the emperor, Rudolph II, declared him deposed. The Protestant princes ultimately de-
serted him, and the newly-elected archbishop, duke Er-
nest of Bavaria, overcame him by force of arms (1584).
He fled to Holland, but not receiving any help there, he
returned to Germany, where he only solicited the as-
sistance of the Protestant princes, as well as peti-
tioned queen Elizabeth of England for aid in regaining his bishopric; he finally retired to Strasburg, where he officiated as dean of the cathedral, and died May 21, 1601. See Köhler, De Nota et Vita Gebelardi (Altd. 1729); Barthold, in Beitraege zur Geschichte des Tuschenduch (1860); Pierer, Univer-IetLexicon, s. v.

Ge'bam (Heb. גְּבָם, גכמ, cisterns [as in Jer.
xiv. 8, "pit"]; or locusts [as in Isa. xxxiii, 4]; Sept. יִגְּבָּם, Vulg. Gabim), a small place a short distance north of Jerusalem, mentioned between Madmenah and Nob, Isa. x. 31, where its inhabitants are prophetically described as fleeing at the approach of the invading Assyrian army. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v.
Ὑγμόνα, Gabim) identify it with "Geba, a village five miles from Guphas towards Neapolis;" and Schwarz
(Palest. p. 123) identifies it with the Geb of 2 Sam. xxii, 18; but both these are at variance with the order of the places named by the prophet. The associated lo-
calities require a position corresponding to that of the
present El-Yehud" (a little village in a valley near the road leading N.E. from Jerusalem (Robinson, Re-
sources, ii, 168). See Non. It probably derived its Hebr. name from the vicinity of excavations (הַעֲקָלִים = the ditches; comp. 2 Kings iii, 16).

Gedal'iah (Heb. גֵּדַלְיָּה, גְּדַלְיָּה, made great by Jeho-
vah, Extra x, 18; Jer. xli, 5, 8; xili, 16; Zeph. i, 1; elsewhere in the prolonged or full form Gedal'ya'h, גֵּדַלְיָּה; Sept. usually גּוֹזָדִיָּה, Vulgate Godalia), the name of five men.

1. The son and second assistant of Jeduthun in the Levitical choir of the Temple in the time of David (1 Chron. xxv. 9).
2. The son of Amariah and father of Cushli of the
father of the prophet Zephaniah (Zeph. i, 1). B.C.
ante 685.
3. Son of Pashur, and one of the Jewish nobles
who conspired against and imprisoned Jeremiah (Jer. xxxviii, 1). B.C. 589.
4. The son of Ahikam (Jeremiah's protector, Jer.
xxvi, 24), and grandson of Shaphan, the secretary of
king Josiah. After the destruction of the Temple, B.C. 588, Nebuchadnezzar deserted from Judah, leav-
ing Gedaliah with the Chaldean guards (Onomast.
Onomast. 38) of Mizpah, a strong (1 Kings xv, 22) town, six miles north of Jerusalem, to govern, as tributary (Josephus, Ant. x, 9, 1) of the king of Babylon, the vine-dressers and husbandmen (Jr. iii, 16) who were exempted from captivity. He was probably the number of those who left the city, as well as the instance of the prophet, justly de-
spairing of the successful defence of a place which God had abandoned. Gedaliah had inherited his father's respect for Jeremiah (Jer. xi, 5 sq.), and was, more-
ever, enjoined by Nebuzaradan to look to his safety and welfare. Gedaliah was in every way worthy of the difficult mission that had been confided to him, and he adopted, as the principle of his conduct, that submission to existing circumstances which was requisite in one who be-
lieved that Judah had, according to the declared will of God, been justly doomed and punished for her in-
solences, and who yet believed that his loving kindness had not utterly departed from her. He established the seat of his melancholy government at Mizpah, in the
tribe of Benjamin; and there the inhabitants, who had fled at the advance of the Chaldean armies, or when the troops of Zedekiah were dispersed in the plains of
Jericho, quietly engaged in their trades, began to gather around him. Gedaliah wisely counselled them to submission and quietness; and he promised, on that condition, to
insure them the undisturbed enjoyment of their pos-
sessions, and of the produce of the ground. In this
hope the labors of the field were resumed, and the ex-
traordinary returns of that season secured as if special-
lly given to repair the recent injuries of war. Jer-
icah joined Gedaliah; and Mizpah became the resort
of Jews from various quarters (Jer. xi, 11, 11), many
of whom, as might be expected at the end of a long
war, were in a destitute state, unrestrained by relig-
ion, patriotism, or prudence. The gentle and popular char-
acter of Gedaliah (Joseph. Ant. x, 9, 1 and 8), his he-
reditary piety (Rosenmüller on Jer. xxxvi, 24), the pro-
spersity of his brief rule (Jer. xi, 12), the reverence
which revived and was fostered under him for the ruined Temple (2 Kings, i, 5), fancied of the Chaldaean conquer-
or, whose officer he was—all proved insufficient to se-
cure Gedaliah from the foreign jealousy of Baalis, king
of Ammon, and the domestic ambition of Ishmael, a
member of the royal family of Judah (Joseph. Ant. x,
9, 5). This man came to Mizpah with a secret pur-
pose to destroy Gedaliah. Gedaliah, generously re-
fusing to believe a friendly warning which he received of the intended treachery, was murdered, with his
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Jewish and Chaldæan followers, two months after his appointment. After his death, which is still commemo-
rated in the Jewish Calendar (Prăduex, Convocac, anno 588, and Zech. vii, 19) as a national calamity, the Jews, in their native land, anticipating the resentment of the Persians, gave way to despondency. Many of them, out of fear, solicited Jeremiah to accompany them, fled to Egypt under Johanan. By this series of tragic events the utter ruin of Judea was consummated (2 Kings xxv, 22-26; Jer. xxxix., 14; xii, 18). See JER-

5. A descendant of Jeshua, and one of the priests who divorced their heathen wives after the return from the Babylonian captivity (Ezra x, 18). B.C. 485.

GEBOIRL. See inc. GEBOIRL.

GEDDES, Alexander, a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1597, at Arradawl, Banffshire, Scotland. He studied theology at the Scotch College in Paris, and, after his return to Scotland, he officiated at various chapels till 1729, when he retired from the clerical functions. For many years he was engaged on a new translation of the Old and New Testament, and Lord Petre allowed him a pension of £200 a year to enable him to carry it into effect. "The prospectus, which contained an account of his plan, was published in 1704; this was soon followed by the bishop of London, containing Queries, doubts, and diffi-
culties relative to a vernacular version of the Holy Scriptures, by a specimen of the work, and by a General Answer to the queries, consults, and criticisms" which his prospectus and specimen had excited. It was not, however, till 1759 that the first volume of the translation was published under the title of 'The Holy Bible, or the Books accredited Sacred by the Jews and Christians, otherwise called the Books of the Old and New Covenants, faithfully translated from corrected texts of the originals, with various readings, explanatory notes, and critical remarks.' The second, which contained the translation to the end of the historical books, appeared in 1738; and the third, which contained his critical remarks upon the Pentateuch, in 1800. The remainder of the work was never finished; he was employed, at the time of his death, on a translation of the Psalms, which he had finished as far as the 118th Psalm, and which was published in 1807. In 1800 he published Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures (Lond., 4to). He died Feb. 25, 1802. A Memoir of his Life and Writings, by Dr. R. M'Cray, was published in 1803 (London, 8vo). See Graves, On the Penta-
teach; British Critic, vols. iv. xix. xx; English Cyclop.; Cotton, Rheims and Douay, Oxford, 1864.

GEDDES, Janet, 'known in Scottish ecclesiastical history as 'Jenny Geddes,' has had her name transmitted as the person who took a prominent part in re-
sisting the introduction of the Liturgy, or Service-book, into the Church of Scotland in 1637. The circum-
stances were these. Sunday, 23d July, 1637, was the day fixed for this innovation, so obnoxious to the Scott-
ish Presbyterians, and an immense crowd filled the High Church of St. Giles's, Edinburgh, on the occa-
sion. In the dean of Edinburgh beginning to read, his voice was lost in a tumultuous shout, and an old
woman, said to have been one Jenny Geddes, who kept a green-stall in the High Street, bawling out, 'Villain! don't thou say mass at my lug' (that is, ear), launched her stool at the dean's head. 'Universal confusion ensued, and the dean, throwing off his surplice, fled, to save his life. The bishop of Edinburgh, on attempting to appease the storm, was assaulted by a volley of sticks, stones, and other missiles, accompanied by cries and threats that effectually silenced him. This tumult proved the death-blow of the liturgy in Scotland. It has been observed, however, if there was such a person as Jenny Geddes. In 1756, a citizen of Edin-

native city, published a tract called The Cross Removed, Prelaty and Patronage Disproved, etc., in which he claims the exploit of Jenny G. for his great-grand-
mother, 'the worthy Barbara Hamilton, spouse to John Mein, merchant and postmaster in Edinburgh, who, in the year 1654, was openly in the church at Edin-
burgh against archbishop Laud's new Service-book, at its first reading there, which stopped their proceed-
ings, and dismissed their meeting, so that it never obtained in our Church to this day.' In the obituary no-

tice of Robert Mein, in Weekly Magazine, vols. iv. v. and Scoa Magazine, vol. xxxvi. (1776), this Barbara Ham-
ilton is said to have been descended from the Hamiltons of Bardowie, 'but was better known in our his-
tory by the name of Jenny Geddes, though called so erroneously.' Jenny Geddes's famous stoil is said to have been burned by herself in the bonfires at the cross of Edinburgh at the Restoration, and what has been called hers in the Museum of the Society of Anti-

questions in Edinburgh has no claim to that name be-

beyond gratuitous conjecture. See Proceedings of So-

ciety of Antiquaries of Scotland, vol. iii. pt. ii., p. 179, 180.'

GEDDES, Michael, a divine of the Church of Eng-

land, was born in Scotland, and in 1678 was appoint-
ed chaplain to the English factory at Lisbon. In 1686 he was summoned to appear before the court of the In-

quisition. The judges received him at first with great affec-
tion, and with the most mark of courtesy, desirous of keeping him down and to be covered before they proceeded to ex-

amine him. After this ceremony was over, they stern-
ly asked him how he dared to preach or exercise his function in that city? He answered that he enjoyed that liberty by virtue of an article in the treaty be-

between the English Factory and Portugal. In the capacity of chaplain, as many others had done before him. To these declarations he falsely replied that they were entirely ignorant till lately that any such liberty had been assumed, and that if they had known it they would never have suffered it. They strictly forbade him to minister any more to his con-

gregation; and, after threatening him with vengeance if he should disobey, dismissed him. It is said that they were encouraged to take this step by the Romanist party in England. Upon this interdict, letters of complaint were addressed by the factory to the bish-

op of London; but as they did not reach England before the suspension of his liorship, all hopes of speedy redress were vain. Geddes was returned to his native coun-

try in the beginning of 1688. He was soon made LL.D. by the University of Oxford, and was made chancellor of Sarum by bishop Burnet. He wrote a History of the Church of Malabar (Lond. 1684, 8vo).—The Church History of Ethiopia (Lond. 1686, 8vo).—Miscellaneous Treatises against Popery (Lond. 1728, 3 vols. 8vo); and the Council of Trent, or Free Assembly. He died in 1715.——Birch, Life of Tillooten; Hook, Eccles. Biog. v, 308.

Géddur (Yélédin), one of the 'Temple servants' or Nethinim, whose 'sons' are stated to have returned

from the exiles (2 Esdr. v. 80); evidence of which is found in the psalm (q.v.) of the Heb. texts (Ex. lii. 47; Ne. viii. 49).

Gédon (Yélédin), the Crucified form of Gidon, the name of two men.

1. The judge Gédon (q.v.), thus Anglicized in the N.T. (Heb. xi. 32).

2. The son of Rehaim and father of Anamias, among the sons of Judith (Judg. viii. 1; where, however, many copies have 'Gideon').

Géder (Heb. id. '3b, Sept. Pádo), a name signi-

fying a wall (e.g. of a court, garden, sheepfold, etc.,

Prov. xxiv. 31; Ezek. xliii. 10), hence an inclosed or fortified place, and thus the basis of several names of
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castellated towns (e. g. Gederah, Gedor, Gadara, Gederoth, etc.); used once only (Josh. xii, 13) in this simple form as that of one of the thirty-one ancient royal towns of the Canaanites. It was defeated by Josiah. It is mentioned between Debir and Hormah; but, as the localities in that list are not strictly in geographical order, it may be identified with the Gador (q. v.) in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 58), and with the Bith-edog (q. v.) of I Chron. i, 61. The notices of Schwartz (Palest. p. 86, 104) are quite confused.

Gederah (Heb. with the article hay-gederah, הַגְּדֶרַח, the fortress or sharp-cote [see Gederah]; Sept. Γάδερα, a town in the Shephelah or plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 86, where it is mentioned between Adithaim and Gederothaim [q. v.])]. According to Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Ζαδέα, Gaddara), it was still a village (Πασκα, Gudara) near Jerusalem “around the Terelith,” an expression which Rammur (Pilast. p. 183) interprets of the valley of Elah or the terelithin (1 Sam. xvii, 1); although Kell (on Joshua, ad loc.) shows that it means the wood of Mamre, near Hebron, and Relan had pointed out that this was in the mountains and not the lowlands of Judah (Palest. p. 900). Van de Velde has identified the site with that of "Getheron or Gederah, a village on the south banks of wady Surat, near the high road from Ramleh to Gazzeh" (Memor. p. 518; a position exactly agreeing with that of the Cedus (Kibboc, Jerome Gederus), described by Eusebius (Onomast. s. v. Ζαδέα, Gaddara) as a very large village ten miles from Diospolis (Lydda) towards Eleutheropolis (Beit-Jibrin). The inhabitants seem to be those designated as Gederites (q. v.) in I Chron. xxvii, 28 (comp. iv, 28, "hedges").

Gederathite (Heb. only with the art. hay-Gederathit, הַגְּדֶרַחִית, as if from Gederah; Sept. at Γαδεραθίτης, Vulg. Gaderathitis), an epithet of Josiah (1 Chron. xvi, 19), the line of David's overseers of olive and sycamore groves in the lowland of Judah (1 Chron. xxvii, 28); hence probably so called as being native of Gederah (q. v.) in that region (Josh. xxv, 56).

Gederoth (Heb. Gederoth, גְּדוֹר, ᾶ ὑπερβαλλοντος, for sharp-cote [see Gederah]; in Chron. with the art.; Sept. Γαδερωθ, v. r. Γαδερωθίος, Vulg. Gaderothem), a town in the "valley" of Judah (Josh. xv, 41, where it is mentioned between Kithlah and Beth-dagon); one of those captured by the Philistines from Ashdod (1 Chron. xxviii, 18). It cannot be identical with the Gederah or Gederothaim (q. v.) of Judah (which lay in a different group), nor yet with either Geder or Gedor (which were in the mountains). The associated names require a position "in the actual plain from north to south by the hill region and territory of Gaza" (Kell, on Joshua loc.); perhaps at the modern Beit-Tima, marked on Van de Velde's Map as 6 miles east of Ascalon.

Gederotha'im (Heb. Gederotha'aim, גְּדוֹרָה'אֵים, two folds [see Gederah]; Sept. omita, but some copies translate αἱ εἰρικαὶ αἱ ἱρικαὶ, Violet Gadderethaim), the name of a town in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 86), mentioned in connection with Gerdah (q. v.). v; when used as 1 of the 15 districts of the Philistine coast (Kell, on Joshua loc.); perhaps at the modern Beit-Tima, marked on Van de Velde's Map as 6 miles east of Ascalon.

GEDI. See GOAT; EN-GEDI.

GEDIYAH. See GOAT.

Ge'dor (Heb. Gedor, גְּדוֹר, or [in 1 Chron. iv, 4, 18] הַגְּדוֹר, a wood [see Gederah]); Sept. Γάδος, but 1 Chron. vii, 31 Γάδος, and 1 Chron. xii, 7 Πιπαπα; Vulg. Gedor), the name of one or two places, and also of a man.

1. An ancient city in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 58), some of whose inhabitants joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 7). It was probably this town to which "Josabah the Gederuthite" (q. v.) belonged (1 Chron. xlii, 4); as also "Jerobam of Gedor," whose sons Joelah and Zedebiah were among the mighty men that joined David in his difficulties at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 7); for it does not appear that all in that list were "Saul's brethren of Benjamin" (compare the terms "Haruphit," "Korhite," following). See ZERAHI. The name has the definite article to it in this latter passage (יְדָרוֹן). The place was probably the same as the Gedor (q. v.) of the ancient Canaanites (Josh. xii, 13), rebuilt as Bith-Gedor (q. v.) by Hezrohp (1 Chron. ii, 61), in conjunction with Penuel (1 Chron. iv, 8); or by David (1 Chron. iv, 16). See MAHOR. It is doubtful the Gidara of the Onomasticon, between Jerusalem and Hebron. See GIDERAH. It is very doubtful (see below) whether this be the same Gedor in whose fertile valley the Simeonites found good pasture for their flocks (1 Chron. iv, 90), yet Relan regards them both as the same (Palest. p. 988). Dr. Robinson, travelling from Jerusalem to Gaza, came in sight of a place called Jedur, with ruins, on the brow of a mountain ridge, which he identifies with Gedor (Researches, ii, 458; also new ed. ii, 988). It was also recognised by M. D. Sauley (Nordestreit, ii, 453); comp. Schwartz (Palest. p. 86) and Wilson (Lands of the Bible, p. 386).

2. The above-named place (1 Chron. iv, 89) was originally inhabited by Hamites, and its fertility induced a predatory incursion and forcible occupation by a party of Simeonites. From this it would seem to have adjoined the territory of Simeon on the south; and a writer in the Journal of Sacred Literature (July, 1860, p. 218) suggests the solution that these aborigines were Philistines, the place itself being no other than Gerar (by the slight and frequent error in transcription of יָד for יִדָּר, which latter the Sept. appears to have actually read). Ewald had already adopted this emendation. Stieck (ii, 389, note) accepted the term (בָּדֶר, scly) elsewhere applied to Gerar (q. v.) is different from that here used (יָדוֹר, the valley).

3. A chief of the Benjamites (apparently of the house of Gideon) resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 31; ix, 37). B.C. 586 or ante.

Gea, Joshua, a Congregational minister, was born at Boston in the year 1698. He graduated at Harvard in 1717, and was early regarded as a young man of promise. He accepted an invitation to settle as colleague of Cotton Mather, and was ordained December 18, 1728, Cotton Mather giving the charge. In this relation he continued till the close of his life. Mr. Gee distinguished himself by a vigorous and earnest defence of the great Whitfieldian revival. He cordially welcomed Whitfield to Boston, adopted in his own church the measures which Whitfield recommended, and opposed the action of a convention of Congregational ministers in 1743 which protested against his doings. Mr. Gee was an invalid during the latter part of his life, and was obliged to have an assistant. He died July 17, 1748. He published A Sermon on the Death of Cotton Mather (1728);—Two Sermons on Luke xiii, 24 (1729);—Letter to the Rev. Nathaniell Eells, Moderator of the last Convocation of Pastors at Boston (1743).—Sprague, Annals, i, 812.

Geffcken, Johannes, a Lutheran clergyman of Germany, was born in 1603 at Hamburgh. He became
in 1829 pastor of St. Michael's church, in his native
city, and retained this position until his death, Oct. 2.
1865. He wrote a history of Semipelagianism (Gesch.
der Semipelagianismus (Hamb. 1826); on the division
of the church into the two parties (Gesch. der
Streitigkeiten des Desaklosianus, Hamb. 1838); on the picture catherine
of the 15th century (Ueber d. Bilderkatechismus, des 15th
Jahrhunderts, Leipz. 1855), and several other works.—

Gehazi, Timothetus, a leader of the Pau-
lincans about A.D. 700. About this time " the sect was
divided into two parties out of the
antagonism between a Catholick and a Protestant prin-
ciple. Gehazi held that spiritual gifts were
communicated by tradition, and connected with the regu-
larity of succession. But his younger brother, Theo-
dore, refused to acknowledge any such principle, main-
taining that any such outward mediation was unessen-
tial, and that he had received the Spirit immediately
from the same divine source with his father. Under
the reign of Leo the Isaurian, new complaints were
lodged against the Paulicians at Constantinople, and
the emperor ordered Gehazi to appear at the court
and undergo a trial. The emperor was con-
uenta to the patriarch, before whom Gehazi con-
trived to answer all the questions proposed to him re-
specting his orthodoxy in a satisfactory manner; at-
taching, however, quite a different sense from the true
one to the ceremonies of Church worship. The pa-
triarch asked him why he had left the Catholic Church?
Gehazi replied that he had never entertained the
remotest wish of forsaking the Catholic Church, within
which alone salvation was to be found. But by the Catholic Church he meant only the Paulician com-
nunities, called, as they believed, to restore the Church of
Christ to its primitive purity. The patriarch de-
manded why he refused to give the mother of God the
reverence which was due to her? Gehazi here pro-
nounced the anathema on all who refused re-
veneration to the mother of God—so her into whom Christ entered, and from whom he came—the mother
of us all. But he meant the invisible, heavenly city of
God, the celestial Jerusalem, mother of the divine
life, for admission of the redeemed into which Christ had prepared the way by first entering it himself as
their forerunner. He was asked why he did not pay
homage to the cross? Gehazi here pronounced the
anathema on all who refused to venerate the cross;
but by this he understood Christ himself, called by that
symbolical name. Furthermore, he was asked why he
denied the holy water. The reply to this also was satis-
factory; but by the holy water he was accustomed to understand the doc-
tines of Christ, in which he communicated himself.
So also he answered the question respecting baptism;
but by baptism he understood Christ himself, the liv-
ing water, the water of life. This trial having been
reported to the emperor, Gehazi received from his sover-
ign a letter of protection securing him against all
further complaints and persecutions."—Neander,
Church History (Torrey's transl.), iii, 249. See PAU-
LICIANS.

Gehazi (Heb. Gechaza), "111713, as if for
v77, valley of vision; but, according to Furst, denser,
from an obsol. 1775; occasionally contracted Gecha-
2 Kings iv. 31; v. 25; vili, 4, 5; Sept. Deu-
2 Kings iv. 31; v. 25; vili, 4, 5; Sept. Do-
the servant of Elisha, whose entire confidence be at first enjoyed. He personally appears first in reminding
his master of the best mode of rewarding the kindness of the Shunammite (2 Kings iv. 14). B.C. 886. He
was present at the interview in which the Shunammite
FIG. 260. The servant of Elisha, from the distances of the formulæ, church orthodoxy was re-
and was sent forward to lay Elisha's staff on the child's
face, which he did without effect (2 Kings iv. 31).
B.C. 887. The most remarkable incident in his
career is that which caused his ruin. When Elisha,
with a noble disinterestedness, declined the rich gifts
pressed upon him by the illustrious leper whom he had
healed, Gehazi felt distressed that so favorable an
opportunity of profiting by the gratitude of Naaman
had been thus thrown away. He therefore ran
after the retiring chariot, and requested, in his mas-
ter's name, a portion of the gifts which had before
been refused, on the ground that visitors had just ar-
ived for whom he was unable to provide. He asked
a talent of silver and two dresses; and the grateful
Syrian parted with two talents in a day of time.
Having deposited this spoil in a place of safety, he
again appeared before Elisha, whose honor he had so
carelessly compromised. His master asked him where
he had been, and on his answering, "Thy servant
went no whither," the prophet put on the severities
of a judge, and pronounced his crime, piled upon him
the terrible doom that the leprosy of which
Naaman had been cured should cleave to him and his
forever. "And he went forth from his presence a leper as white as snow" (2 Kings v. 20-27). B.C.
868. See c. He became now a somewhat parallel with that of
Ananias (q.v.) and Sapphira (Acts v). The rebuke
inflicted on Gehazi, though severe, cannot justly be
reckoned too hard for the occasion. He ought to have
understood, from the determined rejection of Naaman's
offers by Elisha, that there were important principles
involved in such a matter, which he should not
have been careful on no account, or by any movement on his
part, to bring into suspicion. There was a great com-
plication of wickedness in his conduct. He first arro-
ged to himself a superior discernment to that of the
Lord's prophet; then he falsely employed the name of
that prophet to take a purpose which the prophet him-
self had expressly and most emphatically repudiated;
father, an excuse for aiming at such a purpose, he
invented a plea of charity, which had no existence but
in his own imagination; and, finally, on being interro-
gated by Elisha after his return whither he had gone,
he endeavored to dignify his procedure by a lie, which
was no sooner uttered than it was detected by the
prophet. Such accumulated guilt obviously deserved
some palpable token of the divine displeasure; the
more so, as it tended to give a covenanted aspect to the
lord's service when the very principles of which the
regulations were out of course, and when the true worshippers
of God were called to sit loose to all earthly possessions.
This, indeed, is the thought that is most distinctly
brought out in the prophet's denunciation of Gehazi's
conduct (ver. 26)—the false impression it was fitted to
give of the religious and character of the servant
of God. We afterwards find Gehazi recounting to king Jo-
ram the great deeds of Elisha, and, in the providence of
God, it so happened that when he was relating the
restoration to life of the Shunammite's son, the very
woman with her son appeared before the king to claim
her house and lands, which she had been usurped while
she had been absent abroad during the recent famine.
Struck by the coincidence, the king immediately
granted her application (2 Kings viii, 1-6). B.C. 876.
Lepers were compelled to live apart outside the towns,
and were not allowed to come too near to uninfect ed
persons. See LEPROY. Hence some difficulty has
arisen with respect to Gehazi's interview with the
king. Several answers occur. The interview may
have taken place outside the town, in a garden or gar-
den-house; and the king may have kept Gehazi at a
distance from the usual processions which were ordinarily
initiated. Some even suppose that the incident is mis-
placed, and actually occurred before Gehazi was sms-
itten with leprosy. Others hasten to the opposite con-
clusion, and allure the probability that the leper had
then repaired to the prophet's house, and that Gehazi was
sent for to stay to the child's disease, which was of
health by his master, a view which is somewhat cor-
raborated by the fact that he is there still called "the
servant of the man of God," from which it is supposed
that the relationship between him and Elisha contin-
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ned to subsist, or bad in some unexplained manner been renewed. See ELISHA.

Gehe nna (Tivnva, A. V. invariably "hell"), the Greek representative of הֶגֶּנֶּן, which is widespread in the Psalms (see 2, 8; Neh. 1, 30 (rendered by the Sept. Tniyya, Josh. xviii, 16); more fully, הֶגֶּנֶּנּבָ, or מֶגֶּנֶּנּי (2 Kings xxii, 10; 2 Chron. xxviii, 8; xxxiii, 6; Jer. xix, 2, the "valley of Hinnom," or "of the son" or "children of Hinnom," a deep narrow gash a few miles from the south of Jerusalem, where, after the introduction of the worship of the fire-gods by Ahaz, the idolatrous Jews offered their children to Moloch (2 Chron. xxviii, 3; xxxiii, 6; Jer. vii, 31; xix, 2-5). In consequence of these abominations, the valley was polluted by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii, 10), who succeeded the common lay-stall of the city, where the dead bodies of criminals, and the carcasses of animals, and every other kind of filth was cast, and, according to late and somewhat questionable authorities, the combustible portion consumed with fire. From the depth and narrowness of the gorge, and, perhaps, its ever-burning fires, as well as from its being the receptacle of all sorts of purifying matter, and all that defiled the holy city, it became in later times the image of the place of everlasting punishment, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," (Matt. xxv, 41; cf. also Mark xvi, 4; and James, 3, v. 6. See HINNOM, VALLEY OF; CHA- PIKH; HELL.

Geibel, Johann, a clergyman of the Reformed Church of Germany, was born April 1, 1776, at Hanau. After finishing his theological studies at the University of Marburg, he was for a short time tutor in a family at Copenhagen. In 1797 he was appointed vicar of the aged pastor of the Reformed church at Lubeck, and, when the latter died in 1798, Geibel became his successor. In his theological views Geibel had been influenced at first by Daub, Jacob, and Schleiermacher, subsequently by the mysticism of Kerner and the peculiar tenets of the Dantyes; but gradually he confirmed himself more fully to the Reformed Church, in which he had been reared and to which he had been attached from his youth. Geibel died at Lubeck in 1885, at the age of 67. He was a man of great learning and research, and wrote many books on various subjects. Among his works are: "Die Kirche in der Christlichen Lehre," 1821, and "Introduction into the Christian Doctrine" (Einleitung in die christliche Lehre, 1821), and two "Guides to the Instruction in the Christian Doctrine" (Leitfaden bei dem Unterrichte in der christlichen Erlaubniss, 1822; and Kurzer Leitfaden, etc., 1825). He also wrote several pamphlets in defence of his son, pastor Karl Geibel, of Brunswick, who by his orthodox zeal had offended many of the rationalistic majority of his own congregation, and was censured by the Reformed Synod of Lower Saxony. Geibel declined several calls to other more lucrative positions, and remained in Lubeck until April 11, 1847, when he resigned. He died on the 29th of July, 1858. He is the father of the celebrated Ger- man poet Geibel. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, xix, 546.

Geiler, Martin, D. D., a German theologian, was born at Leipsic in 1614, became court-preacher at Dresden in 1636, professor of theology at Leipsic in 1661, and in 1680 at Freiburg. As the principal writings are commentaries on the Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, which, as some valuable theological treatises, are collected in his Opera omnia quà Latina edita sive (Amst., 1636, 2 vols. fol.). His commentary on the Psalms has been often published separately, and is still esteemed.

Geiger, Frans Tibrutius, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Hertingen, Württemberg, in 1755. He studied at first under the Jesuits, then jogged the Franciscans at Lucerne in 1772, and after 1778 applied himself to the study of philosophy at Ratisbon, and of theology at Würzburg. He subsequently became professor of Hebrew at Ratisbon, of rhetoric at Offenburg, of philosophy at Freiburg, and afterwards in the Franciscan school of Solothurn, and finally, in 1792, professor of theology at Lucerne, whence he became a leader of ultramontanism through Switzerland and Germany. This, however, made him many enemies, and in 1819 he was obliged to resign his position, and died May 8, 1848. A collection of his works has been published (Lucerne, 8 vols.).—Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, s. v.

Geiger, Jacob, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born at Allentown, Lehigh County, Pa., Oct. 17, 1738. He began his studies with the Rev. Dr. J. C. Becker in Northampton County, Pa., in 1814, and subsequently completed them with the Rev. Dr. C. L. Becker in Baltimore, Md. He was licensed and ordained in 1816, and in 1817 took charge of congregations in and around Manchester, Md., and not far from Baltimore, in which he labored up to the time of his death, Oct. 19, 1848. He was a very successful minister, having baptized 3,714 and confirmed 1,668 during a ministry of thirty-one years. His charge at the time of his death numbered 1,200 members. He preached only in the German language. (H. H.)

Geiler von Kaiserberg, an eminent preacher, was born March 16, 1445, at Schaffhausen, and was educated at the University of Freiburg, where he became bachelor in 1462, master in 1463, member of the faculty of philosophy in 1465, and dean in 1469. In 1470 he went to Basel, where he studied theology for five years, and was received as doctor in 1475. The following year he accepted the professorship of theology in Freiburg, and became also rector; but the best of his genius led him to abandon his ecclesiastical sitings, and he became himself to the pulpit. He was preacher of the cathedral of Strasbourg until 1488, when he removed to Augsburg, but returned to Strasbourg, where he remained until his death, March 19, 1510. As an earnest, powerful, and popular preacher, he had few rivals in that age. His sermons, usually composed in Latin and delivered in German, are marked by great eloquence and earnestness; nor do they disdain the aids of wit, sarcasm, and ridicule. Vivid pictures of life, warmth of feeling, and a bold, even rough morality, are their leading characteristics. In fact, Geiler's ethical zeal often urged him to a pungency of satire hardly in keeping with modern views of the dignity of the pulpit, but quite congruous with the taste of his own age. His style is vigorous, free, and lively, and in many respects he may be regarded as a sort of predecessor of Abrahast the 'Quaker' (p.). Geiler's work of his published during his lifetime was the Ora- tua habita in symbo Aruminae (1482); he also edited the first collection of Gerson's Works (Strab. 1488, 3 vols.). From his MSS. a large number of sermons were compiled and published after his death. Of these, the best known are his Articula sive spectrum fictio-
GELASIANUS

Gelasianus I, a Pope and saint of the Roman Church, succeeded Felix III March 1, 492. He is one of the popes who contributed most to the extension of the temporal power of the see of Rome. He was the first to claim for the Papacy a complete independence of the emperors in matters of faith. See his Letter to Faustus (Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et ampliss. collection, viii, 19), in which he argued that the Pope has not only a right to decide all ecclesiastical questions, but that an appeal from such decision to any other tribunal is insubordinate to the first rank (præsidii) in the Church, and councils derive their authority from his countenance and co-operation (pro suo scilicet principatu).

There are two powers," he wrote to the emperor, "who have sovereign rule over the world: the spiritual and the temporal authority; the sacred authority of the bishops is so much the greater, as on the day of judgment they must render an account of the actions of kings. You know, magnanimous emperor, that your dignity surpasses that of other princes of the earth; nevertheless, you are obliged to submit to the power of the bishops in matters of faith. It is to them you address yourself to know what are the sources of your safety, and the rules which you ought to follow in receiving the sacraments, and in disposing of religious things. The bishops persuade the people that God has given you a sovereign power over temporal things, and to them you submit your laws. In return, you should obey, with entire submission, those who are destined to distribute to you the holy sacraments. If the faithful ought blindingly to follow the orders of bishops who acquit themselves worthwhile in their functions, so much the more ought they to receive the decree of the pope. The bishops, whose God has established as the first of his bishops, and whom the Church has always recognised as its supreme chief." The schism of the Eastern Church, which had already taken place, continued during his administration, notwithstanding the efforts he made; and the Synod of Rome, 495, to heal breaches. He wrote on this controversy his De duabus in Christo natura adversus Eutychem et Nestoriam. He is said to have written also the so-called Decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis, which is a list of the scriptural books, etc., considered authoritative and rejected. This book, which he held at Rome in 496, but this work was probably compiled in the 6th century. Among the minor works ascribed to Gelasianus are a Liber sacramentorum, published by Jonas Maria Thomasius (Rome, 1690), and a number of letters. He died in Rome Nov. 19, 496. See Schöckel, Kirchenurk. (xxvii, 181 sq.), Schott, De canonibus Apostolorum et codice Eccles. hiagiou Dia. (Vratisl. 1829).—Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 761; Bower, History of the Popes, ii, 216 sq.

Gelasianus II, Pope (John of Gaeta), studied theology at Monte Casino, ascended gradually to the higher degrees of the Roman hierarchy, and was finally elected pope in 1118, as successor of Paschal II. The emperor Henry V, dissatisfied with this election, took upon himself to appoint another pope, under the name of Gregory VIII; and one of his generals took Gelasianus prisoner, but was obliged to release him. Gelasianus then went to Gaeta, where he was ordained to the priesthood, and was called a council, and communicated both to Gregory VIII and Henry V. He finally retired to France, where he died in the convent of Cluny, Jan. 29, 1119. See Muratori, Scriptores Rom. Italicorum, iii, 397; Mansi, xvi, 161.—Hoefner, Nouv. DB. Gen. ix, 819; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vi, 1.
GELDENHAUR

GELDERT, GERARD (Gerhardus Nortonianus, Gerardus de Nimegen), an eminent German writer, was born in 1452 at Nim fascism, and educated at Louvain and at Deventer, where he had for his instructor Alex- ander Hugus, the preceptor of Erasmus. In 1517 his skill in Latin versification obtained for him the laurel crown from the emperor Maximilian I. He after- wards became secretary to the chancellor of Phillip of Burgundy, bishop of Utrecht. He was sent to Witten- berg in 1526 to visit the schools and Church, and found that he "could not oppose a doctrine so consonant with that of the prophets and apostles" as that of Luther. He denounced popery, and retired towards the Upper Rhine, where, as at Wurzburg, he married, and became a school-master. Afterwards he was called to Augsburg, and eventually became professor, first of history, and then of theology, at Marburg. Erasmus, who at one time was his friend, attacked him violently on his success- ion Lutherananism. Gelderhaus died of the plague in 1542. He wrote "Historia Botanica:" "Historia suæ Asiae," iii, vii; "De Institutione Batavorum;" "Catalogus Episcoporum Ultraterritorum;" "Epistolae Zelandiae;" "De Viris Illustribus Inferioris Germaniae," and sev- eral controversial pieces. - Hook, Echtes. Leg. v, 288; Bayle, Dictionary (London, 1783), iii, 146.

GEL'їloth (Heb. גלילות, גלט), circuits [see below]; Sept. פֶלַסָלָה, Vulg. facilitating, the name of a place on the boundary of Judah, between En-Shemesh and the ascent to Adiramin (Josh. xviii, 17); apparently another form of the Gilo (q. v.) of the parallel passage (Josh. xv, 7).

The word is distinctly used (see Stanley, Bibl. Ueber Tischend. App. § 23) five times in the original; twice to refer to the preference to the Philippe- tan heptarchy ("borders of the Phileistines," Josh. xii, 2; "coasts of Palestine," Joel iii [iv], 4); twice to the circle [see CICCAR] of the Jordan ("borders," Josh. xxii, 10, 11); and once (in the sing.) to the district sloping easterly towards the Dead Sea ("country," Exod. xviii, 8). Its derivation (from גל, to roll) connects it with that of גלולה (q. v.), with which the versions sometimes confound it. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

Gell, Robert, D.D., an English divine, who was rector of St. Mary Aldermaston, London, and chap- lain to the archbishop of Canterbury. His "Remains contain much ingenious and solid criticism." They are commemorated by John Wesley, and also by Charles Wesley, who took from them much for hymns. He died in 1656. We have from him "Sermons" (Lon- don, 1650, 4to) — "Sermons (1654, 4to) — Essay towards the Amendment of the English Trans. of the Bible (1659, fol)." - "Remains, or select Script. of the New Test. (1676, 2 vols. fol.)" — Darling, Cycloped. Bibliographica, i, 1829; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 658; Wes- ley, Words (N. Y. ed.), vii, 601.

Gellatly, Alexander, a minister of the Associa- te Church, was born in Perth, Scotland, in 1720. In 1752 he became a student of theology in connection with the Antiburgher Synod of Scotland. By that synod he was sent out in 1758 as a missionary to the inhabitants of the eastern counties of Pennsylvania, who were in Newsmgen and educated at at land. He was accompanied by the Rev. Andrew Ar- not, and together they formed themselves into a Presby- tery, under the name of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania. They soon became obnoxious to the church chlorin and secretary to the groundwre (rcht) against them, and who issued a series of publications against them, which were answered by Mr. Gellatly and oth- ers. Mr. Gellatly was settled first at Middle Octoro- ra, Lancaster County, and then at Oxford, Chester County, Pa., where he labored with great diligence during the remainder of his life. He died March 15, 1781. He was a man of vigorous intellect, and an earnest, faithful minister of the Gospel. — Sprague, Annales of Am. Pulpit, ii (Associate), 1.

Gellert, Christian Gottfried, a German poet and hymn writer, was born July 4, 1715, in Hain- nichen, Saxony, and studied philosophy and theology at Leipzig. In 1744 he was made priester docent, and in 1761 professor extraordinary of philosophy in the University of Rostock, and professor ordinaria- ry in 1761, and died Dec. 13, 1769, after gaining the high esteem of Frederick the Great. His fables have never been surpassed in German literature, and his narrations and moral essays occupy a creditable place in German literature, while his comedies are forgotten. He also wrote some fine work for the stage, which give him a more enduring reputation than all his other writings. A translation of his hymn Jesus lebt, mit ihm auch Ich, is given in Schaff's Christ in Song, p. 275. "In order to understand Gellert's position as spiritual song-writer, we must consider him with reference to his age. The spirit which was the basis of the old songs of Germany had altogether departed. Gellert's songs were so fully the expression of his pious inner nature that they found a hearty response in the breasts of many kindred natures. 'Never did he attempt a spiritual song for his biographer, Cramer, informs u, 'without carefully preparing himself, he took a long time with all his soul to experience previously the truth of his utterances. He then chose his most ecstatic mo- ments for composition, and as soon as his ardent cooled he laid aside his pen until the golden moments came again. . . . Among Roman Catholic Germans Gellert's songs found a warm reception. A country priest in the mountains of Bohemia had been so im- pressed by them that he wrote to Gellert and urged him to join the Catholic Church, since this Church could much better reward his good works than the Protestants were able to. Also in Milan, Vienna, and other great Catholic cities, Gellert found many warm admirers. There can be more purely Christian songs than Gellert's; songs that would be the evi- dences of recent improvement in our language and liter- ature, and might partake of more of the old fire of reformatory times, or bear the romantic coloring of mystician or recent orthodoxy; but all these perfec- tions could not supply the place of the simple, glowing language of a Gellert, which was his expression of inner, self-experienced truth. Gellert will long remain the poet of the people. By the agency of his friends and lib- erals he will long continue to plant the seeds of virtue in the hearts of tender youth; and where the later tendencies have not obliterated the old German meth- od of domestic training, he will continue to save many a young man from the ways of sin. He will still con- solate the broken-hearted. And though but few of his songs have been reserved for use in our churches, even these few—for instance, the Easter song, Jesus lebt, and I lie with him—will continue to elevate our Christian congregations, and help them to gain the victory over the world. Gellert has not only influenced one generation by his songs, but has deeply affected succeeding ones. That humble man wished no higher honor than the salvation of any one whom he met, 'You have saved my soul!—you!' But in the coming world of bliss there will be thousands met by him who, like Gellert, would have done what the普- riasen sergeant did, walk five miles to prey the hand of the man who had saved his soul!" (Hagen- bach, Recen Church History, translated by J. F. Hurst). Among his works are, Pabelln and Erziehungen (Lpz. 1745) — Church History (Lpz. 1767) — Deutsche Vorkenner (Schlegel and Hoyer, Lpz. 1770) — Sämmtliche Schriften (Lpz. 1789-74, 10 vols.; 1840-41, 6 vols.; and 1858, 6 vols.). See J. C. Cramer, Lebensbeschreibung (Lpz. 1774); Döring, Lebensbeschreibung (Greitz, 1638, 2 vols.) — Eck, Gellert's Empfehlung (Lpz. 1770); F. Neumann, Gellerthaus (Dresden, 1864); Fierer, Unit. Lex. s. v.
GELMON

Gem (γέμος, γεμ, γειμ, usually "precious stone")
The Hebrews, among whom, as among all Asiatic nations (see especially Heeren, Ideen, i, i, 118 sq.), gems constituted an essential and highly-prized ornament.
(Dox. xxvii, 18) of the high-priest (Exod. xxvii, 17), and of distinguished persons generally (Judith, x, 21; xx, 15), especially when set in rings (Cant. v, 10), derived them chiefly from Arabia (see Ezek. xxvii, 22; i Kings x, 2) and India, by the overland as well as maritime traffic of the Phenicians (3 Sam. x, 30; Exod. xxi, 18), in the time of Solomon, they procured themselves directly from Ophir (1 Kings x, 10 sq.). The art of cutting (engraving letters) and setting them was a highly respectable vocation (Exod. xxxiv, 38).
In the Bible (especially Exod. xxxiv, 17 sq.; xxxix, 10 sq.; Ezek. xxviii, 18; Rev. xxii, 19 sq.) the following names and kinds of gems chiefly occur (comp. Josephus, Ant. iii, 7, 6; War, v, 5, 7; Epiph. Opp. ii, 255; see Hiller, Syntagmata hermetica, p. 83 sq.; De Dieu, on Exod. xxviii; Braun, De secret. sacrorum. Hebr. ii, vii, p. 497 sq.; Hartmann, Hebräer- und Christenken, i, 276 sq.; iii, 37 sq.; Bellemann, Urim und Thummim, in loc.; Eichhorn, De gemmis sculptis Hebr., in der Comment. Sac. Gotting. rec. ii; Rosenmüller, Alterth. iv, i, 28 sq.; Wetstein, N. T. ii, 844 sq.). See ENGRAVING.

1. O'dom, 'Ηδωμ (Exod. xxviii, 17; xxxix, 10, according to the Sept. and Vulg., the Sardius (compare Rev. xxii, 20), i.e. carnelian, a well-known, mostly flesh-colored, semi-transparent gem, akin to the chalcedon, valued for its hardness, which, however, did not render it incapable of being cut. The most beautiful specimens come from Arabia (Niebuhr, Beobhr. p. 142). Josephus (War, v, 5, 7) assigns the above meaning to the word; but elsewhere (Ant. i, 1, 7) he calls it sar- dinius. (For other significations, see Gesenius, Thes. Hebr. ii, 66.) See SARDIUS.

2. Pitdak, πετδκ (Exod. l, c.; Ezek. xxviii, 13; Job xxviii, 19), according to most of the versions, the Topaz, ῥωτασθενία (Josephus ῥωτασθενία), described by the Greeks as a gold-yellow stone (Strabo, vii, 770; Diodorus Siculus, iii, 20), although Pliny (xxvii, 28) assigns it as a green color. Hence moderns have regarded the topaz of the ancients as our chrysolite. The passage in Job describes the mineral in question as coming from Cush, and Pliny (vi, 94) mentions a topaz-land in the Red Sea (comp. Diod. Sicil. l, c.). The topaz now so called is a yellow, chryso-wine-colored or citron-yellow stone of the siliceous species (Hoffmann, Mineral. i, 557 sq.; comp. Pareau, Comment. ad Job xxviii, p. 333 sq.). See TOFAZ.

3. Bareketh, בְּרֶכֶת (Exod. xxviii, 17; xxxix, 10; Ezek. xxviii, 18), according to the Sept., Vulg., and Josephus, the Emerald (Rev. xxvii, 20; Tobit xiii, 21, etc.), green, very hard, transparent, with double refraction (Pliny, xxxvii, 16 sq.). The Hebrews obtained this stone almost entirely from Egypt (Pliny, l, c.; comp. Braun, Vestit. p. 517 sq.; yet see Theophr. Lapid. xxiv.). See CARMUNCLE.

4. Nophes, נופס (Exod. xxxix, 11; Ezek. xxvii, 16; xxviii, 18), according to the Sept. and Josephus, the Chrysostome, i.e. Carmuncle. By this name the ancients (Theophr. Lapid. xvii sq.; Pliny, xxxvii, 22) mostly designate red (like glowing coal) brilliant stones ("a simulitidium ignium appellet," Pliny, l, c.), as rubies and garnets. But their most valued caruncules appear to have been the Oriental or Indian rubies. They were of the same kind as the lapiz lazuli (comp. Eichhorn, ut sup. p. 12), which is also the case with the ruby, although they had a degree of hardness—not greater, however, than the sapphire, which was likewise engraved. See EMERALD.

5. Sapphiros, σάπφηρος (Exod. xxiv, 10; xxviii, 18; xxxix, 11; Ezek. xxviii, 10), σάρπθηρος. Our Sapphiros is sky-blue (comp. Ezek. i, 26; Exod. xxix, 10), transparent, and harder than the ruby. What the ancients so named must, according to the description (Pliny, xxxvii, 25; Theophr. Lapid. xvii, xxxvi) be the lapiz lazulí, azure-stone (Beckmann, Erdk. ii, 137 sq.). This is opaque, often shining into dark blue (violet), and sometimes has gold-colored quartzose spots (Hoffmann, Mineral. ii, 276 sq.; comp. i, 348). But as this stone is not so costly as to be justly estimated, as in Job xxviii, 16, nor possessed of sufficient hardness ("inutile sculpitur," Pliny, l, c.) to correspond with its use in Exod. xxviii, it is probable that the Heb. term denotes the true sapphire, which occurs in notices of ancient gems. See SAPPHIRE.

6. Yakalon, יָכָלון (Exod. xxxix, 11; Ezek. xxviii, 13), by which most of the ancient versions and Josephus appear (if we can trace the order of the gems enumerated, see Bellemann, ut sup. p. 47) to understand the Onyx (Luther, with some of the Rabbins, the Diammond, a kind of chalcedon, in resembling the human nail with the flesh showing through. The simply so-called onyx (of the ancients) has milk-white or brown streaks, and is not transparent, but takes a polished, a mirror-like lustre (Pliny, xxxvi, 12; xxviii, 24). Eichhorn understands the Beryl. See DIAMOND.

7. Le'akhem, לְאָכֶה (Exod. xxix, 19; xxxix, 12), Sept., Josephus, Vulg. λειχαυον (ligurio) or λειχαυον, i.e. Jacinth (as in Rev. xx, 20), a transparent, hard, usually hyacinthine stone, but sometimes shading into yellow, almost like gold-dust. In the fire it loses its color. Many ancient cut specimens are still extant. See LIGURIO.

8. Shèbo, שֶבֹ (Exod. xxviii, 19; xxxix, 12), Sept., Vulg. and Josephus Agape (αχαγη), a mixed sort of stone, consisting of quartz, chalcedony, carnelian, flint, Jasper, and so forth, that two kinds are usually compounded; hence agates have all possible ground-colors, with various inclusions of spots, and even figures. The oriental are finer than the European. In high antiquity they were very valuable, but later their value sank considerably (see Pliny, xxxvi, 54; Hoffmann, Mineral. ii, 129 sq.). See AGATE.

9. Achshalmū, אֶכְשַלְמַע (Exod. xxviii, 19, Sept., Vulg., Amethystos (αμέθυστος; comp. Rev. xx, 20), a transparent, mostly violet-blue stone, usually found in a stone-like form, but sometimes octahedron shaped. The ancients prized it highly, especially the specimens from India. But Arabia and Syria also afforded amethysts (Pliny, xxxviii, 40). As the Greek name points to a superstitious attribute of the stone (suppelling intoxication; see Harduin, d'Antiquités, ii, 739), so the Heb. designation refers to another property, d. "dream-stone;" see Simonis, Lex. p. 331). See AMETHYST.

10. Tarshish, צָרֵשִׁי (Exod. xxviii, 20; xxxix, 13; Ezek. i, 16; Dan. x, 6, etc.), according to the Sept. (in the Pentateuch) and Josephus (comp. Rev. xx, 20), the Chrysolite (χρυσολίθος). The stone so now called is generally found crystallized, and is of a pale green color, wholly transparent, with double refraction. According to Pliny (xxxvii, 42), the ancients appear to have had a yellow stone called the chrysolite, which would seem to have been our topaz (but compare Bellemann, ut sup. p. 62). Bredow (Histor. Unterwurst. p. 206) would take the tarshish of the Ezekiel prophecy, as the name probably came from the place so called [see TARSHISH], whence the Phoenicians imported it; a notion altogether unlikely view, inasmuch as electrum was well known in earliest antiquity, was highly prized, and bore an exalted point of estimation (Exod. xxvii, 21). The authority of the ancient versions must here prevail; and when our attention is once directed by the name to Spain, the statement of Pliny (xxxvii, 48) makes it clear that the chrysolite was also produced there. See BERYL.

11. Sko'kam, סְקָרָם (Gen. ii, 12; Exod. xxviii, 9;...
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1. The son of Shaphan, one of the nobles of Judah, and a scribe of the Temple in the time of Jehoiakim. B.C. 605. Baruch read aloud the prophecies of Jeremiah to the people at the official chamber of Gemariah at Jerusalem (Jer. xxxvi, 10; comp. 2 Kings xv, 26). Gemariah’s son may have been the one mentioned in the Psalms (Pliny, xxxvi, 20; see Hoffmann, Mineral., i, 604 sq.). The chrysoprassos (χρυσοπράσας), which the Sept. has in the passage in Gen. for skohem, may be the beryl. Many versions (with Braun, Michaelis, Fichhorn, Pareau, Ewald, and others) understand the skene (Herod. iii. 11). Roland (following the Sept. in Exod. xxxvi, 9, 20) holds it to be emerald, on the ground that Huhah (q.v.) was a part of Scythia, whence emeralds were obtained (Pliny, xxxvi, 16 and 17). See ONYX.

2. A son of Hilkiah, who, with Elazah, son of Shaphan, was sent to Babylon by king Zedekiah in his tribute-money for Nebuchadnezzar. He also took charge of a letter from Jeremiah to the Jewish captives at Babylon, warning them against the false prophets who deluded them by promises of a speedy return to their own land (Jer. xxix, 3, 4). B.C. 694. See JEREMIAH.

GEMIN. See Gem.

GEMNA. See Gem.

Genealogy (Γενεαλογία), literally the act or art of the genealogy, i.e. of him who treats of birth and family, and reckons descents and generations. Hence, by an easy transition, it is often (like istorios) used of the document itself in which such series of generations is set down. In Hebrew the term for a genealogy or pedigree is יֵשָּׁמֵר (yeshmar), "the book of the generations;" and because the oldest histories were usually drawn up on a genealogical basis, the expression is often extended to the whole history, as in the case of the Gospel of Matthew, where "the book of the generation of Jesus Christ" includes the whole history contained in that gospel. So Gen. ii, 4, "These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth," seems to be the title of the history which follows. Gen. vi, 1; vi, 9; x, 10, 27; xxv, 12, 19; xxxvi, 1, 9; xxxvii, 2, are other examples of the same usage, and these passages seem to mark the existence of separate histories from the book of Genesis which is now lost. Nor is this genealogical form of history peculiar to the Hebrews or the Semitic races. The earliest Greek histories were also genealogies. Thus the histories of Acusilus of Argos and of Hecateus of Miletos were entitled Γενεαλογίαν, and the fragments remaining of Xanthus, of Aristocles, and of Lycophron are strongly tinged with the same genealogical element (comp. Josephus, Antip. i, 8), which is not lost even in the pages of Herodotus. The frequent use of the patronymic in Greek, the stories of particular races, as Herulids, Alcaonide, etc., the lists of priests, and kings, and conquests at the gates, preserved at Elis, Sparta, Olympia, and elsewhere; the hereditary monarchical and priestly offices, as of the Branchidae, Euomoids, etc., in so many cities in Greece and Greek Asia; the division, as old as Homer, into tribes, fratrie, and phratries, and the existence of the tribe, the gens, and the families among the Romans; the Celtic clans, the Saxon families using a common patronym, and their royal genealogies running back to the Teutonic gods, these are among the many instances that may be cited to prove the strong family and genealogical instinct of the ancient world. Coming nearer to the Mediterranean, it will be enough to allude to the hereditary principle, and the vast genealogical records of the Egyptians, as regards their kings and priests, and to the passion for genealogies among the Arabs, mentioned by Layard and others, in which the attention paid by the Jews to genealogies is in entire accordance with the manners and tendencies of their contemporaries.

again, conatr. Apion, i, 7, he states that the priests were obliged to verify the descent of their intended wives by reference to the archives kept at Jerusalem; adding that it was the duty of the priests, after every war (and he specifies the wars of Antiochus Epiphan., Pompey, and Q. Varus), to make new genealogical tables from the old ones, and to ascertain what women among the priests were to be permitted to marry their sons instead of grandsons (Gen. xlviii, 5) of Jerusalem. Afterwards the names of persons belonging to different generations would often stand side by side as heads of families or houses, and be called the sons of their common ancestor. For example, Gen. xlvii, 21 contains genealogies of the sons of Juda and the sons of his son; and in Exodus vi, 24 probably enumerates the son and grandson of Asa as heads, with their father, of the families of the Korhites; and in innumerable other instances. If any one family or house became extinct, some other would succeed to its place, called after its own chief father. Hence, of course, a census of any tribe drawn up at a later period would exhibit different divisions from one drawn up at an earlier. Compare, e.g., the list of courses of priests in Zerubbabel's time (Neh. xii) with that of those in David's time (1 Chron. xxiv).

The same facts would be derived from the narrative of any particular genealogy. The sequence of generations may represent the succession to such or such an inheritance or headship of tribe or family rather than the relationship of father and son. Again, where a pedigree was abbreviated, it would naturally specify only such genealogical details as were necessary; e.g., in all cases by Africanus for reconciling the two genealogies of Christ. But there can be little doubt that the registers of the Jewish tribes and families perished at the destruction of Jerusalem, and not before. Some partial records may, however, have survived that event, as it is probable, and indeed seems to be implied in Josephus's statement, that at least the priestly families of the dispersion had records of their own genealogy. We learn, too, from Benjamin of Tudela, that in his day the princes of the captivity professed to trace their descent to David, and he also names others, e.g. R. Ca-

lakme, "a descendant of the house of David, as proved by his pedigree" (Itin. ed. Asher, i, 52), and R. Eleazar ben-Teemseh, "who possesses a pedigree of his descent from the prophet Samuel, and knows the melodies which were sung in the Temple during its ex-

istence. He also mentions the genealogies of the merchant families of the tribe of Levi. The patriarchs of Jerusalem, so called from the Hebrew יְּהֵי רֵעָה, claimed descent from Hillel, the Babylonian, of whom it is said that a genealogy, found at Jerusalem, declared his descent from David and Abital. Others, however, traced his descent from Benjamin, and from David only through a daughter of Shephatiah (WOLF, B. H. iv, 380). But, however tradition may have preserved for a while true genealogies, or imagination and pride have coined fictitious ones after the destruction of Jerusalem, it may be safely affirmed that the Jewish genealogical system then came to an end. Essentially connected as it was with the tenure of the land on the one hand, and with the peculiar privileges of the houses of David and Levi on the other, it naturally failed when the land was taken away from the Jewish race, and when the promise to David was fulfilled, and the priesthood of Aaron superseded by the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. The remains of the genealogical spirit among the later Jews (which might, of course, be much more fully illustrated from Rabbinical literature) has only been glanced at to show how deeply it had penetr-

ated into the Jewish national mind. It remains to be said that just notions of the nature of the Jewish genealogies have a great deal in common with a right view to the right interpretation of Scripture. Let it only be remembered that these records have respect to political and territorial divisions, as much as to strictiy genealogical descent, and it will at once be seen how erroneous a conclusion it may be, that all who are cal-

led sons of such a patriarch or chief father, must necessarily be his very children. Just as in the very first division into tribes Manasseh and Ephraim were numerically their descendants, as their sons and grandsons instead of grandsons (Gen. xlviii, 5) of Joseph; afterwards the names of persons belonging to different generations would often stand side by side as heads of families or houses, and be called the sons of their common ancestor. For example, Gen. xlvii, 21 contains genealogies of the sons of Juda and the sons of his son; and in Exodus vi, 24 probably enumerates the son and grandson of Asa as heads, with their father, of the families of the Korhites; and in innumerable other instances. If any one family or house became extinct, some other would succeed to its place, called after its own chief father. Hence, of course, a census of any tribe drawn up at a later period would exhibit different divisions from one drawn up at an earlier. Compare, e.g., the list of courses of priests in Zerubbabel's time (Neh. xii) with that of those in David's time (1 Chron. xxiv). The same facts would be derived from the narrative of any particular genealogy. The sequence of generations may represent the succession to such or such an inheritance or headship of tribe or family rather than the relationship of father and son. Again, where a pedigree was abbreviated, it would naturally specify only such genealogical details as were necessary; e.g., in all cases by Africanus for reconciling the two genealogies of Christ. But there can be little doubt that the registers of the Jewish tribes and families perished at the destruction of Jerusalem, and not before. Some partial records may, however, have survived that event, as it is probable, and indeed seems to be implied in Josephus's statement, that at least the priestly families of the dispersion had records of their own genealogy. We learn, too, from Benjamin of Tudela, that in his day the princes of the captivity professed to trace their descent to David, and he also names others, e.g. R. Calakme, "a descendant of the house of David, as proved by his pedigree" (Itin. ed. Asher, i, 52), and R. Eleazar ben-Teemseh, "who possesses a pedigree of his descent from the prophet Samuel, and knows the melodies which were sung in the Temple during its existence. He also mentions the genealogies of the merchant families of the tribe of Levi. The patriarchs of Jerusalem, so called from the Hebrew יְּהֵי רֵעָה, claimed descent from Hillel, the Babylonian, of whom it is said that a genealogy, found at Jerusalem, declared his descent from David and Abital. Others, however, traced his descent from Benjamin, and from David only through a daughter of Shephatiah (WOLF, B. H. iv, 380). But, however tradition may have preserved for a while true genealogies, or imagination and pride have coined fictitious ones after the destruction of Jerusalem, it may be safely affirmed that the Jewish genealogical system then came to an end. Essentially connected as it was with the tenure of the land on the one hand, and with the peculiar privileges of the houses of David and Levi on the other, it naturally failed when the land was taken away from the Jewish race, and when the promise to David was fulfilled, and the priesthood of Aaron superseded by the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. The remains of the genealogical spirit among the later Jews (which might, of course, be much more fully illustrated from Rabbinical literature) has only been glanced at to show how deeply it had penetrated into the Jewish national mind. It remains to be said that just notions of the nature of the Jewish genealogies have a great deal in common with a right view to the right interpretation of Scripture. Let it only be remembered that these records have respect to
GENEALOGY

seen in Ruth iv, 18-22, or 1 Chron. iii. Of the ascending,
1 Chron. vi, 33-43; Ezra vii, 1-5. The descending
form is expressed by the formula A begat B, and
B begat C, etc.; or, the sons of A, B his son, C his son,
etc.; or, the sons of A, B, C, D; and the sons of B, C,
D, E; and the sons of C, D, E, etc. The ascending
is inverted in the same way. Of the two, it is
obvious that the descending scale is the one in which
we are most likely to find collateral descents, inasmuch
as it implies that the object is to enumerate the heirs
of the person at the head of the stem; and if direct
heirs failed at any point, collateral ones would have to
be found. It is thus that in London, where the
descendants of the Lord's protection were preserved, when the direct line failed, the
heir would naturally place his own name next to his
predecessor, though that predecessor was not his father,
but only his kinsman; whereas in the ascending scale
there can be no failure in the natural order of things. But
neither form is in itself more or less fit than the other
to express either proper or imputed filiation.

Females are named in genealogies when there is
anything remarkable about them, or when any right
or property is transmitted through them. See Gen.
xxxvi, 1-10; xxxvii, 1-25; xxxix, 1-27; Exod. vi, 28; 2
Numb. xxvi, 58; 1 Chron. ii, 4, 19, 55, 50, etc.
The genealogical lists of names are peculiarly liable
to corruptions of the text, and there are many such in
the books of Chronicles, Ezra, etc. Jerome says of
corruptions of the Hebrew text that the list of names is
more likely to suffer than the more material,
the lists of high-priests in Josephus are so corrupt,
that the names are scarcely recognisable. This
must be borne in mind in dealing with the genealogies.
The Bible genealogies give an unbroken descent of the
house of David from the creation to the time of
Christ. The genealogies in books of the New Testament
must both have supplied
the same to the priestly and many other families.
They also inform us of the origin of most
of the nations of the earth, and carry the genealogy of the
Edomitic sovereigns down to about the time of Saul.
Viewed as a whole, it is a genealogical collection of
surpassing interest and accuracy (Rawlinson, Herodot.
vol. i, ch. ii; Burmington, General Tables of the Old
and New Testaments, London, 1836; Selden's Works,
passim).

GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST, the only one

1. Object of this Genealogical Record.—From the foregoing
article it is evident that no nation was more
careful to frame and preserve its genealogical
records than Israel. Their sacred writings contain geneal-
ogical lists that go back through a period of about 3500
years, from the creation of Adam to the capableness
of Judah. Indeed, we find from the books of Ezra and
Nehemiah that the same carefulness in this matter was
observed after the captivity; for in Ezra ii, 62 it is
expressly stated that some who had come up from Babylon
had sought their register among those that were reck-
oned by genealogy, but were not found; therefore they
were, as polluted, removed from the priesthood.
The division of the whole Hebrew nation into tribes, and
the allotment to each tribe of a specified portion of the
land of Canaan as an inalienable possession, rendered it
indispensable that they should keep genealogical tables.
God had, however, a still higher object that of
giving stability to property in Israel in leading succes-
sive generations of his people thus to keep an accu-
curate list of their ancestry. That they should do this
was enjoined, 23-29, and required from them, 22-24, and the
voice of prophecy declared that the promised Messiah
should be of the seed of Abraham, of the posterity of Isaac,
of the sons of Jacob, of the tribe of Judah, and of the fam-
ily of David.

The Rabbis affirm that after the Captivity the Jews
were most careful in keeping their pedigrees (Yalk. 1.
Gemara, Glos. fol. xiv. 2). Since, however, the period
of their destruction as a nation by the Romans, all their


tables of descent seem to be lost, and now they are
utterly unable to trace the pedigree of any one Israelite
who might lay claim to be their promised and still ex-
pected Messiah. Hence Christians assert, with a force
that no reasonable and candid Jew can resist, that Shi-
lok must have come.

The popular belief of Aaron having ceased, the posses-
sion of the land of Canaan being transferred to the
Gentiles, there being under the N.T. dispensation no
difference between circumcision and uncircumcision,
Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, there is but one
who genealogy it concerns us as Christians to be ac-
quainted with, that is the Lord Jesus Christ. The
prophets announced as the seed of Abraham, and the
son of David, and the angels declared that to him
should be given the throne of his father David, that
he might reign over the house of Jacob forever. His
descendants from David and Abraham being therefore
an essential part of his Messiahship, it was right that
his genealogy should be given as a portion of gospel
truth. Considering, further, that to the Jews first he
was manifested and preached, and that his descent
from David and Abraham was a matter of special in-
terest to them, it seems likely that the Gentile
descent would be one especially adapted to convince
them; in other words, that it would be drawn from
documents which they deemed authentic. Such were
the genealogical records preserved at Jerusalem. See
GENEALOGY. Now when to the above consideration we
add that it was only from this list that the messianic
prophecies had been absolutely made out from authentic records for the purpose of
the civil census ordered by Augustus, it becomes mor-
ally certain that the genealogy of Jesus Christ was ex-
tracted from the public registers. Another considera-
tion adds yet further conviction. It has often excited
surprise among Jews and Gentiles that the genealogy of Christ should both
be traced through Joseph, and not Mary. But if
these genealogies were those contained in the public
registers, it could not be otherwise. In them Jesus, the
son of Mary, the espoused wife of Joseph, could only
appear as Joseph's son, and not as Mary's. It is
transcending the pages of the gospels, the evangelists
only added the qualifying expression "as was sup-
posed" (Luke iii, 23, and its equivalent, Matt. i, 16).

We find other traces of the existence of the public
tables of descent in the New Testament: the taxation
spoken of by Luke iv, 1, 2, 3, would clearly show this,
for how could each one be able to go to his own city
unless he knew the specific tribe to which he belonged?
Hence it was, we think, that Paul was able with confidence to appeal to the Hebrews concerning the
lineage of appeal, "for it is as it was in the


life of our Lord in the days of the Maccabees" (Heb. vii, 14; 2 Tim.
ii, 8). To evince this beyond reasonable doubt, it
pleased God to give us, by his inspired servants Matthew and Luke, these genealogies.

II. Statement of the Subject.—The following is a
tabular view of these records, with which it will be
convenient to compare the parallel lists as found in the
Hebrew copies of the Old Testament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Enos</td>
<td>Calan</td>
<td>Calan</td>
<td>Calan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enos</td>
<td>Canaan</td>
<td>Melchizedek</td>
<td>Melchizedek</td>
<td>Melchizedek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canaan</td>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Joch</td>
<td>Joch</td>
<td>Joch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Mathusael</td>
<td>Methuselah</td>
<td>Methuselah</td>
<td>Methuselah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Methusael</td>
<td>Lamech</td>
<td>Lamech</td>
<td>Lamech</td>
<td>Lamech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lamech</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>Sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>Shem</td>
<td>Arphazad</td>
<td>Arphazad</td>
<td>Arphazad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shem</td>
<td>Eber</td>
<td>Calneh</td>
<td>Calneh</td>
<td>Calneh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eber</td>
<td>Peleg</td>
<td>Shela</td>
<td>Shela</td>
<td>Shela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Peleg</td>
<td>Reu</td>
<td>Sabtah</td>
<td>Sabtah</td>
<td>Sabtah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sabtah</td>
<td>Joktan</td>
<td>Kenah</td>
<td>Kenah</td>
<td>Kenah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Joktan</td>
<td>Kenah</td>
<td>Naphtah</td>
<td>Naphtah</td>
<td>Naphtah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Solution of Difficulties.—We do not find that there was any objection made to these genealogies, either by Jew or Gentile, during the 1st century. Had any difficulty on this head existed, we may reasonably suppose that the Jews, of all others, would have been both too ready and too bold to detect and expose it. We may, therefore, fairly conclude that, whatever difficulty meets us now in harmonizing our Lord’s pedigree as given by the two evangelists, it could have had no place in the first age of the Christian Church. In subsequent ages, however, objections were and are made to the genealogies of Matthew and Luke.

A preliminary difficulty, which applies, however, equally to the O.T. lists, lies in the small number of names between Judah and David, being only nine for a period of 433 years, making the incredible average of nearly a century for each generation. Hence arises the presumption that some names have been omitted (see Browne, Ordo Seculorum, p. 283), and at least three—more probably nine—must be supplied, in order to reduce this average to the ordinary age of paternity; three, Judah, Boaz, and Jesse, are known to have been advanced in life at the birth of their youngest sons, and Salmon was considerably so. The synchronism of Nahshon with the Exode, and Boaz with the earlier judges, requires the insertion of these omitted

2. Issac. 2. Reboam.
3. Jacob. 3. Abijah.
5. Phares. 5. Jehoshaphat.
10. Salmon. 10. Zedekiah.

(2.) It is objected that Matthew omits three kings, viz. Abasihah, Joash, and Amsiah (comp. 1 Chron. iii, and 2 Kings viii), from his second series. In reference to this objection, it might suffice to say that Matthew, finding fourteen generations from Abraham to David inclusively, contracted, most likely in order to assist memory and give uniformity, the second and possibly the last series. If we compare Exra vii, 1-5 with 1 Chron. vi, 3-15, it will be seen that Exra, in detailing, with apparent particularity, His own lineage, descends from Aaron, calls Asariah, who was high-priest at the dedication of the first Temple, the son, not of Johanan his father, but of Meraioth, his ancestor at the distance of six generations. Doubtless the desire of abridgment led him to omit names with which there were connected no very remarkable prophetic anticipations. Some of the early fathers, however, give a different solution of this difficulty. Hilary (in Matthew, cap. i) says: “Three generations are designedly passed

over by Matthew, for Jara is said to have begun Oza, when, in fact, he was the fourth from him, i.e. Jara begat Oza from the Gentle family of Ahab, whose wife was Jezebel." That the omission of the three kings was a punishment inflicted upon the house of guilty Joram to the fourth generation is the view yet Mathew; the fact that the three from Luke in Matthew's genealogy, and Melchi, the third in Luke's list, married successively the same woman, by whom the former begat Jacob, and the latter Heli. Heli dying without issue, his maternal brother took his widow to wife, by whom he had Joseph, who, according to the manner in which Luke is written, is said as the son of Heli, though naturally the son of Jacob, as Matthew records him. This is the explanation which was generally admitted by Eusebius, Nazianzen, the writer of Ad orthodoxos, and others, for ages.

(3.) Matthew terms Zoroabel the son of Salathiel, whereas in 1 Chron. iii. 19, he is called the son of Pedaias. How is this? We answer that the Sept. version of 1 Chron. iii agrees with Matthew in using, and ording this is the manner in which Luke is written; Zoroabel is designated in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Haggai. Josephus also calls him the son of Salathiel. Were he not the immediate son of Salathiel, but of Pedaias, yet is it suitable to the language of the Jewish nation to count the grandson the son of the grandfather. Thus Laban is called the son of Nahor (Gen. xxix, 5), as being the son of Bethuel, who was, in fact, the son of Nahor (xxxiv, 47). If, according to another manner of rendering ver. 17 and 18, Salathiel and Pedaias were brothers, Zoroabel might have been, by the Jewish law, the natural son of the one and the legal son of the other. See PEDAIAS.

(4.) It is again asked, if it be, as Matthew states, that Salmon, son of Naomi, prince of Israel, had married so remarkable a person as Rahab, how then comes it that such a circumference is not noticed in the book of Judges, nor yet in thepentateuch. Indeed, it is possible that if we remember that this book, full as it is in describing the partition of Canaan among the several tribes, is yet very silent concerning the exploits, and even names, of the subordinate leaders of Israel. There is nothing, therefore, depending in the circumference that it should pass over in total silence Salmon's marriage with Rahab. Had the matter in question been the exposal of Rahab by Joshua himself, the presumption against its truth would be very different. Indeed Kimchi, in his Commentary on the Book of Joshua, adresses a tradition to this effect, taken of the Babylonian Talmud. Every consideration, moreover, of a chronological character is in favor of the circumstance of the son of Naomi, born to him in the wilderness, being married to Rahab. See RAHAB.

(5.) But a far graver objection than that which is alleged is urged upon the reader for having omitted names is brought against Luke for having inserted that of Cain as son of Arphaxad—a name neither to be found in the Hebrew nor Samaritian text, nor yet in any of the targums or versions, save the Sept. We may infer, then, that either Philo d'Ephraim, or another who in other respects followed this version, receive this name as genuine, that it was not found in the earlier copies of the Sept.; it was, no doubt, borrowed from the corrupted Sept. which has come down to us, containing the name in question, but which cannot, with any propriety, be raised to a level of authority with the Heb. text. It is clear, moreover, that Irenaeus, Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome reject it as an interpolation. (See, on this subject, Whitby's Preface to Reader, and Lightfoot's Hymm; also Usher's Dissertation on Cainam, and Kiddler's Demonstr. of Measiam.) See CAIN.

2. We are now to compare the evangelists as to the points on which they agree and differ. It does not appear that Celsus attacked the genealogies on the score of any inconsistency with each other. Not so the emperor Theodosius; he makes his remarks on the specific ground of attack. Jerome (in Matt.) observes, "Julianus Augustus in this place attacks the evangelists on the ground of discrepancy: Matthew calls Joseph the son of Jacob, whereas Luke calls him the son of Heli! Had Julian been better acquainted with the modes of speech of the Hebrews, he would have seen that one evangelist gives the natural and the other the legal pedigree of Joseph."
also, on both hypotheses, Lightfoot’s \textit{Harmony Ex.}; South’s \textit{Sermon on Rev. xii}, 16, vol. iii; Wetstein, \textit{ad Mathen}, i, 17; Bishop Kidder’s \textit{Demonst. of Messiah}, part. ii to ch. xiii; Hale’s \textit{Analysis of Chronology}, vol. iii.

In constructing their genealogical tables, it is well known that the Jews reckoned wholly by males, rejecting, where the blood of the grandfather passed to the grandson through a daughter, the name of the daughter herself, and counting that daughter’s husband the son of the paternal grandfather (Num. xxvil. 38; xxvii. 4–7). On this principle Joseph, begotten by Jacob, marries Mary, the daughter of Hel, and in the genealogical register of his wife’s family is counted for Hel’s son. Salaheth, begotten by Jeconiah, marries the daughter of Ner, and, in like manner, is accounted his son: in Zorobel, the offspring of Salaheth and Ner’s daughter, the lines of Solomon and David and Nathan coalesce; Joseph and Mary are of the same tribe and family; they are both descendants of David in the line of Solomon; they have in them both the blood of Nathan, David’s son. Joseph deduces his descent from Abjud (Matt. i, 13), Mary from Rhesa (Luke iii, 27), sons of Zorobel. The genealogies of Matthew and Luke are parts of one perfect whole, and each of them is essential to the explanation of the other. By Matthew’s table we prove the descent of Mary, as in Joseph, from Solomon; by Luke’s we see the descent of Joseph, as well as Mary, from Nathan. But still it is asked how know we that Mary was the daughter of Ner?

[1.] Because the angel Gabriel, at the Annunciation, told the Virgin that God would give her divine son the throne of his father David (Luke i, 32), and thus it was necessary to prove this by her genealogy afterwards.

[2.] Mary is called by the Jews הָיָה לִתְבּוּן, “the daughter of Hel,” and by the early Christian writers “the daughter of Joakim and Anna” (Lightfoot, on Luke iii, 25). But Joakim and Eliakim (as different names in Hebrew for God) are sometimes interchanged (2 Chron. xxxvi. 4): Eli or Hel, then, is the abridgment of Eliakim.

[3.] The evangelist Luke has critically distinguished the real from the legal genealogy by a parenthetical remark, Ἰωάννης δὲ Ἰωάννης Ἰακώβου ἰδιός Ἰακώβου (Luke i, 31), “Jesus being (as was assumed) the son of Joseph (but in reality), the son of Hel,” or his grandson by the mother’s side, for so the eclips is to be supplied. Moreover, on comparing the two tables, we find that from Abraham to David they agree with each other because genealogies in accordance with genealogies of Genesis, Ruth, and 1 Chron. iii; but from David to Joseph they are evidently distinct lines of pedigree, agreeing only in two persons, viz. Salaheth and Zorobel.

Again, it is objected that there are now in Luke’s genealogy seventy-two names; whereas Irenaeus, Africanus, and other early fathers, acknowledge but seventy-two. But if we omit the names Math, Mathathias, Mele, Mainam, and Casim, as being interpolations, then the number will be reduced to seventy-two.

It is said that Abjud and Rhesa are called by the evangelists the sons of Zorobel, though in 1 Chron. iii, 19 we have no mention of them among his sons. We remark that it was a custom with the Jews to call the same person by different names, and that this custom was prevailingly observed at the time of the captivity (Dan. i, 6, 7; also comp. 2 Sam. iii, 3 with 1 Chron. iii, 1).

Lastly, it is inquired whether the evangelists had their genealogies from Zorobel to Christ, there being nothing of them to be found in Scripture. We answer, from those authentic public tables kept by the Jews, of which, as before noticed, Josephus speaks; and regarding which also Eusebius (\textit{Hist. Eccles. i}, 1) says, \textit{Omnis Hebraorum generationes descriptas in archiia Templi secretioribus habebantur}. It was doubtless from this source that they had the above-named parts of our Lord’s legal and natural pedigree; for, otherwise, they would have exposed themselves to the censure of the Jews; nor could the apostles have appealed, as they did, with confidence, to Christ’s pedigree, as answering all the requirements of prophecy.

—Kito, s. v.; Smith, s. v.

\begin{tabular}{|lllll|}
\hline
\hline
26. & AVAM & & & & & \\
27. & Seth. & 4051 & & & & \\
28. & Enos. & 4051 & & & & \\
29. & Cain. & 4051 & & & & \\
30. & Abel. & 4051 & & & & \\
31. & Noah. & 4051 & & & & \\
32. & Japheth. & 4051 & & & & \\
33. & Shem. & 4051 & & & & \\
34. & Ham. & 4051 & & & & \\
35. & Japheth. & 4051 & & & & \\
36. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
37. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
38. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
39. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
40. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
41. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
42. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
43. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
44. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
45. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
46. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
47. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
48. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
49. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
50. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
51. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
52. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
53. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
54. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
55. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
56. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
57. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
58. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
59. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
60. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
61. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
62. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
63. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
64. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
65. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
66. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
67. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
68. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
69. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
70. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
71. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
72. & Pharez. & 4051 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
be the "Hananiah" of 1 Chron., but omitted by Matt.; then identifying Matthew's "Abidah" with Luke's "Juda," and both with the "Hodaiah" of 1 Chron.; also Matthew's "Matthan" with Luke's "Matthath;" and finally cutting off all the remaining names in 1 Chron., and supposing a number of generations to have been omitted in the following names of Matthew; so that the lists will, in this part, stand thus:

(Matt, and Luke)  
Sachar  
Zerobabel (the Prince, or Rhesus)  
Jehoiakim (Hananiah, 1 Chron. III. 19, omitted by Matthew, 1, 13)  
Juda, or Ab-bad (Hodaiah, 1 Chron. III, 8, 9)  

Sacrah
Sachar
Matthaias
Melchizie
Kai
Joseph

(Asher)
Simeon
Judah
Naphtali
Ephraim
Zebulun
Issachar
Joseph
Zebulun
Naphtali

(Jacob)
Matrias
Matthaias
Joseph
Josed
Matthaias

(Matt, and Luke)  
Jesu  
Marr.
Jacob's heir was Joseph
Jesus, called Christ.

The violent character of these suppositions is sufficiently obvious. (See each name in its place.)

(3.) Others, like Alford (Comment. ad loc.), content themselves with saying that solution is impossible without further knowledge than we possess. But this is a view in which, with the actual documents before us, few will be disposed to acquiesce.


Genebrard, Gilbert, a celebrated Benedictine, was born at Rioni, in Auvergne, in 1537. Having entered into the Benedictine order at the abbey of Maussac, he studied at Paris, where he learned Greek under Ternebius. In 1569 he was made professor of Hebrew at the Royal College of Navarre. In 1592 he was made archbishop of Aix by Gregory XIV. He had, in the same year, published a "Treatise of Elections" (De Sacrarum Electorum Jure et necessitate, ad Ecclesiam Gallicam Redintegrationem), in which he maintained that the elections of bishops belonged of right to the clergy and people, and argued acutely against the nominations of kings and princes. The Parliament of Aix in 1566 decreed that his book should be burnt by the hands of the common executioner, and, after depriving the author of his see, condemned him to banishment from the kingdom, prohibiting his return to it on pain of death. He was afterwards permitted to return to his priory at Semur, where he died on the 24th of July, 1567. Genebrard was one of the most learned men of his time. He wrote in Latin, besides the work above mentioned, and others of which a list is given in Dupin, A

Sacred Chronology (5vo).—Notes upon the Scripture:—A Commentary upon the Psalms (5vo), in which he particularly applies himself to reconcile the Hebrew text with the vulgar Latin, and defends the Septuagint version; the best edition is that of Paris (1868, fol.).—A Translation of the Psalms of David (2 vols. 8vo).—Dupin, Exe. Writ. cent. xvi.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xix. 688; Hook, Exe. Biog. v. 307.

General (of religious order), "in the Roman Catholic Church, the superior head, under the pope, of the aggregated communities throughout Christendom belonging to a religious order. The governing authorities of the monastic orders in the Roman Catholic Church may be arranged in three classes: (1.) The superiors of individual convents or communities, called in different orders by various names, and having no authority over the whole of the order, but possessing considerable privileges and rights; (2.) The provincial or major superiors; (3.) The general or major superiors, who have authority over the whole of the order, being immediately responsible to the pope, and possessing, under the pope's authority, the right to examine and suppress irregularities in the order."

General Assembly. See ASSEMBLY, GENERAL.

General Councils. See COUNCILS.

General Vicar. See VICAR-GENERAL.

Generation (γενεά, γενεσία, the act; γενεσία, the result: γένος, γένος, a period). Considerable obscurity attends the use of this word in the English version, which arises from the translators having merged the various meanings of the original word, and even of several different words, in one common term, "generation." The remark, too, is just, that in the literal translations of the Scriptures, the word "generation" generally occurs wherever the Latin has generatio, and the Greek γενεά or γενεσία (Rees's Encyclopaedia, article Generation). The following instances seem to require the original words to be understood in some one of their derivative senses: Gen. ii, 4, "These are the generations" (γενεανίου, Sept. ἡ γενεάντος γενεσίας; Vulg. generationis), rather "history," or "the genealogy of," rather than "the generation of the," as in the Greek words, Matt. i, 1, are rendered "genealogy," etc., by recent translators: Campbell has "lineage." Gen. v, 1, "The book of the generations" (γενεανίου, Βιβλίο τῆς γενεανίου; Sept. as before; Vulg. librum generationis) is properly a family register, a history
of Adam. The same words, Gen. xxxvii, 2, mean a history of Jacob and his descendants; so also Gen. vi, 9; Ex. 1, and elsewhere. Gen. vii, 1, "In this generation" (טֹּבָה יְוָּעָב, Sept. יְוָּעָב תֹּבָהי, Vulg. in generationem) is identical in this sense. Gen. xxv, 6, "In the fourth generation" (טֹּבָה יְוָּעָב, Sept. יְוָּעָב תֹּבָהי, Vulg. generatio) is an instance of the word in the sense of a certain assigned period. Ps. xlix, 19, "The generation of his fathers" (טֹּבָה יְוָּעָב, Sept. יְוָּעָב תֹּבָהי יֲבָּרוֹע, Genusius renders "the dwelling of his fathers," i.e., the grave, and adduces Isa. xxxviii, 12. Ps. lxii, 22, "The generation of thy children" (טֹּבָה יְוָּעָב, Sept. יְוָּעָב תֹּבָהי וְאֵּבֵן סֹא), is "class," "order," "description," as in Prov. xxx, 11, 12, 13, 14. Is. lii, 8, "Who shall declare his generation?" (טֹּבָה יְוָּעָב יְוָּעָב תֹּבָהי יְנֵגָּמֶר וּלָלֶמֶר, Vulg. generalis) Lowth renders "manner of life," in translation and note, but adduces no precedent. Consider it equivalent to עָרָי, ver. 10: יְנֵגֶר (Sept.) answers to עָרָי, Esth. ix, 28. Josephus uses πόλιν γενεας, *Ant.* i, 10, 3 (Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament*, vol. i, Washington, 1860-61; Pauly, Analect. Hebr. p. 162, Oxford, 1880). Michaelis renders it, "Where was the providence that cared for his life?" Genesis, "Where was the providence of the temporalities reflected?" Sellier, "Who can describe his length of life?" In the New Testament (Matt. i, 17), γενεας is a series of persons, a succession from the same stock; so used by Josephus (*Ant.* i, 1, 2; Philo (Vit. Moa. i, 653); Matt. iii, 7, γενεας εξεδρας, is well rendered "race" or "tribe" by the Revised Version. Matt. xxiv, 34, ἡ γενεας αὐτῆς means the generation or persons then living contemporary with Christ (see Macknight's *Harmony* for an illustration of this sense). Luke xvi, 8, τὸν γενεας τῶν Ἰουδαίων, "in their generation," etc., wiser in regard to their dealings with the men of their generation; Rosenmüller gives the rendering (ς. αὐτῶν, see). 1 Pet. ii, 8, γενεας ἰδιωτων, is a "chosen people," quoted from Sept. of Ver. of xxxii, 20. The ancient Greeks, and, if we may credit Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, the Egyptians also, assigned a certain period to a generation. The Greeks reckoned three generations for every hundred years, i.e. 334 years to each; Herod. ii, 142, γενεας τρις ἀνδρῶν ἵκετων ἐνα ιστώ, "Three generations of men make one hundred years." This is nearly the present computation. To the same effect Clem. Alexandria speaks (*Strom.* i, 2); so also Philo, *De oculo,* first mentioning the age of Moses. Homer speaks of the age of the heroes (Il. i, 290), ἡ δ' ἐκεῖν ἡδο τίνι γενεας, "two generations," says it means ὑπερβασι τὰ ἐκεῖνα ἐγρή, "he was above sixty years old." The Greeks, however, assigned different periods to a γενεας at different times (*Perizonius, Orig. Aegypt. p. 175 sqq.; Josiah, Fercul. Literar. p. 6*). The ancient Hebrews also reckoned by the generation, and assigned different spaces of time to it at different periods of their history. In the time of Abraham it was one hundred years (comp. Gen. xx, 16, "In the fourth generation they shall come hither"). This is explained in ver. 15, and in Exod. xiii, 40, for four hundred years. Caleb was fourth in descent from Judah, and Moses and Aaron were fourth from Levi. In Deut. i, 35; ii, 14, Moses uses the term for thirty-eight years. In later times (Baruch vi, in the Epistle of Jeremiah, ver. 2) γενεας clearly means ten years. The seventh in this age. Gen. xvii, 7, "In these generations living in the same sense (Il. i, 250); also Herodotus (i, 5). (See Genesiuss's and Robinson's Lexicon, under the above Heb. and Gr. words.) Kitto, s. v. *See Genealogy.*

Generation, Eternal, of the Son of God. 

See Christology; Sonship of Christ.

Genesis (Sept. Pisanis, generation), the first book of the Law or the Pentateuch, is in Hebrew called בְּרֵאשִׁית, from the word with which it begins. See Law.

1. General Character.—The book of Genesis has an interest and an importance to which no other document of antiquity can be compared. If, negatively, it is the oldest book in the world, it is the oldest which lays any claim to being a trustworthy history. There may be some papyrus-rolls in our museums which were written in Egypt about the same time that the genealogies of the Semiitic race were so carefully collected in the tents of the patriarchs. But these rolls are better than the registers of little service to the historian. It is said that there are fragments of Chinese literature which, in their present form, date back as far as 2200 years B.C., and even more (Gfrörer, *Oripathie*, i, 215); but they are either calendars containing astronomical calculations, or records of merely local and temporary interest. Genesis, on the contrary, is rich in details respecting other races besides the race to which it more immediately belongs; and the Jewish pedigrees there so studiously preserved are but the scaffolding whereon is reared a temple of universal history.

If the religious books of other nations make any pretensions to vie with it in antiquity, in all other respects they are immeasurably inferior. The Mantras, the oldest portions of the Vedas, are, it would seem, as old as the 4th century B.C. (see *Cyclopaedia* vii, 283, 284); and from Wilson's preface to his translation of the *Rig-Veda*). The Zendavesta, in the opinion of competent scholars, is of very much more modern date. Of the Chinese sacred books, the oldest, the Yihking, is undoubtedly of a venerable antiquity; but it is not certain that it was a religious book at all, while the writings attributed to Confucius are certainly not earlier than the 6th century B.C. (Gfrörer, i, 270).

But Genesis is neither like the Vedas, a collection of hymns more or less sublime; nor like the Zendavesta, a philosophic speculation on the origin of all things; nor like the Yihking, an unintelligible jumble whose expositors could twist it from a cosmological essay into a standard treatise on ethical philosophy (Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, iii, i, 16). It is a history, and it is a religious history. The earlier portion of the book, as far as the end of the eleventh chapter, may properly be termed a history of the world; the latter is a history of the fathers of the Jewish race. But from first to last it is a religious history: it begins with the creation of the world and of man; it tells of the early happiness of a paradise in which God spake with them; it tells of man's falling from grace; it tells of the promise of redemption; of the gigantic growth of sin, and the judgment of the Flood; of a new earth, and a new covenant with man, its unchangeableness typified by the bow in the heavens; of the dispensation of the human race over the world. It then passes to the story of redemption; to the promise given to Abraham, and renewed to Isaac and to Jacob, and to all that chain of circumstances which paved the way for the great symbolic act of redemption, when with a mighty hand and a stretched out arm Jehovah brought his people out of Egypt.

It is very important to bear in mind this religious aspect of the history if we would put ourselves in a position rightly to understand it. Of course the facts must be treated like any other historical facts, sifted in the same way, and subjected to the same laws of evidence. Moses can put on record all that was done; but we must not forget the evident aim of the writer. It is only in this way we can understand, for instance, why the history of the Fall is given with so much minuteness of detail, whereas of whole generations of men we have nothing but a bare catalogue. Only in this way can we account for the fact that far the greater portion of the book is occupied, not with the fortunes of nations, but with the biographies of the three patriarchs. For it was to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob that God revealed himself. It was to
them that the promise was given, which was to be the hope of Israel till "the fulness of the time" should come. Hence to these wandering sheiks attaches a grandeur, an interest, other than that of the Is-Beals and Nimrods of the world. The minutest circumstances of their lives are worthier to be chronicled than the rise and fall of empires. This is not merely from the patriotic feeling of the writer as a Jew, but from his recognition of the chosen race. He lived in the land given to the fathers; he looked for the seed promised to the fathers, in whom himself and all the families of the earth should be blessed. See ABRAHAM.

II. Unity of Design. — This venerable monument, with all the sacred literature of the Hebrews commences, and which forms its real basis, is divided into two main parts; one universal, and one special. The most ancient history of the whole human race is contained in chapters i.-xi., and the history of Israel's ancestors, the patriarchs, in chapters xii.-l. These two parts are, however, the Jewish nation was confected with each other that it would be erroneous to ascribe to the first merely the aim of furnishing a universal history. That a distinct plan and method characterize the work is now generally admitted. This is acknowledged, in fact, not only by those who contend for, but by those who deny the existence of different documents in the book. Ewald and Tuch are no less decided advocates of the unity of Genesis, as far as its plan is concerned, than Ranke or Hengstenberg. Ewald, indeed (in his Composition der Genesis), was the first who established the identity, and clearly pointed out the principle on which it rests. What, then, is the plan of the writer? First, we must bear in mind that Genesis is, after all, but a portion of a larger work. The five books of the Pentateuch form a consecutive whole: they are not merely a collection of ancient and儒家, and the history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In a word, creation and redemption are eternally linked together. This is the idea which, in effect, gives its shape to the history, although its distinct enumeration is reserved for the N. T. There we learn that all things were created by God (Col. i. 16, 17); and that by the Church is made known unto principalities and powers the manifold wisdom of God. It would be impossible, therefore, for a book which tells us of the beginning of the Church, not to tell us also of the beginning of the world. The history of Genesis has thus a character at once special and universal. It embraces the world; it speaks of God as the God of the whole human race. But, as the introduction to Jewish history, it makes the universal interest subordinate to the national. Its design is to show how God revealed himself to the first fathers of the human race, and how he might be shown to himself a nation who should be his witness in the midst of the earth. This is the inner principle of unity which pervades the book. Its external framework we are now to examine. Five principal persons are the pillars, so to speak, on which the whole structure of the world is erected; Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

(1.) Adam. — The creation of the world, and the earliest history of mankind (ch. i.-iii.). As yet, no divergence of the different families of man.

(11.) Noah. — The history of Adam's descendants to the death of Noah (ch. iv.-v.). In this book we have the line of Cain branching off while the history follows the fortunes of Seth, whose descendants are traced in genealogical succession, and in an unbroken line as far as Noah, and (3) the history of Noah himself (ch. vii., viii.), continued to his death.

(III.) Abraham. — Noah's posterity till the death of Abraham (x-xxyv., 18). Here we have (1) the peopling of the whole earth by the descendants of Noah's three sons (xi, 1-9). The history of two of these is then dropped, and (2) the line of Shem only pursued (x, 10-22) as far as Terah and Abraham, where the genealogical table breaks off. (3) Abraham is now the prominent figure (xii-xxyv., 18). But as Terah had two other sons, Nahor and Haran (xi, 27), some notices respecting their families are added. Lot's migration with Abraham into the land of Canaan is mentioned, as well as the fact that he married Ammon (xix, 38, 36), nations whose later history was intimately connected with that of the posterity of Abraham. Nahor remained in Mesopotamia, but his family is briefly enumerated (xxii, 20-24), chiefly, no doubt, for Rebekah's sake, who was afterwards the wife of Isaac. Of Abraham's own children, there branches off first the line of Ishmael (xxi, 9, etc.), and next the children by Keturah; and the genealogical notices of these two branches of his posterity are apparently brought together (xxv, 1-6, and xxv, 12-18), in order that, being here severally dismissed at the end of Abra-
ham's life, the main stream of the narrative may flow in the channel of Isaac's fortunes.

(IV.) Isaac.—Isaac's life (xxvi, 19-35), a life in itself retiring and uneventful. But in his sons the final separation takes place, leaving the field clear for the great story of the chosen seed. Even when Na
dor's family comes out of Egypt (xxviii), the two sons of Jacob who then drops out of the narrative in order that (2) the history of the patriarchs may be carried on without interruption to the death of Joseph (ch. xxxvii-1).

Thus it will be seen that a specific plan is preserved throughout. The main purpose is never forgotten. God's relations with Israel holds the book, as in the writer's mind. It is this which it is his object to convey. The history of that chosen seed who were the heirs of the promise, and the guardians of the divine oracles, is the only history which interprets man's relation to God. By its light all others shine, and may be traced back to it. It is connected with the history of different families drop off here and there from the principal stock, their course is briefly indicated. A hint is given of their parentage and their migrations; and then the narrative returns to its regular channel. Thus the whole book is connected as a whole, while a certain amount of detail remains, as the various families of Israel are traced, supplying details at those points where the form is abrupt and deficient, etc. These two documents are said to have been subsequently combined by the hand of an editor, so ably as often to render their separation difficult, if not altogether impossible. But Banke, Hengstenberg, Droysel, Havercorn, Baumgarten, Keil, and others, maintain that Genesis is a book closely connected in all its parts, and composed by one author, while the use of the two different names of God is not owing to two different sources on which Genesis is founded, but solely to the different significations of these two names. The weight of probability lies on the side of those who argue for the existence of distinct documents, but only as sources to some extent which, together with original materials, were brought by the author into one homogeneous whole.

1. It is impossible to renew the previous assumption that Genesis is founded on written sources, but also to determine more closely the character of those sources, has gained more lasting approval among the learned. Which different names of God are prevalent in different portions of Genesis is a question much discussed by early theologians and rabbinists. Astruc, a Belgian physician, in his Conjectures sur les Memoires originaires, etc. (Bruxelles, 1758-8), was the first to apply the two Hebrew names of God, Jehovah and Elohim, to the subject at issue. Astruc assumed that there had originally existed a number of isolated documents, some of which, he thought, were attributed to different authors, and that at a later period these documents were united into the present form of Genesis. Eichhorn's critical genius procured for this hypothesis a favorable reception almost throughout the whole of Germany. See Astruc. Eichhorn pruned away its earlier branches, and fixed his own view to the assumption of only two different documents, respectively characterized by the two different names of Jehovah and Elohim. Other critics, such as Ilgen (Urkunden des Jerusalem Tempel-Archives, 1788), Grumbach (Adumbratio libri Genesee secundum fontes, 1808), and others, went still farther, and presupposed four different documents in Genesis. Vater went much beyond Eichhorn. He fancied himself able to combat the authenticity of the Pentateuch by producing an hypothesis, which substituted for Eichhorn's "document-hypothesis" his own "fragment-hypothesis," which obtained great authority, especially on account of its being adopted by De Wette.

According to this opinion, Genesis, as well as the greater part of the Pentateuch, consists of a great number of very small detached hypostases, usually unconnected with each other, but transcribed seriatim, although originating in very different times, and from different authors. This "fragment-hypothesis" has now been almost universally given up. Even its most tenacious defenders, not excepting De Wette himself, have relinquished it. In its place the former "document-hypothesis" has been resumed by some critics, simplified, however, and supported by new and better arguments. There is at present a great variety of opinion among divines concerning this hypothesis. The leading features of this theory are comprised in the following summary. According to the view of Stahelin, De Wette, Ewald, Von Bohlen, Tuch, Knobel, Delitzsch, and others, Genesis is founded on two principal original documents. That of Elohim is closest connected in its parts, and forms a whole, while that of Jehovah is more incomplete. Smooth, in its form, supplying details at those points where the form is abrupt and deficient. These two documents are said to have been subsequently combined by the hand of an editor, so ably as often to render their separation difficult, if not altogether impossible. But Banke, Hengstenberg, Droysel, Havercorn, Baumgarten, Keil, and others, maintain that Genesis is a book closely connected in all its parts, and composed by one author, while the use of the two different names of God is not owing to two different sources on which Genesis is founded, but solely to the different significations of these two names. The weight of probability lies on the side of those who argue for the existence of distinct documents, but only as sources to some extent which, together with original materials, were brought by the author into one homogeneous whole.

3. The resumptive form of some of the narratives, e.g. the repetition of the account of the creation of man in chap. ii, with additional particulars, is evidence of the same character. We may even hazard the conjecture that the pure cosmogony of chap. i. may have been one of the mysteries of the Egyptian theosophy while the more distinct accounts of the subsequent chapters may have been derived from the traditions of the Hebrews and cognate nations. See Moses, "The last distinct use of the divine names, Jehovah in some sections, and Elohim in others, is characteristic of two different writers; and other peculiarities of diction it has been observed fall in with this usage, and go far to show both the theory. As it is in harmony with what we might have expected a priori, viz., that if Moses or any later writer were the author
of the book, he would have availed himself of existing traditions, either oral or written. That they might have been written is now established beyond all doubt, the art of writing having been proved to be much earlier than Moses. That they were written we infer from the book itself. Yet these peculiarities are not so absolute as to show that the same writer did not employ all into one composition, for they are sometimes found blended in the same piece.

The evidence alluded to is strong; and nothing can be more natural than that an honest historian should seek to make his work more valuable by embodying in it the most ancient records of his race; the higher the text supposed to be, the more anxious would he be to preserve them in their original form. Those particularly in the earlier portion of the work were perhaps simply transcribed. In one instance we have what looks like an omission (ii, 4), when the inscription seems to promise a larger case of money. Here and there throughout the book we meet with a later remark, intended to explain or supplement the earlier monument. In some instances there seems to have been so complete a fusion of the two principal documents, the Elohist and the Jehovist, that no longer possibility to distinguish them. The later writer, the Jehovist, instead of transcribing the Elohistic account, thought fit to blend and intermingle with it his own remarks. We have an instance of this, according to Hupfeld (Die Quellen der Genesis), in chap. vii.; vers. 1-10 are usually supposed to be the Jehovist; but when he admits this, he detects a large admixture of Elohistic phraseology and coloring in the narrative. But this sort of criticism, it must be admitted, is very doubtfult. Other many instances might be mentioned where there is the same difficulty in assigning their own to the several authors. These sections generally recognized as Jehovistic, chaps. xii., xiii., here, there and there a sentence or a phrase occurs which seems to betray a different origin, as xii., 5; xiii., 6; xiv., 29. These anomalies, however, though it may be difficult to account for them, can hardly be considered of sufficient force entirely to overthrow the theory of independent documents which has so much, on other grounds, to recommend it. Certainly when Keil, Hengstener, and others, who reject this theory, attempt to account for the use of the divine names on the hypothesis that the writer (or his compiler) employed the one or other name according to the subject of which he was treating, their explanations are often of the most arbitrary kind. As a whole, the documentary character of Genesis is so remarkable when we compare it with the later books of the Pentateuch, and is so exactly what we might expect of a Mosaic authorship of the whole, that whilst contending against the theory of different documents in the later portions, we feel convinced that this theory is the only tenable one in Genesis.

Of the two principal documents, the Elohist is the earlier. So far as we can detach its integral portions, they still present the appearance of something like a connected work. This has been very well argued by Tuch (Die Genesis, Allgem. Einl. II-lxv), as well as by Hupfeld (Die Quellen der Genesis), Knobel, and Delitzsch. This whole theory of a double origin of the book, however, is powerfully opposed by Tiele in the Stud. u. Krit. 1895, i.

Hupfeld, however, whose analysis is very careful, thinks that he can discover traces of three original records, an earlier Elohist, a Jehovist, and a later Elohist. That this is no longer possible, according to him, subsequently united and arranged by a fourth person, who acted as editor of the whole. His argument is ingenious and worthy of consideration, though it is at times too elaborate to be convincing.

The following table of the use of the divine names in Genesis will enable the reader to form his own judgment as to the relative probability of the hypotheses above mentioned. Much as commentators differ concerning some portions of the book, one pronouncing passages to be Elohistic which another, with equal confidence, assigns to the Jehovist, the fact is certain that whole sections are characterized by a separate use of the divine names. (See Quary, Genesis, p. 400 sq.)

(1) Sections in which Elohim is found exclusively, or nearly so: chap. i., 5 (creation of heaven and earth); chaps. xii., 5, 17 (Jacob's dream); xxiii., 7 (Jacob's marriage); xxiv., 62 (Jacob's dream at Bethel); xxxii., 24 (birth and naming of the eleven sons of Jacob which Jehovah occurs; vi, 9-22 (generations of Noah); vii, 9-24 (the entering into the ark), but Jehovah in ver. 16; viii, 1-19 (end of the flood); ix, 1-17 (covenant with Noah); xvii (covenant of circumcision), where, however, the Hebrew text occurs in it, it is always associated with Elohim seven times; xix, 29-38 (conclusion of Lot's history); xx (Abraham's sojourn at Gerar), where again we have Jehovah once and Elohim four times, and Ha-shelohim twice; xxi, 1-21 (Isaac's birth and Ishmael's dismissal), only xxxi, 1, Jehovah; xxi, 29-34 (Abraham's covenant with Abimelech), where Jehovah is found once; xxxv, 1-18 (sons of Keturah, Abraham's death, and the generations of Ishmael), Elohim once; xxvii, 46-xxviii, 9 (Jacob goes to Haran, Esau's marriage), Elohim once, and El Shaddai once; xxxi, 1-46 (Jacob's departure from Laban), where Jehovah occurs twice; xxxii, xxxiii (Jacob's reconciliation with Esau, Dinah and the Shechemites, Jacob at Bethel, Esau's family, Joseph sold into Egypt). It should be observed, however, that in large portions of this section the divine name does not occur at all. (See below.) xi-l (history of Joseph in Egypt); here we have Jehovah once only (xli, 18). (Exod. i, ii (Israel's oppression in Egypt, and birth of Moses as deliverer).)

(2) Sections in which Jehovah occurs exclusively, or in preference to Elohim: iv (Cain and Abel, and Cain's posterity), where Jehovah ten times and Elohim once; vii, 1-8 (the sons of Noah and the daughters of men, etc.); vii, 1-9 (the entering into the ark), but Elohim once, ver. 9; viii, 20-22 (Noah's altar and Jehovah's blessing); ix, 18-27 (Noah and his sons); x (the families of mankind as descended from Noah); xi, 1-9 (the confusion of tongues); xii, 1-20 (Abram's journey from Haran to Canaan, and then into Egypt); xiii, Abram's separation from Lot); xv (Abram's faith, sacrifice, and covenant); xvi (Hagar and Ishmael), where xvi 2>xxii once; xvi-xviii, 28 (visit of the three angels to Abram, Lot, destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah); xxi, 24 (betrothal of Rebekah and Isaac's marriage); xxv, 19-xxvi, 35 (Isaac's sons, his visit to Beer-sheba); xxvii, 5-36 (Esau's wiles); xxx, 40 (Jacob obtains the blessing), but in ver. 28 Ha-shelohim, xxx, 25-43 (Jacob's bargain with Laban), where, however, Jehovah only once; xxxviii (Judah's incest); xxxix (Jehovah with Joseph in Potiphar's house and in the prison). (Exod. iv, 18-21 (Moses' return to Egypt); xvi (Pharaoh's treatment of the messengers of Jehovah).)

(3) The section Gen. ii, 4-iii, 24 (the account of Paradise and the Fall) is generally regarded as Jehovahistic, but it is clearly quite distinct. The divine name as there found is not Jehovah, but Jehovah Elohim (in which form it only occurs once beside in the Pentateuch, Exod. ix, 38), and it occurs twenty times; the name Elohim being found three times in the same section, once in the mouth of the woman, and twice in that of the serpent.

(4) In Gen. xiv. the prevailing name is El-Elyon (Lord of Heaven, the most high God'), and only once, in Abram's mouth, "Jehovah, the most high God," which is quite intelligible.

(5) Some few sections are found in which the names Jehovah and Elohim seem to be used promiscuously. This is the case in xxiii, 1-10 (the offering up of Isaac); xxvii, 19-22 (Jacob's dream at Bethel); xxviii, 31-xxx, 24 (birth and naming of the eleven sons of Jacob).
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(cob); and xiii (Jacob’s wrestling with the angel). [Exod. iii, 1-19 (the call of Moses).] (6.) It is worthy of notice that of the other divine names Adonai is always found in connection with Jehovah, except Gen. xx. 4; whereas El, El-Shaddai, etc., occur most frequently in the Elohist sections. (7.) An examination of the Hebrew and other versions shows that the divine names occur: Gen. xi. 10-32; xii. 20-24; xiii.; xiv., 23-34; xvii. 40-45; xxix. 1-80; xxxiv.; xxxvii.; xli. [Exod. iii, 1-22].

IV. The historical character of the contents of Genesis forms a more comprehensive subject of theological discussion. It is, however, a matter of general admission that the opinion regarding it must be principally influenced by the dogmatical views and principles of the respective critics themselves. Hence the great variety of opinion that still prevails on that subject. Some, as Vatke, Von Bohlen, and others, see in Genesis a history. To others, the contents of Genesis are unhistorical. Such and others consider Genesis to be interwoven with mythical elements, but that the rich historical elements, especially in the account of the patriarchs, can be clearly discerned. Some, again, limit the mythical part to the first two chapters only; that the others are purely mythological; and hold that a consistent and truly historical impress. The field of controversy is here so extensive, and the arguments on both sides are so numerous, that we must content ourselves in this article with a very few remarks on the subject.

(v.) The plot is divided into two contrasting parts: the first introduces us into the greatest problems of the human mind, such as the creation and the fall of man; and the second into the quiet solitude of a small, defined circle of families. In the former, the most sublime and wonderful events are described with childish simplicity; in the latter, the most simple and common occurrences are interwoven with the sublimest thoughts and reflections, rendering the small family circle a whole world in history, and the principal actors in it prototypes for a whole nation and for all times. Not the least trace of mythology appears in it. Genesis plainly shows how very far remote the Hebrew mode of thinking was from mythical poetry, which might have found ample opportunity of being brought into play when the writer began to sketch the early times of the Creation, or when he attempted to illustrate the manifold deeds of God, are the very subject of Genesis. None of these wonders, however, bear a fantastic impress, and there is no useless prodigality of them. They are all penetrated and connected by one common leading idea, and all are related to the counsel of God for the good of men. But yet this cannot be accounted for by the luminous beams through the whole of Genesis; therefore the wonders therein related are as little to be ascribed to the invention and imagination of man as the whole plan of God for human salvation. The foundation of the divine theocratic institution throws a strong light upon the early patriarchal times; the realisation of the one proves the reality of the other, as described in Genesis.

Luther used to say, “Nihil pulchrior Genesi, nihil utilius.” But hard critics have tried all they could to make it a beast and to detract from its utility. In fact, the bitterness of the attacks on a document so venerable, so full of unifying interest, hallowed by the love of many generations, makes one almost suspect that a secret malevolence must have been the mainspring of hostile criticism. Certain it is that no book has stood with more determination and unpBarasing assailants. To enumerate and to reply to all objections would be impossible. We will only refer to some of the most important.

1. The story of Creation, as given in the first chapter, has been assailed in two ways: first, by placing it on the same level with other cosmogonies which are to be found in the sacred writings of all nations; and next, by asserting that its statements are directly contradicted by the discoveries of modern science. (a.) Now when we compare the Biblical with all other known cosmogonies, we are immediately struck with the great moral superiority of the former. There is no confusion here between the divine Creator and the things he makes; there is conformity between all things; this is the sublime assertion of the Hebrew writer. On the contrary, all the cosmogonies of the heathen world are in one of two directions: either they are dualistic, that is, they regard God and matter as two eternal co-existent principles; or they are pantheistic, that is, they consider God and matter as identical or identical in the material universe a kind of emanation from the great Spirit which informs the mass. Both these theories, with their various modifications, whether in the more subtle philosophies of the Indian races, or in the rougher and simpler forms, such as the Cabalists and Babyloni ans, are alike exclusive of the idea of creation. Without attempting to discuss in anything like detail the points of resemblance and difference between the Biblical record of creation and the myths and legends of other nations, it may suffice to mention certain particulars.

Fourthly, there is the fact of a relation between the personal Creator and the work of his fingers, and that relation is a relation of love; for God looks upon his creation at every stage of its progress, and pronounces it very good.

Fifthly, there is throughout a sublime simplicity which and itself is characteristic of a history, not of a myth or of a philosophical speculation. See Creation. (b.) It would occupy too large a space to discuss at any length the objections which have been urged from the results of modern discovery against the literal truth of this chapter. One or two remarks of a general kind must suffice. It is an axiom of science that a thing which could not have existed before the sun, or, at any rate, not that kind of light which would be necessary for the support of vegetable life; whereas the Mosaic narrative makes light created on the first day, trees and plants on the third, and the sun on the fourth. To this we may add that it would not be proper to make an argument upon our ignorance. We do not know that the existing laws of creation were in operation when the creative fiat was first put forth. The very act of creation must have been the introducing of laws; but when the work was finished, those laws must have suffered some modification. Men are not now created in the full stature of manhood, but are born and grow. Similarly, the lower ranks of being might have been influenced by certain necessary conditions during the first stages of their existence, which conditions were afterwards removed to disturb their natural functions. Again, it is not certain that the language of Genesis can only mean that the sun was created on the fourth day. It may mean that then only did that luminary become visible to our planet.

With regard to the six days, many have thought that they ought to be interpreted to mean about twenty-four hours only. On the contrary, the divine Sabbath still continues. There has been no creation since the creation of man. This is what Genesis teaches, and this geology confirms. But God, as we have seen, has a series of periods of creative activity, entered into that
Sebahth in which his work has been, not a work of creation, but of redemption (John v, 17). No attempt, however, which has as yet been made to identify these six periods with corresponding geological epochs can be pronounced satisfactory. See GEOLOGY. On the other hand, it seems rash and premature to assert that no such periods do exist, for the true, that no reconfiguration of the facts which we have presented is possible. It is certain that the author of the first chapter of Genesis, whether Moses or some one else, knew nothing of geology or astronomy. It is certain that he made use of physiologic concerning physical facts in accordance with the information which he possessed. It is also certain that the Bible was never intended to reveal to us knowledge of which our own faculties, rightly used, could put us in possession. We have no business, therefore, to expect anything but popular language in the description of physical phenomena. Thus, for instance, when it is said that by means of the firmament God divided the waters which were above from those which were beneath, we admit the fact without admitting the implied explanation. The Hebrew supposed that there existed vast reservoirs of water corresponding to the waters under the earth. We know that by certain natural processes the rain descends from the clouds. But the fact remains the same that there are waters above as well as below. Further investigation may perhaps throw more light on these interesting questions. Meanwhile it is certain that modern writers who aspire to put on the story of the confusion of tongues, and the subsequent dispersion of mankind, there is no good ground for setting it aside. Indeed, if the reading of a cylinder recently discovered at Birs Nimrud may be trusted, there is independent evidence corroborative of the Bible. It is not written in a language unknown to the biblical peoples, and in no way opposed to the great outlines of the Mosaic cosmogony. That the world was created in six stages, that creation was by a law of gradual advance, beginning with inorganic matter, and then advancing from the lowest organisms to the highest, that something like a succession of man upon the earth, no new species has come into being; these are statements not only not disproved, but the two last of them at least amply confirmed by geological research.

8. To the description of Paradise, and the history of the Fall and of the Deluge, very similar remarks apply. All nations have their own version of these facts, colored by local circumstances, and embellished according to the poetic or philosophic spirit of the tribes among whom the tradition has taken root. But if there be any one original source of these traditions, and if we cannot doubt where to look for it. The earliest record of these momentous facts is that preserved in the Bible. We cannot doubt this, because the simplicity of the narrative is greater than that of any other work with which we are acquainted. This simplicity is a preservative at once in favor of the antiquity, and also of the greater truthfulness of the story. It is hardly possible to suppose that traditions so widely spread over the surface of the earth as are the traditions of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, should have no foundation whatever in fact. It is quite as impossible to suppose that that version of these facts, which in its moral and religious aspect is the purest, is not also, to take the lowest ground, the most likely to be true.

(1.) Opinions have differed whether we ought to take the story of the Fall in Gen. iii to be a literal statement of facts, or whether, with many expositors, since the time of Philo, we should regard it as an allegory, framed in child-like words as befitted the childhood of the world, but conveying to us a deeper spiritual truth. But in the latter case we ought not to deny that this truth. Neither should we overlook the very important bearing which this narrative has on the whole of the subsequent history of the world and of Israel. Delitzsch well says, "The story of the Fall, like that of the Creation, has wandered over the whole. Heathen nations have transplanted and mixed it up with their own mythology, their history, their ethnology, although it has never so completely changed form, and color, and spirit that you cannot recognise it. Here, however, in the Law, it preserves the character of a universal, human, world-wide fact; and the grounds of Creation, the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and the heart of every man, conspire in their testimony to the most literal truth of the narrative." See FALL or MAN.

(2.) The universality of the Deluge, it may be proved, is quite at variance with the most certain facts of geology. But then we are not bound to contend for a universal deluge. The Biblical writer himself, it is true, supposed it to be universal, but that was only because it could not be otherwise. It is the woman who is responsible for the serious doubt that it did extend to all that part of the world which was then inhabited; and this is enough, on the one hand, to satisfy the terms of the narrative, while, on the other, the geological difficulty, as well as other difficulties concerning the ark, and the number of animals, disappears with this interpretation. See DELUGE.

(3.) When we come down to a later period in the narrative, where we have the opportunity of testing the accuracy of the historian, we find it in many of the most important particulars abundantly corroborated.

9. The mythological history of the fall of man is, as has been shown, largely connected with the story of the Ark. The Hebrews believed that the Ark was to be preserved as a token of the deliverance of the Israelites from the Flood. The Ark was to be a symbol of salvation, a type of the Messiah. The Ark was to be a reminder of the power and mercy of God. The Ark was to be a sign of the covenant between God and man. The Ark was to be a symbol of the Church. The Ark was to be a type of the New Testament Church. The Ark was to be a symbol of the salvation which is to come. The Ark was to be a sign of the coming of the Messiah. The Ark was to be a type of the Church. The Ark was to be a symbol of the salvation which is to come.

(4.) On the other hand, the Hebrews believed that the Ark was to be preserved as a token of the deliverance of the Israelites from the Flood. The Ark was to be a symbol of salvation, a type of the Messiah. The Ark was to be a reminder of the power and mercy of God. The Ark was to be a sign of the covenant between God and man. The Ark was to be a symbol of the Church. The Ark was to be a type of the New Testament Church. The Ark was to be a symbol of the salvation which is to come. The Ark was to be a sign of the coming of the Messiah. The Ark was to be a type of the Church. The Ark was to be a symbol of the salvation which is to come.

10. The Ark was to be a token of the deliverance of the Israelites from the Flood. The Ark was to be a symbol of salvation, a type of the Messiah. The Ark was to be a reminder of the power and mercy of God. The Ark was to be a sign of the covenant between God and man. The Ark was to be a symbol of the Church. The Ark was to be a type of the New Testament Church. The Ark was to be a symbol of the salvation which is to come. The Ark was to be a sign of the coming of the Messiah. The Ark was to be a type of the Church. The Ark was to be a symbol of the salvation which is to come.
Of the minute accuracy of this table we have abundant proof: for instance (Gen. x, 4), Tarshish is called the son of Javan. This indicates that the ancient inhabitants of Tarshish or Tartessus in Spain were erroneously considered to be a Phoenician colony like those of Cyprus and Crete. The existence of such a colony is attested by the presence of Greek coins in Spain, and by the use of wine by the kings (Wilkinson, ii, 142-146); the fact that even at that early time a settled trade existed between Egypt and other countries, are all confirmed by the monuments or by later writers. So again Joseph's priestly dress of fine linen, the chain of gold round of his neck, the chryselephantine shrine of the king, the rites of burial (though mentioned only incidentally), are spoken of with a minute accuracy which can leave no doubt on the matter to the credibility of the historian. In particular, the account of his genealogy in which the Pharaohs became proprietors of all the lands, with the exception of those belonging to the priests, is confirmed by Herodotus (ii, 109), and by Diodorus Siculus (i, 73). The manner of embalming described in Gen. I entirely agrees with the description of Herodotus, ii, 84, of the procedure in which the mummy is packed in the hero-casket. Hence the portion in which the Pharaohs became proprietors of all the lands, with the exception of those belonging to the priests, is confirmed by Herodotus (ii, 109), and by Diodorus Siculus (i, 73). The manner of embalming described in Gen. I entirely agrees with the description of Herodotus, ii, 84, of the procedure in which the mummy is packed in the hero-casket. Hence the portion in which the Pharaohs became proprietors of all the lands, with the exception of those belonging to the priests, is confirmed by Herodotus (ii, 109), and by Diodorus Siculus (i, 73). The manner of embalming described in Gen. I entirely agrees with the description of Herodotus, ii, 84, of the procedure in which the mummy is packed in the hero-casket. Hence the portion in which the Pharaohs became proprietors of all the lands, with the exception of those belonging to the priests, is confirmed by Herodotus (ii, 109), and by Diodorus Siculus (i, 73). The manner of embalming described in Gen. I entirely agrees with the description of Herodotus, ii, 84, of the procedure in which the mummy is packed in the hero-casket.
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writer, because of difficulties such as these. The positive evidence is overwhelming in favor of his credibility. The patriarchal tent beneath the shade of some spreading tree, the wealth of flocks and herds, the free and generous hospitality to strangers, the stride for the well, the purchase of the cave of Machpelah for a burial-place—we feel at once that these are no inventions of the compiler of the civilizing, patriarchal period. So again, what can be more life-like, more touchingly beautiful, than the picture of Hagar and Ishmael, the meeting of Abraham's servant with Rebekah, or of Jacob with Rachel at the well of Haran? There is a fidelity in the minutest incident which cannot be overlooked; reading it, we are not false. Or can anything more completely transport us into patriarchal times than the battle of the kings and the interview between Abraham and Melchizedek? The very opening of the story, "In the days of Amraphel, etc., reads like the work of some old chronicler who lived not far from the time of which he speaks. The archaic forms of names of places, Bela for Zoar; Chataban Tamar for En-gedi; Emek Shaveh for the King's Vale; the Vale of Siddim, as descriptive of the spot which was afterwards the Dead Sea; the expression "Abram the Hebrew;" and the later name, as descriptive of the nation, are evidences of the narrative. So also are the names of the different tribes who at that early period inhabited Canaan; the Re- phaim, for instance, of whom we find in the time of Joshua but a weak remnant left (Josh. xii, 12), and the Zuzim, Ezon, Chorim, who are mentioned be- tween the Pentateuch (Deut. ii. 10, 12). Quite in keeping with the rest of the picture is Abraham's "arming his trained servants" (xiv, 14)—a phrase which occurs nowhere else—and, above all, the character and position of Melchizedek: "Simple, calm, great, he comes and goes the priest king of the divine history." The representations of the Greek poets, says Creuzer (Symb. iv, 378), fall very far short of this; and, as Havernick justly remarks, such a person could be no theocratic invention, for the union of the kingly and priestly offices in the same person was no part of the theocracy. Lamech, the name by which he is known, the "most high God, possessor of heaven and earth," occurs also in the Phoenician religions, but not amongst the Jews, and is again one of those slight but accurate touches which at once distinguishes the historian from the compiler; see the Personages.

V. Author and Date of Composition.—It will be seen from what has been said above, that the book of Gen- nis, though containing different documents, owes its existing form to the labor of a single author, who has digested and incorporated the materials he found ready to his hand. The question of the writer is important in itself; besides, the successes of the exposition which he has gained, give some argument in favor of his view of the passage. The question "the Canaanites were then in the land" (xlii, 6; xii, 7), is thought to imply that the Canaanites were still in possession of Palestine, and so could not have been written till after their expulsion. But such a time is impossible not only for the same reason as the Canaanites were not expelled, but for the investigation they had made of the country and the book was written in the days of David, Solomon, and the united monarchy. The document of this time is called the "canaanitish" or "canaanitish." Literally taken, however, the remark is inapplicable to any period, since the kingdom of the Jews at no period of their history extended so far. That promise must, therefore, be taken in a rhetorical sense, describing the central houses of the chosen people, in the country situated between the two rivers. The remark, "Before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (xxxvi, 31), could not have been made, it is maintained, until the establishment of the Hebrew monarchy—an assumption which overlooks the relation of the "sons of Eber" to the promises of a royal posterity to the patriarchs, and especially that in an immediately preceding passage
It stands in a relation similar to Deut. xvii, 14, where the erection of a kingdom is viewed as a necessary step in Israel's development. This explanation will of course satisfy the book that in a simple historical style, a statement having such prophetic reference "is not only preposturous, but impossible" (Kalisch, Genesis, p. 601); but against rationalistic prepossessions of this kind there is no arguing.

VI. Commentarians. - The following are expressly on the whole of this book, the most important being designated by an asterisk (*): prefixed: Origens, Commentaria (in Opp. ii. 1); also Homiliae (ib. ii. 52); Chrysostom, Homilia (in Opp. iv. 3; also [Sporia] sb. vi. 61); and Sermones (sb. iv. 746, 790); Jerome, Questiones (in Opp. iii. 903); Eusebius, Commentaria (in Nal. Man. Patr. vi); Iodone, Commentaria (in Opp. p. 283); Damianus, Expositio (in Opp. iii. 889); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. iv. 19); also Questiones (ib. vii. 78); Alcuin, Interrogations (Hagenau, 1529, 8vo); also in Opp. i. ii. 805); Angelomus, Commentarium (in Faex. Thren. iv. 1); Ebrard, Commentarius (Lips. 1564, 8vo). Hugo, Annotationes (in Opp. i. 8); Rupert, Commentarius (in Opp. i. 1); Aquinas, Expositio (Antwerp, 1572, Lugd. 1578, 8vo; Paris, 1614, fol.); Écolampadis, Adnotationes (Basil. 1523, 1586, 8vo); Zwingle, Adnotationes (Tigur. 1527; also in Opp. iii. 4); Zeigler, Commentaria (in Opp. ii. 376); also Libri, Commentaria (Rom. 1564, 4to); *Luther, Emserationes (by different eds. part i, Vittemb. 1544, fol.; part ii, Norbu. 1550; after, Francof. 1545-50, 8vo, and later; also in Op. Exeg. ii.; in English, London, 1855, 8vo); Melanchthon, Commentarius (in Opp. ii. 377); Musculus, Commentarius (Basil. 1554, 1566, 1600, fol.); Honsela, Commentarius (Complut. 1555, fol.); Chytrium, Commentarius (Vittemb. 1587, 1588, 1600, 8vo); *Marloratus, Expositio (Par. 1562; Morg. 1568, 1580, 1584, fol.; Genev. 1580, 8vo); *Calvin, In Genesis (in Opp. i.; also tr. Lond. 1578, 8vo, 2 vols. 8vo); Strigel, Auslegung (Lips. 1566, 1754, 8vo); Solnecker, Commentarius (Lips. 1599, fol.); Martyr, Commentarius (Tigur. 1572, 1579, 1596; Heidelberg, 1606, fol.); Brentius, Commentarius (in Opp. i.); Brocard, Interpretatio [mystical] (L. B. 1560, 8vo; ib. 1884, 4to; Bremen, 1568, 1608, 4to); Fabricius, Commentarius (Lips. 1584, 1622, 8vo; Egenolff, 1601, 4to, Argent. 1854, 4to); *Peregrus Romainian, Commentarius (Rom. 1589-1598, 4 vols. fol.; Colon. 1601, 1606, Ven. 1607, fol.; Lugd. 1616, 4 vols. 8vo; and later); Museus, Auslegung (Magdeburg, 1596, 8vo); Martinengius, Glossa (Patav. 1577, 2 vols. fol.); Dassab, Predigten (Lips. 1597, 8vo); Mercier, Commentarius (Genev. 1598, 8vo); Kaefer, Expositio (Lips. 1620, a fol.); Hunsenmann, Adnotationes (Lips. 1560, fol.); Stella, Commentarius (Rom. 1601, fol.); Schmuck, Auslegung (Lpz. 1603-9, in 8 pts. 4to); Geisser, Disputationes (Vittemb. 1604, 1618, 1629, 4to); Lyser, Commentarius (in 6 pts. Lpz. 1604 sq., 4to); *Willet, Expositorium (London, 1605, 8vo); Delrio, Commentarius (Lugd. 1608); Remigius, Praxis (Paris 1616, 8vo); Parez, Commentarius (Francof. 1609, 1614, 4to); Ge- dick, Auslegung (Lpz. 1611, 1622, fol.); De Petigijan, Commentarius (Ven. 1616, 4to); Ferduziz, Commentationes (Lugd. 1618-19, 3 vols. fol.); Babington, Notes (in Works, 1); Mersennus, Questions [polemical] (Par. 1622, 4to); Gersius, Disputationes (Comarbur. 1624, 4to); Böhme, Erklärung [mystical] (s. l. 1624; also in his other works); Rivetus, Exercitationes (L. B. 1638, 4to); Gerhard, Commentarius (Jen. 1637, 1654, 1693, 4to); De la Haye, Commentarius (Lugd. 1638, Par. 1651, 1663, 2 vols. fol.); Syrius, Commentarius (Uscu, 1639, 8vo); Lipsius, Commentarius (Lond. 1639, 4to); also in Bohemian, ib. 1639, lii. 820); and Annotationes (ib. x. 392); and Guandion, Conten- tia (Pisa, 1644, 4to); Carvagh, Adnotationes (from Targums) (Lond. 1648, 8vo; also in Critici Sacri, 4to); Rives, Exercitationes (in Opp. i. 1); Terner, Adnotationes (Upsal. 1657, fol.); Chemitz, Disputationes (Jen. 1665, Lips. 1711; Vittemb. 1710, 4to); Calov, Commentarius (Vittemb. 1671, 4to); Hughes, Exposition (Lond. 1672, fol.); Cocceius, Commentarius (in Opp. i. 1); also Cruwys. Commen- taries (Lond. 1692); *Persius, Commentarius (Jen. 1696, 8vo); *Kern, Exposition (Paris 1697, 4to); also in Bohemian, ib. 1706, lii. 892); and Annotationes (ib. x. 392); and Gaundion, Conten- tia (Pisa, 1644, 4to); Cartwright, Adnotationes [from Targums] (Lond. 1648, 8vo; also in Critici Sacri, 4to); Rives, Exercitationes (in Opp. i. 1); Terner, Adnotationes (Upsal. 1657, fol.); Chemitz, Disputationes (Jen. 1665, Lips. 1711; Vittemb. 1710, 4to); Calov, Commentarius (Vittemb. 1671, 4to); Hughes, Exposition (Lond. 1672, fol.); Cocceius, Commentarius (in Opp. i. 1); also *Cruwys. Commentaries (Lond. 1692).
assigned for his death: Tillemont and Ruinart fix it at A.D. 296; Baronius and Fleury at A.D. 308. His day in the Roman Catholic calendar is Aug. 25. Rotrou has made this apocryphal history the subject of a tragedy. See Acta Sanctorum, August, vol. v.; Ruinart, Acta Sincera, p. 269; Butler, Lives of the Saints, Aug. 25.

Genev. FRANÇOIS, a French prelate, was born at Avignon Oct. 16, 1640. He became canon and theologian of the cathedral of Avignon, and in 1668 bishop of Vaison. Implicated in the affair of the Daughters of Childhood of Toulouse, whom he had received in his diocese, and who were held to be Janissaries, he was arrested in 1688, and imprisoned for fifteen months. The pope finally persuaded Louis XI. to restore Genevèse to his diocese in 1702, while on his way from Avignon to Vaison. He is the author of Théologie Morale, which was disapproved by the bishops, and condemned by the University of Louvain, March 10, 1703. The best edition is that of 1715 (8 vols. 12mo); it was reprinted at Rosen in 1749—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xix. 673.

Genethliaci, astrologers, who pretended to calculate men's nativities by erecting schemes and horoscopes, to know what position the stars were in at their birth, and thence to foretell their good or bad fortune. "And because some of these pretended to determine positively of the lives and deaths of kings, which was repugnant to a dangerous piece of treason, therefore the laws of the state were more severe against them even under the heathen emperors, as Gothofred shows out of the ancient lawyers, Ulpian and Paulus; and that was another reason why the Church thought it proper to unlavish upon these with the utmost severity of ecclesiastical censures, as thinking that what the heathen laws had punished as a capital crime ought not to pass unregarded in the discipline of the Christian Church. It was this crime that expelled Aquila from the Church. For Epiphanius says (De Menæris et Panderibus) he was once a Christian, but, being incorrigibly bent upon the practice of astrology, the Church cast him out, and then he became a Jew, and in revenge set upon a new translation of the Bible, to corrupt those texts which had any relation to the coming of Christ."—Bingham, Orig. Ecc. lxi. ch. v. See DIVINATION.

Geneva (French Genève), capital of the Swiss canton of the same name, celebrated for its historical and religious associations, and in particular as the seat of the reformational labors of Calvin. The canton had, in 1860, 82,876 inhabitants, of whom 40,069 were Protestants, 42,991 Roman Catholics, 381 Dissidents, 377 Jews. During the French revolution Geneva was the seat of dispute between the bishop of Geneva, who was an immediate feudatory of the German empire, and the count of Genevois, who ruled the adjoining province of Savoy. After the extinction of the line of the counts of Genevois, the dukes of Savoy were appointed their successors by the German emperor Sigismund (1432). Hence the claim of Savoy upon Geneva, from which the Genevans could only free themselves by alliances with the Swiss cantons of Fribourg (1519) and Berne (1526), and by the aid of the Reformation. The latter was introduced into Geneva by Farel, from France, and others, about 1552, and in 1556 was officially established. Being put under the ban by the bishop, the city declared the episcopal see vacant, and declared itself a republic. Calvin first came to Geneva in 1536, and after an absence of a few years returned in 1541, when he settled down in making himself temporal as well as the spiritual ruler of the town. Thus Geneva became the metropolis of Calvinism, and, as such, exercised a great influence upon all the Calvinistic churches. From 1798 to 1814 Geneva was united with France; in 1814, its territory having been enlarged by the annexation of the Savoyard and Frencum communities; it joined the Swiss Confederation as the 23rd canton. The Reformed State Church, which in 1688 had 16 congregations and 3 ministers, has for some time been under the influence of Rationalism, and a part of the orthodox members have therefore organized a Free Evangelical Church, which has a celebrated theological school, several of whose professors, as Merle d'Aubigné and Gaussens, have established a great theological reputation throughout the Protestant world. —Thouret, Histoire de Genève (Geneva, 1863); Cherbuliez, Genève et les Genevois (Geneva, 1888). (A. J. S.)

Geneva Bible. See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

Geneviève, St., the patron saint of Paris, was, according to tradition, born at Nanterre, near Paris, about 423. By the advice of St. Germain, bishop of Auxerre, she took the vow of chastity, and when afterwards accused of hypocrisy and superstition, she was warmly defended by the bishop. When the inhabitants of Paris, frightened at the approach of Attila, contemplated leaving their city, Geneviève dissuaded them, saying that Paris would be spared; and as the prediction proved true, she became the object of general veneration. She also advised the building of a church to St. Peter and St. Paul, in which she was afterwards buried, and which bears her name. She died in 512. Her reputation for sanctity became so great that Siméon Stylites inquired about her from all persons coming from Gaul. Miracles were said to take place at her tomb. There exists a life of her in Latin, claiming to have been written eighteen years after the death of Clovis. The life of St. Germain by the priest Constance, said to have been written during her lifetime, relates her consecration by that bishop. See the Belgians, Acta Sanctor. July 31; Charpentier, Vie de St. Geneviève (1867); Butler, Lives of the Saints, Jan. 3.

Geneviève, St., Canons of, called also canons regular of the Congregation of France, a congregation of canons regular (q. v.) established in 1614 by Charles Faure, a member of the abbey of St. Vincent of Senlis, who effected a reformation of the French canons which was soon adopted by several other abbeys. Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld, who in 1619 had been made abbot of the abbey of St. Geneviève du Mont at Paris, being desirous to reform his abbey, sent, in 1624, for twelve members of St. Vincent of Senlis, and made Faure its spiritual superior. In 1634 the pope confirmed the new congregation. Soon after its first chapter general was held, which was attended by the superiors of fifteen houses, and elected Faure coadjutor of the abbots of St. Geneviève and general of the congregation. The king had previously given up his right of nominating the abbots of St. Geneviève, and consented that he be elected every third year. Helyot, in his History of Religious Orders, states that at his time the congregations had in France 67 abbots, 28 priors, 2 provosts,
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and 8 hospitals, besides, in the Netherlands, 8 abbeys and 3 priors. A large number of parishes were served by its members. It was customary to elect one of the chancellors of the University of Paris from this congregation. Helyot, Dict. des Ordres Relig., art. Genévétains. (A. S. J.)

Geneviève, St. Daughters of (more commonly called Mariliana), a monastic order in the Roman Catholic Church, founded, in 1368, at Paris, by Françoise de Blosset, for the purpose of nursing the sick and instructing girls. In 1665 it was united by Marie Bonneau de Rubelle Beaumanois de Miramion with a similar order which she had founded in 1661, under the name of the Holy Family. The order obtained considerable reputation, and extended widely. Its members took no vows, but only promised a faithful observation of the rule and the statutes of the society as long as they might belong to it.—Helyot, Dict. des Ordres Relig., art. Miramione.

Genius, Attendant. See Guardian Angel.

Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded Anastolius in that dignity A.D. 458. He was a man of quick parts, and composed Homilies; a Commentary on Paul's Epistles; and a Commentary on Daniel. He died A.D. 471. His writings are lost, except an Epistle preserved by Gregory, and other fragments, all of which are given by Migne in Patrologia Graeca, tom. lxxv. Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. ii. 11; Dupin, Eccl. Hist. iv. 156; Cellarius, Annals Sacris (Paris, 1861), xi. 845.

Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople (whose proper name was George Scholarios), was one of the most original and prolific writers in the Greek Church of the 15th century. He was secretary to the emperor John Paleologus, and attended the Council of Florence in 1438, while yet a layman. He became an ecumenical council in 1449 or 1450, and entered a monastery, taking the name of Gennadius. At Florence he had declared himself strongly on the side of union with the Latin Church, in three orations to be found in Har- douin, Concilia, i. 446 (supposed to be much interpolated). After becoming a monk he changed his views, and wrote against the Council of Ferrara-Florence. In 1458 he was made patriarch by the sultan, but retired in 1458, and died about 1460. Some have disputed the identity of Scholarios with Gennadius, but Renaudot puts it beyond doubt. A list of his writings will be found in Renaudot, who edited his homilies De Eucharia (Paris, 1794), and, in a larger edit., with Meletius and others (Paris, 1798, 4to). His literary work was composed when he was bishop, and afterwards edited by Liborius (Prague, 1678, 8vo). Migne, in Patrologia Graeca, tom. clix, gives Renaudot's dissertation on the life and writings of Gennadius, with his writings as follows: Concessio Fidelis (ii. i); Homiliae: Orations in Synodo Florent., De Redominatone: De Deo in Trinitate uno: Epistola; and other writings. Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graecae (ed. Harles), xi. 349 sq., gives Renaudot's list of the writings of Gennadius, seventy-six in number, and adds twenty-four more. See also a list of his writings and their various editions, in Hoffmann, Bibliographia Lectur., i. 159 sq. Of the writings attributed to him, perhaps the most important are the two Confessiones made for the sultan, (1) Ομαλία (or ομαλογία) μηθεια περί της θρής και αμώμων πιστών των Χριστιανών; and (2) a dialogue περί της ιδιού της πατρίως των αδελφών, both given in Migne (C. ix. 382) and in the Brevis edition. In addition, we have the Concilia, and in Gass, Gennadius et Plentho (see below). These confessions have been critically studied by Dr. Otto, who gives the text of the dialogue, a literary history of the two confessions, and an investigation of the genuineness of the dialogue, in Ztschrif für hist. Theol., xx. 389 sq.; xxxiv, 111 sq.; and separately, from additional sources, Des Patriarch Gennasiades Confession (Wien, 1864). Otto decides that the dialogue was not written by Gennadius, but is probably a recension of the ομαλία των ισόποντων (falsely ascribed to Athanasius), made by some Greek, in the interest of the Church of Rome, to favor the union of the Greek and Latin churches. The sultan also gave the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son (Migne, tom. cit., p. 822 D), the Latin and Latinizing Greeks have made much use of it in the Fideique controversy. —Mosheim, Church History, cent. xiv, pt. ii, chap. ii, § 28; Dupin, Eccl. Writers, v. 110; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. l. c.; Hoefer, Real-Encyclop. 5th Ed., xii. 913; Gass, Gennadius et Plentho (Breslau, 1844).

Gennadius, Marsilius, a presbyter of Marselles, a Gaul (end of 5th century). Although some modern writers assert that he was a bishop, some say of Marselles, others of Toledo, he was only a presbyter. He was versed in Greek and Latin, and a laborious student of the Scriptures and the fathers. He wrote a number of books, of which only two have come down to us: (1) De Viris illustribus, or De Scripturis Ecclesiasticis (Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers), a continuation of that of Jerome, to which it is usually joined. It begins where Jerome's ends, A.D. 392, and ends 493, and has been better read than many editions of the Gospels. Of the sides that which is inserted in the works of St. Jerome; the best is that of Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica (Hamb. 1718, fol.). (2) De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus (Hamb. 1594 and 1614, 4to). Gennadius advocates doctrines on free-will and predestination similar to those of Faustus of Rhegium. In his tract De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis, he says, God first of all warns man, and invites him to salvation; it is in the power of man to follow him. In his work De Viris illustribus, cap. 58, he speaks of Augustine with commendation, yet does not hesitate to add, that by writing so much he fell into the error of which Solomon says in the 10th chapter of Proverbs, 'In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin.' He makes mention of an error which had arisen from much speaking, and evidently refers to the doctrine of absolute predestination. This arose from carrying things to an extreme, but for all this Augustine had not fallen into heresy" (Neander, History of Dogmas, Ryland's transl. p. 888).—Dupin, Eccl. Writers, iv. 185; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. ii. 341; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii. 647; Hook, Eccles. Dogm. v. 285; Cave, Hist. Lit. (Geney. 1720, fol.), i. 299.

Gennius (Γεννιος, i. e. high-born, but v. τι-νος, apparently given (2 Mac. xii, 2) as the name of the Syrian priest Appolonia (q. v.); but perhaps it is a mere epithet.

Gennath (Γενναθ, apparently for the Chald. ܓܢܢܐ, or נַכִּהל, q. d. "garden-gate," perhaps [as Schwartz suggests, Palest. p. 254] from the "rose-garden, סירנה גן, mentioned in the Talmud (Moerer, ii. 5) as lying west of the Temple mount), the name, according to Josephus (War, v. 4, 2), of one of the gates of Jerusalem, important as mainly determining the course of the second wall, which has been greatly disputed. See Talm. His account is as follows: "But the second (wall), while it had its beginning from that gate which they called 'Gennath,' which belonged to the first wall, yet encircling only the northern slope [or quarter], reached as far as Antonia" (To διά του πόλου την μιν ἄρχη ἐκ τῆς Ατονίας, τοῦ δὲ πόλου της γενναθ, διήκονε την πρὸς την Ατονίαν ἄρχην). From which, together with the context, the following conclusions are certain: (1) The gate in question formed part of the first wall that skirted the northern brow of Mount Zion, for the second wall must have started from this gate, and run along and lay between the first and the second wall on the same side of the city. (2) It was situated at some point east of the tower Hippicus, which formed the common
GENNESAR

The Water of (γεννασάρ Γεννασάρ), a place where Jonathan Maccabaeus encamped on his way to attack the forces of Demetrius at Kadesh (1 Macc. xi. 67); doubtless the Lake GENNESARET (q.v.).

GENNESARET [y pron. hard] (Γεννασάρ), the Greek form of the lake (Luke vi. 1) and plain (Matt. xiv. 34; Mark vi. 53). Invariable found in the N. T. in place of the GENNESAR (Γεννασάρ) of the Apocrypha (1 Macc. xi. 67), and usually also of Josephus (War. iii. 10, 7). In the Talmudical writings and Targums we always find the latter form Hebraized נַנָּר נַ נָּר, as an equivalent of גְּנַ נָּר, קִ נָ נַ נָּר or קִ נָ נַ נָּר. In the Lightfoot, Works. ii. 222, from which it was usually taken, it is written נַ נָּר, by an interchange of כ over ת, and the insertion of ד; although others derive it from נַ נָּר, a valley, and נַ נָּר, a shoot or flower, as if q. “the vale of flowers” (Jerome, Opp. vi. 136, ed. Migne); or from גְּ נַ נָּר, a garden, and נַ נָּר, a prince, as if q. “the prince’s garden” (Lightfoot, i. 489), or even from Sharon, a fertile vale not far distant (Reland, Palest. p. 198, 259).

1. The town. This is variously named in the O. T. as Cinnereth or “Chinnereth,” “Chinneroth,” “Sinaieth,” “Sinaieth,” and “Thineath.” As to the form “Chinnereth,” this is assigned to Naphthali. In later times it was called Genesaret (1 Macc. xiv. 34, Moffitt, o. a.). In the Talmudic period one Jonathan ben-Chara was buried there (Tosephat Kelim, s. f.). At the time of Farchi (beginning of the 14th century) it was still in existence; doubtless the ruins Genesaret, still found at the present day one hour north-west of Tiberiyyah, according to Fürst (Heb. Lex. p. 678, a), although no modern map lays it down. See CINNERRIT.

2. The district (N. T. γαία, γαία), named from its be-

sin-like form (like the body of a πώλε, or lyre). This was a small region of Galilee, on the western shore of this lake, visited by Christ on his way (southward along the lake) to Capernaum (Matt. xiv. 35, 86). It is described by Josephus (War. iii. 10, 8) as about four miles in length and three in breadth, and distinguished for its fertility and beauty. The Talmud also (Berak. 44) describes the luxuriant growth of this low-

lying district (נַ נָּר צַ נָּר) under the same name (נַ נָּר צַ נָּר). Dr. Robinson thus describes it (Bib. Rez. iii. 289 sq.): “The plain is a little below the main land. It is first called Aral el-Medjel, but further on takes the name of el-Choueir. ‘Little Ghor,’ which strictly, perhaps, includes the whole. It is exceedingly fertile and well watered; the soil, on the southern part at least, is a rich black mould, which in the vicinity of Medjel is a marl. Its fertility can hardly be exceeded; all kinds of grain and vegetables are produced in abundance, including rice in the moist-

er parts, while the natural productions, as at Tiberias and Jericho, are those of a more southern latitude. Indeed, in beauty, fertility, the landscape will answer well enough to the glowing though exaggerates description of Josephus. Among other pro-

ductions, he speaks here also of walnut-trees, but we did not note whether any now exist.” It is a crescent-shaped plain, about three miles long and two broad, shut in by steep, rugged hills. Only a few patches of it are cultivated, its melons and cucumbers being the first and best in market, owing to its deep depression. The rest is covered with tangled thickets of lotus-trees, oleanders, dwarf palms, and gigantic thistles and brambles. (See also Wilck, Josh. of the Bible, ii. 156 sq.; Tholen, Land and Leute. i. 589; Stanley, Palestine, p. 808.) In this identification of the plain of Genesaret with the one in question, Mr. De Saulcy coincides (Narrative, ii., 856-8; see also Hackett’s Illustr. p. 820). See CAPEMENAR.

3. The lake (γεννασάρ, N. T. and Josephus), or water (Clapp, i. 487; Bruno, Vita Joseph. Ant. xix. 3, 7), or sea (22, 0. T.). Josephus calls it Genesaret (Γεννασάρ, Αντ. xix. 2, 1), and this seems to have been its common name at the commencement of our era (Strab. v. 750; Plin. v. 16; Ptol. v. 15). At its north-western angle was a beautiful and fertile plain (Matt. xiv. 84), from which the name of the lake was taken (Josephus, War. iii. 10, 7). The lake is also called in the N. T. of Galilee which bordered on its western side (Matt. iv. 18; Mark vi. 81; John vi. 1); and “Sea of Tibe-

rias” from the celebrated city (John vi. 1; so also Barhebr. Chron. p. 400; the Talmud, Midrash Kolal. fol. 102, 1; Pausanias, ξυέμας Τηερίτις, v. 7, 3; Eusebius, ξυέμας Τηερίτις, Onom. s. v. Θερίθις; see also Cyr. ad Ise. i. 5). It is a curious fact that all the numerous names given to this lake were taken from places on its western side. Its modern name is likewise Bakter Tiberi-

yah. In Josh. i. 2, “the plains south of Chinnereth” are mentioned. It is the sea and not the city that is here referred to (comp. Deut. iii. 17; Josh. xii. 8), and the “plains” are those along the banks of the Jordan. Most of our Lord’s public life was spent in the environs of the Sea of Genesaret. On its shores stood Caperna-

um, “his own city” (Matt. iv. 13); on its shore he called his first disciples from their occupation as fisher-

men (Luke v. 1-11); and near its shores he spoke many of his parables and performed many of his mir-

acles. This region was then the most densely peopled in all Palestine. It was then not only the chief resort of the very shores of the lake, while numerous large villages dotted the plains and hill-sides around (Porter, Hand-


A mournful and solitary silence now reigns along the shores of the Sea of Genesaret, which in former ages rolled with the sounds of cities, and resounded with the din of an active and industrious people. Seven out of the nine cities above referred to are now unin-
habited ruins; one, Magdala, is occupied by half a doz-

en mud hovels; and Tiberias alone retains a wretched remnant of its former prosperity. See GALLIUS, SEA OF.

Gennesaret; Genesaret. See Gennesa-

ret.
GENEUS. See GENEOUS.

Genoese, Antoine Eugène de, a French priest and publicist, was born in 1792 at Montalbort. After the first expedition of Napoleon he entered the service of Louis XVIII, and became adjutant of the prince de Polignac. In 1820 he established the journal Le Directeur, the motto of which, "Vive l'empereur," xi. xxiii, 30, idolatrous, uncircumcised, and unclean (Isa. li, 1; Jer. ix, 26). Thus age after age the word became more invidious, and acquired a significance even more contemptuous than that of the Greek διόδος, the "door of the town," which, on numerous occasions to imitate the strange sound of foreign tongues, is paralleled by the Hebrew חֵּלָה, חֵלָה, a stammerer, applied to foreigners in Prov. xxiv, 10; Isa. xxviii, 11; xxxii, 19. The word חֵלָה gains its last tinge of hatred as applied to Jews by all Christians. Other expressions, intended to point out the same distinction, are used with a shade less of scorn; such, for instance, as יֵּילְשֵׁס (see Buxtorf, Lex. col. 728), or ולוא, those without, which is Hebraistically used in the N. T. (1 Tim. iii, 8). See Otho, Lex. Rob. p. 111; Schöttgen, loc. cit. in 1 Cor. xv, 12. In Mark iv, 11 it is applied to the incredulous Jews themselves); and בְּנֵי מִשְׁרְקָת, kingdom (1 Chron. xxiii, 50). The Jews applied the terms יֶנְסָרֹים, and, according to some Rabbis, בְּנֵי אַרְשָׂן, region of the sea, to all countries except Palestine, just as the Greeks distinguished between Hellas and η βα derbyos (2 Chron. xiii, 9; xvii, 10; Ezra ix, 1; Luke xii, 80; Lightfoot, Crit. Chorogr. i, ad init.). Although the Jews thus separated between themselves and other nations, they hesitated as little as the Romans did to include themselves in the Greek term βα derbyos (Josephus, Ant. xi, 7, 1; comp. Justin Mar. Apol. i, 46). See BARBARIAN.

In the N. T. θερι (although sometimes used in the singular of the Jewish nation. Acts x, 22; Luke vii, 5) is applied in this general sense to the inhabitants of any one of the countries of the east; and it is used of the people (Luke ii, 82). But the term most frequently thus rendered is (not θερι, but) Ἠλληνες, which is distinguished from Ἠλληνισται (Acts vi, 1), and, although literally meaning Greeks (as in Acts xv, 1, 5; xvi, 17, Rom. i, 14), yet usually denotes any non-Jews, because of the general prevalence of the Greek language (Rom. i, 16, and passim); 1 Cor. xii, 22; Gal. iii, 28, etc.). Thus Timothy, who was of Lystra, is called Ἠλλην (Acts vi, 1, 8), and a Syrophoenician woman Ἠλληνιστι σ (Mark vii, 26), and the Jews of the Dispersion, ἡ ἴδια Ἑλλάς (Acts xvi, 4).—Protoporia (Naples, 1787), and even found in the apocryphal writings, where Ἠλλη νίς is made a synonym to ἀληθινον (2 Macc. i, 13), and ἱδια τιν Ἠλλα προς πάντα Ἠλλα τοις ἰδια φίλοις (Schleusner, Lex. N. T. ii, 759). See GREEK.

It was perhaps impossible for the Jews, absorbed as they were in the contemplation of their own especial mission, to see or hear any true or profound record of the common brotherhood of all nations. Hedged round by a multitude of special institutions, and taught to regard the non-observance of these customs as a condition of uncleanness, imbued, too, with a blind and intense national pride—they often seem to regard the heathen amongst their existing at all for the purpose of punishing the apostacy of Judaea (Deut. xxviii, 49; 1 Kings viii, 38, etc.), or of undergoing vengeance for their enmity towards her (Isa. lxxiii, 6). The arrogant, unreasoning hatred towards other nations, generated by too exclusive an adherence upon this or that petty narrow conception, made the Jews the most unpopular nation of all antiquity (Tacitus, Hist. v, 2; "gens te tertima," ib. v, 8; Juvenal, Sat. iv, 103; Quint. Just. iii, 21; Pliny, xiii, 9; Dio Sis. Eccl. 84; Dio Cass.
GENTILIS

GENTILLET

ixviii, 33; Philostr. Apolol. v, 33; Ammian. Marcell. xxil, 5, "Sotienes Judei," etc., "contrary to all men," 2 Thess. ii, 15). Socially, he did not respect the laws of nature. As such, he lived in an environment where the Early Christians, who were generally considered as an unclean group, were not جميعه with the Jews, and eventually, the Jews themselves were also considered unclean by the Gentiles.

The life of Gentilus is a case study of the consequences of ignoring religious and moral laws. He was known to be a man of great wealth and influence, but his actions were seen as a threat to the religious and moral fabric of the community. His actions and beliefs were condemned by the Jewish community, and he was eventually excommunicated from the community.

The story of Gentilus is a warning to all who choose to ignore the laws and teachings of their community. His actions and beliefs are a reminder to us all to respect the laws and teachings of our community, and to live in a way that is consistent with the values and beliefs of our community.

The story of Gentilus is also a reminder of the importance of community and the need for unity. The community of Gentilus was divided and in conflict, and this division ultimately led to his downfall. The story of Gentilus is a reminder to us all of the importance of unity and the need to work together to build a strong and healthy community.
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Council of Trent, wherein the said council is proved in many points to be contrary to the ancient councils and canons, and to the king's authority." He died about 1605. See Bayle, Dict. s. v.; Haag, La France Protestant, vol. iv; Hoefier, Nouv. Bih. Générale, xix, 949.

Gentily, COUNCIL OF (Concilium Gentilicense), held on Christmas day, A.D. 767. Six legates from Rome, ambassadors from the emperor Constantine Copronymus, several Greek bishops, and most of the bishops of Gaul and Germany, were present, together with King Pepin and many of his nobles. The question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was discussed, with regard to the litany made by the emperor, and the words "filioque" to the creed. There was also a discussion concerning the use of images.—Landon, Manual of Councils, s. v.; Gieseler, Ch. History, vol. iii, § 12.

Genoots. See HINDOOS; INDIA.

Genubath (many Genubath) (Heb., Genubath', Genubat'; Pss., Sept., Genubas), the son of Hadad, of the Edom- itish royal family, by the sister of Tahpenes, the queen of Egypt (in the time of David), reared in Pharaoh's household (1 Kings xi, 90), to save him from the extermination by Joab (ver. 16). He was born (B.C. cir. 1086) in the palace of Pharaoh, and weaned by the queen herself; after which he became a member of the royal establishment, on the same footing as one of the sons of Pharaoh. Some connect the name with the Heb. ש.fillStyle, may mean treasure, and suppose the name either to be his, the product of a foreign amour (Clericus), or to his existence being owing to his father's having stolen away from the destructive fury of the Israelites (Thenius); others, with greater probability, find in it an allusion to the Egyptian deity Ἀινήφ and Cynphis.

See HADAD.

Genuflectores, genukneerders, kneesers, a class of penitents in the ancient Church; also called prostrati; prostraters, because they were allowed to stay after the hearers were dismissed, and to join in certain prayers particularly offered for them while they knelt. Forms of prayer, prepared for such occasions, are to be found in the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. viii, cap. viii); also in Chrysostom (Hom. 18 in 2 Cor.). The station of this class was within the nave or body of the church, near the ambo or reading-desk, where they received the bishop's benediction, and imposition of hands. Some canons call these the penitentes, by way of distinction from the others, but many hold that because they were most noted, and the greatest number of penitential acts were performed by them whilst they were in this station.—Bingham, Orig. Ecc. bk. x, ch. i, § 4, and xvii, ch. i, § 5.

Genuflection, the act of bending the knee, or kneeling in prayer. Baronius says that the early Christians carried the practice of genuflection so far, that some of them had worn cavities in the floor where they prayed; and Jerome relates of St. James, that he had, by this practice, contracted a hardness on his knees equal to that of camels. The Church of England gives many directions for the rubrics as to the proper time of kneeling in prayer; but warns all worshippers, in the last rubric on the communion service, that by the posture prescribed for receiving the symbols, "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."—Farrar, Ecc. Dictionary, s. v.; Buck, Theol. Dictionary, s. v. See KNEELING.


Geoffrey (Geoffroi) of Auvergne, a French theologian, was born at Auvergne about 1120. He studied under M. de Marci and was aeton of Paris when St. Bernard came there to preach on the conversion of the clergy (de conversione ad clericos). Deeply impressed by Bernard's preaching, he entered the convent of Clairvaux in 1140. For thirteen years he was principal secretary and travelling companion of St. Bernard. In 1161 or 1162 he was elected abbot of Clairvaux, but the monks, dissatisfied with the severity of his rule, petitioned Alexander III to depose him. Geoffrey voluntarily resigned, and withdrew to Clifflles, where he died. The monks of Citeaux sent a seer of the relics of St. Bernhard to attempt a reconciliation between the pope and emperor Frederick, but he did not succeed. The following year he endeavored to make peace between the archbishop of Canterbury and Henry II of England, who invited him to remain in his kingdom. Geoffrey became a consecrated abbot in 1170, and of Haute-Come in 1176. We have no information concerning him after 1188, though Oudin claims that he lived until 1215. He compiled the letters of St. Bernard, and his own writings have been inserted in the works of that saint. A number of his letters, together with a life of St. Bernard, and a tract against Gilbert de la Porre, will be found in Bernardi Opera, vol. ii. He is considered as the author of the Compendium Caesarii de corpore Christi et sacramento Exteriarum, a manuscript tract against Ablard. See Oudin, De Script. Æ. S. B., vol. ii; Bih. litér. de la France, xiv, 480; Hoefier, Nouv. Bih. Générale, xx, 27 sq.

Geoffrey of Monmouth (Geofruidus, Galiisidus, Gaufrieus) was first abedarch of Monmouth, afterwards bishop of St. Asaph. He died in 1154. He wrote a Chronicum seu Historia Brittonum in two books, supposed by some to be a translation from the Welsh. It is one of the sources for the legendary history of Britain. The first edition is that of Paris, 1568, 4to; the latest, that of J. A. Giles (London, 1844, 8vo). Translated, The British History, from the Latin by A. Thompson, Esq. (Lond. 1719, 8vo; new ed. revised by J. A. Giles, Lond. 1842, 8vo); also in Bohin's Annales, lib. iii, p. 402, Bih. Brittan. Libr., Anglo-Norman Period, p. 143-149.

Geogony. See COSMOGONY.

Geography, considered as a systematic description of the earth, took its rise at a much later period than other sciences, probably because it is of less essential necessity to man; yet the elements of the knowledge out of which scientific geography is constructed must have existed as soon as men turned their attention to the earth on which they lived, and found it necessary to journey from one part of its surface to another. See COSMOLOGY.

1. In the absence of positive statements, we have to gather the views of the Hebrews as to the form of the earth from their allusions, and the use of particular images or words in the poetical books, where it is difficult to decide how far the language is to be regarded as literal, and how far as metaphorical. There seem to be traces of the same ideas as prevailed among the Greeks, that the world was a disk (Isa. xi, 22; the word כSerializable, a circle, is applied exclusively to the circle of the horizon, whether bounded by earth, sea, or sky), bordered by the ocean (Deut. xxx. 13; Job xxxv. 10; Ps. cxxix. 9; Prov. viii. 27), with Jerusalem as its centre (Ezek. v. 5), which was thus regarded, like Delphi, as the navel (š622; Judg. ix, 87; Ezek. xxxviii, 12), or, according to another view (Genilus, Thesaurus, s. v.), the highest point of the world. The parages quoted in support of this view admit of a different interpretation: Jerusalem might be regarded as the centre of the world, not only as the seat of religious light and truth, but to a certain extent in a geographical sense; for Palestine was situated between the important empires of Assyria and Egypt: and not only between them, but above them, its elevation above the plains on either side contributing to the appearance of its centrality. A different view has been gathered from the expression "four corners" (כTt2, generally applied to the skirts of a garment), as though implying
the quadrangular shape of a garment stretched out, according to Eratosthenes's comparison; but the term "corners" may be applied in a metaphorical sense for the extreme ends of the world (Job xxxvii, 8; xxxviii, 13; Isa. xi, 12; xxiv, 16; Ezek. vii, 2). Finally, it is suggested by Bähr (Symbolik, i, 170) that these two views may have been held together, the former as the actual and the latter as the symbolical representation of the earth's form. See Earth.

In the account of creation mention is made of a spot called Eden, out of which a river, after watering Paradise, ran, and "from thence it was parted, and became into four heads" (fountains), which sent forth as many rivers—Pison, Gihon, Hiddekel, Phrat or Euphrates. See Exod. Josephus, on this point, says (Ant. i, 2), "The garden was watered by one river which ran round about the whole earth and was parted into four parts." The idea here presented is that of a vast circular plain (the earth), with water, a river, or the sea (seevion in Homer, II. xxi, 196) encircling it, from which encircling body of water ran the said four rivers. Such, whether derived from the Hebrew Scriptures or not, was the earliest conception entertained of the earth. That some such idea was entertained among the Hebrews, even at a later period, appears from the words found in Ps. xxiv, 2: "He hath founded it (the earth) upon the seas, and established it upon the floods" (see also Prov. viii, 27); though Job xxvi, 7, "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing" (compare Job xxxviii, 4, 6), would seem to intimate that the writer of that book entertained superior notions on the
point. That, however, the general idea was that the earth formed an immense disk ("the circle of the earth"), above which were the substantial and firmly fixed heavens, the abode of God, while the earth beneath was his footstool, appears from the general phraseology employed in the sacred books, and may be found specially exhibited or implied in the following passages: Isa. xi. 1 sq.; Job xxxvii, 18; Psa. cii. 25. See Astronomy.

As to the size of the earth, the Hebrews had but a very indefinite notion; in many passages the "earth," or "whole earth," is used as co-extensive with the Babylonian (Isa. xiii, 5; xiv, 7 sq.; xxiv, 17), or Assyrian empire (Isa. x. 14; xiv, 28; xxxvii, 18), just as at a later period the Roman empire was styled orbis terrarum; the "ends of the earth" (גְּפֹנָתָם) in the language of prophecy was applied to the nations on the border of these kingdoms, especially the Medes (Isa. v. 26; xiii, 5) in the east, and the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean in the west (Isa. xlii, 5, 9); but occasionally the boundary was contracted in this latter direction to the eastern shores of the Mediterranean (Isa. xxiv, 16; Zech. ix. 10; Psa. lxxii, 8). Without unduly pressing the language of prophecy, it may be said that the views of the Hebrews as to the size of the earth extended but little beyond the nations with which they came in contact; its solidity is frequently noticed, its dimensions but seldom (Job xxxviii, 18; Isa. xiii, 5). The world in this sense was sometimes described by the poetical term tevel (תְּפָלֶל), corresponding to the Greek orbis mundi (Isa. xiv, 21).

The earth was divided into four quarters or regions corresponding to the four points of the compass; these were described in various ways, sometimes according to their positions relatively to a person facing the east, before (מִזְמַעְתָּם), behind (מעֶה), the right hand (ימין), and the left hand (שמאל), representing respectively E., W., S., and N. (Job xxiii, 8, 9); sometimes relatively to the sun’s course, the rising (מִצְנָעַתָם), the setting (מִצְנָעְתָם), the brilliant quarter (בָּפָר), Ezek. xi, 24), and the dark quarter (מִצְנָעַתָם), Exod. xxi, 20; comp. the Greek Ζώρας, Hom. Il. xii, 240); sometimes as the seat of the four winds (Ezek. xxxvii, 9); and sometimes according to the physical characteristics, the sea (ים) for the W. (Gen. xxviii, 14), the porch (פָּרָח) for the S. (Exod. xxvii, 9), and the mountains (מִזְמַעֲתָם) for the N. (Isa. xiii, 4). The north appears to have been regarded as the highest part of the earth’s surface, in consequence, perhaps, of the mountain ranges which existed there, and thus the highest part of the earth (Job xxxvi, 7). The north was also the quarter in which the Hebrew El-Dorado lay, the land of gold mines (Job xxxvii, 22, margin; comp. Herod. iii, 116).

These terms are very indistinctly used when applied to special localities; for we find the north assigned as the quarter of Assyria (Jer. iii, 18), Babylonia (Jer. vi, 22), and the Euphrates (Jer. xvi, 10), and more frequently Media (Jer. i, 3; comp. ii, 11), while the south is especially represented by Egypt (Isa. xxx, 6; Dan. xi. 5). The Hebrews were not more exact in the use of terms descriptive of the physical features of the earth’s surface: for instance, the same term (ים) is applied to the sea (Mediterranean), to the lakes of Palestine, and to great rivers, such as the Nile (Isa. xviii, 2), and perhaps the Euphrates (Isa. xxvii, 1); mountain (עלה) signifies not only high ranges, such as Sinai or Ararat, but an elevated region (Jobh. xi, 16): river (ירדן) is occasionally applied to the sea (Jonah ii, 3; Psa. xxiv, 2) and to canals fed by rivers (Isa. xxxiv, 27). Their vocabulary, however, was ample for describing the special features of the lands with which they were acquainted, the terms for the different sorts of valleys, mountains, rivers, and springs being very numerous and expressive. We cannot fail to be
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struck with the adequate ideas of descriptive geography expressed in the directions given to the spies (Num. xiii. 17-20) and in the closing address of Moses (Deut. viii. 7-9); nor less, with the extreme accuracy and the variety of almost technical terms with which they described the scenes and the features of the land of Promise. They had acquired the art of surveying from the Egyptians (Jahn, i, 6, § 104). See Topographical Terms.

2. We proceed to give a brief sketch of the geographical knowledge of the Hebrews down to the period when their distinct names and ideas were superseded by those of classical writers. Like most other sciences, geography owes its elementary cultivation as a science to the Hellenic race, who, from the mythic period of their history down to the destruction of the Vandal empire (A.D. 476), continued to protract the study with more or less system, and to more or less definite results; yet it must be added that it is only in a qualified sense that the ancients may be said to have known or advanced scientific geography.

The highlands of Armenia would appear to have been described by the Phoenicians, that the Descendants from these, some may have gone eastward, others westward.

The latter alone are spoken of in Scripture. Coming south and west, the progenitors of the world first became acquainted with the countries lying between the Euphrates and the Tigris, roughly termed Media. From this they marched south and west into Aram or Syria, Arabia, Canaan, and Egypt. These are the chief countries with which the ancient Hebrews seem to have possessed an acquaintance; yet if the national geographical table found in Gen. x. is to be referred to the early period which its position in the Bible gives it, it would appear that the geographical knowledge of the Hebrews was, even before the flood, far more extensive, embracing even the "isles of the Gentiles." See Ethnology. Other parts of Scripture by no means warrant us in ascribing to the Hebrews, before the Babylonian captivity, a wider range of knowledge than we have indicated above. This national calamity had the effect of enlarging the circle of their knowledge of the earth, or at least of making their knowledge of Assyria, Media, and Babylonia more minute and definite. It was to their neighbors, the Phoenicians, that the Descendants, following from these, some may have gone eastward, others westward. According to Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. vi. 4, 36), the Egyptians had in circulation writings on geography. Their king Sesousri may have had maps (Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod. iv. 292; Goelet, Orig. des Libr. ii. 227), though probably the first attempt to form a map (that is, a written and printed description of places, with their relative positions and distances roughly guessed) is to be ascribed to the men whom Joshua (Josh. xviii) sent with orders to "go through the land and describe it;" and the men "went and passed through the land," and described it by cities into seven parts in a book.

At a later period, it is unquestionable that the Hebrews possessed a knowledge of the north-west, and a wider knowledge of the east, and even of the north of Asia (Ezek. xxvii; Isa. ii. 17). From the period of the Maccabees the Jews entered into relations of a more decided character, and they acquired a knowledge of the earth, and made them better acquainted with Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. In the time embraced by the New Testament history they must have been widely acquainted with the then known world, since colonies and individuals of their nation were spread over nearly the entire surface covered by ancient civilization, and identified with the Roman empire. The occasional, if not periodical, return of Jews to the land of their ancestors probably increased the relations which they would sustain with their mother country, must have greatly widened, and made less inaccurate, the knowledge entertained in Palestine of other parts of the world.

Accordingly we read (Acts ii. 5 sq.) that, at the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the "tongues of fire, as it were, divided and came and stood at Jerusalem Jews out of every nation under heaven."

3. The Hebrews do not seem to have devoted any attention to geography as a science, though they were widely scattered at the commencement of our era, and occupied a disjunctive place in literature. The Greeks probably led the way in systematic geography. The first map is said to have been constructed by Anaximander, about B.C. 600. Nearly a century later, Heceateus of Miletus wrote a geographical work entitled Ἴπαθικω Στράτος (Ubert, Geographiae des Hecat. und Domitian i. 37). Following this went Ptolemy, who made the first really scientific map of the world. The Phoenicians and Egyptians were likewise distinguished as geographers. Ptolemy acknowledges that his great work was based on a treatise written by Marinus of Tyre (Heeren, Commentatio de Ptolemaio Geographae Libri), etc.). Pliny, the only Roman writer who gives any account of the geographical science in the first century a. d., makes it a mere compiler. As a geography his book is of little value (see Ubert, Geographie d. Griech. u. Römer; Mannert, Geographie), etc.). Sacred geography was not reduced to a system until a comparatively recent time.

The Commentaries of Ptolemaio and some is an alphabetic list of places, with brief descriptions. The tract of Carduus, written in the 18th century, is little more than an itinerary. To Samuel Bochart, a French Protestant minister (born 1599), belongs the honor of writing the first systematic work on Biblical geography. His Geographiae Sacrae is a storehouse of learning from which all subsequent writers have drawn freely. Wells wrote his Historical Geography of the O. and N. T. in the beginning of last century. Reisch's Palestinena, published in 1714, remains to this day the standard classic work. Dr. Robinson's Researches opened a new era in Biblical geography. It is neither complete nor systematic; it is only a book of travels, with most important historical and geographical illustrations. Ritter's Palastina und Syria aims at system and completeness, but it is too diffuse. It gives use of the land, though there is little upon the Bible lands. A systematic and thorough treatment on Biblical geography is still a great desideratum in literature. See Archæology, Biblical.

Among the profane writers, Herodotus mentions Palestine, and probably Jerusalem, which he names Cadya (Herod. i. 163; ii. 106, 157, 159; iii. 5, 62, 64, 91; iv. 39). Strabo (in the time of Augustus) treats of Palestine in the second chapter of his sixteenth book on Geography, mingling together much truth and much error. Ptolemy, who died A.D. 161, treated of Palestine and the neighboring countries in chapter, xvii-xvii of his Geography. His Geographia Sacra (published in 1757) contains the conquest of Palestine by Pompey (xxvii., 15-17), the siege of Jerusalem by Titus (ix. 4-7), the restoration of the Temple by Hadrian, and the insurrection of the Jews under the same emperor (ix. 12-14). Of the Roman writers, the most useful is Tacitus (v., 18-19), treaties of Syria, including Palestine, and supplies much useful information. Tacitus's History, from the first to the thirteenth chapter of the fifth book, also relates to our subject. He hated both Jews and Christians (Annal. xi. 44), and in consequence gave such a false and paltry conception of what he knew or supposed to the Jews (Hist. ii. 8, 4; ii. 79; Annal. ii. 42; xii. 28). Some information may also be found in Justin (xxxvii. 2), in Suetonius (Augustus, 28; Claudius, 29, 28; Vespasian,
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4, 5; Titus, 4, 5), in Pomponius Mela (1, 5), and in Ammianus Marcellinus (xiv, 8; xvi, 1).

Among the fathers of the Church much serviceable knowledge on the subject of Biblical geography may be found in the John writings of Lector and Jerome. The most important work, however, is the Onomasticon urbium et locorum sacra Scripturae (ed. J. Bonfrere, 1707). Living as they did for a long time in Palestine, the writings both of Eusebius and Jerome possess peculiar value, however, because they are given less as the times of which they speak recede from their

Some Arabian writers are not without value. We have Edrisi, Geographia Nubiensis (Paris, 1815); also Abulfeda Tabula Syria, and his Annales Musulmici, Schultens, in his Inser Geographicus in Visam Saladinii (Lucignani Batar, 1792), has collected many observations of Arabian authors on Palestine. See also Rosenmüller, Icones. 1, 34; Ritter, Erdkunde, ii, 478.

Modern works of travel in Bice countries have contributed much original information on this subject. They are too numerous, especially those on Palestine (q. v.), to be enumerated here in detail. Some of them may be seen in Durling's Cyclopaedia, col. 1819 sq; and most of them are referred to under each country in this work. The following lists embrace the most important in the several classes, including the above, as far as the space will permit.

a. Ancient and Medieval Writers: In this class are included the following works:

1. The chief text-book is of course the Bible. Next to this are (1.) Jumeinn—The Apostrophos; Josephus, Opera (ed. Hudson, 1729, 2 vols., fol.); Trall's translation of the W. London, 1838, 4 vols.; Strabo, Geographia (ed. Cassanbo, Geneve, 1867); Pliny, Historia Naturalis (ed. Sillig, Geneve, 1864-60, 6 vols.). Dio Cassius (Hamburgh, 1792) gives some account of the East. His work is a matter of great value in Tacitus and Livy are of little value. (2. Christian—Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, in Histories Eccles. Scriptores, Grecor, 1859, 4 vols.; Jerome, Opera (ed. Migne, 9 vols. fol.). Theodoret, Opera (ed. Migne, 8 vols.); In the exegetical writings of Jerome and Theodoret are some useful notes on places they both resided in Palestine. William of Tyre, Historia Belli Sacri; James de Vitry, Historia Orientalis, etc. (these two works, with several others, are contained in Bonner's Gesta Dei per Francos, fol. 1611); Chronicles of the Crusades (ed. Monastier, 2 vols.); Edward of Devizes, Geoffrey de Vinsauf, and De Joinville.

2. Geographical Works and Itineraries:—The best are Geographia (vol. 1535); Tabula Peutingeriana, a rude chart of the Roman empire, made in the 3rd century. Reland gives the part including Palestine. Eusebius and Jerome, Onomasticon Urbium et Locorum Sacra Scripturae (ed. Clerico, fol. 1707; last edit. by Larow and Parthey, 1863); Vetara Romanorum Itineraria (ed. Wesselingius, 1730), containing the important itineraries of the Bordeaux pilgrimage, and of Antonine, with Synecdoces of Hierocles; Edrisi, Geographia Universali (in Rosenmüller's Analecta Arabica, 1829); Topographical Index in Bokhadi Vias et Resta Kota Saladin (ed. Schulz, folio, 1732); Brocardus, Locorum Terrae San. Description (ed. Clerico, appended to the Onomasticon, folio, 1707); Abulfeda, Tabula Syriaca (1735); Busching, Geographia Universa (1730); Leuschner, Itinerarium Byzantium (1712, 3 vols. fol.); Sanson, Geographia Sacra (ed. Clerico, folio, 1714); Carolis A. S. Paulus, Geographia Sacra (ed. Holsten, folio, 1704); Cellarius, Notitia Orbis Antiqui (1701-5, 2 vols. fol.). Wells, Historical Geography of the C. and N. T. (1819, 2 vols.); Reland, Palestinae Scripta (1718, 2 vols. fol.); G. de Bobois, Jerusalem, 2 vols. fol.; Busching, Erdreisabriefe, Pallatina, Arabien, etc. (1785); Rosenmüller, Bib. Geogr. of Central Asia (by Morren, 1836, 2 vols.); Rauner, Paltina (1850); Forster, Historical Geography of Arabia (1844, 2 vols.); Brör, Historico-Geographica, Account of Palestine (1843); Ritter, Die Sinai-Hilbien, Paltina und Syrien (1848-55, 4 vols. in six parts; an English transl. has appeared, Lond. 1868, 2 vols.); Kitto, Physical Geography of Palestine (1841, 2 vols.); Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul (1855, 2 vols. fol.); Smith, Voyage and Shrewde, of St. Paul (2d ed. 1855); Porter, Island-hand book for Syria and Palestine (1858, 2 vols.); Van de Velde, Map of Palestine (1858); Robinson, Phys. Geog. of the Holy Land (2d ed. 1855).

b. Books of Travel:—Wright's Early Travels in Palestine (1848, containing, among others, Arculf, Sewulf, Benjamin of Tudela, Maundeville, and Maundrell); Cotovicius, Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum (1913); Quarnemont, Historia Theolochica et Moralis Terrae Sanctae (1841); Elchelide, Travels in Syria and Egypt (1841, 2 vols.); D'Arriuex, Travels in Arabia the Desert (1782); Shaw, Travels in Barbary and the Levant (1808, 2 vols.); Pococke, Description of the East (1743-45, 4 vols. fol.); Hasselquist, Travels in the Levant (1766); Niebuhr, Travels through Arabia (1728, 2 vols.); Volney, Voyage en Syrie, etc. (Paris, 1807, 2 vols. fol.); Collectanea and Observations touching notes and illustrations. (2) Heathen—Herodotus, especially Rawlinson's translation (Lond. and N. York, 1858-60, 4 vols.); Strabo, Geographia (ed. Cassanbo, Geneve, 1867); Pliney, Historia Naturalis (ed. Sillig, Geneve, 1864-60, 6 vols.). Dio Cassius (Hamburgh, 1792) gives some account of the East. His work is of great value in Tacitus and Livy are of little value. (3.) Christian—Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, in Histories Eccles. Scriptores, Grecor, 1859, 3 vols. fol.; Jerome, Opera (ed. Migne, 9 vols. fol.); Theodoret, Opera (ed. Migne, 8 vols.); In the exegetical writings of Jerome and Theodoret are some useful notes on places they both resided in Palestine. William of Tyre, Historia Belli Sacri; James de Vitry, Historia Orientalis, etc. (these two works, with several others, are contained in Bonner's Gesta Dei per Francos, fol. 1611); Chronicles of the Crusades (ed. Monastier, 2 vols.); Edward of Devizes, Geoffrey de Vinsauf, and de Joinville.

b. Geographical Works and Itineraries:—The Polomy, Geographia (vol. 1535); Tabula Peutingeriana, a rude chart of the Roman empire, made in the 3rd century. Reland gives the part including Palestine. Eusebius and Jerome, Onomasticon Urbium et Locorum Sacra Scripturae (ed. Clerico, folio, 1707; last edit. by Larow and Parthey, 1862); Vetera Romanorum Itineraria (ed. Wesselingius, 1730), containing the important itineraries of the Bordeaux pilgrimage, and of Antonine, with Synecdoces of Hierocles; Edrisi, Geographia Universali (in Rosenmüller's Analecta Arabica, 1829); Topographical Index in Bokhadi Vias et Resta Kota Saladin (ed. Schulz, folio, 1732); Brocardus, Locorum Terrae San. Description (ed. Clerico, appended to the Onomasticon, folio, 1707); Abulfeda, Tabula Syriaca (1735); Busching, Geographia Universa (1730); Leuschner, Itinerarium Byzantium (1712, 3 vols. fol.); Sanson, Geographia Sacra (ed. Clerico, folio, 1714); Carolis A. S. Paulus, Geographia Sacra (ed. Holsten, folio, 1704); Cellarius, Notitia Orbis Antiqui (1701-5, 2 vols. fol.). Wells, Historical Geography of the C. and N. T. (1819, 2 vols.); Reland, Palestinae Scripta (1718, 2 vols. fol.); G. de Bobois, Jerusalem, 2 vols. fol.; Busching, Erdreisabriefe, Pallatina, Arabien, etc. (1785); Rosenmüller, Bib. Geogr. of Central Asia (by Morren, 1836, 2 vols.); Rauner, Paltina (1850); Forster, Historical Geography of Arabia (1844, 2 vols.);

I. History of the Inquiry.—(Comp. the treatise of Paxton, The Earth and the World, Lond. 1858, p. 129–189.) The prevalent opinion among the learned for upwards of two centuries after the revival of letters was that organic remains were mere mineral concretions which had been invented to account for their production in methods quite worthy of the school of subtle philosophy whence they issued. This was maintained, not by obscure monks, but by really accomplished persons, the lights of natural history in their day, such as Fallopio, Mercati, and Olivi in Italy, Plot and Lister in England, and Agricola in Germany.

The excavations made for repairing the city of Verona in 1517 brought to light a number of fossil remains, the appearance of which exercised the wits of that time; and, among others, Fracastoro boldly expounded their true meaning and relations. He declared that they had not originated in any such "plastic force" as was pretended, nor could they have been the results of the waters of the deluge. After having been rescued from the mineral kingdom, they were easily and naturally attributed to the deluge. Fabio Colonno, in 1600, and the whole of the Italian writers of this period, considered that all petrifications were the remains of the Noahian deluge.

In 1639, Steno, a Dane, attached to the court of Tuscany, exposed the true theory of organic fossils, which he deduced from the examination of the sedimentary rocks by selecting strata which appeared to him to be unmosaiferous, and treating them as having been created before the existence of animals and plants. In 1676, Quirini contended that the diluvial waters could not have effecte all the operations attributed to them, and maintained that the universality of the Mosaic deluge was not to be insisted on. In 1688, Robert Hook, in his posthumous treatise on earthquakes, assigns to organic remains their true character, and supposes that some species may have been lost. In his diluvial theory he attempted to crowd the time between the creation and the deluge, and into the latter, all the visible phenomena of upheaval or dislocation.

In 1690, Dr. Thomas Burnet, in his Sacred Theory of the Earth, describes the earth at the beginning as a fluid mass composed of all kinds of materials. The heaviest descended to the bottom and formed a solid kernel, around which the waters, and afterwards the atmosphere, united; but between the water and atmosphere there was formed an oily stratum, which received, little by little, all the earthly constituents with which the gists, or similar charges, were mixed. Of this, he supposed to be the bed, marshy, thin, uniform, level, without mountains, without valleys, without either seas or rivers, lived the antediluvian generations. At this epoch the marshy crust, dried up by the heat of the sun, split, and fell down in the great abyss of waters. From thence came the universal deluge, the disarrangement of the axis of the globe, and the changing of climates. The earth, thus drowned, had still some cavities into which this water and other materials were returned to their subterranean reservoir. Thus the ocean is a part of the great abyss, the islands are the fragments, the continents are the great residuary masses of the old world. To the confusion brought about by the breaking up of the waters are owing the mountains and other unequal parts of the earth. This is a specimen of a large class of writings which passed for the effusions of learning and piety in the Augustan age of English literature.

In 1656, Whitson, the great astronomer, published his Discourse of the Deluge of the earth. He conceived of the earth as still having in its midst a solid and burning kernel, retaining the heat which it received from the sun when it was only the nucleus of the comet, and continually spreading it towards its circumference. This nucleus is itself surrounded by a great abyss, which is composed of two rings, of which the lower is a heavy fluid, and the upper water; it is this layer of water which constitutes the foundation of our earth. The deluge was occasioned by another comet striking the earth, and was the parent of all the disturbances now manifest in its crust.

About the same time, great Leibnitz wrote of the earth as an extinct sun vitrified. According to him, its greater portion was the subject of a violent fire, at the time when Moses tells us that the light was separated from the darkness. The fusion of the globe produced a vitrified crust; when the crust was cold, the humid parts, which had risen in vapour, fell again, and formed the ocean. The sea then deposited calcareous rocks. It at first enveloped all the surface of the globe, and surrounded the higher parts which at present form the continents and isles. Thus the shells and other rubbish of marine animals that one finds everywhere prove that the sea has covered all the land; and the great quantity of fixed salts, of sand, and other matters, fused and calcined in the earth, testify to the universal fire, and that it preceded the existence of the sea.

In 1696, Dr. Woodward, in his Discourse on the Natural History of the Earth, most ably vindicates the proper nature of organic remains, and disposes of the views of those who attribute them to casual inundations, or to the wash of the sea when the land was first made; but he is equally unsuccessful in the formation of a hypothesis of a hypothetical origin. He holds that at the deluge the solid strata of the earth were dissolved in the water; the remains of animals sank down and became imbedded according to their relative gravity.

In Italy, Vallierani, finding by his own careful observations that the facts were not in accordance with the theories then in vogue, which were affirmed to be founded in the interpretation of Scripture, attacked the interpreters, and demonstrated that they were in error. He wisely contented himself with recording his own observations; and would not attempt the construction of a theory.

In 1740, Moro, on the other hand, with much that is valuable in his onslaught upon other cosmogoniasts, fell into the error of becoming one of their number. His theory, however, is much more consistent, as well as reverential to the truth, than that of any of his predecessors.

In 1749, Buffon published, like his fellow philosophers, a theory of the earth, which is now found in the first part of his collected works. It is a free and easy way of world-making. Of course one begins with a comet, volcanic and aqueous forces at pleasure. The Sorbonne required him to recant so much of his work
as expressed the sentiment that the waters of the sea had produced the land, and then left it dry, and that the land was again, by wear and tear, gradually merging into the sea. The recantation is published with his consent, while his sons, as author forty years' thought, and enjoyed uncommon reputation. Even now their decision of tone and eloquence of statement command an interest.

In 1756, Lehmann, the German mineralogist, confined the action of the flood to the production of a few only of the rocks, and assigned the inoffensive strata to the original creation, and the conglomerates to an intermediate revolution.

In 1760, Michell, who held for eight years the Woodwardian professorship at Cambridge, showed himself to be the true predecessor of modern geology. Neglecting cosmogony altogether, and applying himself to the description of the strata as they appeared under his own observation, he discovered the true sequence of the beds, and indicated a direction in which the geologist might pursue his labors without infringing on theology.

After Michell, the visions of the cosmogonists were again reproduced by various English writers. Sound geology, however, began to take precedence of world-making; the actual wonders of the subterranean world were preferred to the fancy creations of the world-makers. Hutton, Wilson, and William Smith, the latter comprising Cuvier and Brogniart, kept the republic of letters well employed in acquiring the grammar of the new science, which was created by physical researches into the strata and their contents. Henceforward cosmogony assumes a second-rate position.

De Luc, in 1799, wrote the chronology of Moses, as only commencing with the creation of man; and of the days of creation as being not natural days, but indefinite periods. A long line of illustrous men, many of whom are now living, diverted attention from the vain attempts of the early philosophers, and occupied themselves exclusively with descriptive geology. A classification of opinions — taking only the views of the leading men—will serve to show, in a general way, what has been said and done for the last fifty years in this department of knowledge. The following are the principal hypotheses:

1. That the days of creation are indefinite periods, during which all the phenomena of geology occurred; that the deluge is now marked by the drift and gravel remains of the post-tertiary age (Cuvier, Parkinson, Jameson, and others).

2. That the first sentence of Genesis has no connection with the subsequent verses. The phenomena of geology have place between the first and second verses. The chaos was universal, and ushered in the present creation (Chalmers, 1864. See also The Earth's Antiquity in Harmony with the Mosaic Account of Creation, by James Gray, M.A., 1849).

3. That the earth that now is was the bed of the antediluvian sea. That all the phenomena now visible resulted from operations in the interval between the creation and the end of the deluge. That, save this, the rocks were created as they now exist (Granville Penn, Young).

4. That we cannot rely on an interpretation of the Hebrew records, and therefore we may set them aside when apparently at variance with geological facts (Babbage).

5. That the records are poetical representations, and not historical (Baden Powell).

6. That the first verse is a detached account of the original creation. The chaos, the six days' creation, and the flood were local phenomena, and refer to what was actually in the province occupied by man only (Dr. Pye Smith).

7. That the "days" were great natural periods. The Paleozoic system, pre-eminently that of plants, is the work of the third day; the secondary, pre-eminently the epoch of sea-monsters and creeping things, is the work of the fifth day; and the tertiary, the time of mammalian creatures, is the work of the sixth day" (Hugh Miller).

8. That the Mosaic narrative is a revelation made in visions to the mind of the prophet; the days are therefore spoken of not in connection with the events, but the duration of the vision. The events occurred in extremely lengthened periods. The deluge was partial (Lime, Mosaic Record in harmony with Geology, 1864; Preachers, Genesis of the Earth and Man, 1867).

9. That all creation took place consecutively, according to the literal reading of Gen. i. All things, fossil and recent, form part of one whole system of life, and were created at once on the successive days of creation. That the fossil species have been geologically extinct, and their remains buried by disturbances occurring from the first (L'Abbe Soignet, Cosmogonie de la Bible, Paris, 1854).

10. P. H. Gosse (Omphaklos, Lond., 1857). The theory of this writer is a reproduction of Granville Penn, with a dash of the old, and a streak of rational and anti-geologic notion of the creation of the rocks, with fossils complete as they are. He affirms a principle which he calls the law of "prochronism," in virtue of which the strata of the surface of the earth, with their fossil flora and fauna, may possibly belong to a "prochronic" (i.e. to an unreal, fantastic, or typical) development of the mighty plan of the life history of the world.

The preceding account, though it is only a very general view of the principal hypotheses on this subject, yet sufficiently shows how the minds of the framers have been fixed. The form of the sacred writings. They have done homage, unconsciously in many instances, to divine truth, by acknowledging the necessity of accordance with it, however widely they have diverged from its plain teaching. It is a notable instance of the commanding power of the Scriptures that thus far, in ages of skepticism and of enlightenment, they should still have been the polestar, guiding all voyagers in their pathless track towards the unknown.

11. We have reserved until last, as being, on the whole, the most comprehensive and satisfactory, the conclusions of Old Testament writers, which have now for some years been before the world (originally sketched in Kitts's Journal, Jan. 1850), and have not been refuted by any philologist. He affirms that, apart from geological considerations, and judging from analogy with Scripture alone, the Interpretation of the sacred volume renders the following ten propositions credible:

(1.) That the absolute age of our earth is not defined in the sacred volume.

(2.) That there may have been a long interval in duration between the creation of "the heaven and the earth" mentioned in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis and the continuation of the earth's history in the second verse.

(3.) That the term "the earth" does not apply necessarily, in every instance, to the whole of our planet, but sometimes only to a part of it.

(4.) That the state of the earth, described in the second verse as "without form and void," does not necessarily mean matter never reduced to form and order, but may signify matter reduced to disorder, after previous organization and arrangement.

(5.) That the "darkness" "upon the face of the deep," also mentioned in the second verse, is not negative of the present existence of light, but may have been only a temporary one.

(6.) That the commencement of the account of the first six days' creation dates from the beginning of the third day; and God said, Let there be light.

(7.) That the act of "the first day" does not necessarily signify the creation of light, but may have been only the calling of it into operation upon the scene of "darkness" described in the second verse.
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(8.) That the calling of "the light Day" and "the
darkness Night," with the declaration that "the even-
ing and the morning were the first day," does not nec-
essarily imply that this was the first day, absolutely
speaking.

(9.) That the work of "the second day," mentioned
in the sixth, seventh, and eighth verses, may have been
only an operation performed upon the atmosphere of
our earth.

(10.) That the work of "the fourth day," described
from the fourteenth to the eighteenth verses, does not
necessarily imply that the sun, moon, and stars were
then first created or formed, for the first time, from
pre-existent matter; but may only have been that
which was first in the geological history of the presen
time, made visible to it, and ordained to their offices with
respect to the coming hu-
man creation (Genesis and Geology, Lond. 1832; Phila.
1853).

11. Controversy between Geologists and Theologians.—
"The kindred sciences of geology and palaeogoggy
cannot yet be said to have been in existence more than
eighty years. But they had scarcely begun to assume
the form and lineaments of sciences when that jeal-
ousy, which has never since the days of Galileo ceased
to exist to some extent between the theologian and the
gleologist, in the sense in which the word was used by
the theologian was alarmed by rumors that the rocks, un-
der the searching eye of the geologist, disclosed a state
of facts which was wholly at variance with the Mosaic
detail of the manner and order of the creation; and
that which the creationist had been taught, was to be
condemned and denounced, in no very measured
terms, as destructive of the doctrine of the divine in-
spiration of the Scriptures, and as infidel in their
inception and tendency. On the other hand, the man
of science was not slow in retorting that, if the record
of Moses was the Divine origin, it had nothing to rup-
ture the development of facts; and that, if it
might not be the test of physical truth, it must give
way, even though it stood on the threshold of the
treasury of inspiration; for that, in such a crisis, the
memory of the senses with which man has been end-
dowed for his guidance must prevail against unsure
matters of faith. In argument the man of science
had the advantage, but in practice he erred by too fre-
quently assuming geological facts and Scripture inter-
pretation without sufficient inquiry, and so contribu-
ting to the present absurdity which is so generally ex-
posed. The theory of the universal waters and the
word and the works of God, which, by the decrees of
Omni-science, must ever be joined together.

"The contest, in its early stages, was carried on by
those theologians who contended the Mosaic days of
the creation to have been six successive natural days
of twenty-four hours each, measured by the revolution
of our globe on its axis; and the objection of the ge-
ologist was founded on the obvious impossibility or
absurdity that the world could have been stocked
with the various animal and vegetable organisms, whose
remains have been found in the crust of the earth, in
the brief period of the six natural days that preceded the
birth of Adam. The evidence was incontrovertible
that for untold ages before that event generation upon
generation of extinct animals had lived and died upon
the earth.

1. To meet this difficulty, which threatened to bloc
out the first page of the Scriptures from inspired rev-
olution, and which was obviously subversive of the
authenticity and inspiration of all Scripture, a host of
champions arose, who, instead of examining with pa-
tience and testing with care the alleged facts of geol-
yogy, recklessly denied their existence, or sought to
explain and account for them on wholly inadequate,
and in many instances on false and absurd principles
and grounds. Some ascribed the existence of fossil
remains to the flood in the days of Noah; others to
what was termed a plastic power that existed as one
of the natural laws of matter; and others, again, in-
sisted that the various systems of rocks were created
by the flat of the Almighty with the fossil remains of
animals that never lived, and of plants that had never
grown, imbedded in them. These were the rea-
sonings of Granville Penn, Fairholm, Kirby, Sharon
Turner, Gisborne, Taylor, dean Cockburn, etc.; and
of them it is unnecessary to say more than that the
progress of science discoveries has extinguished their
arguments, not only without injury to the cause of
Scripture truth, but with the effect of establishing it
on a surer basis.

2. Another class of inquirers sought to solve the
difficulty by conceding the well-established facts of
geology, and the deductions from those facts, but sug-
uggesting that the imperfection of our knowledge of
the original Hebrew at the present day was such as to
preclude all certainty of a right interpretation of its
meaning. This was the position of Babbage; while
Baden Powell insisted that the narrative of the crea-
tion is couched in the simple language of the choice
mythical poetry, and was not intended to be a historical
detail of natural occurrences. It is satisfactory to know
that the ne-
cessity for arguments so injurious in their tendencies
are the cause of the truth and integrity of the Bible no
longer exists; for the precision of the Mosaic phrase-
ology was never so well defended by the theologian as
it had been taken in the development of the truths of
geology.

3. At an early period of this controversy, Dr. Cal-
mers, whose sagacious mind and prudent foresight
comprehended the importance of this issue between
the facts of geology and the sacred Scriptures,
proposed the proposition that 'the writings of Moses
do not fix the antiquity of the globe'—that after the
creation of the heavens and the earth, which
could have comprehended any interval of time and
any extent of animal and vegetable life, a chaotic period
of darkness and separation held its place upon our
globe, and the earth became, in Scripture language,
'without form and void,' and all that had previously
existed was, by some catastrophe, blotted out, and a
new world of light and life produced, by fits of the
Daity, in a period of six natural days, closing with
the birth of Adam: and thus the whole of the earth
now exists was cut off from that which preceded it by a
period of black, chaotic disorder. The geologist had
thus ample room for the existence of all the organisms
whose remains are found in the rocks that compose
the crust of the earth, and there was no specific in-
vestigation of the nature and order of geological events
without endangering the truth of the Mosaic record of
the creation.'

Against this view Dr. Conant urges several ob-
jections (Revised Version of Genesis, p. xx), the force of
which, however, may, in a great measure be readily
parried. 1. The sacred writer himself gives no inti-
mation of such an interval. Of course not, since its
mention forms no part of his plan. An argumentum a
silentio is wholly invalid. It is sufficient if a space
can be found in point of fact. 2. It assumes that Mo-
ses has given us an account of only one part of the crea-
tive work. But no one claims that he has given all
the details of creation, or even a complete outline of
it. His object was merely to state so much as stands
connected with human history; and on the view in
question, this is more perfectly done to evince the
other interpretation, since it was the last creative stage
by which the earth was specially fitted for man's abode.

8. Science shows no such convulsion in the period pre-
ceding man's introduction on the earth. On the con-
trary, an innumerable series of such cataclysms are
revealed, by the very nature and character of the var-
ious strata of the earth's crust, and there is special evidence of some general
ice-wave almost immediately preceding the historic
period, in the phenomena of drift, bowlders, and strata-
ned rocks, all of which are everywhere strewn upon
the present surface of the globe. 4. Six extended cre-
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ative periods allow time for the operation of second causes, such as those which were common for long ages in the formation of the earth, whereas six mere days would be no more called for than a single instant, such as that in which the Almighty first evoked the primitive matter into being. But we are not competent to prescribe what would be a worthy process for the formation of the heavens and earth and their astonishing significance of these week-days as compared with the Sabbath. Besides, the theory in question affords equal scope with any other for the cycles of geogyology, geology, and zoology, while it brings the inspired narrative closer to man's present condition with his animal and vegetable companions. For example, on the opposite view, little propriety could be made out of the historical statement, Gen. ii, 19, 20: "Now Jehovah God had formed from the ground every living [thing] of the field, and every bird of the heavens, and brought [each] to the man to see what he would call it; so that whatever the man might call it [as] a living creature, that [was] its name; accordingly, the man called names to all the cattle, and to the bird of the heavens, and to every living [thing] of the field; but for the man [one] did not find a helper as his counter-part, and Jehovah God formed from Adam's body's dust a woman. Forth with in the field in six days Jehovah God reviewed the fossil forms of long-extinct species from the bowels of the earth; and yet he must have done so if the animated tribes just spoken of, which are obviously the same with those of the sixth demiological day, were those of the geological ages. The advocates of a literal sense through intemperance, say, the first six day are at liberty to apply the above-quoted language to an inspection of merely the surrounding creatures, or those inhabiting the garden of Eden along with Adam, as specimens of the various races roaming the earth—as in the case of the animals assembled in his own neighborhood by Noah into the ark [see Deluge]; for their interpretation gradually narrows down the scope of the Mosaic cosmogony to man's special accommodation; but this symbolical theory, being throughout of cosmopolitan extent, requires all its text to be taken in their most usual application. Indeed, in order to be consistent, it should not be content with the creation of a single human pair, and their location in a particular spot; but it really favors the modern skeptical demand for an aboriginally widespread humanity in various independent centers of origination. See Am."

The objections of Kalisch (Commentary on Genesis, p. 46 sq.), who concludes that, "with regard to astrology and geology, the Biblical records are, in many essential points, utterly and irreconcilably at variance with the established results of modern researches" (p. 52), are as follows: (1) That the connecting ένεργόν, of ver. 2, "expresses immediate sequence." So little force is there in this as an absolute or universal remark, that the connection in question occasionally appears at the beginning of a book (Exod. i, 1; 1 Kings i, 1; Ezra i, 1) or even an isolated epistle (2 Kings v, 6; x, 2). See Gesenius, Theaurus, p. 355, b. (2. Exod. xx. 2). For in six days Jehovah God made the heavens and the earth," etc., so far from being "in direct opposition" to this view, is in exact agreement with it, since that expression, which is a mere repetition of the summary statement in Gen. ii, 1, contains not one syllable concerning the creation (it is N.Σ.Σ. there, not N.Σ.Σ. as in Gen. i, 1) of matter. The formula "heavens and earth" in Gen. i, 1 denotes the universe in its present state of animal life is specified. (3) Abraham appropriately compares "heavens and earth," although expressive of the universe, does not mean the celestial and terrestrial worlds as such, or as now extant, but merely their elementary state or materials. This will be disputed by few if any interpreters. But thus, under any theory, a long interval must have elapsed between this primordial state of matter, and its organization or crystallization which refutes itself. (4) "The earth could not have been termed 'dreary and empty' if it had [badly] teemed with life and vegetation long before." Certainly it could if this life and vegetation had been destroyed, as we suppose. (5) For the same reason, the argument cited by the same author (p. 45) from Hugh Miller (Transactions of the Geologists, p. 121, 122) is inappropriate here, that "for this origin moral and religious, it is led into being not a of [the species of] his humble contemporaries of the fields and woods enjoyed life in their present haunts, and that for thousands of years previous to their appearance many of the existing species of animals were inanimate and in the air. Species may very readily have been recreated, on the theory we are now advocating, even if they had been exterminates just before the period of man—which, however, does not necessarily follow, for their germs may have survived the cataclysm suppose."

The objections which Dr. Taylor Lewis urges against this "chasm theory," as he styles it, and which he regards as "the most difficult as well as the most unsatisfactory" of all the proposed solutions, are still less forcible (Lange's Commentary on Genesis, p. 157): 1. The incongruity between the spoken and the events of verse 1, after the words of the becoming are repeated, and after these words there is no direct connection. 2. Want of natural or moral reasons for the alleged catastrophes. But no catastrophe is stated in the narrative; it is only an inference of modern times. The theory is evidently brought in geologically as a difficulty or objection to the interpretation against it, for all the modern explanations are but ingenious devices to meet some speculative view, except the bale one that holds to the literal creation of the universe in six periods of twenty-four hours each. On the other hand, the interpretation under consideration simply allows Moses to say nothing about matters with which he had nothing to do. We protest against making him wise in all the modern scientific ratiocinations. 4. It makes the "heavens" of ver. 1 different from those of ver. 8. This is true only as to the extension of the term, which the different character of the two contexts requires us to vary. Does any reasonable interpreter suppose the mere sky alone to be meant in ver. 1, as in ver. 8? 5. The connecting "and," does not admit "so sharp and remote a severance" in the history. We may reply that there was no wide gap in the imagination of the writer; it exists only in the mind of the modern savant. But, supposing that Moses did know all about the period thus ignored by him, every Bible reader is aware how often in the Bible the silence is silently bridged by the conjunction in question, which might almost be described as a "disjunctive" rather than a copulative. The erudite objector himself candidly admits (p. 180) that such minute grammatical points as the sense of the verb T.M. in, "was," instead of T.M., as well as the question whether the first day is exclusive or inclusive of the "beginning," are inconclusive.

On the other hand, the sacred text itself discloses several positive indications of such a hiatus as we have supposed between verse 1 and 2 of Gen. i. (1) The term "beginning" implies a sequel or later stage of creation, especially as it stands in so emphatic a position and a different form. (2. Act here designated by the word "created" is not a general one, of which the details follow, but one totally distinct in kind from them, namely, the abomination of matter itself; hence it is not used again until the bringing into existence of that which is specified. (3) If the sequence is thus precise "heavens and earth," although expressive of the universe, does not mean the celestial and terrestrial worlds as such, or as now extant, but merely their elementary state or materials. This will be disputed by few if any interpreters. But thus, under any theory, a long interval must have elapsed between this primordial state of matter, and its organization or crystallization.
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zation into the most rudimentary forms to which it is possible to apply the statements of the succeeding verse. (4) For 'the earth' is there spoken of separately as a distinct globe, and special prominence is given to it by its emphatic position in the sentence, as well as by the strong disjunctive accent placed upon it by the Masoretes, whereas the reduction of the heavenly bodies to their present order is not spoken of till a much later point—a fact utterly irreconcilable with the view that makes the latter phenomena coincide with their astronomical production.

(5) The force of the substantive verb הָבָשָׂה, "was," which, as being expressed in ver. 2, is not the simple copula, adds intensity to this distinction of the terrane from the aerial sphere, and shows that the writer has descended from the universal creation to our own planet as the immediate abode of man. Now, although the verb in question ought not perhaps, with some, be rendered became, remained, etc., yet as the equivalent of וַיִּשָּׂא, in distinction from וַיְסֹreleased, it certainly serves to point out a particular condition of the earth at a definite stage of its history as an actual exist in contrast with its later and prior state; q. d., "The earth, however, still existed as," etc. (6) The peculiar phrase employed to describe the condition in question is even more conclusive of this interpretation; for not only is this not an adjective, which would have expressed simple quality, but the nouns יִתְנָה and יִתְנָה, literally usitateness and desolation, or emptiness and vacancy (for both these ideas are implied, and the two terms are synonymous), by way of reiterated asseveration, are both expressive of a positive rather than a negative fact, the result of an active cause, and not a mere continuance of disorder or the absence of organic principles, q. d. "wreck and ruin" (compare Isa. xxxiv, 11, "He shall stretch out the heavens as a curtain, and spread the earth over as a tent")—the deception [see of emptiness [םָּא], "speaking of the complete demolition of a city]."

(7) The same picture of devastation is contained in the parallel terms רָעָה, abys, and יָסַדְתָּה, surface of the water; by which the face of the globe (not its interior) is represented as a vast and billowy sea, just such as an arctic deluge or a suddenly hidden more de place would exhibit. (8) Finally, the brooking (דְּנַתַּה) of the divine Spirit over this dark and turbid nest (not chaotic world-egg) does not express the idea of active or restorative effort, but rather implies the already fecundated germ or organized embryo, which only needed incubation to bring it to perfection and manifestation. The semina terrae survived the extinction of the parent races, and a fresh brood was to repopulate the globe. Or perhaps the figure may still better be interpreted of the budding earth, chilled and stunned by the recent catastrophe, nestling for warmth and protection beneath the genial wings of its Creator, to gather new vigor for the final essay at independent life and action.

Dr. Pyle Smith, in his Geology and Scripture, suggested that the chaotic period was confined and limited to one particular portion of the earth's surface, viz. that part which God was adapting for the dwelling-place of man and the animals connected with him. This section of the earth he designates as 'a part of Aria lying between the Caucasian range, the Caspian Sea, and Tartary on the north, the Persian and Indian seas on the south, and the mountain ridges which run, at considerable distances, on the eastern and western flanks;' and he suggests that this region was brought by atmospheric and geological causes into a condition of superfluous ruin, or some kind of general disorder. This theory left to the geologist the unbroken series of plants and animals in all parts of the world, with the exception of this particular locality. But the explanation was never received with favor, and was obviously inconsistent with the language of Scripture, inasmuch as the term 'the earth,' in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, embraces the whole of the terrestrial globe, and 'the earth' that is, in the next verse, 'the earth is void,' cannot be more restricted in its meaning and extent." This theory, however, is maintained by one of the latest expositors of this portion of Scripture (Murphy, Commentary on Genesis, ad loc.).

5. Another scheme of reconciliation of Scripture and geology has for its foundation the assumption that the Mosaic days designate periods of vast and undefined extent—that the six days of creation portray six long periods of time, which commenced with 'the beginning,' and have succeeded each other from thence through the inexplicable spaces depicted by Moses, up to and inclusive of the creation of man; and that the seventh day, on which God rested from his work of creation, is still current. Against such a construction of the word 'day' in the Mosaic record, Dr. Buckland, who was one of the advocates for the natural-day interpretation, stated that 'there is no sound critical or theological objection;' an admission, however, which there is abundant reason to dispute. See DAY.

'Long before the question had assumed the importance and interest which the discoveries of geology have given to it, many well-informed philologists advocated the view that the Mosaic days were periods of long duration. Among the Jews, Josephus and Philo, and of Christians, Whiston, Des Cartes, and De Luc, have so expressed themselves; while of those who have written with full knowledge of geological facts, we have Conybeare, Philippi, and Hugh Miller—all of them holding the opinion that the Mosaic days of creation were successive periods of long duration." Nevertheless, in a hermeneutical point of view, this theory is open to the gravest objections. See COSMOGONY, MOSAIC.
question, they altogether fail to tally. However in-
definite an extension, therefore, we may give to the 
whole subject the treatment it richly merits. It is but 
simply so long as the successive events themselves so 
widely differ from those of the scientific system. More-
over, the creations of the geological world overlap 
each other, and vary in their relative position in dif-
ferent places. , whereas those of the biblical cosmog-
ony are strictly consecutive and universal.

Similar objections apply to an ingenious theory of 
Prof. S. D. Hillman (in the Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1868), 
that, while admirably defending the "nublar hypo-
thesis," proposes to identify the days of creation with 
temporal events. , whereas those of the biblical cosmo-
gony are strictly consecutive and universal.

"The consistency or harmony of these two records of 
the creation—that of Moses and that of the geologist 
—has, in conformity with the foregoing interpretation 
of the word "day," been attempted to be traced and 
vindicating by the late Hugh Miller in a lecture deliv-
ered by him to the 'Young Men's Christian Associa-
tion' in the year 1855, and afterwards republished in 
The Testimony of the Rocks, and also by Dr. M'Caus-
land in his Sermons in Stones. The former sought to 
show, at least, that the "world was a clay, and the 
evens recorded by Moses as having occurred on the 
third, fifth, and sixth days or periods of creation, 

The Lazarine habitation of Central 
and Southern Europe; 2. 'K" 1; -m"d"d"d' or "Ki-
then refuges of the coasts of Denmark and Norway, 
and the Atlantic coast of North America; 3. Deltas, 
as those of the Nile, Po, Ganges, and Mississippi; 4. Care 
exists in various parts of Europe; 5. Remains [of 
human bones and other objects] found in the peat, 
and in the beds of clay, and in the deeps and lower 
parts of the world."

He then sums up the proper 
scientific conclusions from these geological data 
thus:

(1.) Man and the mammoth in some parts of the globe were 
contemporary.

(2.) Instead of carrying man back to the period assigned 
to the mammoth and other great extinct pachyderms, we are 
required to bring the mammoth down to the period of man.

(3.) We may safely say that the sands named do not 
exist in any parts of the Mesolithic epoch; the sands 
and clays of that age may have been formed within the six thousand years of 
historical chronology, but that in all probability such was the 
temporal order of these events.

(4.) The knowledge we yet have of the dynamical geology 
of the various superficial formations from the "paleocene" 
upward, is not sufficient to enable us to reach trustworthy con-
clusions with regard to past time.

(5.) Geological changes have taken place in the past with a 
rudimentary skill if ever witnessed at present.

6. In view of all the difficulties, some interpreters in 
despair abandon all attempt at reconciliation between the 
Mosaic record and scientific findings, e.g. Kallash, 
as above, and in general the whole Rationalistic school.

Even Quarré (Genesis and its Authorship, Lond. 1866 
chap. I), by a combination of the conclusions that the 
tenableness of the adjustments proposed in favor of 
the geological schemes, is not content with pronounc-
ing the effort premature, in view of the unsettled state 
of the sciences involved, but proceeds to lay down the 
axiom that we must "give up looking for physical 
proofs and to admit the truth when the "natural" interpre-
tion of the text is concordant with the laws of nature." 
Surely this is not simply a case where the phenomenal 
theory of interpretation is competent to explain the 
whole discrepancy—applicable as that principle was 
seen to be to much of the phraseology of the Mosaic 
account as early as the time of Gregory of Nyssa 
(Hecatomeron, in Opp. Greg. Nysa., where the optical 
explanation is advocated); for as Moses is expressly 
writing on the subject of creation, a just exegesis 
mands that his statements—so far as they are parallel 
—must tally with all later discoveries and conclusions.

See HAMMOND.

Mr. Quarré (Genesis, p. 17 sqq.) adds the follow-
ing alleged discrepancies as evidence of the non-his-
torical character of the narrative in Gen. 1, ii: (1.) 
The apparently simultaneous creation of both "the 
heavens and the earth" in the beginning, whereas the 
firmaments were not completed and the earth was not 
completely formed as being formed in detail at a later 
day. But if, as we hold, the first verse merely declares the calling into 
existence of the primordial material or elements, not only does all repetition vanish, but the distinction inherent 
in the nature of the case between creation proper and 
progressive development is duly observed. Our ex-
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plation likewise dissipates his objection to the use of the term "days" before the creation of the sun. (2.)

He alleges that the numeral וּדָעָה, one, being here anarchous, cannot properly be rendered "first" in connec-
tion with the opening eye-morn of creation, in the sense of the order of time. But certainly it can have no other meaning when followed in the same series by the other undoubted ordinals "second," "third," etc. That the sixth day alone has the article is due to its eminence as the concluding day of the working week.

(3.) The correlation between the two triads of weeks—

"the luminaries of the fourth day corresponding to the light of the first, the fishes and birds of the fifth to the waters and the firmament of the second, and the ter-
restrial animals of the sixth to the dry land of the third"—constitutes no valid argument against the matter-of-fact character of the representation; for these are merely signs of the progress and harmony observ-
able in all God's plans, and a special coincidence aris-
ing in this case from the necessarily gradual prepara-
tion of the globe for its varied classes of tenants. The
assumptions that birds are impliedly represented as
being produced from the air, that the creatures were
all brought before Adam immediately upon their cre-
atation, and that the woman was formed on a different
day from the man, are all gratuitous and erroneous, as
is likely the supposition that vegetation in cap. ii, 5 was absolute and universal, in-
stead of referring to a mere spontaneous growth, and
that in Eden simply.

III. Geological Formations.—"The crust of the earth
is composed of rocks, which have been formed, some
by the action of fire, such as granite, basalt, porphyry,
and rhyolite, which are termed igneous rocks, and
some by sedimentary deposit at the bottom of water,
such as sandstone, limestone, shale, etc., which are
known as aqueous or stratified rocks. Igneous rocks
were first formed; and on these, from time to time,
through the long ages of our planet's existence, were
deposited the many successive layers of sedimentary
stratified rocks, in which are found the fossil remains
of the animals and plants that were in existence
during the several periods of deposition. These lay-
ers of rocks have been frequently and extensively,
throughout these areas of their formation, broken up
and distorted by volcanic action, and the protrusion
of igneous rocks from beneath, upwards, and through
them; and by these the mountain ranges, in all parts
of the earth, have been elevated, and those diversities
of land and sea which the face of our planet presents,
have been produced." We shall consider, in accordance
with the prevalent theory, to characterize the basis
rocks, i.e. granite, and its unstratified congeners, as
igneous, although recent investigations tend to the con-
clusion that they, as well as the superincumbent anima-
ted series, are the result of the disintegations, decom-
positions, and fresh combinations of aqueous agency.

"The first aspect of the globe which the investiga-
tions of the cosmoquonist have enabled us to realize,
present to view a viscid igneous ball revolving on its
axis, and-wheeling its annual course around the sun,
its centre of attraction. Its present obliterate sphero-
idical shape, and as the poles are elevated at the equat-
or, is the exact form that a liquid sphere of the
size and weight of the earth, revolving on its axis in
twenty-four hours, would assume; and the still pre-
valing central heat, which is indicated by the gradual
increase of temperature as we ascend in mines from
the surface to a depth of one or two miles beneath the
centre, reveals the igneous origin of the mass. The
gradual cooling down of this fiery sphere, by radiation into
space, would result in the formation of a crust of gran-
ite or some other igneous rock on the surface; and as the
fountains of the seas were fed by the rains of a tem-

mental heat, and which are kept ardent by intense
heat, would naturally combine, and thus the crust, in
process of time, would be covered with an ocean. Thus
we have all the elements requisite for the production
of the first series of sedimentary rocks, which were
formed out of the disturbed particles or detritus of the
igneous crust at the bottom of the waters which encir-
cled the globe. The lowest of our sedimentary rocks,
gneiss and mica schist, which rest on the primordial
granite, are probably the result of the decomposi-
tion, on inspection, to be composed of the débris or broken
particles of granite, and so far the foregoing theory of
their origin is confirmed. This series of rocks has
been styled ' metamorphic,' from the great change that
has been undergone in their structure by the action of
the intense heat to which, at the time of their forma-
tion, they must have been exposed, and by which they
have been partially crystallized, and their lines of
stratification obliterated. They form a portion of that
vast pile of the bottom rocks which have been termed
'the Cambrian,' and which have been calculated to be
25,000 feet, or nearly five miles, in depth or thickness.

"Throughout the long ages occupied by the deposi-
tion of the mass of sediment of which these bottom
rocks are composed, the temperature of the globe must
have been very high, though gradually becoming more
cool. There is no trace of animal life in these rocks;
and it is extremely rare and difficult to detect and iden-
tify. The scanty fossil remains which have been discovered by
the industry and research of the geologist, reveal no
type of animal life of a higher order than the zoophytes
(a creeping animal, and partly a vegetable in nature),
annelids, or sea-lice, and bivalve mollusks, and
all of them marine creatures devoid of the sense of
sight and hearing; and with them have been found traces of
fungus and sea-woods, but no land vegetation. In
fact, all that has been discovered of organic matter in
these rocks is a beginning of life at the time of their
formation, and a beginning of life in the low-
est and most humble of its forms.

"The long era of the Cambrian formation was suc-
ceded by another as extensive, during which the rocks
which have been denominated ' the Silurian ' were form-
ed, by sedimentary deposition, to the depth (as some
estimate) of 50,000 feet. The fossil remains of animals
throughout this formation are abundant, and disclose
the zoology of the era to have been confined to sub-
marine invertebrates, zoophytes, mollusks, and crust-
acea; and no vertebrate animal appears until the close
of the era, when the remains of fishes are found in
the beds which immediately are the top of the
Silurian formation. Light to some extent must have
pervaded the earth during this period; for many of
the mollusks, and all of the crustacea, were furnished
with eyes, as well as the others, so as in the interval of
a tri-
lobiote, of a peculiarly elaborate and perfect structure.
It appears to be a law of nature, that animals whose
entire existence is passed in darkness are either wholly
devoid of the organs of sight, or, if rudimentary eyes
are discoverable, they are useless for the purposes
of vision, as exemplified by the animals of all orders, from
the mollusk to the mammals, which have been discov-
ered in the caverns of Illiria, in the caverns of South
America, mentioned by Humboldt, in the Mammoth
Cave of Kentucky, in deep wells, and in depths of the
sea where no ray of light can penetrate. The system that
succeeded the Silurian was that in which the Devonian
or Old-Red-Sandstone rocks were formed; and all geologists concur in stating that the
position in which these rocks are found indicates
that the era was ushered in by violent commotions,
which disturbed the principal mountain ranges of the
world were thrown up. The fossil remains of
this era, during which sedimentary rocks, calculated
to be about 10,000 feet in thickness, were formed, pre-
sent to our view, in addition to the previous existing
type of life, to the class of animals the coral, and
Genoid species. These have been graphically de-
scribed by Hugh Miller, in The Old Red Sandstone, as

III.—26
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The above distribution of the successive layers consist merely of the titles and systems adopted by different authors. Some of the strata are found only in certain localities of limited extent, and there are modifications peculiar to other places. The "rocks" (a general term in geology for all strata, of whatever character) are represented in the cut as filled up by an adjacent mountain. Several such changes of level, and not seldom even by depression, are sometimes exhibited as having successively taken place. The layers are frequently corrugated or otherwise disturbed, either singly or throughout the whole or various parts of the series. Any one of them may appear at the surface, in consequence of denudation or the absence of those properly belonging above it. Seldom or never are they all found together as here. They exist in endless variety of combination, both chemical and mechanical, and are sometimes thrown into almost promiscuous confusion by volcanic and other causes; but when present and in their natural state, they observe the arrangement indicated in the diagram.

Section of the Earth's Crust, showing the Relative Position of its Strata.

N.B.—The above distribution of the successive layers consist merely of the titles and systems adopted by different authors. Some of the strata are found only in certain localities of limited extent, and there are modifications peculiar to other places. The "rocks" (a general term in geology for all strata, of whatever character) are represented in the cut as filled up by an adjacent mountain. Several such changes of level, and not seldom even by depression, are sometimes exhibited as having successively taken place. The layers are frequently corrugated or otherwise disturbed, either singly or throughout the whole or various parts of the series. Any one of them may appear at the surface, in consequence of denudation or the absence of those properly belonging above it. Seldom or never are they all found together as here. They exist in endless variety of combination, both chemical and mechanical, and are sometimes thrown into almost promiscuous confusion by volcanic and other causes; but when present and in their natural state, they observe the arrangement indicated in the diagram.

The system that succeeded the Devonian is the Carboniferous, which is one of importance and interest to mankind, as having been the period of the formation of coal, iron, and the mountain limestone—a combination of products that have contributed so largely in these latter days to the comfort and convenience of the human race. The coal-measures, it is well ascertained, are the product of profuse and extensive vegetation, and the nature of the plants of which it has been formed is easily discoverable by a close examination of the mineral itself, which, on inspection, discloses them to have been almost entirely of the cryptogamic order, and such as would be produced in abundance in positions of shade, heat, and humidity. Ferns, calamites, and equisetaceous plants preponderate, and wood of hard and ligneous tissue, which is, in a great measure, dependant on the unshaded light of the sunbeam, is of rare occurrence in this formation, while season rings, which result from the impact of the direct rays of sunlight on the tree, are not found at all in the fossil woods of this or the previous formation, though they appear in those of the succeeding systems.

In confirmation of these views, it is remarkable
that other geological phenomena, besides that of the absence of the season rings in the trees, indicate that there was no variation of seasons on our earth before the close of the carboniferous era. Temperature appears, up to that period, to have been tropical and uniform in all latitudes; for the fossil remains testify that the animal life that lived and grew in the carboniferous and preceding eras at the equator were of the same species as those that lived and grew at the same period in the arctic regions—and the coal-measures are as abundant in the high latitudes as in the temperate and equatorial zones. The geological phenomena of the period cannot only be accounted for by the continued prevalence of the central heat, and the consequent neutralization of the effect of the sun's rays, the influence of which now operates to produce the variety of seasons. The climatic condition of the earth in those ages must have been similar to those of a modern humid bothushade, from the direct radiance of the sun, and which would be eminently conducive to the production of a prolific vegetation, such as that which has been stored up in our extensive coal-measures.

The zoology of the age furnishes us with the first undertaking of the terrestrial animal life, in the form of insects of the beetle and cockroach tribes, scorpions, and reptiles of the lizards and snakes—creatures which were adapted by nature to live in the dull, dusty, tepid atmosphere that pervaded our planet at that time.

The earliest traces of the carboniferous period have disappeared, during which the system of rocks, which has been denominated 'the Permian' system, was formed, the fossil remains of which indicate that great changes must have taken place in the physical constitution and aspect of the earth. The exuberant vegetation which had supplied the material of the coal-measures of the preceding formation had died away, and a vegetation of a higher order succeeded. The animals, too, which inhabited the Permian earth disclose an advance in organic life. The Saurian, or true reptile, here made its first appearance; and the earliest traces of birds were found in the New Red Sandstone of the Dinorwig district, a member of this system. The foot-tracks of these birds, of immense magnitude, which stalked on the Permian sands and mud, are found impressed on the now hardened slabs of sandstone and shales of that formation both in Scotland and in America. The Permian was succeeded by the systems of the Trias and Oolite, whose fossil remains attest an advance in animal as well as vegetable organization. Trees of the palm, pine, and cypress species were mingled with the diminished ferns, calamities, and coniferous trees, and with this varied vegetation, a higher order of insects appears to have come into existence to feed on and enjoy the increasing bounties of Providence. But the peculiar and most striking feature of the age was the extraordinary increase, in number and magnitude, of the Saurian reptiles which then peopled the earth. The Saurians were divisible into three distinct classes—the terrestrial, or Dinosaurians; the marine, or Elasmosaurians; and the aerial, or Pterosaurians. They were all of them air-breathing creatures—anomalous, and more or less aquatic in their nature and way of life; and, together with the birds whose tracks have appeared in these same systems. The fossil remains of the reptilian inhabitants of earth, ocean, and air of the Oolite world, more especially of the Liais member of it, have revealed them to have then swarmed out in such amazing numbers among the animals and plants that lived and grew in the vast dimenison of the earth, that we have always dwelt on the scene which the earth of those days must have presented with astonishment and wonder, and have named that era 'the age of the reptiles.'

The Chalk or Cretaceous system succeeded that of the Oolite, and presents little, if any evidence of advance in creation. There is, however, a manifest decrease of the Saurian reptiles, which reigned in such abundance in the preceding formation, and some traces of the true mammals have, it is said, been found in this system. At all events, in the next formation, the Tertiary, we have distinct evidence of the existence of the mammal race of animals, including the quadruped mammifers, resembling those now extant.

No traces of human races, or of any work of art, have been found below the superficial deposits, or outside coating of the globe; yet there is no evidence of the introduction on the earth of any species of animal whose prototype was not in being before the human race became inhabitants of the earth. The human pedigree is of less antiquity that that of any other known creature, though, geologically and physically, he is at the top of the ascending orders or scale of created beings; for it is admitted by the most eminent and best-informed geologists that the well-attested facts of their science demonstrate that this species has not reached the top of a system, or of any known measure of time. We can only look at the vast piles of the sedimentary rocks which have been laid down at the bottom of the waters in that period, to the depth of fifteen miles at the lowest calculation, and ask how long was the space of time occupied in the formation of those masses by the slow process of depositing grain after grain of the particles of the matter of which they have been formed, and yet that is but a brief portion of duration when compared with that which must have been occupied by the cooling down of the globe, so as to admit of the existence of life upon its surface. The Scriptures do not fix the age of the earth, or supply any means by which we could calculate the length of time that had elapsed between 'the beginning' and the first appearance of the creation, including that of Adam; and the Biblical records have unfolded to us that nearly six thousand years have passed away since he became an inhabitant of the earth. Facts, however, have recently come to light on which it has been argued that, though the extent of the human era must have been short indeed when compared with the vastness of the geological series, yet that it is the human era that is the earth at a time long anterior to that assigned by the Bible records to have been the date of Adam's birth. Mr. Leonard Horner's experimental researches in Egypt, instituted with a view to ascertain the depths of the sedimentary deposits in the valley of the Nile, have brought to light relics of works of art and specimens of man's handwork, such as pieces of pottery and sculpture, that tend to prove the existence of intelligent manufacturers at a period of time that could not be less than eleven or twelve thousand years; but the periods from which the evidence that has been deduced are too uncertain and fallible to warrant such an extension of the commonly received age of man. The rate of secretion of sedimentary deposits of a river like the Nile is subject to so many varying external influences, that, as a measure of time, it may be most misleading. Many of the most reliable geologists believe the Nile has always dwelt on the scene which the earth of those days must have presented with astonishment and wonder, and have named that era 'the age of the reptiles.'
are found in the diluvium formed by the last great geological revolution. If these implements are of artificial origin, they afford strong evidence that the races of men by whom they were manufactured were the contemporaries of animals which geologists affirm could not have existed within the Scripture term of human life. Nor is it at all improbable that the original implements with these animals, and affirm that mere juxtaposition is no evidence of contemporaneity, when no remains of the human frame are to be found in the same place. The few instances in which such remains have been found together are all resolvable into cases of animals of comparatively recent extinction (Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1867, p. 457 sqq.).

The age of the diluvium also in which these remains have been discovered, uncertain as it was before, has not been determined by the presence of human relics, relies in its, so that the Scripture chronology of the human era has not been displaced.

IV. Proposed Identification of these Geological Periods with the Mosaic "Days."—Most geologists have frankly avowed the utter incompatibility of these rocky revolutions with the Scriptures, if these can be regarded as the result of the same events; while those who have believed them to be reconcilable have usually contended themselves with vaguely referring to the progress and order evidenced in both by a proof of their general agreement, without attempting anything like a minute comparison—doubtless for the reason that any distribution of the geological strata into precise portions, such as those of Moses, whether six or any other number, must be highly arbitrary and fanciful. A few, however, following out the suggestion of Jameson, have of late ventured upon such a collation in detail, e.g., Hugh Miller and Dr. Macaulay (see above).

1. The most ingenious of these schemes makes the first Mosaic "day" correspond to the age of the lower, metamorphic, or Cambrian rocks, in which the eyerocks zoophytic life is compared with the vivifying influence of the Spirit brooding over the abyss as yet in darkness; the second "day," on which the firmament was formed, would answer to the Silurian series, containing only submarine invertebrata, evincing the presence of light; the third "day," when the dry land brought forth vegetation, would be equivalent to the Old Red Sandstone period, containing also vertebrated fish and traces of land vegetation; the fourth "day," which witnessed the development of the celestial luminaries, would agree with the Carboniferous era, which indicates the lifting up of the veil of vapor that had before enshrouded the globe, thus giving rise to the more solid form of woody fibre; the fifth "day," when birds and reptiles were produced, would be denoted by the period of the Permian, New Red Sandstone, Trias, and Oolite systems, with their gigantic sauropods and birds; and finally, the sixth "day," which saw the creation of land animals, would fall in the Cretaceous or rather the Tertiary epoch, which presents the most perfect fossil mammals. Unfortunately, however, there exist several important discrepancies in this effort at identification, which go to show that it is altogether insufficient. Nevertheless, many of these contradictions are not exactly six of these strata of rocks, but some ten or a dozen; indeed, geologists are not agreed among themselves as to their proper number and classification, some making them out to be a score or more. Each epoch is well defined in itself, and most of them contain their own peculiar fossil formations; yet even they are evidently in general but progressive developments of the same organic types, and not totally fresh orders of being, such as the successive stages of the Mosaic creation exhibit. Nor are they uniformly distributed over the earth's surface, but here and there, although preserving almost invariably the same relative order; so that it is doubtful whether in all cases they mark regularly consecutive epochs, or the earth's history in the whole, whether long. Neither are they equal in extent or thickness, so as to lead us to conclude that they occupied fixed portions of time, such as the Mosaic days of co-ordinate length. In the second place, they do not Lillie in their productions with the Mosaic days of the Genesis. Trees are not set in groups as in the sixth day; while geology does not discover vegetation (unless inchoately) till the junction of the Silurian with the Old Red Sandstone, and it does not become characteristic till we reach the Carboniferus era. In like manner, Moses makes the creation of earth simultaneous with that of fishes, whereas fish appear in the strata of the period prior to that of the bird-tracks—indeed, anterior to plants themselves. Moreover, reptiles, which figure so conspicuously in the geological animals, are passed over with little, if any distinction in the Mosaic record, if any story is recorded at all, as the other hand, to which Moses says death did not come till the sixth day, begins in the geological series as early as the Carboniferous age. In a word, the animal and vegetable kingdoms, which the sacred narrator places at a decided interval, go on in parallel progressions through the successive cycles; and yet the relative order of appearance is, if anything, rather the reverse of that given by Moses, while little coincidence appears in the order of land and water products. In the third place, not only is this theory opposed to the obviously literal meaning of the word "day" in the Mosaic record, but it is hampered by the difficulties in advance point in its details (such as the application of the Spirit's formative "haverning," ver. 2, upon the dark chaos, to the evolution of zoophytes; the segregation of the firmament," to the deposition of the Silurian rocks; the emergence of "dry land," to the formation of the Old Red Sandstone; the bursting form of the heart's "lights," to the production of the coal-measures; the formation of marine "creatures and fowl," to a motley stratification that chances to contain huge lizards and nondescrip rocks; and the creation of animat nature in general to the uplift of the earth, and the deposit of alluvial soil)—aside from these formidable difficulties, the whole interpretation of Moses's simple language as adumbrating the vast and complicated systems of geological changes is preposterous in the highest degree. We conclude, therefore, that a hypothesis, which, while it outruns every just and natural principle of hermeneutics, at the same time so utterly breaks down the moment it is actually brought to the test of scientific comparison, is wholly unworthy our acceptance. Moses is clearly relating a historic narration of the present races of animal and vegetable life, and the analogies between the present and the progress of his days and those of the geological cycles are merely such resemblances as the successive restorations from a chaotic state would naturally present, although on a vastly different scale in point of duration.

2. Prof. Dana, in his Manual of Geology (Phila. 1862), gives (p. 712), as the latest conclusion of science on the relation between the Mosaic and the geological cosmogonies, the following, which he has condensed from the lectures of Prof. Guyot (see Bibliotheca Sacra, Apr. 1855, p. 224 sq.), and which we here place in parallel columns with the statements of the first chapter of Genesis:
1. The beginning of activity in nature. In such a beginning from matter in the state of a gross fluid the activity would be intense, and it would show itself at once by manifestation of light, since light is a resultant of molecular activity. A flash of light through the universe would therefore be the first announcement of the work begun.

2. The development of the earth. A dividing and subdividing of the original fluid going on would have evolved systems of vast as grades, and ultimately the orbs of space, among these the earth, the igneous sphere enveloped in vapors.

3. The production of the earth's physical features by the subdivision into the continents and oceans. The condensable vapors would have gradually settled upon the earth, cooling progressively.

4. The introduction of life under its simplest forms, as in the lowest of plants, and perhaps also, in animals. The systems of structure characterizing the two kingdoms of nature, the animal and vegetable, and the Podostoma, mollusks, articulate, and pelecypoda, are brought out from the tree seed of the vegetable kingdom, and the earth, and the gathering together of the waters of the sea; and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let there be firmament, and there was a firmament above the firmament, and the waters under the heaven were gathered together into one place, and the dry land appeared; and it was good. And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters under the heavens he called Sea; and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night; and it was so. And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day. And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth, and it was so. And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the fourth day. And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind; and God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth. And the evening and the morning were the fifth day. And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creatures after their kind, and the fowl of the air after their kind, and every thing that creepeth creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it is; which is eyelid above all was so. And God made the other vertebrata for a qualitative of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let us make men in our image, after our image, and after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Ver. 26-31.

Now, however probable these stages of creative progress may be as an exposition of science, yet we find the following (among other) discrepancies in them when compared with the Biblical text, which to our mind shows their utter incompatibility.

5. The display of the system in the kingdoms of life. The exhibition of the four grand types under the animal kingdom, being the predominant theme in this phase of progress.

6. The introduction of the highest class of vertebrata—that of the mammals (the class to which which Man belongs), viviparous species, earth after his kind; and it is; which is eyelid above all was so. And God made the other vertebrata for a qualitative of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let us make men in our image, after our image, and after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Ver. 26-31.

Now, however probable these stages of creative progress may be as an exposition of science, yet we find the following (among other) discrepancies in them when compared with the Biblical text, which to our mind shows their utter incompatibility.

1. It is not clear how light would necessarily be the first characteristic of an active in a material in which the mass, we should suppose, would have already been in an incandescent state. Nor would such "comical light" (whatever that phrase may mean) have been subject to the ebb and flow constituting the alternations of "day and night," or "darkness." Indeed, the phraseology of Moses reveals to us at the outset a turbulent surface rather than a homogenous but quiescent mass of igneous vapor as the primeval chaos.

2. "Water" is certainly a very inappropriate term for the nebular substances in whatever stage of fluidity; and the division of the supras from the infra-firmamental liquid is a strange description of the disintegration of melted spheres from each other, whether still vaporized or cooled to semi-solidity.

3. The picture of the chaotic floods retiring to their proper places is similar to the crystallization of the azotic rocks, or the hardening of the metamorphic basis of the earth's crust, but it is slightly more to the condensation of steam and other volatile matter by a radiation of heat. Besides, as geology itself shows, the present linguistic and mountain chains, river and desert, has been the effect of innumerable changes, elevations, and subsidences at vastly different periods scattered throughout the pre-Adamic history of the globe.

4. On the third day life was not merely "introduced under its simplest forms," but there were created, besides "grass" and "herb yielding seed," also the fully developed "fruit-tree, whose seed is in itself," whereas geology, instead of exhibiting in the lowest stratified rocks any of these higher forms of vegetation, leaves but the bare presumption (for the author is only able to state that "in the day of God's creation the sea-weeds or algae are the earliest of the globe, probably preceding animal life") of the existence of any plants whatever in that age. The fourth day, which was devoted to the production or manifestation of the heavenly luminaries, has, it will be observed, nothing corresponding to it in the geological cycles. A notable chasm!

5. The "four grand types of the animal kingdom (radiate, mollusk, articulate, and vertebrate)," however, are not to be found in the Mosaic statement, which refers only to marine creatures and (aquatic) birds as belonging to the earlier stages (day), for the reason obviously that the soil was still too humid for land animals, such as geology, never-
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The geological order laps over into the other, instead of being sharply defined as in the scriptural statement; it is the "plants" of the fourth geological "day," rather than those of the third, that correspond with the vegetable productions of the scriptural progression; the marine creatures of the fifth Scripture day are only to be recognised in the "amphibians" and "fishes" of the fourth geological cycle; indeed, the fourth of the Scripture days, which is occupied only with the formation of the heaviest of the marine species, is most active of the geological periods in the production of every form of animated existence, beginning with trilobites and running up to complete vegetation.

But, most of all, we object to the general view under which this is set forth as an interpretation of the Biblical passage in question, namely, that it is a "pictorial" description, or "symbol," or "vision," "retrospectively prophetic." - whereas it seems to us a plain literal history, utterly destitute of the least semblance of imagery or seer-like import beyond the mere use of a few anthropomorphisms familiar to the Hebrews. If such liberties, like all others, are made in hermeneutics, that is the end of all meaning in words. For instance, when the successive scenes in the Mosaic narrative are compared (Meth. Quart. Rev. April, 1868, p. 298) with the regularly numbered emblems of the Apocalypse (the seven seals, trumpets, and vials), it would be an important fact overlooked that the latter are as joyously set forth as symbolical representations of ecclesiastical import, while the former are unaccompanied by any intimation of an ulterior significance. Indeed, this comparison is suicidal to the interpretation which it is put forth to support; for the visions of John in the Revelation could only have authority as premonitions of the future on the concession of their actual occurrence in the manner related by himself, so the description of Moses in the opening chapters of Genesis must be accepted as literal statements of real phenomena, in the most obvious and house-like sense, before they can be made the basis of a symbolical application. See Cosmog., p. 528.

This much only may, however, be granted as true in the hypothesis upon which these and similar explanations are based: that the geological and the Mosaic creation were two acts in a gigantic scheme, virtually typical of each other, insomuch as they proceed upon a uniformity in the divine plan—the development of an archetypal idea—were in their great outlines, of course, similar, and hence may, to a considerable extent, be judged, compared, and, as it were, portrayed in the same general terms; but on this very account interpreters of the Bible ought to be the more careful not to confound the two, and especially not to substitute the distant and more dimly shuddled event for the one directly in the mind of the sacred writer. See Double Sense (of Scripture). In the present instance, moreover, there is an eminently a natural ground of necessity for the coincidences above discernible: although no amount of ingenuity has been able to dramatize the facts of geology into precisely six acts, yet the aboriginal creation of matter is of course the first scene in each case; light is a prerequisite of vegetation, and this, again, must be the antecedent food for the animal tribes, while man forms the fit outcome of the entire plot; the incidental details of the two schemes might be expected to vary, as, in fact, they are found to do.

V. Scriptural Allusions to Geological Facts.—(Concluded from Patent, at unp. 105-108.) The sacred writers make frequent references to the physical phenomena of the earth beneath. Are such references in accordance with the facts established by subsequent researches and the observations of the sacred writers? The latter convict the former of ignorance and error? The question is the more important as the materials of the earth are not treated conventionally in the Scriptures, but naturally. In speaking of the sand on the sea-
shore, one writer alludes to it as a barrier placed by God against the encroachments of ocean, another as an illustration of the countless host of the Philistines, a third as representative of the multitude of God's people. Far different and more adapted to universal use is this than the employment of one object always to express the same idea, as the same symbolic picture-writing of the Egyptians and Assyrians, and as is the usage in much of the literature of the East. Freedom of language, if not of thought, is unknown where every object is used as a conventional sign, always appropriated to one fixed sentiment. We shall find incidents, then, in the scenes of our Rocky Sinai, the hills of Judas, the rivers and lakes, the mountain chains, and the Great Sea, would all fall into their proper places on his ideal map.

So the allusions to "the dust of the earth" will carry a fulness of meaning to persons living in a land where, during a large portion of the year, the whole surface is reduced to dust by the influence of heated winds. God's power in creating man out of such incoherent matter, and man's humble bodily origin and end in this life, are forcibly represented by the frequent employment of this illustration, so familiar to the inhabitant of the East.

In like manner, the references to the inundation of the Nile (Amos ix. 5; Job xxvii. 11), to earthquakes (Isa. ii. 19; Job ix. 6; xxxiv. 20), to mines, metals, precious stones, flints, and other mineral substances, and all have accurately to be in accordance with the actual physical phenomena.

The references to clay in the Scriptures are frequent, and accord with its uses and localities at the present day. See Clay.

VI. Geology of the Bible Lands.—(Compare Patterson, op. cit. p. 111-116.) The geology of the countries mentioned in holy Scripture is as yet but imperfectly known to us, but quite sufficient has been ascertained to test the accuracy of the incidental allusions made by the writers of the Bible.

1. The framework of Syria is composed of two mountainous ranges, running in a parallel strike with the coast of the Mediterranean, much broken by transverse clefts, extended by irregular spurs on either side, with detached minor masses, having the same north and south bearing. Between the two ridges runs the upper valley of the Jordan, occupying a deep depression, terminating in the Dead Sea.

The body of the country is a mass of Jurassic (oolitic) rocks, overlaid unconformably by a spread of cretaceous deposits (chalk and green sandstones), both much disturbed by outbursts of trappean matter (greenstone and quartzite), and separated into almost unmerous lines of ancient fracture. The oolite was eroded before the deposition of the chalk, and the latter has been washed and worn away prior to the deposition of the third system, namely, the eocene tertiary, which is found in patches, and abounds along the lands of medium height on the shores of the Great Sea. There are a few reconsolidated rocks and gravels of a more recent period, but the bulk of the whole region is a highly contorted, inclined, and broken mass of secondary, metamorphic, and igneous rocks.

2. The Jordan is an axis of Jurassic rock, with some thin beds of oolitic coal, surmounted by chalk, and flanked towards the coast by the great tertiary nummulitic limestone so universal along this parallel of the earth. The chalk contains fossils similar to that of the south of France. The tertiaries are often found laced after the fashion prevalent in other countries. In some places conglomerates of the later Jurassic age occur, containing pebbles and fossils of the lower oolites.

Towards the sources of the Jordan we find igneous rocks rising, with some concentration of metallic minerals, highly-colored landscapes, abundant springs, and verdant pastures. Hermon (the highest
above its present waters, both due to its former condition, first as an arm of the Red Sea, and then as a lake.

The Mount of Olives and the other eminences around Jerusalem are composed of chalk with flints; the older limestones appear in the bottom of the deep valleys. This is the substratum of the Holy City and its vicinity. Bethlehem is surrounded by coarse yellow cretaceous lime.

The Dead Sea is bounded on the west principally by tall cliffs of stratified limestone, with much rubble of an ancient date; towards the south, tertiary marls and clays prevail, the whole abounding with traces of volcanic agencies. The upper portion of the long mound at the south of the lake is gypsum, overlying rock salt, which is furrowed into knolls and pillars. The south-eastern shore is colored by the bright red of the sandstone; on the east are heavy limestones and chalk, altered by the igneous masses forming the mountains of Moab. The north-eastern angle is formed of basaltic rocks, with volcanic slag and pumice.

The whole Jordan valley was undoubtedly a vale in tertiary periods; but the Dead Sea appears to have received the remarkable features which now characterize it subsequently to the deposition of the tertiary beds.

2. Extending our survey eastward from Palestine, we may embrace a wide area, extending from Arrast to the head of the Persian Gulf, the general features of which are now well known. Many of the groups of secondary sedimentary strata familiar to us in Western Europe also occur here, upheaved, together with their overlying tertiary deposits, by igneous rocks, in like manner.

Along the margin of the present river-courses are alluvial deposits now in process of formation. Next, marine alluvium, following the direction of the existing great valleys, opening out into the sea, and still increasing at the outlet. Colonel Rawlinson and Mr. Ainsworth represent the marine alluvium as increasing at the head of the Persian Gulf at the rate of a mile in thirty years (Quarterly Journal, 2, 465). There are occasional fresh-water deposits, showing the former existence of small lakes; somewhat of earlier date are extensive formations of gravel, proving the occurrence here, as in the West, of a period of turbulence at the commencement of the post-tertiary epoch.

The highest tertiary deposits form a system of red sandstone and marls underlying the valleys of the
Mesopotamian rivers. This newest red sandstone territo-rially is much developed in Asia Minor, and thence eastward. It has subordinate beds of gypsum, with occasional naphthites and bitumen springs. Underneath the Witternig, and beginning to extend southward, is a sandstone 3000 feet thick. This has been much disturbed by elevation, has thrown it into domes and waves, constituting much of the peculiar scenery of the Turkish eastern frontier. Below this occurs the cretaceous series in the form of blue marls, white limestones, and bituminous shales. A few of the Palaes of Palæozoic rocks are brought to the surface: the whole is sustained by the granitic axis of the Caucasian chain, and occasionally metamorphosed by ancient volcanic contact.

There are two common to the cretaceous series and the beds above, though both are marine deposits, nor are there any common to the two great tertiary divisions, the nummulitic and the red.

8. On turning westward towards the head of the Red Sea we encounter the remarkable peninsula of Sinai, formed of red sandstone, borne up and rifted by one of the most forcible exhibitions of igneous rocks to be found in the world. On approaching the spurs of the Sinaiic range, bolders of red granite and metamorphic rock give indications of the disturbed district.

4. The well-known narrow plain of Egypt is a valley bordered by nummulitic rocks of oocene age, interspersed with sandstones. As the plain narrows, the scenery becomes diversified by frowning precipices of granite, basalt, and porphyry, which confine the foaming river at the cataracts, and expand into the mountains of Nubla. The sands, which stretch away towards the peninsula, cover tertiary strata, with silicified forests of the same age.

Geometrical Style. See Gothic Architecture.

Ge'on (Γεών), a Greek word (comp. Gen. ii, 18, Sept. Geô) of the name Geon (q. v.), one of the rivers of Paradise, mentioned (Eccles. xxiv, 27) along with the Jordan, Euphrates, etc., in a description of wisdom ("as Geon in the time of vintage," meaning apparently the Nisus at its period of annual overflow.) Fritzsch, ed loc.

George, David. See Joris.

George, duke of Saxony, celebrated for his antagonism to Luther and to the Reformation, was born Aug. 4, 1471. He began to govern his province in 1500, and immediately showed a persecuting spirit against those who inclined to the Reformation. In 1519 he proclaimed the four-days' controversy between Eck and Carlstadt at Leipzig, and afterwards that of Eck and Luther, from the 4th to the 14th of July. Discussions followed between the duke and Luther, which were afterwards continued alternately in Dresden and Leipzig. In several times accused Luther to his uncle, the elector of Saxony, and sought to prejudice him against the reformer. Family misfor- tunes, such as the death of his brother Frederick in 1510, of his daughter Margaret in 1524, and of his wife in 1525, also contributed to embitter his disposition. He died April 17, 1539, but his religious views had some time before undergone a change; and under his successor and brother, Henry, the Reformation made great progress in Saxony. There is a MS. life of George of Saxony by George Spalatinus in the library of Gothic.—Hertzog, ReaI-Encyklop. v, 29; Schultz, Geschichte der Lutheraniz. ('84).

George, elector of Brandenburg-Ansbach, one of the first German princes who embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, and who was therefore surnamed the Confessor, or the Pious, was born at Onolitz March 4, 1484. In 1515 he became, conjointly with his brother Casimir, regent of the province, in consequence of the infirmities of his father, Frederick. Both his father and his brother having died, he assumed the govern-ment in his own name in 1527. In 1524 he had become acquainted with Luther, and adopted his views. In 1529 he declared for the Diet of Spire, where he signed, on the 19th of April, the celebrated protestation against the "Majority Decision" of the German princes. The next year he went to the Diet of Augsburg, where he indorsed the Evangelical Confederation on the 26th of June, on which occasion he proudly said he knew no emperor that "he would rather lose his head than renounce his religious convictions," following out the plans of ecclesiastical reform of his brother Casimir, he framed in 1538 the Church organization of Brandenburg-Boutemberg, as also the liturgy which accompanied it, and which has been recently revived. He died at Onolitz Dec. 17, 1548. See Pauli, Allgemein Preuss. Staatsarch., iii, 476, 476; Buchholz, Gesch. d. Kurmark Brandenburg, iii, 217, 296, 305; Mosheim, Ch. Hist., iii, 42; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v, 28.

George, Enoch, bishop of the Methodist Episco- pal Church, was born in Lancaster Co., Virginia, in 1767 or 1768; was converted at about eighteen; entered the itineracy in 1790; was made presiding elder in 1796; 1801 and 1802 located; in 1808 re-entered the travelling ministry; was elected bishop in 1816; and died at Trila, Va., August 28, 1826. He was the son of a planter in moderate circumstances of religious profession. His mother died while he was young, and he acquired in youth the gay and dissolute morals of the district where he lived. He was, however, at this period deeply convinced of sin under the preaching of that man, the Rev. D. Jarratt (q. v.), of the English Church. But the subsequent re-moval of his father to North Carolina for a time left him to grow more wicked than before, until at length, with his father, he was converted by the instrumental-ity of the Rev. John Easter. Although young, and exceedingly confident, he was thrust out by his own and his own inward convictions into public serv-ice, and for two or three years was very useful as an exhorter, local preacher, and assistant on circuits with Philip Cox and Daniel Asbury. In 1790 he entered the itinerancy, and from that time he bore for many years the hardships and trials of a pioneer Methodist preacher. His usefulness and influence continually increased, and in 1786 he was made presiding elder on a district which included Charleston, S. C., and his labors there resulted in a great revival of religion. In 1799 he was elected bishop, and he became "increas-ingly used." In 1800 he re-entered the itineracy, but in 1801 his health failed again, and he located and opened a school at Winchester, Virginia, and soon after married. In 1805 he re-entered the Conference. In 1816 he waslegate to the General Conference at Baltimore. In the same year his wife died. Bishop McKendree's health had now nearly failed, and when the Conference met it was decided to elect more bishops, and the choice fell upon R. R. Roberts and Enoch George. From this time he labored with untiring zeal and universal acceptability in supervision, visitation, and in preaching the word with mighty power, until he was taken from labor to reward. His funeral sermon was preached by bishop McKendree at the General Conference of 1832. Bishop George was a man of large information, and of great activity and force of mind. His gifts were original; the effect of his teaching was very great. Dr. Samuel Luckey gives the fol-lowing account of a sermon by bishop George at John Street Church, New York, in June, 1816. "The sub-ject of the discourse was the conquest which Christ achieved by the cross of his death. His words were: 'When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive;' and, from the moment he uttered it, had com-plete command of his audience. The picture he drew of sin, and the desolations it has wrought, was truly terrific. Like a mighty cataract, he rushed on with
constantly increasing impetuosity, till every nerve that had braced itself to resist was unstrung, and his hearers seemed passively to resign themselves to an influence which was too strong for them. At a felicitous moment, when the feelings of his auditors were at their height, to turn bear to be turned into a different channel, he exclaimed, in the language of holy triumph, and in a manner peculiar to himself, 'But redemption smiled, and smiled a cure!' His train of thought was now changed, but the power of his eloquence was not at all diminished. Sin had been once, could not be the tyrant more, to declare that he, from the shadowy and the earth, was the sinner and the conqueror of death. He came to destroy the works of the devil, and to deliver those who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. The risen and ascended Saviour was represented as coming up from the empire of death, having seized the tyrant upon his throne, and then as triumphantly passing the portals of heaven amid the acclamations of heaven's shining hosts. The description was so vivid as to be almost overwhelming. The audience, which had just before seemed like a terror-stricken multitude, almost within the very grasp of the destroyer, now exhibited countenances returned with returning smiles. The whole assembly, actually in a common ecstacy (Augustine, Aen. sacra, vii, 193). — Minutes of Conferences, ii, 35; Wakely, Heroes of Methodism, p. 187; Fry, Life of Ep. George (1810); Stevens, Hist. of the Methodist Episc. Church, vols. i, iv.

George of Laodicea, one of the Semi-Arian leaders in the theological controversies of the 4th century. He was born at Alexandria, and was presbyter of the church of the Virgin, where, on learning his Arian opinions caused him to be deposed. He then removed to Syria, where he became bishop of Laodicea. He attended the Council of Antioch in 329 or 380, and the Council of Tyre in 385. He failed to be present at the Council of Sardica in 347 (his enemies said through fear), and, while absent, was deposed and excommunicated, but the sentence was never carried into effect. He was in great favor during the reign of Constantius II, and took part in many matters of importance; among others, in the elevation of Flavian to the episcopate of Antioch (q. v.) and George of Laodicea were the heads of the so-called Semi-Arians, who adopted the Eusebian doctrine that the Son is of similar essence with the Father. They published, in conjunction with other bishops assembled in a synod at Ancyræ, A.D. 386, a long and copious work against the Arians, of a doctrinal and polemic nature, in which the doctrines of this party concerning the resemblance of essence, as well as opposition to the Nicene as to the Eunomian articles, were fully unfolded; at the same time that the Church was warned against the artifices of those who, by expunging the term oioia, were seeking to suppress the doctrine of the resemblance of essence itself. It was here very clearly shown that true resemblance in all other things presupposed resemblance of essence, and that without this the notion of a Son of God, essentially different from the Father, in his very existence, could not be entertained. (Neander, Ch. History, ii, 406). This creed was adopted by the emperor Constantius and by the Synod of Sirmium, A.D. 386. We know nothing of him after the death of Constantius. His works are: Letters to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria. — Eucaristos ev Eon. bov rων Ευκαρίστος; — A work against the Manichæans, now lost. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx, 116; Neander, Church History, Torey's transl., ii, 406; Faur, Trinitaristen, i, 471; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 30; Lardner, Works, iii, 596.

George of Polenz, the first regular Roman Catholic bishop who embraced the Reformation, was born at Meissen in 1478. He studied theology in Italy, was licensed there, and, having gone to Rome, became private secretary to pope Julius II. Having been admitted to the order of Teutonic Knights, he went to Prussia, where, in 1516, he was elected bishop of Brandenburg, appointed him bishop of Sambia. His diocese was the first in which the Reformation strongly established itself. Briseman, a pupil of Luther, who had previously been a Franciscan, came to Königsburg, and the bishop invited him to preach the first evangelical sermons in the cathedral, Sept. 24, 1520. The bishop himself soon openly adopted the Reformed doctrines. In January, 1524, he ordered that all sermons and baptisms should take place in the vernacular throughout Prussia, and at the same time recommended Luther's Bible and writings. Luther went to Spalatin (Feb. 1, 1524), Episcopus tandem versus Christi nomen dedit et evangeliæ in Prussia, nempe Sambiana, and in the following year, 1525, he dedicated to Dr. Georgio a Polenzia, vere episcopo Sambiensis ecclesi, his Latin commentary on Deuteronomy. In 1526 bishop George resigned all secular government. He then retired to the palace of Balga, and died April 28, 1550. — Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 26.

George of Trebizond was really a native of Crete, but as that island has a bad name, especially unfit for a priest, he took that of Trebizond, where his ancestors had come. In 1430 he came to Italy—first to Venice, afterwards to Rome, where he lectured on rhetoric and philosophy. He was an intrepid defender of Nicholas V, but lost the favor of the pope by his fierce advocacy of Aristotle against Bessarion, Pethio, and other learned Greeks. Alphonsus, king of Naples, received him at his court and gave him a pension. He died at Rome in 1486, aged 91. He was undoubtedly a man of talent and power, but partially some and vain. He translated some of Plato's writings, and Eusebius's, but inaccurately. He published also a treatise De Rhetorica (Venice, 1523, fol.); controversial pieces against the Greek Church, to be found in Allatius, Graecia Orthodoxa (Rome, 1602, vol. i); Comparatio Aristotelis et Platonis (Ven. 1523, 8vo). See Brucker, Hist. Phil. iv, 65; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 23; Cave, Hist. Lit. ii, App. p. 49; Fabricius, Bibl. Greec. iii, 102; Niceront, Mem. pour Servire, etc., tom. xix; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx, 127.

George, prince of Anhalt and bishop of Merseburg, was born at Dessau Aug. 13, 1507, and educated at Leipzig. In 1525 he was made subdeacon, and in 1526 cathedral chaplain and magister. In 1528, in the second year of age his attainments were such that he was chosen by Albert, elector of Meissen, to be one of his council, and gained his highest confidence. About this time the Reformation attracted the attention of all men, and Luther's writings concerning the difference between the law and gospel, etc., were dispersed and read everywhere. Prince George was no idle spectator. At first he diligently opposed the so-called "novelties," and devoted himself specially to the study of Church history and to the Scriptures, the better to defend the "Old Church." He began all his investigations with prayer. The result was that he openly embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, and renounced all connection with popery. He put down superstition and set up semiaries of learning—the surest way, under God, of exterminating the errors which in 1517 had, once more, been introduced. When ever, was done with Christian mildness, and multitudes were soon brought by divine grace to rejoice experimentally in the light of the Gospel. By 1534 Anhalt may be said to have become Lutheran. In 1545, by his influence, his cousin, he consented to give himself to the work of the ministry, and was made bishop of Merseburg—an office full of danger and difficulty, which no worldly man would covet. He was ordained by Luther, Melancthon, and other divines.
GEORGE

August 2, 1545, in the cathedral at Merseburg. His whole time was thenceforward devoted to this holy work. Above all love ambition and revenge himself, he endeavored to remove them from others. He was a peacekeeper among princes. Insults he bore with Christian magnanimity. He lived with God in his heart, and for God in his intercourse with men. Luther and Zwinglius, and others were his most intimate friends. As in life, so in death; he was full of resignation, faith, and love; dwelling most sweetly on the promises, especially John iii. 16; x. 27, 28, and Matt. xvi. 28. He died Oct. 17, 1555, aged forty-six. His symodal addressation. He is commonly figured on horseback, in full armor, with the dragon writhing at his feet. It is difficult to separate the mythical from the historical in the accounts of St. George. Calvin and the Magdeburg curators deny that there ever was such a person. But it is certain that he was honored, and churches named after him, at a very early period, in the Eastern Church, especially in Georgia. Gregory of Tours mentions the honors paid him in France in the 6th century; and Gregory the Great ordered the renewal of an ancient church of St. George that was falling to ruin. His relics are said to be still preserved in the church of St. Germain des Prés at Paris. The Crusaders held St. George in special devotion; the English Council held at Oxford, 1222, made St. George's day a festival for all England; in 1347 Edward III instituted the Order of the Garter under his protection. Some writers identify St. George with the Arian of Cappadocia (so Gibbon, Decline and Fall, Harpers' edit., ii. 454). Mr. John Hogg, secretary of the Royal Society of Literature, published a pamphlet in 1862, entitled Supplementary Notes on St. George the Martyr, in which he proves that the story of the ancient church at Eza, in Syria, in which George is styled Martyr, and the date of his death fixed before A.D. 346, while George the Arian, of Cappadocia, was yet living. See Heylyn, Historie of St. George (Lond. 1631, 4to); Gibbon, Decl. and Fall, chap. xxiii.; Acta Sanctorum, i. iii.; Milner, Historical and Critical Inquiry into the History and Character of St. George; Lowick, Life and Martyrdom of St. George; Methodist Quarterly Review, 1862, p. 499.

GEORGE THE ARIAN, or GEORGE THE FULLER, of Cappadocia, was called by the name from the occupation of his father, and the second became an inhabitant of that province. Few men have been more corrupt and more despicable. He began life as a parasite. Afterwards he was provided with a subaltern office in the chimmariat department of the army, and he there embezzled the money of the public, and was, from this sin, to fly. He then became a vagabond. To so many bad qualities he added profound ignorance; he had no knowledge of letters, and still less of the holy Scriptures and theology. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, this man appeared to the Arians a fit instrument to work their will. They taught the emperor to converse into their views; they was a pantomaker of their and their support. At Antioch, in the year 356, there was an assembly of thirty Arian bishops, and in this assembly George was ordained, and received the mission to go and govern the Church of Athensius. George entered Alexandria accompanied, by the order of Constans, by soldiers under the command of Sebastian, duke of Egypt, and a Manichaeans. In the search for Athensius, they violated the most sacred places, and committed every kind of crime. The Alexandrians rose against him and obliged him to fly; but, supported by Constans, he returned more powerful than ever. But a pagan, whose temple George had pillaged after dinner, rose in revolt, threw themselves upon George, and overwhelmed him with abuse and with blows. The next day they paraded him through the town upon a camel, and, having lighted a pile, they threw him and the animal on which he was mounted upon it, after Sergius, but nothing further to the ashes to the winds, and plundered his house and his treasures (A.D. 361). Julian, on learning this outrage, was much irritated, or pretended to be so; he wrote a severe letter to the insurrects, but pursued them no further. As a lover of books, he endeavored to recover the library of George, but the work was very numerous. It is hard to reconcile the accounts of George's extreme ignorance with the accounts given of this library. — Socrates, Hist. Eccl. li. ii., ch. xiv. 28; lii. iii.; ch. ii.; Neander, Ch. Hist. li. 60; Hook, Eccles. Hist. Eccl. ii. 250; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. iii. 5; iv. 10; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx. 117.

GEORGE THE PHILIAN (Georgios Filios or Pisdos) flourished about the middle of the 7th century. (This account is taken substantially from Smith, Dictionary of Biography, s. v.) George is described, in the manuscripts of his writings, as deacon and xerophylax, "record-keeper," or xerophylos, "keeper of the sacred vessels" of the Great Church (that of St. Sophia) at Constantinople. He appears to have accompanied the emperor Heraclius in his first expedition against the Persians, and to have enjoyed the favor both of that emperor and of Sergius, but nothing further is known of him. Among his writings are Eic twn xarwv Psev overlay "Eucaristiasin nhrkoukoukis to basileos xarwov tro, De Exegetike Heraclii Imperatoris contra Persas Libri tres. This work is mentioned by Suidas, and is probably the earliest of the extant works of this writer. The three books are written in trilingual iambics, and contain 1098 verses. They describe the first expedition of Heraclius, whose valor and piety are in moderately praised, against the Persians, A.D. 622, when he attacked the frontier of Persia in the neighborhood of the city of Ecbatana. "Agape" on Africa, an argument of the first book of 541 trimeter iambic verses, describing the attack of the Persians on Byzantium, and their repulse and retreat (A.D. 626); Eic twn xarwv nhrkoukoukis to basileos xarwov tro, in Symeon Sin Kastri, De Nostri, Resurrectio, consisting of 129 trimeter iambic verses, in which George exults Flavius Constantine, the son of Heraclius, to emulate the example of his father; probably written about A.D. 627. Eic twn xarwv nhrkoukoukis, Opus Deorum seu Mundus Opificium, a poem of 1210 iambic verses in the edition of Great Britain and restored to the lines omitted by previous editors. It has been supposed that this work has come down to us in a mutilated condition, for Suidas speaks of it as consisting of 3000 verses. But it is possible that the text of Suidas is corrupt, and that we should read Eic twn xarwv nhrkoukoukis. The poem has a resemblance of incompleteness. The xerophylos contains a prayer as if by the patriarch Sergius for Heraclius and his children. The poem was probably written about A.D. 629. Eic twn xarwv proswos, De Vinite Vitae, 248 iambic verses; Kerd Xanxos, 68 verses; Kerd Xanxos tou Symioutou, 76 verses; Kerd Xanxos tou Symioutou, Contra impium Securum Antiochiae. This poem consists of 738 iambic verses. A passage of Nicephorus Callisti
The ancient history of Georgia is altogether fabulous. It submitted to Alexander the Great, but after his death was made an independent kingdom. In this condition it remained for about twenty-one centuries. Christianity spread in Georgia about the close of the 4th century and dislodged the ancient religion, which was probably kindled from the Mithraic service of the ancient Persians. In consequence of the profession of the Christian faith, Georgia became allied to the Byzantine empire, conjointly with which it resisted the attacks of the Sassanides. More successful than the inroads of the Sassanides were those of the Arabs, and under the dynasty of the Bagratis, a branch of the Armenian dynasty of that name (since 614), Georgia became a province of the empire of the Arabian caliphs, and only the mountainous districts in which the kings of Georgia found a refuge preserved a kind of independence. In the 9th century, during the decline of the caliphate, the Georgians recovered their independence for a short period, but in the 10th century they became tributary to the Mohammedan dynasties in Persia. Toward the end of the 10th century they again achieved independence, and it was from this period that the two great and brilliant eras in Georgian history: from this period to the 15th century, when they were conquered by the Mongols, Georgia was governed by a series of able sovereigns, who increased its extent and raised it to great prosperity. Toward the end of the 14th century the country was conquered by Timour, who was driven from it in the beginning of the following century by George VII. Alexander I, the successor of George VII, divided the kingdom between his three sons. Each of these states was again divided, and at one time 26 different princes reigned in Georgia. The general history of Georgia now divides into two parts: the state of Kachet and Kachet; and that of the western states, including Imereth, Mingrelia, and Guria. From the 16th to the 18th century the eastern states were heavily oppressed by Persia, and in 1795, Gregory XI, after many attempts to establish their independence, resigned the states in favor of the 10th emir-caliph, and in 1802 the emperor Alexander proclaimed the territory a Russian province. Of the three states forming Western Georgia, Guria fell into the hands of Russia in 1801, and formally surrendered itself to that empire by the Treaty of 1801. Mingrelia was virtually added to Russia in 1808, and fully incorporated with it in 1868, and the state of Imereth toward the close of the 18th century. Thus the whole of Georgia has been brought under the dominion of Russia, and has been united, along with the other Transcaucasian possessions of that country, into a general government, the head of which unites in his own person the military, civil, and ecclesiastical powers, and exercises military supremacy over the whole of the Caucasus. The Georgians were represented in the synods convened by the Armenian patriarch in the 5th and 6th centuries, and embraced the Monophysite faith, and they also withdrew from the communion of the patriarch of Constantinople. In the latter part of the 6th cen-
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tury they resumed their former ecclesiastical connexion, and they have since been considered as a part of the Greek Church. When Georgia passed into the hands of Russia it lost the independence of its national Church. The differences between the Russian and the Georgian forms of religion being very small, the latter was suppressed by the Russian authority. The authority of the Georgian Catholicos was also transferred, and a Russian archbishop sent to occupy the see of Georgia. Convents and nunneries are abundant, and the inamles are all mendicants. Most of the bishops are rich, but the majority of the priests are both very poor and ignorant. The best and fullest information about Georgia is contained in the work of Brosset, *Histoire ancienne de la Géorgie* (Peterburg, 1849, 2 vols.; Additions, 1861), and *Histoire Moderne de la Géorgie* (Peters, 1854-57, 8 vols.).—Brockhaus, *Concisa. Lex.*; Farrar; *Halyot, Ordres des Relig.* (ed. Migne), r. v. Melchizedek. (A. J. S.)

Georgian Language. The Georgian language, which is also spoken by the Mingrelians, Lazians, and the Svanet, belongs to the Isberian family. The chief characteristics of it are as follows. Its alphabet consists of thirty-five letters; it has no articles; the substantives have eight cases and no genders; the adjectives, when associated with nouns, are indeclinable, but when they stand by themselves are declined; the comparative is formed by the prefix у and the suffix ai, and cardinals are obtained by prefixing м to the ordinals. It possesses eight conjugations with several minor subdivisions, and the different persons are indicated by terminations and prepositions; it has several forms for the preterite and the future tenses, and only one form for the present tense; three modes, viz. indicative, imperative, and the participle, and supplies the place of the infinitive by a verbal noun; it has postpositions governing different cases, in addition to the prepositions, and can multiply the verbs to any extent by the terminations елос and оло, form abstracts from adjectives by the terminations ооло and ооло, as well as active personal nouns, adjectives—both active and passive—and diminutives, by various terminations and prefixes, and its construction allows many liberties. From the venerable old Georgian language a dialect developed itself, in the course of time, by the introduction into it of many Armenian, Greek, Turkish, and other foreign words, and by the vitiation of the pronunciation and spelling of many words. The two dialects have distinct alphabets: the alphabet in which the old Georgian is written is called хуар, я. i. the sacred, and consists of the letters invented by Mriosb; and the alphabet of the modern Georgian is called кесути, and is supposed to have been invented by the Georgians themselves in the 14th century. The old language is the ecclesiastic or literary, and is employed in all sacred and literary writings, while the modern is the civil dialect, or the dialect of common life. Compare Eisele and Gruber's *Encyclopædia*, s. v. Georgians, p. 122; Eichhorn, *Algemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literature*, i. 156 sq.

Georgian Version. This is one of the oldest versions of the Bible in the east. 1. Name, Date, and Source of this Version. —The Georgians call their Bible by different names—1. *Biblia*, i. e. the Bible; 2. *Zminda Zerilii*, the holy Scripture; 3. *Samtso Zerilii*, the divine Scriptures; 4. *Zigbo m Zabauda de akabide ogilizna*, the books of the O. and N. T.; 5. *Biblia*, the books of the Bible. The version is supposed to have been made about A.D. 570, when the Georgians, stimulated by the example of the Armenians [see ARMENIAN VERSION], sent young men of talent to Greece to study the Holy Scriptures, and translated the Scriptures and liturgic books of the Greek Church. The translation of the O. T. is made from the Sept., and of the N. T. from Greek MSS. of the Constantinopolitan family, and is composed in the ecclesiastical or ancient dialect. See GEORGIAN LANGUAGE.

II. Text and Editions of the Version.—This venerable version has shared in all the troubles to which Georgia has been subject. The entire books of Macabees and Esthers are missing; the descriptions of the country, passages disappeared from different parts of the volume, and the whole text got into a state of confusion. It was only in the beginning of the 17th century that prince Vakhtang published at Tiflis the Psalms, the Prophets, and the New Testament. In 1758, a full version was printed at Tiflis, with the notes of the text. Shortly after, prince Arcili, uncle of prince Vakhtang, who fled from Kartel to Russia, undertook a revision of this version, making it conformable to the Russian translation as it then was, and divided it only into chapters, because the Russian translation was divided into chapters only. But this prince only lived to carry through the revision from Geneva to the Prophets, and to translate from the Russian Bible the lost books of Macabees and Ecclesiastical. His son, prince Vaknet, was, however, induced by the solicitation of a bishop, prince Khakuli, and a Georgian clergy resident in Russia, to continue the work of revision. He made the text conform still more to the Russian translation, newly revised according to the command of Peter the Great, supplied from this translation all the passages which were wanting in his version, made also the additions which his father had published conformable to this translation, and divided the whole into chapters and verses. He had Georgian types cast at Moscow, and at once began printing in that city; the correction of the press he committed to four native Georgians, and the first edition of the entire Bible was lost in 1740. In 1760, fol., prince Bachar, brother of the editor, defraying the entire expense. From this edition the Moscow Bible Society reprinted the N. T. in 1816, 4to, under the superintendence of the Georgian metropolitan Ion and of archbishop Pafnuti, with types cast from the very matrices which had been used for the former edition, and which had escaped the conflagration of the city at the time of Napoleon's invasion. Another edition was published in 1818, in the chief character, 4to. It is said that there have appeared more recent editions of various portions of this version both at St. Petersburg and in Russia, but there is no particular account of them.

III. Critical Value of the Version.—The value of this version, in a critical point of view, has been greatly impaired by the corruptions which it has suffered during the centuries of political changes which the country has undergone, and especially by the disfavor of its editors to make it conform to the Russian translation. It must not, however, be supposed that its value is entirely gone. Both Tischendorf (N. T. Graec. 2d ed. pref. p. lxxvii) and Mr. Malan regard it as a good auxiliary to the criticism of the Greek text. Indeed, Mr. Malan, who has published an English translation of the Georgian version of John’s Gospel, goes so far as to say that “it differs from the Slavonic in many places in which it might be expected to agree, it has a character of its own, is a faithful version, and is a true criterion.” The same comment is applicable to St. John, translated from the eleven old Versions, etc., by the Rev. S. C. Malan, M.A., Lond. 1862, p. ix, note 3).

IV. Literature.—A very interesting treatise on this version, containing a brief account of its history and publication, from the preface of prince Vakhtang, was communicated by professor Adler, of Copenhagen, to Eichhorn, who published it in his *Algemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literature*, i. 158 sq., and afterwards reprinted it in his *Einleitung d. Alten Testament*, vol. i., sec. i. He has also published a part of the translation of the Old Testament, and both Georgia and Russia, could do no more in his Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia (London, 1826, p.
GEORGIIUS SYNCELLUS

518, etc.) than to give a literal translation of this account. A valuable book has also been published by Franz Carl Alber, entitled Uber Georgisacische Literatur (Wien, 1796), in which is given an extensive collection of the various readings from both the O. and N. T.

Georgeus Syncellus, termed also "Abbas and Monachus," lived in the latter part of the 8th and beginning of the 9th century. He obtained his distinguishing epithet from having been syncellus or personal attendant of Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, who died A.D. 806. Theophanes, who was his friend, describes him as a man of talent and learning, especially well versed in chronographical and historical subjects, which he had studied very deeply. He died in "the orthodox faith," without completing his principal (and, indeed, only known) work, the completion of which he strongly urged, as his dying request, upon his friend Theophanes. He is the author of a chronography or chronicle, the title of which in full is as follows: Εὐχέλα Χρονογραφίας συγγεγεντιδινύκτω Νεωτέρων Μανάγοι Συγκέλλου γεγονότοι Ταρασιών Πατριάρχων Κωνσταντινουπόλεως από ἅλα μήνα Δεκεμβρίου ὧν θεωρεύεται αὐτόν ἁπάντως Κοινήν Μουσαλλος, Συνταγμάτων Ρημάτων Συνετάς, Πατριάρχων Κωνσταντινοπόλεως, ἀπό Αδάμ ἄπειται. The author states that he intended to bring his work down to A.D. 800; but, as already stated, he was cut off by death, and the work only comes down to the accession of Dioscorides, A.D. 1234. This work is included in the various editions of the Byzantine writers. Gour, the Parisian editor, contended that we have the work of Syncellus in a complete form, but the contrary opinion seems to be the better founded. Possessing, Vasilius, and others have lately been Syncellus with Georgius Harsmartolus; but Allatius has shown that this identification is erroneous. Syncellus has transcribed verbatim a considerable part of the Chronicon of Eusebius, so that his work has been employed to restore or complete the Greek text of the Chronicon. The Chronography of Theophanes, which extends from A.D. 265 to A.D. 583, may be regarded as a continuation of that of Syncellus, and completes the author's original design. The Bonn edition of Syncellus is edited by W. Dindorf, and, with the brief Chronography of Nicephorus of Constantinople, occupies 2 vols. 8vo, 1829. (Theophanes, A selection of chapters, by George Compend. sub. init.; Allatius, Ibid. p. 24; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. vii, 457; Cave, Hist. Lit. i, 641.)—Smith, Dictionary of Gr. and Rom. Biography, ii, 254. See Syncler.

Gopher. See VINE.

Gephyrus (Γεφύρος, prob. a Greekised form of the Heb. נַמְפֶל, a village; see CAPARH), a town mentioned by Polybius (v. 70, 12) as captured by Antiochus along with Pallus and Camus (Camon), and therefore situated in the same vicinities east of the Jordan (Reland, Palest. p. 804); perhaps the present Arab-Aswe, a short distance N.E. of Kefr-Ablid (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 318).

Ge'ra (Heb. גֵּרַע), N'2, a grain [see GERAH]; Sept. Γεραίος, the name of at least three Benjaminites. 1. The son of Bela and grandson of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 8); probably the same with the one mentioned (with some confusion) in verses 6, 7, unless one of these be identical with No. 2 below. In Gen. xvi, 21, he is given as if directly the son of Benjamin; and he there appears among the descendants of Jacob, at the time of that patriarch's removal to Egypt. B.C. 1674. See JACOB. * Gera is not mentioned in the list of Benjaminite families in Numb. xxvi, 38-40, of which a distinct instance is given here; and at this time he was not the head of a separate family, but was included among the Belaites; it being a matter of necessity that some of Bela's sons should be so included, otherwise there could be no family of Belaites at all.

To the remarks made under Becher should be added that the great destruction of the Benjamites recorded in Judg. xx may account for the introduction of so many new names in the later Benjaminite lists of 1 Chron. vii, 10, the whole of which are probably names of women's names ("Smith"). See BENJAMIN. In 1 Chron. vii, 7, Uzziel occupies the same position as Gera elsewhere in the genealogy. See BELA.

2. The (father or ancestor) of Ebud the judge (Judg. iii, 15); compare 1 Chron. viii, 5, 7; possibly identical with No. 1 above. B.C. ante 1560. See EBUD.

3. The father of the eschatological son of Shimeon, which latter so grossly abused David (2 Sam. xvi, 5; xix, 16, 18; 1 Kings ii, 8); thought by some to be identical with both the foregoing. B.C. ante 1028. See SHIMMIEL.

Gerah (גֵרַע, "Gerah"; a berry or granule [compare English "barley-corn" and "grain" as measure and weight]; Sept. ἀράχ, Vulgate obodius), the smallest weight, and likewise the smallest piece of money among the Hebrews, equivalent to the twentieth part of a shekel (Exod. xxx, 13; Lev. xxvii, 25; Numb. iii, 47; xviii, 16; Ezek. xiv, 12). It would therefore weigh 1313, Paris grains, and be worth about 3 cents. The same Hebrew word also signifies 20c, as being a round mass. It has been supposed by many that the gerah was so called from the fact that some kernels, as of pepper or some other, or perhaps the seeds of the vetch tree (sepainting) may have been originally used for this weight, but it would be equal in weight to 4 or 5 beans of the carob, and, according to the Rabbins, it weighed as much as 16 grains of barley. See Metricology.

Gerando, Joseph Marie, Baron De, a French statesman and philosophical writer, was born at Lyons February 29, 1772, and was educated for the priesthood. During the Revolution he served in the French army, and, under Napoleon, he filled various high civil offices. He was made a French peer in 1857, and died at Paris November 10, 1842. He is mentioned here for his philosophical and ethical writings. He sent an article to the French Academy in 1799, which received a prize, he enlarged it into a treatise entitled Des Signes et de l'art de penser (1800, 4 vols. 8vo). This was followed by De la Generation des connaissances humaines (1802, 8vo), which was crowned by the Berlin Academy. His most important work is his De l'éducation pour le complet d'un essai de l'éducation des enfants (1802, 3 vols.; ed. 1847-8, 4 vols. 8vo);—Du perfectionnement moral de l'éducation de soi-même (1834; 1832, 2 vols.), which received the Montyon prize from the French Academy, and translated into English as "Self-Education," No. 1, 1833. De Gerando wrote many works on economical and political science.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xx, 149.

Ge'rar (Heb. גֶּרָאר), "Gerar," according to Simon's lodging-place, according to others from the Arabic "Garar," but more prob. with Fürst, a region, as being the centre of a distinct Philistine kingdom; Sept. and Josephus "Galilee" (Galailee), a very ancient town and district on the southernmost borders of Palestine, in the country of the Philistines, and not far from Gaza. It was visited by Abraham after the destruction of Sodom (Gen. xxxi, 1) and Isaac when there was a dearth in that country (Gen. xxvi, 1). The intercourse, differences, and alliances of the Hebrew fathers with the king and people of Gerar form a very curious and interesting portion of patriarchal history (Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 380). See ISAAC. In Genesis xxvi and xxvii, which are written by a Philistine; but their habits appear, in that early stage, more pronounced than they subsequently were. Yet they are even then warlike, since Abimelech had a "captain of the host," who appears from his fixed title, "Phichol," like that
GERARD
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to the kingdom, "Abimelech," to be a permanent officer
(comp. Gen. xxi, 82; xxvi, 26; and Psa. xxxiv, title). See
Abimelech. The local description, xxii, 1, "between Kadesh and Shur," is probably meant to
indicate the limits of the Philistines, whose chief seat was then Gerar, ranged, although it
would by no means follow that their territory embr
aced all the interval between those cities. It must
have trenchcd on the "south" or "south country" of later
Palestine. From a comparison of xxi, 52 with xxv
it would seem that the Israelites would soon be on
the verge of this territory, and perhaps to be its limit
towards the N.E. For its southern boundary, though
very uncertain, none is more probable than the wady
El-Arish ("River of Egypt") and El-Ain; south of
which the neighboring "wilderness of Paran" (xx, 15;
xxi, 16) is probably situated. Isaac was most
probably born in Gerar. The great crops
which he subsequently raised attest the fertility of the
soil, which, lying in the maritime plain, still contains
some of the best ground in Palestine (xxii, 2; xxvi,
12). It was still an important place in later times, as
we may gather from 1 Chron. xxxi, 14, 15. According to
the ancient accounts, Gerar lay in or near a valley
(\\"the valley of Gerar,\") Gen. xxxvi, 17; comp. 1 Sam.
xx, 5, which appears to be not other than the great
wady Shrikk (or one of the branches of it) that comes
down from the south; besides, we know that it was
in the land of the Philistines, and that it was not far
from Beerseba when Isaac resided there (Gen. xxxvi,
1, 10, 28; 28-38; comp. xx, 1). The name continued to
exist (perhaps as a matter of tradition) for several
centuries after the Christian era. Eusebius and Je-
ronimo of Jerusalem (s. v. Gerar) place it on the south
side of the Roman miles southward from Eleutheropolis
and Soszo-
men (Hist. Eccles. vi, 82; ix, 17) reports that a large
and celebrated monastery stood there, a winter
torrent. The abbot Silvanus resided there towards
the end of the 5th century, and the name of Marcion,
bishop of Cagliar (s. v. Gerar) appears among the signatures of the
Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451. In the Talmudical
writings the district is termed Gerariki (Schwarz, Pal-
etina, p. 109). The name seems to have been after-
wards lost, and Dr. Robinson (Researches, i, 270 ; ii,
387) was unable to discover any traces of it later in the
locality: but he unnecessarily disregarded the claims of
wady El-Je'erur, which runs into the wady El-Arish
at Jebel el-Halal, to be regarded as a southernmost
trase of the ancient kingdom (Journ. Soc. Lit. July,
1845, p 239). It is well mentioned by him as lying in the shallow wady
El-Kusaimeh, in the same neighborhood (i, 280), may
represent those digged by Abraham and reopened by
Isaac (Gen. xxvi, 18-22). J. Rowlonds, in travelling from
Gaza to Khulasah, came after 3 hours' march to a
broad, deep wady, Jafc el-Gerur, a little below its
junction with a branch valley from wady Sherib.
Near this junction are ruins called Khurbet el-Gerar
(Williams, Holy City, 1845, App. p. 488-492), which he
identifies with Gerar. This account Van de Velde
heard confirmed by the people of Gaza, with a slight
name variation, i.e., (183); but the no ruins
yet standing, but scattered stones which appear to have
been once used in buildings: and in the absence of old
wells, it would seem as if the ancient city had been
supplied from some spring. Stuart's suggestion of
the ruins of El-Abdek (Time and Khan, p. 207) is not
out of the question. See Van de Velde, Memoir, p. (184).
In 1 Chron. iv, 39, the Sept. substitutes Gerar (Girappa) for
Gedor (q. v.).

Gerard, Alexander, an eminent Scotch divine,
was born Feb. 22, 1720, at Garloch, in Aberdeenhire,
and graduated at Marischal College and the Uni-
versity of Edinburgh. In 1750 he succeeded Pordyce
as professor of moral philosophy at Marischal College,
and in 1760 was appointed divinity professor. In 1771
he obtained the theological professorship at King's
College, Aberdeen. He died in 1795. He wrote (1.)
An Essay on Taste (1759, 8vo; enlarged edition, 1780).
This work obtained the prize of a gold medal offered
by the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh. (2.) An
Essay on the Use of Moral Discourse (1769, 8vo). Hermene
(London, 1790, 1782, 2 vols. 8vo); — (4.) Disser-
tations on the Genius and Evidence of Christianity (London, 1776, 8vo); — (5.) The Pastoral Care, edited by his son (London, 1799,
8vo).

Gerard, Gilbert, D.D., son of Alexander Gerard,
was born and educated at Aberdeen. He was for
some time pastor of the English church at Amsterdam,
and afterwards professor of Greek in King's College,
Aberdeen, and in 1775 of divinity. He died in 1815.
His "Institutes" are valuable for the numerous refer-
ce to authorities which they contain, and are very
careful. The greater part of the first edition was lost
at sea. His writings are, Institutes of Biblical Criti-
icism (Edinb. 1808, 3d edit. 8vo) — Compendious View of
the Evidence of natural and revealed Religion (London,
1829, 8vo).—Darling.

Gerard, Thom, Tun, Tuno, or Tenque, found-
er and first grand master of the order of St. John of Jeru-
usalem, was born about 1046, on the isle of Martigues,
on the Mediterranean. While Jerusalem was in the
hands of the Saracens, some merchants of Amalfi ob-
tained permission from the sultan of Egypt and Syria,
in 1000, to erect a Benedictine monastery near the
holy sepulchre, for the convenience of the pilgrims.
It was called Santa Marie la Latine. Among others, Ger-
ard arrived to pay his devotions, and he acquired a
high character for his piety and prudence. The
number of pilgrims increased every year, enriching the
treasury of the monastery. In 1080 the abbot built a
hospital for the reception of poor and sick pilgrims, the
management of which he gave to Gerard. The master of
that hospital was consecrated to St. John, because of a
tradition among the inhabitants of Jerusalem that
Zacharias, the father of St. John, had lived on the spot
where it was built. After the conquest of Jerusalem
by Godfrey of Bouillon, Gerard projected a new reli-
gious order, in which the ecclesiastical and military
characters were to be blended. This design he began
to carry out in the year 1100, when numbers associa-
ted with him under the denomination of "Hospital-
iers of St. John of Jerusalem," who, besides the three
vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, took a par-
ticular vow to devote themselves to the relief of all
Christians in distress. This order, and the rules drawn
up for its government, were approved and confirmed by
pope Paschal II, who, by a bull which he issued,
granted it various considerable privileges, and recog-
nised it as the first grand master. Gerard died in
the year 1120. Such was the commencement of that
order which in succeeding times became so cele-
brated in history, when its members were commonly
known by the name of knights of Rhodes, and after-
wards by that of knights of Malta. — Hook, Eccles.

Gerard or Gerhard Groot. See Groot, Ger-
ard.

Gerßas (Gerasa, prob. of Heb. origin), a cele-
bated city on the eastern borders of Peraea (Josephus,
War, iii, 8, 3), placed by some in the province of Coele-
Syria and region of Decapolis (Steph. s. v.), by oth-
It is doublet of the Gerasa (Geras) of Ptolemaic
(68° 15' 15' 45") (Reland, Palaest., p. 450), who distin-
guishes it from the Gerassene (Gerasa) of Arabia Pe-
traea (66° 46') (Smith, Dict. Geog. s. v.). It is not men
tioned in the O. T.
nor in the New, unless in the reading Gerasene (q. v.) at Matt. vii, 28. It is not known when or by whom Gerasa was founded. Its inhabitants were mostly heathen (Josephus, War, iii, 5, 5; comp. iv, 5, 1; ii, 18, 5; Ant. xii, 18, 6). Before the revolt at Qarqar (Ant. xxv, 5). Before the capture of the city, it was included among the number of those cities which were burnt by the enraged Jews in their vengeance on the Syrians, and on the Roman power generally, for the massacre of a number of their nation at Cassarea (Josephus, War, ii, 18, 1). A terrible retribution was taken by other cities, but Gerasa is honorably excepted (War, ii, 18, 5). It had scarcely recovered from this calamity when the emperor Vespasian dispatched Annius, his general, to capture it. Annius, having carried the city at the first assault, put to the sword one thousand of the youth who had not effected their escape, enslaved their families, and plundered and fired their dwellings. It appears to have been nearly a century subsequent to this period that Gerasa attained its greatest prosperity, and was adorned with those monuments which gives it a place among the proudest cities of Syria. History tells us nothing of this, but the fragments of inscriptions found among its ruined palaces and temples show that it is indebted for its architectural splendor to the age and genius of the Antonines (A.D. 138-80). It subsequently became the seat of a bishopric. Baldwin II of Jerusalem destroyed its castle in the year 1122 (Will. Tyr. p. 922; Hist. Hieroool. p. 615). This was the native place of Nicaemachus Gerasenus. Coins of Gerasa may be seen in Eckhel (Vem. Vet. iii, 360). There is no evidence that the city was ever occupied by the Saracens. There are no traces of their architecture—no mosques, no inscriptions, no reconstruction of old edifices, such as are found in most other great cities in Syria. All here is Roman, or at least anti-Islamic; every structure remains as the hand of the destroyer or the earth-quake shock left it, ruinous and deserted. It is now called Jerash. Its ruins were first discovered by Sceatzen (1, 388 sq.), and have been subsequently visited. They are by far the most beautiful and extensive east of the Jordan. They are situated on both sides of a shallow valley that runs from north to south through a high undulating plain, and falls into the Zerka (the ancient Jabbeh) at the distance of about five miles. A little rivulet, thickly fringed with oleander, winds through the valley, giving life and beauty to the deserted city. The first view of the ruins is very striking, and such as have enjoyed it will not soon forget the impression made upon the mind. The long colonnade running through the centre of the city, terminating at one end in the graceful circle of the forum; the groups of columns clustered here and there round the crumbling walls of the temple; the heavy masses of masonry that distinguish the positions of the great theatres; and the vast field of shapeless ruins rising gradually from the green banks of the rivulet to the battlemented heights on both sides—all combine in forming a picture so real as is rarely equalled. The form of the city is an irregular square, each side measuring nearly a mile. It was surrounded by a strong wall, a large portion of which, with its flanking towers at intervals, is in a good state of preservation. Three gateways are still nearly perfect, and within the city a hundred and thirty columns remain on their pedestals. A description of them may be found in Burckhardt's Syria, p. 232-64; also in those of Lord Lindsay and others, which are well condensed in Kelley's Syria, p. 448 sq. See also Buckingham's Palmyra, p. 403; Keith, Evidence of Prophecy (3rd ed.).

Gerasána (Γερασανή), an inhabitant of Gerasa (q. v.). Several MSS. read Γερασίνων instead of Γερασών, in Matt. vii, 28; but the city of Gerasa lay too far from the Sea of Tiberias to admit the possibility of the miracles having been wrought in the reading Πετρονίαν be the true one, the γερασάνων, "district," must then have been very large, including Gadará and its environs; and Matthew thus uses a broader appellation, where Mark and Luke use a more specific one. This is not impossible, as Jerome (of Ecd., ed. 1) states that Gilead was in his day called Jer- rass, and Origen affirms that Πετρονίαν was the ancient reading (Opp. iv, 140). See GADARA. The nature of Origen's argument makes this statement very doubtful. It looks like a bold hypothesis to get over a difficulty (see Alford, ad loc.). The rival Gerasa, however, is also mentioned by Eusebius, and the title given to the city, the Latin name, makes it certain that Gerasa was on the bank of wady Semal, east of the lake. He describes it as "within a few rods of the shore, and an immense mountain rises directly above it, in which are ancient tombs... The lake is so near the base of the mountain, that the swine rushing madly down it could not stop, but would be buried on into the water and drowned." (Rud. Book, ii, 84-86.) It is uncertain which reading has the highest authority, and consequently these conjectures are very doubtful (see, however, Elliott's Lectures on the Life of our Lord, p. 188, note; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 311; Rendel, p. 502, 507). See Gerasa.

GERAUD, Henry, a French priest of evil name in the 13th cent., first mentioned as chaplain of pope Clement V. He afterwards became arch-deacon of En, in the diocese of Rouen. Clement V finally appointed him bishop of Cahors, in consideration, it is said, of a large sum of money. He soon, however, took advantage of his position to despise the inhabitants of his diocese, and pope John XXII appointed the bishops of Riez and Arras to investigate the charges against Géraud. Accused of simony, of ingratitude towards the see of Rome, of cruelty to those who appealed from his decisions, of spoliation, and of criminal con-
section with women, he was condemned to prison for life. An author of that period, Bernard Guidoin, says that Gérauld, after being stripped of the insignia of his office, was condemned to be dragged on the public highway, flayed in some places, and finally burned alive.


Gerbelin, Jean François, a French Jesuit missionary to China, was born at Verdun Jan. 11, 1868. He studied at Nancy under the Jesuits, and was, with five other Jesuits, sent to missionary work in China, where he arrived March 25, 1866. The missionaries at once sought an audience from the emperor, who refused to admit the new religion, on the ground that as the sects of Fo, Tao-se, the Lamas, and the Han-changs taught men to do good and avoid evil, there was no need of a new one. He conducted several doctrinal disputes. Yet, by special edict, he retained at his court the missionaries Gerbillon, Pereira, and Bouvet, with permission to practice the religion, but not to teach it. He commanded them to learn the Chinese and other dialects, and sent them on several diplomatic missions. In 1869 Christian works were finally permitted in China; but Gerbillon's attempts to introduce the Roman Catholic religion, and to open the country to European commerce, failed through the jealousy of the divers other orders of Roman missionaries, in the Christian Church; and the Jesuits were ordered to leave. They were formally expelled in 1867. They were finally expelled in 1870. He wrote Elements of Geometry in Chinese and Tartar (Pekin):—Theoretical and Practical Geometry, in the same language, and published also at Pekin:—Observations historiques sur la grande Tartarie (in Du Halde's Description de la Chine, t. xxxiii); La Voyages en Tartarie (in Du Halde). He is also considered by some as the author of the Elementa Linguae Tartaricae, which others attribute to the missionaries Couplet and Bouvet. See Lettres écrites, tom. xviii; Hist. géner. des Voyages, t. vii and viii. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxx, 203 sq.

Gerdes, Daniel, a learned German divine, and member of the Berlin Academy, was born at Bremen April 19, 1698. He took his doctor's degree at Utrecht, after which (1726) he became professor of theology and ecclesiastical history at Durlaburg. He removed to Grogingen in 1735, and died Feb. 11, 1776. His works are accurate, and of great utility for the history of the Reformation. Among them are Historia Reformata, sive Introductio in historiam evangeli secundo evi passum per Europam renovati, etc. (Gron. 1744-52, 4 vols. 4to); Florilégium historicorum librorum veterum sive notarum et historiarum (Gron. 1750, 4to); Molematina Sacra (Gron. 1759, 4to); Specimen Italiae Reformatae (L. Batz. 1755, 4to); Doctrina gratiae sive comprehensio theologorum dogmatum (Duibus. 1784, 4to). Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx, 206; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v. 34.

Gerdi, Hyacinthe Sigermond, a Roman Catholic theologian, and cardinal of the Congregation of St. Paul, was born at Sannois, in Savoy, June 23, 1718. In 1782 he entered the order of the Barnabites, and studied at Bologna, where his talents attracted the notice of the cardinal archbishop Lambertini, who secured his aid in the preparation of his great work on Canonism. He was subsequently made professor of philosophy and theology, first at Macerata (1737) and afterwards at Turin (1749). In 1777 pope Pius VI made him cardinal, with the title of St. Cecilia, and afterwards prefect of the Propaganda. He would probably have been elected pope on the death of Pius VI but for his great age. He died August 12, 1802. Gerdi was undoubtedly a man of considerable intellect and of large acquisitions. His writings on metaphysical subjects, especially against Locke's philosophy, have secured the admiration of many Protestants as well as of Roman Catholics. He also wrote largely upon the subjects of Christology and the Encyclopedists. Editions of his works have been published by P. Tosielli (Bologna, 1781-1794, 6 vols.), and by Fontana and Grandi (Rome, 1806 sq., 20 vols.). In

Gerem. See GARMITE.

Gerês, Gerês. See GERÄNNE; GAĐARA; GERÄEVE.

Gerêsene (Γερεσενος), a reading (Γερεσεονος), found in the Received Text (with many fragmentary uncial and other MSS.) in the account of the expulsion of the swine by our Lord (Matt. viii., 28). Instead of Γεκαρεσον (Toασανων, as Tischendorf; with several of the earliest and many later MSS.), some readings (Γεσαρεσον, Γεστερινεσον, Γεστερινεσον, or even Казаре (Toασανων, as the Codex Sinaiticus). In the parallel passages (Mark v., 1; Luke viii., 26) the readings are different, but equally disputed (B. T. Toασανων, with By far the greatest weight of the older authorities, Gerêsene, with X [in Mark only, in Luke Γερεσεονων, B. etc.]. It is evident that the evangelists did not write the same name; and we may therefore suppose that the exact spot was one on the immediate lake shore, within the bounds of the region indifferent- ly known by either of the general names Гадара or Γεραια; or if Gerêsene be retained, it may refer to the ancient territory of the Gerontes (q. v.), in the same neighborhood. See Geräsenne.

Ger'gesite (only in the plur. Γεργεσιονα), a Graecized form (Judith v., 15) of the ancient Girogsseite (q. v.).

Gerhard, Johann, an eminent theologian of the Lutheran Church of Germany, was born in Quedlin- burg October 17, 1582. In 1609 he went to the Univer- sity of Wittenberg, and studied medicine for a time. He left Wittenberg for Jena, where he studied Hebrew, the Scriptures, and the fathers. After passing A.M., he began to give private lectures in those branches and in theology. Thence he went to Marburg, where the teachings of Winckelmann and Muentzer deeply impressed him. After lecturing on theology at Jena, he accepted the superintendency of Heldburg, offered him by Casimir, duke of Coburg, in 1606. Declining two calls to Jena in 1610 and 1611, and one to Wittenberg in 1613, he finally accepted the senorate of the faculty of Jena, at the command of George I, elector of Saxony, in 1615. Here he devoted his great talents industriously to his duties to the university, the Church, and the state. He held the first place in the ecclesiastical conferences at Jena, 1621; Leipsic, 1624 and 1630; and was consulted by princes both in ecclesiastical and secular matters. He died Aug. 20, 1657. Gerhard's great points of excellence as a dogmatic writer are comprehensiveness of plan, thoroughness of the treatment of topics, and per- spicuity of style. The Loci Communes Theologicis has not only been a standard of Lutheran theology for two centuries, but has also been greatly valued by Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians.

The exegetical writings of Gerhard are also of great value, the most important being Comment. in Harmonius Am. evang. de Pasione et Resurrectione Christi (1617, 4to), a continuation of the commentaries of Chenu and Lyra, and written with them (Hamburg, 1582, 8 vols. fol.). It is specially valuable for its patristic learning. Posthumously appeared his Comm. in Genesin (1637, 4to); Comm. in Deuteronomium (1638, 4to); in 1 and 2 Tim. (1648); in 1 and 2 Peter (1641); ad Coloss. (1640, 4to); ad Ephesios (1668, 4to). He also pub- lished De Sacra Script. Interpretatione (1610, 4to); Methodus stud. theol. (1620)—still valuable as a methodological work. In the sphere of doctrinal theology Gerhard has made his name immortal by two great works: the first is Doctrina catholica et evangelica, quam ecclesiam Augustana confessionis adiuvibus profectur ex Romanu-catholicorum scriptorum subreptis confirmita (1684, 3 vols.), a work which many theologians consider the best of Gerhard's writings. The other great work is Loci Theologicis, cum pro addenda variis, tum pro detractis quorumvis contributio summis illestitut, which he began in Heldburg when only twenty-seven years of age, and of which he celebrated the comple- tion (nineth volume) at Jena in 1629 (first edit. Jena, 1629-1630, vol. frequently reprinted). One of the best editions is that by Cotta, Tub., 1762-1768, 22 vols. 4to, the two last volumes containing index by G. H. Muller. A new edition was begun by Dr. Preusse, Ber- lin, 1867 sq.). That part of the Locci which treats of God and of the person of Christ was developed more particularly in his book published in 1629, De Exegesi seu superiori explicationi articulorum, et cetera. The value of the Loci Theologici in comparison with the predecessors of Gerhard in the Lutheran Church, especially with Hutter and with his successors, especially with Calov and Queesstedt, is abundantly testified by George in his Geschichte der protest. Dogmatik, 1, 261.

The practical writings of Gerhard are full of the spirit of Christian love and devotion. He was, indeed, charged by the cold dogmatists of the time with the spirit and mysticism. Among them are Medicina Sacra ad incohendum ex doctrinam medicinalem (Jena, 1619.);—Schola Pietatis, d. i. christl. Unterrichtung a. Gottliebin- keiti (Jena, 1622-23, 12 vols.);—52 Heilige Betrachtungen. These have been frequently reprinted; the Medicinae has passed through scores of editions, and has been translated into English and often reprinted (last- est, Lond., 1623, 12mo). For a list of all his writings see Fischer, Vita Joannis Gerhardi (Lips. 1728); see also Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, v, 40; Gisseler, Church History (ed. Smith), iv, 574.

Gerhard, Johann Ernst, (1.) a theologian, was born at Jena December 15, 1621. He studied at the universities of Jena, Altdorf, Helmstadt, Leipzig, and Wittenberg, devoting himself to Oriental literature and theology. He visited successively the libraries of Holland, Switzerland, and France, and in his journey became acquainted with some of the most eminent literary men of that period. After his return to Jena he became professor of history, afterwards of theology, in the university, and died in that city Feb. 24, 1689. He wrote Harmonia lingvarum orientalium:—Consensus et Dissensus religionum proforum Judaeism, Sor- maristismus, Muhamedam et paganism.—Ezech und Gruber, Allg. Encycl.; Jocher, Allg. Gel.-Lex.; Hoefler, Nowe. Biogr. Generale, xx, 213.

Gerhard, Johann Ernst, (2.) son of Johann Ernst (1.), was born at Jena Feb. 13, 1669. He studied theology at Jena and Altdorf, became a member of the Societas Discipulorum, and contributed a number of Memoirs to the Acta Eruditorum of Leipzig. He was afterwards appointed church and school inspector of Gotha; was called to Glessen in 1696 as professor of theology, and became preacher in the same city in 1698. He wrote some controversial works little sought after now; the most remarkable of them is entitled Der lutherischen und reformirten Religion Einigkeit.—Ezech u. Gruber, Allg. Encycl.; Fischer, Vita Gerhardi; Hoefler, Nowe. Biogr. Generale, xx, 313.

Gerhard, St., was born at Staves, diocese of Na- mur, in 890. In his youth he was under Beversage, count of Namur. Being once at a hunt, he left his companions and retired to pray in a chapel built on a high cliff near the village of St. Gerhard. Having fallen asleep there, he had a dream in which he thought that he saw the apostles, and that Peter, taking him by the hand, took him around the chapel, afterwards telling him that it was to be enlarged in honor of St. Peter and the martyr Eugene, and that the bones of the latter were to be brought there. Gerhard fulfilled this dream, and in 918 built there a church and also a
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convent. Some time after he was sent by Berengar
on a mission to count Robert of Paris, after fulfilling
which he entered the abbey of St. Denis, near Paris.
The relics of St. Eugenius and of several other saints
were given him by the abbey of St. Denis, which was
said to have been a gift of the pope, in order that he
might supply France with the miracles of the pope.
The fame of the miracles wrought by the relics of St.
Eugenius was soon spread abroad, and drew crowds of
visitors, obliging Gerhard to live in a cell near the
church in order to obtain some quiet. After spending
twenty-two years in the reformation of convents, he
died a few days before the jubilee of 1120. He was
instructed by the papal legate. See Mabillon, Acta
s. ordin. s. Benedict., 248 sq.; Hes-
zeroz, Real-Encyklop. v. 38.
Gerhardt, Paul, the "prince of German hymn-
nists," was born at Grafenhausen, in the electorate
of Saxony, in 1561 or 1567. He received his first
appointment as music director at Mir at Gerhardt's,
in 1587, he was called to the church of St. Nicholas, in
Berlin. In 1688 he became archdeacon at Lübben,
in Saxony, where he died in 1676. As a theologian,
he is noted particularly in the controversies be-
tween the Lutherans and the Reformed. As a poet,
his hymns abound in the rich, deep, and spiritual feel-
ing and suggestive thought. They are the expres-
sion of his own feelings and experience, and charac-
terized generally by their subjective tone. Among
his 1205 hymns, there are no less than 16 commencing
with the word "I." 60 others are addressed to God and
the individual heart; yet their popular, element dis-
tinguishes his productions from the poets of the Refor-
mation and those of the later rationalistic period.
"His hymns happily combine simplicity with depth
and force. They are the heart-utterances of one who
had a simple but sublime faith in God, and who recog-
nised his fatherly presence in the operations of nature
and the superintendence of Providence, and the daily
bestowment of the surpassing gifts of redemption."
He never published a complete edition of his hymns,
but after 1640 they found their way into Protestant hym-
books. J. E. Helling, music director at Martin's
church, had them published in 1667, with music of his
own composition. There have been many editions
since; among the latest are those of Wackernagel
(Stuttgart, 1848; new ed. 1849), Schultz (Berlin, 1842).
Becker (Lpz., 1851), and Laisbecker, Leben und Leiden
Gerhardts (Berlin, 1864). Many of his hymns have
been translated into English; the fullest collection is
Paul Gerhardt's Spiritual Songs, translated by John
Kelly (London, 1867), a well-meant but unsuccessful effort. His noble hymn, O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden (based on Bernhard von Clairvaux's Sursum corda), has been
rendered; the best version is that of Dr. J. W. Alex-
ander (O sacred heart now wounded), given in Schaff's
Christ in Song, p. 178. His Bekehr du deiner Wege
is admirably translated by John Wesley in the hymn,
Commit thou all thy griefs (775 of Methodist Episcopal
Hymn-book), and Glee to the winds (780 of the same
collection). His O Jesu Christ mein schones Licht is also translated by John Wesley (Jesus, thy
boundless love to me, Hymn 838, Methodist Hymn-
bok). Dr. Schaff also gives versions of his Wir singen
dir, Immanuel, We sing to thee, Immanuel (Christ in
Song, p. 86); Prickel und schießt Herzflammen. All my
heart this night rejoices (Christ in Song, p. 88, C.
Winkworth's version); O Welt, sich hier deines Lebens,
O world, behold upon the tree (Christ in Song, p. 174,
C. Winkworth's version). Some of these, and also
verses from the hymns of Gerhardt's hymns, are given
by C. Winkworth, Lyra Germanica (London; reprinted
in New York). See, besides the works already cited,
Herszog, Real-Encyklopädie, v. 45; Hoefer, Neue.
Bibl. (Gign., xx, 214; Miller, Our Hymns, their Authors
and Origins (London, 1866, 1Sth ed., 1868); Weir, London Life (Lond.
tenburg, 1728); Roh, G. nach seinem Leben u. Wirken
(Leips.) 1839; Schulz, Paul G. u. der grosse Kurfurst
(Berl., 1840); Wildenbahn, Paul G., ein kirchen-gesch.
Lebenbild (Leips., 1845; 2d edit. 1850).
Gerboch or Gerchoch, a Roman Catholic priest
of Germany, was born in 1589 at Polling, in Bavaria.
Soon after completing his theological studies he took
an active part in the conflict between the pope and the
emperor. The possession by the emperor of the city of
Augsburg made him a canon and scholasticus of the
cathedral school; but he soon left this position, as the
bishop, who sided with the emperor, appeared to him
to be a schismatic. He withdrew to the Augustinian
monastery of Rottenbuch (now Rotenburg), where
he remained until 1129, where he was for some time having peace with the king. He was made a canon
between the pope and the emperor, the bishop of Augs-
burg recalled him. In 1123 he accompanied the bishop
to Rome, to reconcile him with the pope. After his
return from Rome he was again for a time Magister
und Doctor Jurium at Augsburg, but, being disgusted
with the want of ecclesiastical discipline which pre-
valled there, he left the city again for Rottenbuch.
But there also his reformatory efforts were unsuccess-
ful, although they were supported by the pope. In
1126, bishop Kuno, of Ratibon, made him his secretary;
soon after he received his priesthood, and gave him the
priestly of Châlons to establish there a house of canons;
but the opponents of a rigid discipline again thwarted
the whole plan. After the death of bishop Kuno, Gerboch found a new patron in archbishop Conrad
I of Salzburg, who, in 1128, made him provost of the monastic church of Reichenau, which he had
obtained until his death in 1129. Gerboch was a zeal-
ous defender of a rigid orthodoxy and of all the claims
of the pope, and a violent and quarrelsome opponent
of the rights claimed by the emperors in Church af-
fairs, of simony, and of the marriage of priests. He
devoted himself throughout his life to an especial attention to the reformation of the clergy, and was a steadfast adher-
ent of the theological method of his earlier fathers in
opposition to the rising scholasticism. He even went
so far as to charge the Magister Sententiatorum with her-
esy. His eagerness in combating Adoptionism and
Nationalism carried him off into the other extreme,
and he used many expressions on the person of Christ
which seem to be Eutychian. Of his writings, a com-
mentary on the 63th Psalm, in which he treats of the
corrupt condition of the Church, is best known. He
wrote, however, two other commentaries, one on the
Commentary on the Psalms, which has been pub-
lshed by Pes as the fifth volume of his Theosvora
Accedendorus, in 1728. Some of these works have not
yet been found. Those that are known are given
in Migne, Patrologia Latina, vol. cxxii, cxxvi. See
Herszog, Real-Encyklopädie, v. 49; Neander, Church His-
tory (Terrey's transl., vol. iv). (A. J. S.)
Gerizim always with the prefix מ"ר יז, Har
Gerizim", Mount of the Gerizim [from יז", Gerizim],
dwellers in a shorn (i.e. desert) land, from יז", ג"ש
, to cut off; possibly the tribe subded by David,
1 Sam. xxvii, 8; Sept. Φασίς, Josephus Flav. 10,621 et
ce) and Ebal were two mountains of Samaria, forming
the opposite sides of the valley which contained the
ancient town of Shechem, the present Nablous. From
this connection it is best to notice them together. The
valley which these mountains enclose is about 200 or
800 paces wide, by about three miles in length; and
Mount Ebal rises on the right hand and Gerizim on the
left hand of the valley (which extends west-north-
west) as a person approaches Shechem from Jerusa-
lem (see Ritter, Flav. xxxvi, 641 sq.). These two moun-
tains were the scene of a grand ceremony—perhaps
the most grand in the history of nations—duely
performed by Josue as soon as he gained possession
of the Promised Land (Deut. xxxvii; Josh. viii, 30-80).
These scenes are well described by Josue, Gera-
phus as being similarly situated on either side of She-
chem (Ant. iv, 8, 44). He also refers to the temple
GERIZIM built upon one of them by the Samaritans after the exile as the seat of their national worship (Am. xi, 7, 2, 8, 2-6), as related in the Apocrypha (2 Macc. vi, 2). See below. In order to justify their traditions in this respect, they have corrupted the reading of their text of the Pentateuch in Ex. xxvi, 24, so as to read "Gerizim" instead of "Ebal." It was from this top of this mountain that Jotham uttered the famous parable of the trees to the Shechemite insurrectionists under Abimelech, gathered in the plain below (Judg. ix, 7), a position from which he could easily be heard (see Hackett's Illustra. of Script. p. 198). The ascent of the hill is so difficult that, ere any of the followers of Abimelech could climb it, Jotham would be far away among the defiles of the neighboring mountains. See JOTHAM.

Mount Gerizim has been fully described by several travellers who have ascended it. The latest and most complete account of the objects of interest at it may be found in M. Saucy's Narratives, chap. vii, where also its history is given in detail. See also Robinson's Bibl. Researches, III, 98 sq.; Olm's Præces, II, 340 even. Dr. Robinson says, "Mount Gerizim and Ebal rise in steep, rocky precipices immediately from the valley on each side, apparently some 800 feet in height. The sides of both these mountains are as here seen (i.e. from Nablus) were, to our eyes, equally naked and sterile. The side of the northern mountain, Ebal, a fall of 950 feet, is full of the Mount of Ascension and its devoted sepulchres. The southern mountain is now called by the inhabitants Jebel et-Tur, though the name Gerizim is known at least to the Samaritans. The modern appellation of Ebal we did not learn." Dr. Olm states that the summit of Gerizim is some 100 feet higher than that of Ebal. The top of Gerizim affords a commanding view of a considerable region, chiefly occupied with mountains of inferior elevation, but also embracing several fruitful valleys, especially those of Nablus and of wady Sahil, through which lies the road to Jerusalem. A great number of villages are seen all along its north-eastern side, upon high and apparently precipitous spurs of the mountain which push out into the valley from (wady Sahil) the main ridge. Cultivation is carried quite to the top of the mountains, which are adorned with plantations of fruit-trees, while every level spot and a "mount number of small fields, supported by terraces, are sown in wheat. A considerable portion of the table-land on the summit of Gerizim itself exhibits marks of recent tillage. Mount Ebal, as viewed from Gerizim, spreads out, like the table-land, but it is more rocky, and more broken, and less susceptible of cultivation. Mount Gerizim is ascended by two well-worn tracks, one leading from the town of Nablus at its western extremity, the other from the valley on its northern side, near one of the two spots pointed out as Joseph's tomb. It is on the eastern extremity of the ridge that the holy places of the Samaritans are collected. First, there occurs the small hole in the rocky ground where the lamb is roasted on the evening of the Passover; next, the large stone structure occupying the site of the ancient temple. In one of the towers of this edifice, on the northeast angle, is the tomb of a Mussulman saint, Shiek Ghranam. Under the southern wall of this castle or temple is a line of rocky slabs, called the "ten stones," in commemoration of the ten (or twelve) stones brought by Joshua, or of the ten tribes of the northern kingdom; they have several appearance of a large rocky pile divided by twelve distinctly marked natural fissures. Beyond this platform, still further to the east, is a smooth surface of rock, sloping down to a hole on its south side; the scene, according to Samaritan tradition, which some ancient stela in lower Ebal have endeavored to vindicate, of Abraham's sacrifice (Midrash, Gen. xxiv.), of his meeting with Melchizedek (Gen. xiv.; see Theodotus in Eusebius, Prosp. Ev. ix, 22), and several other sacred events. (See Stanley's Sinaiti and Past., p. 245.) Mr. Bartlett also ascended Mount Ebal, but he says he "could discover no trace of by-gone generations, though the view, like that from Gerizim, is splendid and extensive" (Footsteps of Our Lord, p. 186). The remains of the temple on Mount Gerizim are fully described by Thomson (Land and Book, ii, 213 sq.). See SHECHEM.

2. The leading historical incidents connected with Mount Gerizim are of a highly interesting character, and some of them (as above intimated) have been the subjects of controversy.

(1) High places had a peculiar charm attached to them in those days of external observance. The law was delivered from Sinai: the blessings and curses affixed to the performance or neglect of it were directed to be pronounced upon Gerizim and Ebal. (See Michaelis, De montibus Ebal et Gerizim, Argent. 1773; Steibratz, Pindarica rei 52° contra Henicottum, Hal. 1767; Zefell, id. ib. 1768; Verhui, De lectione Samar. ad loc., France, 1767.) Six of the tribes—Simeon, Levi (but Joseph being represented by two tribes, Levi's actual place probably was as assigned below), Judah, Issachar, Joseph, and Benjamin, were to take their stand upon the former to bless; and six, namely, Reuben, Gad, Asher, Zabulon, Dan, and Naphtali, upon the latter to curse (Deut. xxvii, 12-18). Apparently, the ark halted midway between the two mountains, encompassed by the priests and Levites, thus divided by it into two bands, with Joshua for their archon. He read the blessings and curvings successively (Josh. viii, 58, 84), to be re-echoed by the Levites on either side of him, and responded to by the tribes in their double array with a loud Amen (Deut. xxvii, 14). Curiously enough, only the formula for the curses is given (ibid. v., 14-26); and it was upon Ebal, and not Gerizim, that the altar of the whole unwrought stone was to be built, and the huge plastered stones, with the words of the law (Josh. viii, 32; Josephus, Am. iv, 8, 44, limits them to the blessings and curses just pronounced) written upon them, were to be set up (Deut. xxvii, 4-6)—a significant omen for a people entering joyously upon their new inheritance, and yet the song of Moses abounds with forebodings still more ominous and plain-spoken (Deut. xxvii, 5, 6, and 15-26). See JOSUA.

(2) The next question is, Has Moses defined the localities of Ebal and Gerizim? Standing on the eastern
side of the Jordan, in the land of Moab (Deut. i, 5), he asks: "Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down (i.e., at some distance to the W.), in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the campaign over against Gilgil (i.e., whose territory—not those mountains—commenced over against Gilgil); see Josh. ii. 17)." In Deut. xi, 30, besides the plains of Moreh?"... These closing words would seem to mark their site with unusual precision; for in Gen. xii, 6 "the plain (Sept. "okā"") of Moreh" is expressly connected with "the place of Sichem or Shechem" (N.T. Synec. or Syr. "Sicirem," for which last form is thought to be of Canaanite origin). See Reidel, Deut. i, 42. In the Iger, Thes. p. dcoxxv; in Josephus the form is Sicirem), and accordinglyJudg. i, 7, 9, Josh. has made it to address his celebrated parable to the men of Shechem from "the top of Mount Gerizim." The "hill of Moreh," mention ed in the covenant of God with his father Abraham in his 18th year, had been a mountain overlooking the same plain, but certainly could not have been farther south (comp. vi, 83, and vii, 1). Was it therefore prejudice, or neglect of the true import of these passages, that made Eusebius and Epiphanius, both natives of Palestine, concur in placing Ebal and Gerizim near Jerusalem in the former case? In charging the Samaritans with grave error for affirming them to be near Neapolis (Reiland, Deserrt., as above, p. dcoxxv). Of one thing we may be assured, namely, that their scriptural site must have been, in the fourth century, lost to all but the Samaritans; otherwise, it would have been a very different question. It is true that they consider the Samaritan hypothesis irreconcilable with Deut. xi, 9, which it has already shown not to be. A more formidable objection would have been that Joshua could not have marched from the Jordan down to the Mediterranean, through a hostile country, to perform the above solemnity, and retraced his steps so soon afterwards to Gilgal, as to have been found there by the Gibeonites (Josh. ix, 6; comp. viii, 30-33). Yet the distance between Ai and Shechem is not so long (under two days' journey). Neither can the interval implied in the context of the former passage have been so short as even to warrant the modern supposition that the latter passage has been misplaced. The remaining objection, namely, "the wide interval between the two mountains at Shechem" (Stanley, S. and P. p. 256, note), is still more easily disposed of, if we consider Ebal and Gerizim near Jericho, the former pronounced by the Levites, standing in the midst of the valley—thus abridging the distance by one half—and not by the six tribes on either hill, who only responded. How indeed could 60,000 men and upwards, besides women and children (comp. Num. vii. 22 with Judg. vi. 31), find room on the hill, even if the hill were somewhat smaller? Besides, in those days of assemblies "sub dio," the sense of hearing must have been necessarily more acute, just as, before the aids of writing and printing, memories were much more retentive. We may conclude, therefore, that there is no room for doubting the scriptural position of Ebal and Gerizim to have been—where they are now placed—in the territory of the tribe of Ephraim; the latter of them overlooking the city of Shechem or Sichem, as Josephus, following the scriptural narrative, asserts. Even Eusebius, in another work of his (Prop. Evangel. iv, 29), quotes some lines from Theodotus, in which the true position of Ebal and Gerizim is described with great force and accuracy; and St. Jerome, while following Eusebius in the Oecumenica, in his ordinary correspondence does not hesitate to connect Sichem or Nephelae, the well of Jacob, and Mount Gerizim (Ep. civ. v., c. 13, ed. Migne). Procopius of Gaza does nothing more than follow Eusebius, and that clumsily (Reland, Palest. ii, 18, p. 505); but his more accurate nameakes of Caesarea expressly asserts that Gerizim rises over Nephele (see Euseb. Ev. i. 10—Deut. xi, 30), besides forming part of the mountain of Shechem (see Quaevar. Excels. T. S. lib. vii, p. 1, c. 8), but a distinct mountain to the north of it, and separated from it by the valley in which Shechem stood, we are not called upon here to prove; nor again, that Ebal was entirely barren, which it can scarcely be called now; while Gerizim was the same proverb for verdure and grasing rills formerly that it is now, at least where it descends towards Nablus. See Ebal, Balaam, Mount Gerizim, Mountain of the Samaritans, believe, Gerizim was the mountain on which Abraham was directed to offer his son Isaac (Gen. xxii, 2, and sq.). It has been observed that it is not the mountain, but the district which is there called Moriah (of the same root with Moreh: see Corn. i. 28), and Lapid. (Lapid. i. 6) and Thes. of Asia, as the occurrence which took place "upone of the mountains" in its vicinity—a consideration which of itself would naturally point to the locality, already known to Abraham, as the plain or plains of Moreh, "the land of vision," "the high land," and therefore consistently "the land of adoration," or "religious worship," as it is variously explained. That all these interpretations are incomparably more applicable to the natural features of Gerizim and its neighborhood than to the hilltop (in comparison) upon which Solomon built his temple, (see 1 Kings, vii, 5), is plain. Jerusalem unquestionably stands upon high ground; but owing to the hills "round about it," cannot be seen on any side from any great distance; nor, for the same reason, could it ever have been a land of vision or extensive views. Even from Mount Olives, which must have been the promontory on which the scene of the divided waters of Jordan (Gen. xvi, 5) occurred, the view cannot be named in the same breath with that from Gerizim, which is one of the finest in Palestine, commanding, as it does, from an elevation of nearly 2500 feet (Arrow smith, Geogr. Dict. of the M. S. p. 148), "the Mediterranean Sea on the west, the snowy height of Hermon on the north, on the east the wall of the trans-Jordanic mountains, and by the deep-crest of the Jabok" (Stanley, S. and P. p. 256), and the lovely and tortuous expanse of plain (the Mokhna) stretched as a carpet beneath its feet. Neither is the appearance which it would "present to a traveller advancing up the Philistine plain" (ibid. p 252)—the direction from which Abraham came—to be overlooked. On the other hand, it is clear that the "land of Moriah" was only thus designated as containing the notable mountain of the mountain (the hill) where Abraham had himself sacrificed Isaac. Jerusalem is apparently about 3000 geographical miles, to the crow flies, which, in such a country, will give 90 of actual travel. Abraham's servants were on foot, carrying wood; Isaac was also on foot, and Abraham rode an ass. It is not, indeed, absolutely necessary, as Mr. Porter thinks (Hand-book of S. and F. i. 859), that he should have started from Beersheba when he received the command (comp. Gen. xxi, 38, and xxii, 1-3, 19). It appears from the narrative that on the third day he reached the place, offered the sacrifice, and before the stock of wood was eaten by the servants. The distance from Beersheba to Gerizim is about 70 geographical miles, to the crow flies, which, in such a country, will give 90 of actual travel. Abraham's servants were on foot, carrying wood; Isaac was also on foot, and Abraham rode an ass. It is not, indeed, absolutely necessary, as Mr. Porter thinks (Hand-book of S. and F. i. 859), that he should have started from Beersheba when he received the command (comp. Gen. xxi, 38, and xxii, 1-3, 19). But had he set out, even from so southern a spot, "on the morning of the third day, when you would not have heard the voice of the Lord, exactly where the massive height of Gerizim is visible afar off" (Stanley, p. 248), and from thence, with the mount always in view, he would proceed to the exact place which God had told him of" in all solemnity—for again, it is not necessary that he should have arrived on the actual spot during the third day. All that is said in the narrative is that, from the time that he hove in sight, he and Isaac parted from the young men, and went on together alone. Still this interpretation is not the natural and obvious one, and is not supposed to be the sense of the circumstances. The Samaritans, therefore, through whom the tradition of the site of Gerizim has been preserved,
are probably wrong when they point out still— as they have done from time immemorial— Gerizim as the hill upon which Abraham's "faith was made perfect;" a natural result of their desire to magnify their national seat of worship. It is, moreover, strange that a place once called by the "Father of the faithful" Jehovah, should have been renamed Mount Moab, and ever afterwards, in a general name so different from it in sense and origin as Gerizim. Josephus, in one more place, asserts that where Abraham offered, there the Temple was afterwards built (Ant. i, 13, 2: vii, 18, 9). St. Jerome follows (Pauli antiquit. in Gen. xxii, 5, ed. Migne.), and the Rabbinical traditions respecting Mount Moriah are strongly in the same direction (Cunneus, De Republ. Heb., ii, 12). The Christian tradition, which makes the site of Abraham's sacrifice to have been on Calvary, is merely a monkish transference from the Jewish vicinity, Memori.

(4.) Another tradition of the Samaritans is still less trustworthy, viz., that Mount Gerizim was the spot where Melchizedek, met Abraham— though there certainly was a Salem or Shalem in that neighborhood (Gen. xxxii, 18; Stanley, S. and P. p. 347, and sq.). The nearest parallel to this tradition is that of the Jordan valley and the first appearance of Jehovah in him in it, as the plain of Moreh, near Sichem (Gen. xii, 6); but the mountain overhanging that city had not in any case, as yet, been hallowed to him by any decisive occurrence. The city of Moreh, in eternal spring, would be more likely to have deviated from his road so far, which lay through the plain of the Jordan; nor again is it likely that he would have found the king of Sodom so far away from his own territory (Gen. xiv, 17, and sq.). See SHAVEN, VALLEY OF. Lastly, the altar which Jacob built was not on Gerizim, as the Samaritans contend, though probably about its base, at the head of the plain between it and Ebal, "in the parcel of a field" which that patriarch purchased from the children of Hittim, and where he spread his tent (Gen. xxxiii, 18-20). Here was likewise his well (John iv, 6), and the tomb of his son Joseph (John xxiv, 39), both of which are still shown, the former surmounted by the remains of a vaulted chamber, and with the ruins of a church hard by (Robinson, Bibl. Res. ii, 283) the latter with "a fruitful vine" trailing over its whitewashed columns, and before it two dwarf pillars hollowed out at the top to receive lamps, which are lighted every Friday or Mohammedan Sabbath. There is, however, another Mohammedan monument claiming to be the said tomb (Stanley, S. and P. p. 241 note). The tradition (Robinson, ii, 286 note) that the twelve patriarchs were buried in Salem, and that Solomon had the hill of Tameth (without Joseph, or thirteen including his two sons) is probably an erroneous inference from Acts xvi, 16 (where αὐτὸς is not to be included in the subject of μετίκον; see Hackett, ad loc.). See MELCHEZED.

(5.) We now enter upon the second phase in the history of Gerizim. According to Josephus, a marriage contracted between Manaaseh, brother of Jaudus, the then high-priest, and the daughter of Sanballat the Cuthian (comp. 2 Kings xviii, 24), having created a great stir and commotion, two of the strictest laws (who were strictly forbidden to contract alien marriages; Ezra ix, 2; Neh. xiii, 28)—Sanballat, in order to reconcile his son-in-law to this unpopular affinity, obtained leave from Alexander the Great to build a temple upon Mount Gerizim, and to inaugurate there a priesthood and altar, that should have been merged in Moses, and that, for the harmonizing of the names and date, Pridaux, Connect. i, 386, and sq., Mc'Caull's edit. "Samaria thenceforth," says Pridaux, "became the common refuge and asylum of the refractory Jews" (ibid. ; see also Joseph. Ant. xi, 5, 7), as for a while, and their temple seems to have been called by the name of a Greek deity (Ant. xii, 5, 5). Hence one of the first acts of Hecurans, when the death of Antiochus Sidetes had set his hands free, was to seize Shechem, and destroy the temple upon Gerizim, after it had stood there 200 years (Ant. xiii, 9, 1). But the destruction of their temple by no means crushed the rancor of the Samaritans. The road from Galilee to Judaea lay through Shechem, so that the spirit of Gerizim (John iv, 1) here was a constant occasion for religious controversy and for outrage. How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest of drink to me, which am a woman of Samaria?" said the female to our Lord at the well of Jacob—where both parties would always be sure to meet, men passing from Mount Carmel to the mountain, and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship? . . . Subsequently we read of the depredations committed on that road upon a party of Galileans (Ant. xx, 6, 1). The liberal attitude, first of the Saviour, and then of his disciples (Acts viii, 14), was thrown away upon all those who would not abandon their creed. Gerizim thus continued to be the focus of outbreaks through successive centuries. One, under Pilate, while it led to their severe chastisement, procured the disgrace of that ill-starred magistrate who had been crucified with Christ, and the nation (with impurity (Ant. xviii, 4, 1). Another hostile gathering on the same spot caused a slaughter of 10,600 of them under Vespasian. It is remarkable that, in this instance, want of water is said to have made them easy victims; so that the delicious streams in the valley of spring are said to have been so narrowed that they must have failed before so great a multitude (War, iii, 7, 2). At length their aggressions were directed against the Christians inhabiting Neapolis—now powerful, and under a bishop— in the reign of Zeno. Terribilinus at once carried the news of this outrage to Byzantium; the Samaritans were forcibly ejected from Gerizim, which was handed over to the Christians, and adorned with a church in honor of the Virgin; to some extent fortified, and even guarded. This not proving sufficient to repel the foe, Justinian built a second wall round the church, which his historian says defied all attacks (Procop. De Aedif. v, 7). It is probably the ruins of these buildings which meet the eye of the modern traveller (Porter, Handb. of S. and P. ii, 339).

Previously to this time the Samaritans had been a numerous and important sect—sufficiently so, indeed, to be carefully distinguished from the Jews and Gallicanists in the Theodosian Code. This last outrage led to their comparative disappearance from history. Travellers of the 12th, 14th, and 17th centuries take notice of their existence, but extreme paucity (Early Travelers, by Wright, p. 81, 381, and 439), and the numbers now, as in those days, is said to be 200 (Josephson, Bibl. Res. ii, 282, 2d ed.). We are confined by our subject to Gerizim, and therefore can only touch upon the Samaritans, or their city Neapolis, so far as their history connects directly with that of the mountain. We may observe, however, that as it was undoubtedly this mountain of which our Lord said, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, (i.e. exclusively), worship the Father" (John iv, 21)—so likewise it is a singular historical fact, that the Samaritans have continued to exist as a self-conscious community, with the briefest interruptions, to worship according to their ancient custom ever since to the present day. While the Jews—expelled from Jerusalem, and therefore no longer able to offer up bloody sacrifices according to the law of Moses—have been obliged to adopt and perpetuate the cult in the most wretched of destines; here the Paschal Lamb has been offered up in all ages of the Christian era by a small but united nationality (the spot is accurately marked out by Dr. K., Bibl. Res. ii, 277). Their copy of the law, probably the work of Joshua and their temple called the 2d and 3d centuries (Pridaux, Connection, i, 600; and Robinson, ii, 237-301), was, in the 17th, vindicated from oblivion by Scaliger, Usher, Morinus, and others.
and no traveller now visits Palestine without making a sight of it one of his prime objects. Gerizim is likewise still to the Samaritans what Jerusalem is to the Jews, and Mecca to the Mohammedans. Their proscriptions are directed towards it, wherever they are; its holiest spot in their estimation being the traditional site of the tabernacle, near that on which they believe Abraham to have pitched his tent. The ancient stone in the sanctuary is on the summit; and near them is still to be seen a mound of ashes, similar to the larger and more celebrated one north of Jerusalem; collected, it is said, from the sacrifices of each successive age (Dr. R., Bibl. R.; above)." Evidently Gerizim is a name derived from Gerizim. Into their more legendary traditions respecting Gerizim, and the story of their alleged worship of a dove—due to the Jews, their enemies (Reland, Diam. op. Ugolii, Thesaur. vel. p. dcox xix—xxii)—it is needless to enter. See Samaritans.

Gerizite. See Gezirite.

Gerich, Otto von, a German theologian, was born in 1801 at Berlin, and studied first law and then theology at the university there. In 1828 he became prior docent in theology; in 1834, pastor of the Elizabet-Kirche; in 1847, court preacher; in 1849, professor ordinarius of theology. He was a man of earnest piety, and labored zealously as pastor and in fostering missions at home and abroad. In this respect he has been called 'the Wesley of the Church'. The translation of Wesley's sermon on "Awake, thou that sleepest!" was his first literary work. He translated Baxter's Saint's Rest into German. His reputation was largely extended by his Commentar z. N. T. (Berlin, 1841; 8 ed. 1884, 2 vols. 8vo; new ed. 1888). The O. T. was also added, the whole under the title Die heilige Schrift nach Luther's Uebersetzung mit Einleitungen u. erläuternden Anmerkungen (1847-58, 6 vols.). He also published a new edition of select writings of Luther (Berlin, 1840-48, 24 vols.).—Rein, Zustand der Angli. Kirche (Potsdam, 1845).—Kirchliche Anekdoten (trans. from Chalmers, 1847). The last two works were the fruit of a tour in England and Scotland, undertaken by Gerich in 1842 at the command of the king, to investigate the workings of British Christianity. Gerich died at Berlin, greatly lamented, Oct. 24, 1849. —Methodist Quarterly (N. Y.), April, 1845, p. 226; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v. 88.

Gerle, Christophe-Antoine, a French religious enthusiast, was born A.D. 1740, in Auvergne, and died about 1805. When quite a young man he entered the order of Carthusian monks, and soon afterwards was made prior of Pont-Sainte-Marie. In 1789 he was chosen deputy for the Comtat Venaissin of the clergy of Riom, and was one of the first representatives of the clergy who supported the policy of the Tiers État. In the famous Tennis-Court session of the National Assembly (Séance du Jeu de Paume) he exhibited so much earnestness and patriotic fervor that David assigned him a conspicuous place in his painting (Sermont du Jeu de Paume) (Tennis-Court Oath) representing the most imposing scene in that meeting. Having become a member of the Constitutional Assembly, Gerle proposed, Dec. 12, 1789, that all monks who wished to do so might be allowed to retire to the monasteries of their order and live according to their particular rules, provided they conformed to the general laws, and, April 12, 1790, urged in vain the issuing a proclamation declaring the Roman Catholic faith to be the only one accepted by the French nation. In June following he was chosen as one of the Commissaries of the procures of Susanne de Bouze, of Perigord, made eleven years before, in regard to an impending general revolution, and the reforms consequent thereon. In 1792 he was chosen one of the electors of Paris. There was no higher degree of philosophical and superstition in his nature, as was evinced by his support of the Phœnicia, or follower of Catharine Théob or Théob, an old woman who styled herself the mother of God, and announced the near advent of a regenerating Messias, and in whose following a number of silly, superstitious, or intriguing characters were gathered. Gerle thought that both himself and the French Revolution were clearly indicated in the prophecies of Isaiah. As these visionaries were politically friendly to Robespierre, Gerle, in his 'Note sur le Supplice de Robespierre', denounced Robespierre's enemies sought to increase the odium against him by a public exposure of their absurdities, and accordingly Vadier, the organ of the Committee of General Safety, made a report to the National Convention demanding the prosecution of Théob, Gerle, and others as guilty of plotting a fanatical conspiracy, which was adopted, and on May 16, 1794, these persons were arrested and imprisoned on the orders of the committee. In the excitement and confusion following the fall of Robespierre they seemed to have been forgotten. Théob died in prison, and Dom Gerle remained there until the advent of the Directory. He was for some time one of the editors of the Meunier du Soir, and afterwards employed in the bureau of the minister of the interior, Benezech. A memoir written by him in regard to his arrest appears in the Revue Retrospective, No. xi, 269, 309, 1800. —Hofner, Notes, Bibl. Générale, xx, 283-286; Alison, History of Europe, iii, 92 (9th ed. Edinburgh, cr. 8vo.). (J. W. M.)

German, St. See Germanus.

German, St., en Laye, a place near Paris, noted for a treaty of peace concluded between the king of France and the Huguenots, Aug. 8, 1570, in which it was provided that the Protestants should thereafter be unmolested on account of their religion. This treaty was only made to be broken, as the massacre of St. Bartholomew, only two years later (Aug. 24, 1572), terribly demonstrated. See Meoisheim, Church Hist., iii, 173; Smedley, Reformed Religion in France, i, 322.

German, St., Manuscripts (Codices Sans-Germanenses), the name of two very ancient Latin MSS. of the N. T. (usually designated as g' and g''), so called from having formerly been in the library of the Benedictine monastery of St. Germanus des Prés at Paris, partially examined by Marteneay (whose citations were repeated by Bianchini), in his works throughout by Sabatier.—Tregelles, in Horne's Introd. iv, 288; Scrivener, Introd. p. 257. See Manuscripts, Biblical.

German Baptists. See Dunkers, and Mennoitis.

German Catholics, the name of a sect in Germany which sprung up in 1844 in consequence of the Augsburg Confession. This proceeding called forth a vigorous protest from Johannes Ronge, a priest in Siliesia, who, having been suspended from his office, was living in retirement. Ronge addressed a public letter to bishop Arnoldi, of Treves, Oct. 1, 1844, in which he characterized the exhibition of the cost as abolition. Even before the publication of this letter, another priest, J. Cersak, at Schnekmelth, in the Prussian province of Posen, had formally seceded from the Roman Catholic Church, and was about to form a congregation of "Christian Apostolic Catholics". Cersak and Ronge were naturally drawn into confederacy, though their views on doctrine radically differed; the former sympathizing with evangelical Protestantism, and the latter being an ultra Rationalist. Ronge addressed an appeal to the lower orders of the priesthood, calling upon them to assist in the dissemination of the principles of the sect and everywhere to break the power of the court of Rome, and priestcraft in general throughout Germany; to set up a national German Church independent of Rome, and governed by councils and synods; to abolish all clerical confessions, the Latin mass, and the celibacy of the priests; and to establish the Confession of Faith, order, and perfect freedom for the religious education of child-
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dren. Czerski, on the other hand, drew up a confession of faith differing but little from that of the Roman Catholic Church, though it declared the Holy Scriptures and the Nicene Creed as the only standards of Christian faith. The next sect quickly increased. At the beginning of 1845 more than a hundred congregations were in existence, each adopting its own confession of faith, some agreeing with that of Czerski, and the majority adopting the rationalistic views of Ronge. In the confession of faith adopted by the Congregation of Montreal, the word of God and the Holy Spirit were regarded as the only source of religious knowledge. The essentials of belief were limited to the Four Monuments of the faith: belief in God as the Creator and Governor of the world, and the Father of all men; in Christ as the Saviour, in the Holy Spirit, the holy Christian Church, the forgiveness of sins, and eternal life. Baptism and the Lord’s Supper were held to be the only sacraments. Confirmation was retained, but most of the rites and practices peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church were given up. The first council of German Catholics was held at Leipzig, March 22, 1845, and attended by deputies from many of the leading congregations. The many views again in favor of other religious opinions expressed in the rationalistic Brezlaus confessions. The interpretation of Scripture, the only source of Christian belief, was left to the free exercise of reason, and actuated by the “Christian idea.” Forms of worship were adapted to the requirements of time and place. With regard to church government, the council declared in favor of the presbyterian and synodal constitution. The congregations were to have the free election of their clergy and eldership. The increase of the sect continued to be so rapid that by the end of 1845 it numbered nearly 500 congregations, many prominent Roman Catholics joined it, and even a number of Protestant rationalistic clergymen went over to it. Distinguished historians like Gervinus looked upon the movement as a momentous event in the history of Germany. It even exercised a considerable influence upon the Protestant Church of Germany, by causing the organization of the Free Congregations (q. v.), a similar rationalistic sect, chiefly consisting of seceders from the Protestant state churches. Several state governments, as those of Saxony, Prussia, Baden, Bavaria, and Austria, took very serious and active steps to suppress them, or at least to try to put as great obstacles as possible in their way. The internal disagreements between the orthodox and the rationalistic sections also discouraged the spread of the movement, which, at first successful, failed in 1847, after the revolution of 1848 had come to an end. The revolution of 1848 gave the German Catholics full liberty, and, consequently, some additions were made to the number of their congregations, especially in Austria. But the further advance which the majority of the German Catholics now made in their opposition to evangelical Christianity, and the profession of some of their prominent men, that on their part the religious movement had been merely a cloak for covering their revolutionary tendencies in politics, estranged many of their friends. After the political reaction set in, in 1848, strong influence against them was exerted by almost all of the state governments, and in Austria they were again wholly suppressed. In 1850 delegates of the German Catholic congregations attended the council of the Free Congregations, and a union of the two organizations was agreed upon. This union was consolidated at the council held in Gotha in 1857, when the united body assumed the name of “Rund frieheri- ler Gemeinden.” For their further history, see Free Congregations. (A. J. S.)

German Methodists. See United Brethren.

German Reformed Church in America. The German Reformed Church is the historical continuation in America of the Reformed branch of the Protestant Reformation of Germany. The great movement of the 16th century in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church was at first known as simply the Reformation, or Reformed Church, the term Reformed being used in a general sense as designating the whole group of protestants as distinct from the errors and corruptions of Rome. Two distinct tendencies, embracing theology and practical life, were, however, at work from the beginning. The one received its type and character primarily from the genius, faith, and spirit of Martin Luther, and prevailed chiefly among religious persons. The other was not so definitely related to the peculiar spirit of one man. Its character was brought out rather by a succession of ministers and theologians in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, and the German provinces bordering on the Rhine, among whom also the Helvetic Catechism, from the University of Heidelberg, in which Ursinus and Olevianus, the authors of the work, were professors of theology. Palatinate was the name formerly borne by two provinces of Germany, distinguishing Upper and Lower, and having along the Rhine, on the north (Oberpfalz) bordered on Bohemia and Bavaria; the other (Unterpfalz) was situated on both sides of the Rhine, touching on different sides Mayence, Wurttemberg, Baden, Alsace, and Lorraine. The Palatinate did not yield to the power of the Reformation movement until 1546, when it embraced the Lutheran faith. It was moulded, however, rather by the gentle spirit of Melachthon than by the stern spirit of Luther. Under Frederick III, summoned the Plow, who acceded to power in 1550, those German provinces passed over from the Palatinate to the Empire of Germany. The theological controversies which preceded and accompanied this transition gave rise to the formation of a catechism, the design of which was to reconcile opposing Lutheran and Reformed elements on a new basis. The principle and the scope of this new confession is what the Reformed, not the Luther, people called the Palatines’ Creed as its animating and form-giving principle, it rises above extreme antagonisms, and aims at resolving into one consistent whole the divergent tendencies of faith characterizing the two original branches of the preevolutionary church. The Synod of the Palatinate, convened for the purpose Jan. 19, 1563, was followed by the preparation of an order of worship answerable to it, and by a complete religious and educational organization of the two provinces; the great design of Frederick III being to establish and perpetuate the Reformed faith in this German electorate. Thus arose the Reformed Church of Germany, or the German Reformed Church, in distinction from the Reformed Church of Switzerland, of France, Holland, Scotland, and other states and countries. Religious persecution at home, civil opposition, and the offer of land in Pennsylvania by William Penn, led to the emigration of a large number of Palatines to America in the beginning of the last century. From year to year their numbers increased. To these were added hundreds and thousands coming from different parts of Germany, including the Reformed faith. They settled in New York, along the Hudson, in New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and even extended into the Carolinas; but the greater number located in Pennsylvania, east of the Susquehanna. The first minister was the Rev. George Michael Willig; he settled on his way from his native city of Amsterdam, emigrated from the Palatinate in company with about 400 Palatines in the year 1727. They settled along the Skippack, Montgomery County, Pa.
Here a congregation was organized, and a wooden church immediately built. This, so far as known, was the first German Reformed Church in America.

Until the year 1747 the religious condition of these people was very sad. They had no ministers; no Church organization; no school-teachers; no books, except a few Bibles, a Catechism, and Hymn-books, which they brought with them from the fatherland; and no pecuniary resources, for the majority were extremely poor. Besides, they were separated by national customs and by language from the large English population of the country. So helpless and destitute were they to enjoy any graces of grace, that they were exposed to the danger of being misled into all sorts of errors by irresponsible teachers. But they were distinguished for morality, industry, and thrift. In the course of time they began to accumulate property, and acquire a reputation for honesty and integrity. With this came respect, influence, and general prosperity.

Yet this chaotic state of the Reformed Church grew worse rather than better. Emigration continued. This, added to the natural increase of population, extended the religious and institutional, and multiplied their moral and spiritual dangers; for from the first settlement of Palatines in America, throughout this entire period, there were at no time more than three or four ordained ministers of the Reformed Confession among them.

The arrival in 1746 of the Rev. Michael Schletter, a Reformed minister from St. Gall, Switzerland, who was commissioned and supported by the synods of North and South Holland, introduces the formative period in the history of the Church. A man of great energy, strong faith, burning zeal, and indomitable perseverance, he visited all the German settlements in Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and some in New York; gathered the people; preached the Gospel; administered the sacraments; organized churches; located pastors; established schools; and on Sept. 29, 1747, in the city of Philadelphia, succeeded in effecting the organization of the first synod, or the Coetus, as it was called, of the German Reformed Church. Subsequently it was visited Europe for the purpose of representing the extreme destitution of the Germans in America. He traveled through Holland, Sweden, and England, and everywhere he awakened profound interest. He succeeded in creating a large fund, the yearly interest of which was devoted to the support of ministers and school-teachers in America, and to the purchase of Bibles for gratuitous distribution among the people. He also induced a number of ministers and other worthy persons to emigrate to the New World, of whom five came with him on his return to America.

The first Coetus consisted of thirty-one members—five ministers and twenty-six elders—and represented forty-six churches and a population then estimated at thirty thousand. Organized by direction of the Synod of Holland, the Coetus stood under the jurisdiction of that body. Its proceedings were sent annually for review and confirmation to the Classis of Amsterdam, that Classis having been charged by the Synod of Holland with the superintendence of the affairs of the German Church in America. No minutes were then or ever to be obtained to the office of the ministry without its consent.

This subordinate relation to the Church of Holland continued until 1759, a period of forty-six years. Emigration increased. From time to time, ministers and school-teachers from the Palatinate and other Reformerspeared provinces of Europe arrived. But the increase of ministers was not in proportion to the increase of the population. Though the Church grew, yet the spiritual desultitudes multiplied, so that at the end of this period there were at least one hundred and fifty churches, but no more than about twenty-two ordained ministers.

In 1758 the Coetus resolved no longer to transmit its acts and proceedings for revision to the Classis of Amsterdam, and assumed the right to govern itself, and to have the care of the churches in America, independently of foreign oversight and control. A constitution was adopted, entitled "Symbool-Ordinaat des Hoch-deutsch-Deutsch-rumerschen, . . ." and "Bund der gemeenen Gemeinden in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-America." By this act the Coetus became the Synod, and the Reformed Kirche, or Reformed Church, became the Hoch-deutsche Reformierte Kirche, or High-German Reformed Church, in order to distinguish it from the Dutch, the German, or Low-Dutch Church.

This event introduces a period of thirty-two years, extending to the establishment of a theological seminary in 1752, a period which is not easy to characterize. In one respect there was progress. The people increased in numbers and wealth. They had also large accessions to the population by immigration. Congregations multiplied. Many Germans migrated westward, and churches were organized in Ohio. There was also proportionally a larger accession to the ranks of the clerics, the number of ordained ministers rising from sixty-two to eighty-two. But in another respect there was retrogression. So long as the Church stood directly under the supervision of Holland, the great majority of ministers were men who had been thoroughly educated in the gymnasiums and universities of Europe. But now the number of these men of thorough education, who came from Europe, the larger number came from the membership of the American Church. As the Synod had no theological seminary, no college, and no academy, candidates for the office could acquire only a superficial or partial knowledge of Latin and Greek, of science and theology. They pursued their studies under the tuition of pastors who had charge of from two to eight churches. As a natural consequence, the standard of ministerial qualifications had to be lowered; and with the loss of broad culture, departed also, in great measure, the sense of its value. Some of the leading ministers saw the evil, that the Church was exposed from this tendency, and endeavored to resist it manfully, but without avail.

With the depression of the ministry came ecclesiastical disorders, the fruit of tendencies at work from the beginning. In the attacks on the decisions of the synod; some ministers, also, were disorderly. They were disposed to ordain men to the holy office on their own judgment and authority as individuals. The Church, moreover, felt the enervating influence of German rationalism and megalomania, and of the demoralization of the second decade of the present century, worse than anything though struggling earnestly against these downward forces, could offer but a feeble resistance; for, taking the faith of the Reformation as the standard of judgment, they themselves occupied a false theological attitude. The rationalistic habit of thought of the 18th century, taking hold of them, gave an underrate to their preaching and ecclesiastical life, which, though they cherished firm faith in the truth of supernatural revelation, nevertheless nourished comparative indifference to the original faith of the Reformed Church as embodied in the Palatinate Catechism, and even exerted an influence in direct opposition to it.

Though separated by the ocean, the Church in America was always in close sympathy with the Church of Germany. The profound reaction against Rationalism, which began to reveal its presence there during the middle of the 18th century, was almost simultaneous with a revival of a better faith in the bosom of the American Church. The first decided indications appear in the records of 1815, and from that time onward with gradually increasing clearness. In that year we meet the first recognition of the Heidelberg Catechism. In all the records preceding this time, we find no reference to any confession of faith.
In 1820, the synod enjoin's on all ministers to use no other book but the Heidelberg Catechism in the instruction of youth preparatory to confirmation. The want of literary and theological institutions seems to be felt only in feeble forms, and persevering efforts are made to establish a theological seminary. In 1819 the constitution is revised and amended. The territory is subdivided into classes; a class corresponding to a presbytery in the Presbyterian Church. As the synod, instead of being a general congregation of ministers and elders of each parish, as it had been since 1747, becomes a delegated body composed of ministers and elders chosen by the classes.

The revival of faith and activity resulted finally, after a struggle against much opposition extending through seven years, in the creation of a theological seminary by the Synod of Bedford, Pa., in 1824. The Rev. Lewis Mayer, D.D., was chosen professor of theology. The seminary opened at Carlisle, Pa., the following spring. Removed to York in 1829, the institution continued to meet and to prosper, and it is still at the same place where it still remains. With the seminary was removed also to Mercersburg the high-school opened in York in 1830. This school, under a charter granted by the Legislature of the state, became Marshall College in 1836. The opening of the theological seminary constitutes the most important epoch in the history of the Church in America. Followed soon after by the creation of a classical institution of a high order, it was the means of quickening the historical faith and dormant energies of the Church. Though several decades of years were necessary in order to understand and mould the power of these institutions in the sphere of philosophy, theology, and practical life, yet a new impulse was at once given to thought and life. The standard of qualification for the ministry was elevated. A much larger number of candidates were engaged in preparing for or receiving the call of God to preach the Gospel. The ministry increased rapidly. Religious periodicals were established: first, one in English, 1828; and several years later, one in German, 1836. A board of domestic missions and a board of beneficiary education were created. The board of the college was organized, and its labors manifested itself for the extension of the Church. About this time, also, some men were admitted to the ministry who could preach acceptably in English, and were thus prepared to meet the wants of the younger membership in the cities and larger towns; wants arising from the growing prevalence of that language among the German people; for, until 1820, with perhaps but two or three exceptions, all the pastors conducted public worship exclusively in the mother tongue; in consequence of which, scores of families, who preferred the English language, had, during the previous fifteen or twenty years, in particular localities, passed over to other denominations. The translation, though generally gradual, caused no little dissen- sion and confusion in nearly every congregation where the change was felt to be necessary, owing to the firmness with which the older people clung to German worship. At present this difficulty has been surmounted throughout nearly all portions of the Church west of the Susquehanna and south of the Potomac, where the English language is now generally used either exclusively or in conjunction with the German; but east of the Susquehanna, and the Pennsylvania line, the use of the German language has been perpetuated among not less than fifty thousand of her people, and where the great majority of ministers conduct public worship in the mother tongue, the problem still awaits solution.

Theology and general literature and the use of the German language in the Church and the introduction of the English language both meet a great want and proved to be a great good, yet the Church was thereby exposed to new and serious dangers. This spiritual awakening united positive and negative elements. It was the assertion and development of the old faith, and, at the same time, a reaction against what was defective and wrong in her American history. This reaction, modified by contact with the Presbyterian, Methodist, and other sects, and from a sense of confounding what was true and good in the past with what was false and evil, and was disposed, with the abuse of catechisation, confirmation, the observance of the great festivals of the Church year and other customs, to set aside these customs themselves, and thus ignore the historic and traditional character from each particular Church. The false tendency prevailed most generally among the congregations that had introduced the use of the English language. The German sections of the Church enjoyed a large measure of protection. As the prevalence of the German language deprived them of the advantage of fellowship with the English denominations, so it shielded them also measurably against the transforming influence of a foreign spirit.

But even where this spirit, foreign to the genius of the Church, had acquired the most commanding influence, the Church is not yet extinct. The conditions of a strong counter reaction were always present. It was only necessary that some one assert clearly and forcibly the latent faith of the Church. This was done with great power by the Rev. John W. Nevin, D.D., several years after he had become the professor of didactic theology in the seminary at Mercersburg.

For nearly twenty years the tendency to surrender her distinctive faith and customs had been gaining strength in the German Reformed Church, slowly indeed, but steadily, and the process of assimilation to a foreign form of Christian life was silently going forward. A powerful countering element, however, was developed as early as 1866 in the profound Anglo-German philosophy taught by the Rev. Frederick Augustus Rauch, D.P., the first president of Marshall College, and the foreign influences of a scientific, organic and objective thinking which has ever since characterized the leading educational institutions of the Church. There was accordingly at hand both a general and special preparation for the great Church movement of the last twenty-five years, of which Dr. Nevin has been the principal organizer and the slumbering spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism, which, living in the hearts of ministers and people, perpetuated a sense of dissatisfaction with a foreign religious habit, and constituted a general qualification to support, as by intuition, the protest against error, and the affirmation of the distinctive elements of a great leader; and special, in the genetic method of thought which, in full sympathy with the spirit of the Catechism, had, through the teaching of Dr. Rauch, given character to the college, and moulded the philosophical thinking of the first ministers of the Church, who received a full literary and theological training in her own institutions.

This profound and comprehensive movement constitutes the leading characteristic of the Church in the last period of her American history. The bold criticisms of Protestantism, and the uncritical assertion of the Catholic truth contained in the Protestant confessions of the 16th century by Dr. Nevin, and the publication of the Principle of Protestantism by the Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., in German and English, called forth earnest and sometimes very violent rejoinders from the adherents of the pure and orthodox view; provoked a series of controversies concerning the new measure system, the Lord's Supper, tradition and the rule of faith, the nature of the Church, the present attitude of Protestantism and its relation to Roman Catholicism in the present life and organization of the Church, the necessity of the Church, and, in the course of time, holy baptism and liturgical worship, with many other cogent fundamental doctrines; controversies which have been prosecuted vigorously, with short intervals of repose, down
to the present time, and have not only involved some of the principal denominations in this country, but of late have also extended to Germany.

The main positions, both negative and positive, affirmed by Dr. Nevis and his coadjuvants, have from time to time been sustained by the Eastern Synod and by the General Synod, though not in a formal or public action, but generally in an indirect way, since the main questions have only occasionally been at issue before the judicatories in a formal manner. Indeed, instead of being merely the innovation of a party, the great movement has been only a life movement of the German Reformed Church herself, the men prominent in the controversies being rather the exponents and organs than leaders. Yet a portion of the Church has all along been opposing the prevailing theological views. The opposition has generally been conducted with moderation and sobriety; but sometimes it has been violent and disorderly, and has even included an inclination towards schism. Another effect of the controversies and of the theological attitude of the Church has been to provoke a large measure of opposition from some of the principal Protestant denominations, which shows that the German Reformed Church is no longer true to her origin and history as a branch of the Protestant Church.

Soon after the controversies began the Mercersburg Resolution was issued in order to seek a medium for the development, defense, and progress of what came to be known among opponents as Mercersburg Philosophy and Theology. It was issued regularly from 1849 until 1863 inclusive. Suspended during the progress of the Civil War, it was resumed in January, 1867.

In 1829 the ministers and churches in Ohio organized themselves by the authority of synod into a classis, called the Classis of Ohio; but it stood in organic relation to synod only during the short period of four years. In 1824 it became an independent body, and assumed the title of the Synod of Ohio, having 11 ministers, 80 congregations, and 4,000 members. In 1887 the Synod of Ohio became the Synod of Ohio and Adjoining States. In 1842 this synod subdivided its territory into six classes. Thus came to exist two mutually independent synods, having the same organization, holding the same faith, governed by the same constitution, having the same usages and customs, and each possessing supreme and final authority within its own bounds. The two bodies exchanged delegates annually, the delegate being admitted as a full member of the other, which was the most generous and liberal arrangement in theology. A sense of dissatisfaction with this incomplete and anomalous organization began to prevail, and a strong desire became general, both East and West, to effect a more perfect organization by creating a higher body that should have jurisdiction over the whole Church. The constitution was accordingly so changed by a vote of two thirds of all the classes of each synod as to make room for the organization of a triennial General Synod. This body, composed of delegates, ministers and elders, chosen by all the classes, represents the whole Church. It is the highest judicatory, and "the last resort in all cases respecting the government of the Church not finally adjudicated by the synod." The General Synod held its first session in Pittsburgh in November, 1863.

During the same year the Church celebrated the three hundredth anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism. This celebration was originally suggested by the Rev. Dr. Harbaugh, and the preparatory arrangements made by a committee of which he was chairman. Ministers, elders, and members from all parts of the Church met in Conventions, in the German Reformed church, Race Street, Philadelphia, Jan. 17, 1863, and continued in session six days. Twenty essays and discourses on the origin, history, doctrines, confessionall relations, and the fortunes of the Heidelberg Catechism, prepared by distinguished theologians of Europe and America, were read and discussed. The Jubilee was formally closed by a similar convention held at Reading May 31, 1864. Though occurring during the darkest times of the war of the Rebellion, yet the celebration was in all respects a success. Profound and general interest was awakened in the origin, history, faith, and relations of the German Reformed Church among ministers and the laity. The Church came to a better apprehension of her historical character as an original branch of the Protestant Reformation, and acquired a clearer consciousness of her present relative position and vocation, and of her future mission. A new impulse was at the same time given to all her practical operations.

As the fruit of this celebration, a volume containing approximately one hundred and four thousand words possessing permanent historical value were published: the Triplici Catechism and the Tercentenary Monument. The first is a critical edition of the Catechism in the original German, in Latin, modern German, and in English, printed in parallel columns, and accompanied with an introductory essay. The second is a new translation of the Monument consists of the discourses and essays delivered at the Convention held in Philadelphia, and was published in English and German.

This tercentenary jubilee constitutes a most important epoch in the history of the Church, and may be regarded as the relative conclusion of the ethical forces at work for the present twenty or thirty years.

The second General Synod, held at Dayton, 1856, authorized the organization of two additional synods: the one, consisting of the classes of St. Joseph, Indiana, Sheboygan, Heidelberg, and Erie, to be called the North-western Synod; and the other, consisting of the classes of Clarion, St. Paul's, West New York, and Westmoreland. The first was organized at Fort Wayne, Ind., May 28, 1867. The organization of the other has been delayed, probably to be accomplished during the coming year (1870).

For the last ten years measures have been in progress to restore the original title Reformed Church by dropping the American prefix German. The change has finally been secured by a vote of two thirds of the classes, and awaits the formal decision of the General Synod.

The Heidelberg Catechism is the symbol of faith, and the only standard of doctrine. The book may be said to embody two theological tendencies; the one being that of Melanchthon himself, the other that of Zwingli, which antedates and precedes him. The Zwinglian tendency dominates the Heidelberg Catechism, and if the book is to be interpreted correctly, perhaps, by saying that the one tendency, proceeding from faith in the divine-human Saviour, a concrete fact, as the fundamental principle, is christological, sacramental, churchly, and conservative; while the other, presupposing the sovereign will of God as the determining principle of Christianity, is in sympathy with intellectualistic, unsacramental, and unchurchly views, and renders the book susceptible of a construction which is apparently in full harmony with all the logical deductions which flow from the supralapsarian theory.

The German Reformed Church was never opened to the supralapsarian element as a ruling principle. We mean the German, in distinction from the English, French, Dutch, Scotch, and other branches of the Reformed Church. In the German branch the
Melanthonian element has been predominant rather than the Calvinistic, though many of her theologians and ministers, and even Ursinus, one of the authors, interpret the Catechism in accordance with the Calvinist view.

The leading characteristic of the Catechism is the peculiar position which the Apostles' Creed occupies. The Creed is principal. It is not an element co-ordinate with the Decalogue and the Lord's Prayer, but the Decalogue and Lord's Prayer hold a place respectively independent and subordinate to the idea of the Creed. The Creed underlies and pervades the Catechism like a plastic power, and determines, prevails, generally, the nature and substance of what is received as the true faith.

It determines the ruling theory of Christianity as being a new creation rather than a system of revealed doctrines; as being an objective and concrete order of life rather than subjective experience and abstract theory. It determines the relation in which the believer is to his new creation as being immediate, and, as it were, the natural eye, so do supernatural objects stand before the eye of the spirit as a reality —a reality which is the possession of the believer.

The Creed also determines the order in which the facts of supernatural revelation are developed. As the natural order, the physical, it presents, in the first part, holiness and misery of man, and, on the other, involves and implies holy living as a necessary consequence of the new life, whilst it embraces only those facts which belong to the positive side of revelation, the Catechism, answering to this order, places the creation and fall of man, sin, and depravity, in the first part; conversion, good works, and prayer, as the necessary fruit of the new life, in the third part, under the general head of thanksgiving, taking the Decalogue as the law of good works, and the Lord's Prayer as the model of devotion; whilst the second part gives the positive objective substance of redemption, and consists in setting forth the facts of revelation in the order in which the Creed affirms them; and, in immediate connection therewith, expounds the sacraments and the office of the keys; the sacraments as the means of grace, by which, through faith, the partakers in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and are fed and nourished unto everlasting life; and the office of the keys as embracing the preaching of the Gospel and Christian discipline, by which two things the kingdom of heaven is opened to believers and shut against unbelievers. Huldrych Zwinglius, the Heidelberg, Catechism, projects its peculiar structure, and breathe its animating spirit into the form of instruction. Not that the Catechism realizes the idea of the Creed perfectly at all points; but it acknowledges the original authority of the Creed, and realizes its fundamental characteristics. The Creed thus also holds the Catechism in organic connection with the undoubted faith of the one whole Catholic Church in all the ages of her history up to the apostolic period.

Though the peculiar organizing force of the Creed may not, at all times since the Reformation, or even at the time of its first publication, have been clearly or consciously apprehended, yet this principal element has always been felt, and has always had a correspondent moulding influence whenever and wherever the Catechism has been received, and has, without all prejudice and obstruction, been allowed freely to exert its educational power. Whatever is distinctive in the original character, or subsequent history, or the present attitude, as regards doctrine and worship, of the German as compared with other Reformed branches of the Protestant Church, is owing primarily and mainly to this fundamental and distinguishing element of her confession.

It is the peculiar genius of the Heidelberg Catechism which has given impulse to the profound and comprehensive theological movement by which the Church is now apprehended, and has sustained it with increasing power; a movement that is progressively eliminating two of the most obvious deviations of doctrinal view: the low logically from the Calvinistic theory of the divine sovereignty, and those which proceed from the Arminian conception of human freedom. Neither the sovereign will of God on the one hand, nor the free will of man on the other, is the principle of salvation; neither the God of the covenant, nor the God of the man. According to the general idea of the Catechism, this principle is founded in a concrete fact, the person of the Redeemer, who, being true God and true man, unites in himself mysteriously the freedom of the human with the sovereignty of the divine will. Being by true faith a member of Christ through the power of the Holy Ghost, a Christian determines himself freely, and is at the same time determined by God, when he lives according to the will of God, actualized in the person and work of Christ.

The most important result, theologically, of the tercentenary celebration, 1868, was the advancing and maturing of a consciousness of this principal element of the Catechism, namely, the organic relation which the Creed bears to its structure and doctrines. For the first time in her American history did the Church undertake a full and formal examination of the Creed, and its place in the church's life, from the theological and the historical point of view, in the tercentenary jubilee. The report of this tercentenary convention held in Reading, May, 1864, appointed a committee to submit to the (Eastern) synod for adoption certain topics having reference to the theological and religious bearings of the tercentenary jubilee. The report of this committee was presented to the Synod of Lancaster in October of the same year. It sums up the theological and religious results in the following theses:

1. "Our tercentenary jubilee has served a wholesome purpose for renewing our ecclesiastical consciousness of the organic relation of the Creed to its structure and doctrines. For the first time in her American history did the Church undertake a full and formal examination of the Creed, and its place in the church's life, from the theological and the historical point of view, in the tercentenary jubilee. The report of this tercentenary convention held in Reading, May, 1864, appointed a committee to submit to the (Eastern) synod for adoption certain topics having reference to the theological and religious bearings of the tercentenary jubilee. The report of this committee was presented to the Synod of Lancaster in October of the same year. It sums up the theological and religious results in the following theses:

2. It is an argument of sound and right historical feeling in this case, that the facts of our Christian life are referred, not simply to the epoch and crisis of the Reformation, but through that also to the original form of Christianity as it existed in the first ages.

3. The true genius and spirit of our Church in this respect is shown by the place which is assigned to the Apostles' Creed in the Heidelberg. The fact that it is plainly assumed that the Creed, in its proper historical sense, is to be considered of fundamental authority for the Reformed faith.

4. It is a matter of congratulation that our growing sympathy with the Apostles' Creed is attended with a growing power of appreciation among us also for that christological way of looking at the doctrines of Christianity which has come to characterize all the evangelical theology of Germany in our time, and by which only, it would seem, the objective and subjective (in other words, the churchly and experimental) sides of the Gospel can be brought into true harmony with each other."

These theses were adopted without dissent. They show with what unanimity the mother synod stands, in doctrinal apprehension, upon an historical and doxological basis, as against both archaic and rationalistic tendencies of Protestantism, and against the errors and corruptions of the Roman and Greek churches.

Taking as a general principle the idea enunciated in these theses, that the Church refers her life not only to the epoch of the Reformation, but also to the or the original form of Christianity as it existed in the first ages, and that the Apostles' Creed is to be considered of fundamental authority for the Reformed faith,
we proceed to state in few words some of the principal doctrinal views which the Palatinate Catechism, thus interpreted, teaches and involves:

1. Adam, created in the image of God, was endowed with capacity to resist temptation and abide in his original state of life-communion with God; but he transgressed the command of God by a free act of his own, and the seal of his perdition will through the instigation of the devil, the head of the kingdom of darkness.

2. The fall of Adam was not that of an individual only, but the fall of the human race.

3. All men are born with the fallen nature of Adam, and with the power of evil, and with all the results of darkness, inclined to all evil, and apt to no good; and are subject to the wrath of God, who is terribly displeased with their inborn as well as actual sins, and will punish them in just judgment in time and in eternity.

4. The eternal Son of God, incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, true God and true man in one person, is the principle and substance of the new creation.

5. In the mystery of the Word made flesh, the human nature of the Son of God assumed into organic and eternal union with himself is the most perfect form of supernatural revelation, and the only medium of divine grace.

6. All the acts of Christ are not those of God or of man separately taken, but the acts of the God-man.

7. His suffering, death, and resurrection, his miracles and his word; his agony, passion, and death; his descent into Hades; his resurrection from the dead, ascension to heaven, and session at the right hand of God; the coming of the Holy Ghost, and his second advent, all derive their significance and saving virtue from the sacrificial constitution of his person of redemption and bliss in the glorious resurrection of the last day.

8. The atonement for the sin of man is the reconciliation of God and fallen humanity in the person and work of Jesus Christ. It is not simply the offering of himself on the cross, but the whole process of resuming human nature into life-communion with God, and includes both perfect satisfaction to the law by suffering the penalty and all the consequences of sin, and complete victory over the devil. The full benefit of the atonement inures to the believer, because by faith he is a member of Christ and a partaker of his anointing, and this was before God in the life and righteousness of Christ.

9. The Church constituted by the coming of the Holy Ghost is the mystical body of Christ, a new, real, and objective order of existence, and is both supernatural, divine, and human, heavenly and earthly, the fulness of him that filleth all in all; in whom communion alone there is redemption from sin and all its consequences, fellowship with God in Christ, and the hope of complete victory over death and hell, and of eternal glory. The relation which the new, regenerated humanity, his mystical body, bears to Christ the head, the second Adam, is analogous to the organic relation which the old, fallen, accursed humanity bears to the first Adam.

10. The sacraments are visible, holy signs and seals, wherein God, by an objective transaction, confirms to sinners the promise of the Gospel. They are the means whereby men, through the power of the Holy Ghost, are made partakers of the substance of divine grace, that is, of Christ and all his benefits.

11. Holy baptism is a divine transaction, wherein the subject is washed with the blood and spirit of Christ from all the pollution of his sins, as certainly as he is washed outwardly with water; that is, he is renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be a member of Christ, so that he may more and more die unto sin, and lead a holy and unblamable life.

12. Justification does not attend the resurrection of the dead and eternal life in virtue simply of holy baptism, but only on the condition that, improving the grace of baptism, they believe from the heart on Christ, die unto sin daily, and lead a holy life, and thus realize the full virtue of the incarnation and atonement.

13. The sacrament of the holy supper is the abiding memorial of the sacrifice of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, the fruit of his crucifixion, and the seal of his perpetual presence in the Church by the Holy Ghost; the mystical exhibition of his one offering of himself made once, but of force always to put away sin; the pledge of his unlying love to his people, and the bond of his living union and fellowship with them to the end of time. This holy sacrament, in which the communicants do not only commemorate his precious death as the one all-sufficient vicarious sacrifice for their sins, but Christ himself also, with his crucified body and shed blood, feeds and nourishes their souls to everlasting life; that is, by this visible sign and pledge he assures them that they are really partakers of his true body and blood, through the working of the Holy Ghost, as they receive by the mouth of the body these holy tokens in remembrance of him.

14. The bread and wine of the holy supper and not transmuted into the very body and very blood of Christ, but continue to be natural bread and wine; nor is the body and blood of Christ consubstantial, that is, in, with, and under the natural bread and wine; but the sacramental transaction is a holy mystery, in which the whole life-giving and saving virtue of Christ, his mediatorial death and resurrection, is communicated by the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost, and communicated to those who, by true faith, eat and drink worthily, discerning the Lord's body.

15. At death the righteous pass into a state of joy and felicity, and abide in rest and peace until they reach for ever the consummated communion of bliss in the glorious resurrection of the last day.

16. The second advent of Christ to judge the world in righteousness will complete the objective order of redemption, and also the subjective process of life and salvation in his body, the Church; when the last enemy, which is death, shall be destroyed; when the saints shall come forth from the dead in the full image of their risen Lord, and with him pass into heaven, the state of perfect blessedness; and the wicked shall rise to the resurrection of eternal damnation.

We can give a summary of doctrinal truths not directly included in the foregoing formal statements.

The German Reformed Church desires that the will of God or the will of man is the principle of theology; that Christianity is merely a system of doctrine or a rule of moral conduct; that the covenant is only a compounding of God with man; that God in the Father and the Son; that there is a twofold eternal decree, electing some unto salvation and others unto damnation; that the election of God unto eternal life in Christ becomes effectual outside of the economy of grace; that the humanity of Christ, or the incarnation, is an expedient in order to make an atonement for sin; that the Church is an association of converted individuals; that the Bible is the foundation of the Church; that the relation of the contents of the Bible to the individual is immediate; that the authority of the Church is subordinate to the private judgment of the individual Christian; that the unconverted and ungodly may observe the holy communion; that justification consists in a forensic act of God imputing the righteousness of Christ to extra, or that it is realized by an act of faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ; that the faithful use of the ordinary means of grace is inadequate to the wants of the Church and the world; that the Church of Rome is a total apostasy; and that Protestantism has its ground immediately in the sacred Scriptures.

On the nature of persons, the Church affirms that the person of Christ is the true principle of sound theology; that Christianity is a new life; that the humanity of Christ
is an essential constituent of Christianity; that the Christian Church is an organic continuation in time and space of the life-powers of the new creation in Christ Jesus; that the covenant is an order or institution of the Church, in which the presence of God is real; that the liturgy was written by members of the Church under plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost; that private judgment is subordinate to the general judgment of the Church as expressed particularly in the ecumenical creeds; that the word of God is the only norm of faith and practice; and that the Church, which is the individual comes to a right apprehension of the contents of the Bible through the teaching of the Church; that the election of grace unto life is effective in and by the established economy of grace; that justification is by an act of faith in the person and work of Christ, and consists both in the imputation and impartation of Christ and his righteousness; that holy baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, regeneration being the transition from the state of nature to the state of grace, as natural birth is the transition to the new birth; that exhortation, assurance, held by the conversion and sanctification, completes itself in the resurrection from the dead, inasmuch as regeneration and salvation pertain to the entire man, the body no less than the soul; that believers only hold communion with Christ in the Lord’s Supper; that the ordinance is a spiritual, visible document of the means of grace, addressed to all the needs of the Church and the world, and, if faithfully used, do not fail to promote a steady and vigorous growth of the Church; that, although the Church of Rome holds many articles of faith, and approves and perpetuates many customs which are not warranted by the Scriptures and are wrong, she is nevertheless a part of the Church of Christ; and that Protestantism is an historical continuation of the Church Catholic, in a new and better form of faith, organization, and practice.

The Reformed minority, located chiefly in the West, who dissent from many of the doctrines as given in this statement; a few even resist the whole system of thought as being subversive of the true Reformed faith. Some of them adopt the theory of salvation taught by the Methodist Church, and observe some of the forms of worship that are not in keeping with the Calvinistic theory of decree, and their teaching conforms to the Presbyterian or Puritan type of religion. But the prevailing faith, as held by the Eastern Synod, is gradually overcoming opposition, and extending; and from year to year the number of ministers and churches continues to increase. Both in the West and East, that stand firmly on the historical, churchly, and sacramental basis of the Palatinate Catechism.

As regards worship, the Church is in a state of transition. During the present century extemporaneous prayer has prevailed in the regular services of the Lord’s day; but this is a departure from the original custom. Originally the worship was liturgical. The Palatinate Liturgy was issued one year after the Palatinate Catechism. It did not, however, like the Catechism, acquire an ecumenical character. Every state or province in Europe where the Reformed Church was established had its own liturgy. In Switzerland there were as many liturgies as Reformed cantons. In Scotland they were in use also for at least a century after the Reformation.

These liturgies contain offices for the regular service of the Lord’s Supper, the communion of the sacraments; for the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons; for the solemnization of marriage, burial of the dead, etc.; and contain the creed, the Lord’s prayer, confession and absolution, the Gloria in Excelsis, Te Deum, and Exultet, and responsorial psalms. In one book unites all these elements. They are all a hand-book for the minister rather than an order of worship for the people.

The first ministers in America brought with them the liturgies of those sections of Germany or Switzerland from which they emigrated. These continued in common use, particularly in the German congregations, though preference was generally given to the Palatinate liturgy until the book prepared at the direction of the synod by the Rev. Dr. Mayer, and adopted in 1840. This work had no historical basis, and never took root.

General dissatisfaction prevailed with this state of things. The great christological movement deepened the sense of an essential difference between the German and the American Churches, and the liturgical movement for a liturgy answerable in spirit and character to the churchly and sacramental ideas which had been revived in the Church. A liturgical committee was accordingly appointed in 1841. Specific instructions were given in 1852. The book known as the Provisional Liturgy was reported to synod in 1857, and submitted to the churches for trial. This liturgy excited a controversy which continued until 1864, when the Eastern Synod, in compliance with an order of the General Synod of Pittsburgh, referred the work for revision to a committee consisting of Rev. J. Nevin, Wolff, Zacharias, Bomberger, Harbaugh, Porter, Fisher, Gerhart, and Apple; and Messrs. John Rodemayer, George Shafer, George C. Welker, and Louis H. Steiner, M.D. This committee reported a book entitled An Order of Worship for the Reformed churches in the United States. After an animated discussion, a resolution was passed by a vote of 58 to 14, authorizing the optional use of the “Order of Worship” within the limits of the Eastern Synod, and referring the book for action to the General Synod, which convened at Dayton, Ohio, Nov. 28, the same year.

The General Synod devoted three days to a calm and full discussion of the questions relating to doctrine and cultus, when certain resolutions disapproving the book were lost by a vote of 55 to 66. Thereupon the book was approved “as an order of worship proper to be used in the congregations and families of the Reformed Church” by a vote of 64 to 57. The opposition arose chiefly from ministers and churches in the West. Of the ministers and churches East a very large majority supported the “Order of Worship.”

This liturgy is not simply a hand-book for the minister, or a pulpit liturgy, but it is an order in which the people take part with the minister in the worship of God. Less complicated and shorter in many of its offices than the Book of Common Prayer, it unites all the historic elements of liturgical worship on the basis of the apostolic church order of all the churches East, and to a large extent also of the churches in the West.

The government is Presbyterian. Every congregation is governed by a consistory, which is composed of the pastor, elders, and deacons; no congregation is without either elders or deacons. They are chosen by the commonwealth and authorized for a term of two, three, or four years, generally only two years, and ordained by the laying on of hands, and installed. When the term expires, the administrative power ceases, but not the office. If re-elected, installation is repeated, but not consecration. The consistory is subject to the synod, which consists of the ministers and an elder from each parish within a given district. The classes are subject to the synod. The synod is a delegated body, and consists of a given number of ministers and elders,
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chosen by four or more adjacent classes. The synods subject to the General Synod. This body consists of ministers and elders chosen by all the classes of the Church. It is the highest judicatory, and the last resort in all cases respecting government not finally adjudicated by the synods. Every judicatory has legislative authority within its own sphere; every minister and member possesses the right of appeal from a lower to a higher court.

All the children and youth are carefully catechized by the pastor once in two weeks, or once or twice a week, for a period of from three to nine months in the year. The classes are terminated by an examination in the presence of the pastor. Some pastors, particularly those located in cities and larger towns, have each but one church; but the majority have parishes consisting of from two to four churches, and not a few of from five to eight. Catechumenous possessing the requisite qualifications are, after examination in presence of the elders, received into the full communion of the Church by the rite of confirmation. The holy communion is commonly administered twice a year, and in many of the churches four times. The communicants receive the sacred elements in both kinds. The church services are in German.

In many of the churches it is still customary to administer the communion to the sexes separately; first the men come to the altar, and afterwards the women. But this old German custom is going into disuse. In the English churches men and women approach the altar together, as in some of the German churches. Services preparatory to the celebration of the holy communion are held on the Saturday or Friday previous.

The baptism of infants is faithfully and universally observed. Children are presented by their parents. Sponsors are allowed, but the parents themselves must also be present. Baptism may be administered at any time and in any suitable place, but an occasion of public worship in the church is held to be most appropriate.

The principal festivals, Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, and Whit-Sunday, are held in high honor, and observed with much solemnity. The liturgy has revived the idea of the church year. In many congregations, the pulpit teaching and the worship observes the concrete historic movement of revelation from Advent to Trinity Sunday, and from Trinity Sunday to Advent, which is called the liturgical year, and is still observed around the world.

As the liturgy becomes known and is appreciated, so does the observance of the church year gain favor. Acquiring greater practical power from month to month, it is gradually receiving more general confidence, and being observed in all its parts.

The two main connected with the General Synod are:

1. The Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States, with 16 classes, 290 ministers, 718 congregations, and 86,605 members; 2. The Synod of Ohio and adjacent States, with 8 classes, 130 ministers, 308 congregations, and 20,069 members; 3. The North-western Synod, with 7 classes, 92 ministers, 166 congregations, and 9811 members; 4. The Pittsburgh Synod (in process of formation), which will have about 44 ministers, 126 congregations, and 9240 members. Its statistics are included in synod No. 2 (northern third). Total, 31 classes, 512 ministers, 1192 congregations, 118,485 members. Received by confirmation and certificate during the year, 11,837. Aggregate membership, including those who are baptized, but not confirmed, 192,000.

Two theological seminaries. One at Lancaster, Pa., founded in 1895: 4 professors, 80 students. Seminary at Tiffin, Ohio; founded at Canton, Ohio, 1888; suspended from the fall of 1893 to 1896; reopened at Columbus, Ohio, Oct., 1896; removed and permanently located at Tiffin, Ohio, 1898. Total, 32 students. Mission-house, Franklin, Wisc., 3 professors, 6 students; Freeland, Pa., 4 professors, 10 students. Two fully-organized colleges. (1.) Franklin and Marshall, at Lancaster, Pa. Franklin College, founded at Lancaster in 1787; and Marshall College, at Mercersburg, in 1836; Franklin and Marshall consolidated at Lancaster in 1853: 9 professors, 88 students, 442 alumni. (2.) Heidelberg College, founded at Tiffin, O., in 1850: 11 professors and 124 students. Two female seminaries; one at Allentown, Pa., the other at Tyrconnell, Md.

Periodicals.—Two reviews, four weekly papers, and one semi-monthly; one monthly magazine, and three Sunday-school papers.

There are two printing-establishments; one at Philadelphia, Pa., and one at Cleveland, O.

These statistics represent the condition of the German Reformed Church in the United States, 1896-97.

GERMAN THEOLOGY. See THEOLOGY, GERMAN.

GERMANUS, the name of three patriarchs of Constantinople. (1.) The first was transferred from the see of Cyzicus to that of Constantinople in 715, and was a zealous defender of image-worship, for which he was degraded, in a council held at Constantinople in 730. He died in 740, and was anathematized by a council at Constantinople, fourteen years afterwards (754). A treatise of his, σπυρίδων θεοῦ ἐνδοξισμόν ποιούσος, etc., may be found in H. Justel's Bibliotheca Canonica, and in Le Moyne, Varia Sacra: there also remains some letters and homilies of his (Bib. Max. Patr. xvii, xx.). His remains are all given in Migne, Patrologiae Graecæ, tom. 98. See also Fabricius, Biblio-
theca Graeca, ed. Harles, xi, 155; CELLIER, Antwurpta Sacri (Paris, 1862), xi, 86 sq.

(II.) Germanus the younger, a monk of the Propon-
tis, who became patriarch in 1222; but as Constantin-
ople was then in the hands of the Latins, he resided at
Nicæa, in Bithynia. He corresponded with pope Greg-
ory IX, in hope of bringing about a union between the
Eastern and Roman churches, but in vain. He was
deposed in 1240, restored again to his see in 1254,
and died in 1255. His Episipes and Homilies are given
in Migne's Patrologia Graeca, tom. 98.

(III.) Germanus, bishop of Adrianople, became pa-
triarch of Constantinople in 1267. He accepted the
honor with great reluctance, and resigned it in a few months, to retire to a monastery.—Neander, Ch. Hist. iii, 203; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, vii. 10; viii. 84; xi. 162; Cave, Hist. Lit. I. 1, 621; ii. 289; Hoefner, Nowe Bibg. i. 442; Germainus of Auxerre, St., one of the most striking figures in the period of the fall of the Roman empire, was born in Auxerre, in Roman Gaul, of illustrious parents, about A.D. 880. He was placed in the best schools of Gaul, and having finished his early education, he went to Rome to be formed for a life of clerical eloquence. His merit, and his marriage with a lady of high rank, brought him into notice at the court of the emperor Honorius, and procured for him, besides the government of Auxerre, the office of duke or general of the troops of several provinces. Although a Christian, he was a naturalizer, and was in the habit of hanging on a large tree, in one of the public squares, the heads of the animals he had killed. This custom bearing some resemblance to pagan superstitions, St. Amatorius, bishop of Auxerre, one day, when the duke was about to extort the tree present its return, and the vanity of his monument to be removed. Germainus suffered this correction with impatience, and threatened to be revenged, but God ordered it otherwise. Amatorius was advanced in years, and discerning in Germainus such qualities as were calculated to make a great bishop by the clergy and people. From that time he was completely changed. He practised his episcopal duties to their fullest extent. The Christians of Great Britain, frightened at the progress of Pelagianism in their island, had applied to pope Celestine and the bishop of Gaul to obtain aid, and they, in an assembly held in 428, set up a bishop and established the See. They invited the bishop of Auxerre, St. Lupus, bishop of Troyes. Both set off instantly. This mission had great success at the time, but Pelagianism reappeared seventeen or eighteen years afterwards, and Germainus went again with Severus, bishop of Troyes, to extinguish the heresy. In 433, he was consecrated a bishop by St. Endellicher and H. Hoffmann, 1834, and by J. F. Massmann, 1841, from a codex in the library at Vienna; the dialect in this version is very rude, and, if not provincial, would seem to point to an earlier date than the 9th century. Versions of the Psalter seem to have been executed in considerable numbers in the 10th century; one of these, by Nokker Leabo, aobt of St. Gall, is given by Schiller (Thee. vol. i), and others anonymous are to be found in Graff's Deutsche Interlinear versionen der Psalmen (Quad. 1889). A paraphrase of the Song of Songs, in Latin verse and German prose, had appeared in the 14th century. A new edition of this work, printed by Schütte (Hamb. 1779). Several works of a similar kind, in which the Biblical narratives are set forth, sometimes with apocryphal additions, were produced about this time; of these, one, which exists in various dialects and in numerous codices, is a version of the historical parts of Scripture in prose, composed partly from the poetical versions already extant, partly translated from the Vulgate (Massmann, D. Kaiserchronik, ii. 54). Formal translations from the Vulgate began now to be multiplied; of these MSS. exist, though the names of the authors here for the most part perished (Relase, D. Versa, Germ. autol Lutheram. 1697; Schöberl, Bericht von allen Deutschen geschriebenen Bibles, 1763; Rosenmüller, Hist. Interpr. v. 174, etc.). Out of these, though by what process we are unable to describe, came the complete version of the Bible in German, which was produced in a session of the Diet, on the invention of printing, and of which copies were multiplied to a great extent as soon as that art came into operation. Before 1477 five undated editions, the four earlier at Mayence and Strasburg, as is believed, the fifth at Augsburg, as the book itself attests, had been printed; and between 1472 and 1478, seven at Augsburg, one at Nüremberg, and one at Strasburg, were issued. Several editions of the Psalter also appeared, and one of the Gospels, with the
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PERGAMON FROM THE EPISTLES. Collectors talk also of a translation by Büchsenstern, 1526; of Malachi by Hetzer, 1526; of Hosea by Capito, 1527; and other similar attempts (Riederer, Nachrichten II, 8vo. sq.).—An important place must be also assigned to the translation of the N. T. into Danish by Hans Mikkelsen (Leips. 1524); which, though awfully "ret after latiterac is" in the history of the independence of the Vulgate, and of being made directly from the Greek (Henderson, Dissertation on Hans Mikkelsen's N. T., Copenh. 1818). Of translations into Low German, one was printed at Cologne, 1490; another at Lié- ger, 1518; and a third at Halberstadt, 1519.

2. Luther's Version. The appearance of this constitutes an epoch, not only in the history of the church, but also in that of German literature and of the German people. Luther's version is a permanent monument of the author's ability and indomitable perseverance. Luther had few helpers in his arduous work. His exegetical aids were limited to the Septuagint, the Vulgate, a few Latin fathers, the N. T. of Erasmus, and such Hebrew as could be learned from the imperfect elementary books then extant. He had, however, valuable coadjutors in Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Jonas, Amsbeck, and others, whose help was of the utmost service to him and to the work itself, especially when any difficulty occurred. He had access also to the Rabbinical expositions through some learned Jews. But the main burden of the work rested with himself, and it was to his own resources he had chiefly to trust for success. Of the patient toil he bestowed upon the work many biographers have written, and he himself says of his labors on the book of Job: "On Job, M. Phillip, Aurorall, and I, worked so that sometimes in four days we had hardly succeeded in accomplishing three lines. With what anxious care he sought to perfect his work without any book before him, or some written by others, is the account of the third part of his translation, containing Job, Psalms, and the writings of Solomon, still preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin, written in his own hand, and exhibiting the corrections which he made in the style and expression before sending it to press. Not unfrequently as many as three in his author's expression, and sometimes more, occur, between which he hesitated before finally fixing on the one which he would print. He spent on the work in all twelve years. The N. T., completed by him in the Wartburg, appeared in 1534 in the four books of Moses (Das Alte Testament, Deutsch, th.) in 1522; the other four in 1534, as far as Esther (Das A. T. Deutsch, th.) II in the close of the same year; Job, Psalms, and the Solomonic writings (Das A. T., th.) in 1524; between 1526 and 1531 several of the prophetical writings were issued, and in 1531 the collective Collected Books of the Prophets as th. iv of Das A. T. Deutsch. The Book of Wisdom was issued in 1529, and the rest of the apocryphal books in 1533 and 1534. The whole Bible was thus completed, and appeared under the title "Bible: d. k. die gesamte schrift. D. Martin Luther, Wittenberg gedruckt durch Hans Laet, 1534," fol. (Pischon, Die hohe wichtigkeit der ubersetzer, der H. S. durch Dr. M. Luther, Berl. 1894). Of this work thirty-eight editions were printed in Germany before 1580, besides seventy-two of the N. T., and innumerable reprints of other smaller portions (Panzer, p. 205).

3. Zurich Bible.—This is a combination of Luther's translation of the other books with a new translation of the prophetic writings by Con. Pellican, Leoo Jodua, Theod. Bibblnder, etc. It appeared in 1524, and was reprinted in 1527, and twice in 1530. In 1531 another edition appeared, with a new set of poetical books (Panzer, p. 260). The Worms Bible, 1529, is a work of the same kind as the Zurich Bible.

4. Versions from Luther's Bible in the other Teutonic Dialects.—1. Low German, by J. Holderinus, 1538 and often; 2. Danish, N. T., 1524, Bible, 1535: this is found also in Hunter's Polyglot, S. C. Gneoak, N. T., 1558, by Laurentius Andrek, Bible, 1541, by Laurent and Olaus Petri; 4. Icelandic, N. T. 1540, Bible 1584, by Gudh, Thorlaksson, bishop of Holms; 5. Dutch, N. T. 1526, Antw., printed by Lievelt, whence this is called the Lievelt N. T.; the whole Bible was translated anew after Luther into Dutch by Ad. Vischer in 1648, and this is the existing authorized version for the Dutch Lutherans; 6. Pomeranian, 1548.

5. Versions of the Reformed Church. Of these the first was the production of David Pareus, and appeared in 1579. It was superseded by that of F. Piscator in 1602, of which many editions have appeared. A translation of the N. T., by Amandus Polanus, appeared in 1608. In 1650 a new translation for the churches of the Swiss confederacy appeared at Zurich, the authors of which were Hottinger, Suerer, Fueslin, and others. In Holland various attempts were made to produce versions direct from the original. In 1586 J. Uthen- hoven issued the N. T., and in 1582 the whole Bible; and in 1647 appeared the Dutch Bible translated by J. Hackius, which chiefly follows the Geneva (French) Bible.

6. Authorized Versions.—In the year 1618 the Synod of Dort appointed a commission of 22 members to prepare a new version; this appeared in 1637, and received the authorization of the States General. This version (the Dutch version of which the present author is the author) was completed in 1607 by P. J. Reesen, and in 1647 appeared with the royal sanction, after it had been carefully revised by Hans Svanin, archbishop of Zealand. The Icelandic version received its permanent form in 1644 from Thorlak Skulesen, the grandson of Thorlak. Baher (1600). The authorized Swedish version was completed under the auspices of Gustavus III.; it consists of a revised edition of the work of Andræ and Petri, and appeared in 1618.

7. Roman Catholic Versions.—The earliest of these is the N. T. 1586, with the work of the N. T. Dietenberger, bewerten Texts" etc., sine loc. 1592, fol., Leips. 1592, 8vo, and often since. In 1584 the Bible of Dieten- berger (q. v.) appeared at Mayence; and in 1597, that of Eck (q. v.) at Ingolstadt. Previous to these, Casper Ulenberg had translated the Bible in accordance with the Sixtine text of the Vulgate, and this translation, revised by the Jesuits at Mayence in 1616, appeared as Diet Catholische Bibel. Revised editions were issued by Ehrhard in 1722, and by Cartier in 1751; and it has been often reprinted both with and without the Latin text. More recent versions by Roman Catholic clergymen are the Vienna version (1699) of Wittola (Vien. 1775), Weitenauer (Aug. 1777), Fleisch- chutz (Fuld. 1778), Rosalinio (Vien. 1781), Fischer (Prag 1784), Braun (Vienna, 1786), Lauber (1786), Mutschelle (Munich, 1789), Weyl (May, 1795), Krach (Aug., 1795), Bremel: Diet der christlichen Welt (1799- 1818), Bonn, 1799, 1800, 1815; Voss (1807), Schnappsteg (1807), Widemann (1809), Kistemaker (1825), Scholals (1829), Allioli (1838), Loch and Reischl (1857). Of these, the majority are confined to the N. T. The translations of Voss, Scholals, and Allioli have been repeatedly issued. Casper: pastor of the Bohemian Church in Berlin, published a translation of the N. T. from the Greek in 1815, which has often been reprinted.

8. Other Versions.—In 1630 J. Crell issued a German translation of the Bible in the interests of Socinianism; and in 1660 another, in the interests of Arminianism, was published by J. Fischer. Petri, of a Danish version party in Holland published a translation in Dutch, made by Chr. Hartsacker, in 1660. In 1666 a Jewish translation of the O. T. into German was published by Joseph Athias; this, along with the versions of Luther, Piscator, Caspar Ulenberg, the Dutch Author, and the version of the N. T. by J. J. Reitsen, printed in the parallel columns, was published under the title of Biblia Penta- topia (8 vols. 4to. Hamb. 1711). Of German versions of more recent date there are many. Those of Triller (1708), Reiz (1712), Junkerhoros (1732), Heinemann (1749), Senget (1756), Schmitz (1769-83), Stig- lig (1776), Seller (1783), Stolz (1790), the Berkeling...
GERMANY

Bible (1728), belong to the Lutheran Church; those of Glykas (3 vols. 8vo, Basle, 1776), and Voegelin (Zürich, 1781) to the Reformed. Belonging to the present century are the translations of Preuss (1811), Schäffer (1816), Meyer (1829), [Richter and Fleischer] (1833), Zschietzsch man (1835), and of these the last (1839), chiefly of the N. T. only. But all these yield in importance to the work of De Wette, prepared originally in conjunction with Augusti (6 vols., Heidelberg, 1809-14), subsequently wholly by himself (3 vols., 1831-38, 4th ed. 1858). The Jewish version by Arnim, Fürst, and Schwarz, and the Greek of this scholar of the 18th century is also deserving of notice. Finally we notice the careful translations in Philippeon's *Israelitische Bibel* (1858) and Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* (1858 sq.).—Kitto, s. v.

Germany. 1. *Ancient Religion of.*—The information concerning the religion of the tribes of *Germania Magna*, such as the Alamans, Saxons, Franks, etc., is very incomplete and disconnect ed. The Greek and Latin authors mention the names of but a few deities, who seem to have been to some extent similar in their attributes to their own gods. Thus in the *Iliad* the three main deities, Zeus, Athena, and Hestia, were called *Deus* by the Gauls (Wurtz, 1809), and the last of these is also necessary for their purpose, and their views are naturally colored with their own opinions. The Scandinavian mythology must originally have been very closely connected with that of Germany; but we can get no light from that quarter, as we do not know the name of the chief deity of this tribe at an early period. About the same time the *Taurian* was mixed in the Alle man and the Frank, while among the northern tribes, the Slavonic, Lithuanic, and Finnic myths were introduced; while a tendency towards the Greek worship is perceptible in the religious ceremonies. To the southern Germans, Caesar states that they worshipped only such as visibly exerted a decided influence over events: he particularly mentions three: the Sun, Vulcan, and the Moon. The domestic deities were: *F연구* (Wooden), the supreme god, and his wife *Frìa*, the goddess of the house; *Teris*, or the god of the fields; *War*, the god of war; *Фро*, who watched over the crops, and his wife *Frowa*; afterwards came *Phol or F穿越* (the Balder of the north), *Finne*, and *Thurnar* (Donor), god of the clouds and storms. The progenitor of the human race was *Tuao*, who combined the attributes of the Greek Uranus and the German *Ober der Schüle* (the chief of the mountains), with the subsequent *Irmin*, or the German Hercules. Among the special deities of different tribes were: *Nerthus* (commonly *Hermila*), goddess of fertility and the chase; the *Alos*, two brothers (a sort of Castor and Pollux); *Cater*, in Saxony, etc. Other goddesses appear to have been the *Helias* of the Germans, *Butus Hidana* and *Eira* were identical with Freia, etc. Among the inferior deities (demons) were the *Riesen* (gi ants), physically resembling men, who were supposed to belong to a former period of creation, and dwell in the mountains, where they erected gigantic fortifications, and defended themselves against intruders with stones and rocks. In direct contrast from these were the *Zverge* (pigmies), who appeared among men on special occasions, sometimes to impart gifts and blessings to them, at other times to do them evil and frustrate their plans. There were also the *Dracones* (the mountains), called also *Elbe* or *Elfen* (elves); *Waldegeist* (spirits of the forests), especially the Wild Hunter, Schratz; *Wassergeist* (spirits of the waters), or Nixen. There were also a quantity of lares, or favorable household gods of an inferior degree, while trophies of the gods and heroes haunted the houses of the neighborhood at night, disturbing slumberers and throwing stones at passers-by. Horses and bulls were considered sacred, and bears, wolves, and foxes were objects of respectuous awe. The gods and goddesses offered sacrifices of horses, arms, and weapons, and eagles, raven, and woodpecker were regarded with the highest veneration. The cuckoo was supposed to possess the gift of prophecy. Serpents also were worshipped, and the fear they inspired gave rise to the fable of the dragon. The cosmogony of Germany seems to have greatly varied with the times and in the different tribes; the general belief was that the gods originated out of chaos, created the world, and governed it in its complicated existence. It was shown by the idea of the great city of the dead, Wallalka. The mode of worship was very simple, if compared with that of the Greeks and Romans, or even of the Celta. The temples were not generally structures made by men, but often trees or groves where the deity was supposed to live. Heathenism was healing himself in the rustling of the leaves. Some of the gods dwelt in the mountains, caves, or streams. Yet there were also regular temples, of which vestiges are yet found, and which contained images of the gods; for, although the simple people, for their part, there is oft mention made in the early times of Christianity of the destruction of idols in Germany [see [MENSMUL]], and images of the sun and the moon have been found (though these may also have belonged to Celtic or Slavonic tribes). The holy places were mountains or woods, or the holy isles; Deid mout tains between Silesia and Bohemia, etc. The woods and trees, especially the oak, beech, and linden-tree, were objects of particular veneration. Unbelievers were not allowed to touch them, or to enter the groves. The worship consisted in prayer to the gods; the sacri fices were usually performed by the priests, and the priest also took place before consulting the omens, going to war, blessing a king, or any other special occasion. These sacrifices consisted generally in horses, bulls, goats, etc., and even human beings. The color of the sacrificial animal was generally white. Besides this, on all festive occasions, the sacrifice of the feast was offered to the household gods, and laid before their shrine. No mention is made of the general feasts of the Germans in the earlier times, yet it is considered likely that they had at least as principal ones the *Juel*, *Easter*, and the *Summer Feast*. The priests took part in legislation and the wars as well as in worship, and in war they carried the sacred images or symbols against the enemy. In the household the head of the family could act as its priest. Chosen women, called *Alrunes*, consecrated the horses, and prophesied by consulting the omens at the sacrifice. *Eid Schiede* (the sacred mountain) of Germany (Amst. 1648): G. Schütz, *Excerpta et Germani a sacram gentilium focientiae* (Lips. 1748); Möser, De vet. Germanorum et Gallorum theologa (1749); Meyer, *Erörterung d. christl. Religionsweisen d. Deutschen* (Lips. 1753); Hermann, De der heerlichsten classen bey dem Altertum, *Hierusalem* (Lips. 1761); Siebenböck, *De der Religion der alten Deutschen* (Altdorf, 1771); Reinhold, *Beiträge einer Mythenlehre d. alten D. Göter* (Münster 1791); Loos, *D. Göttlerhcr der alten Deutschen* (Col. 1804); Scheller, *Mythologie d. nordischen u. deutsch enen Völker* (Regensburg 1816); Braun, *De der relig. u. alten Deutschen* (Mainz 1819); *Mone, Gesch. d. Heidenthumsn im nordischen Europa* (Lips. 1819-23, 2 vols.); Bönisch, *D. Göter Deutsclands* (Kamenze, 1830); *Logis, Hand buch d. altdutschen und nordisch. Göttlerhcr* (Lips. 1831); Barth, *Altdutsche Religion* (Leips. 1835); v. Grimm, *Deutsche Sagen* (Göttingen, 1836); *Kerr, Hand buch d. D. Mythologie* (Munich, 1844-55, 2 vols.); J. W. Wolf, *Zeitschrift fur d. Myth. u. Sitten kunde* (Göttingen 1855-58, 2 vols.). (J. N. P.)

II. History of Christianity in Germany.—As some of the German tribes were the most barbarous at the birth of the Christian era, Christianity became known to the Germans at a very early date. Some of the epicopal sees, as Cologne, even claim to have had disciples of the apostles as their first bishops. Peter is said (Baron. ad ann. 46) to have ordained the bishops of the city in the early times of the German. In 314, when the Council of Arles was held, we have trustworthy information of a bishopric in Cologne. In the south of Germany, on the other hand,
we find the first Christians at Augusta Vindelicorum (Augsburg), in Rheotia, into which Christianity was introduced by the bishop Narcissus, in the time of Diocletian (284-305). In the following centuries the number of bishoprics in Western Germany gradually increased, and at the beginning of the 6th century we find subject to the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Trier; and hence it appears that all other bishoprics, Worms, Speyer, besides a number of others whose sees now belong to France or Switzerland. Next to south-western Germany, it was the south-east in which Christianity made the greatest progress. At the beginning of the 7th century, there were, in the two Bavarian provinces of upper and lower Bavaria, proportionately almost as many Christian churches as in the other countries of the ancient Western empire, and Bavaria, in particular, became an entirely Christian state. Even before this time many of the German tribes which had invaded and conquered the western provinces of the Roman empire had either become Christian or were inclined to be so. The Goths received the first announcement of Christianity from prisoners taken in war, and a Gothic metropolitan had a seat in the Synod of Nicaea. Among the West Gothic princes, Fritigern was favorable towards the Arianism of Athalarich; and it was he who protected it. When the Western Goths, conquered by the Huns, had to seek refuge in the Roman empire, they had to consent to be baptized. The form of Christianity which they then received from the emperor Valens was that of the Arian Church. Other East German tribes, the Goths and the Vandals, likewise became Christians of the Arian faith, which was carried by the German conquerors into Spain, Italy, and Northern Africa. To an Arian bishop of the West Goths, Ultibas, Germany is indebted for the first German version of the Bible. The conversion of Clovis, the king of the Franks, to the Catholic Church, gave to the German tribes who had left the fatherland the first orthodox king; and the success of the Franks in their wars with the Arian kings, in which they were aided not a little by the Catholic subjects of the latter, soon led to the destruction of Arianism as a national religion in the Germanic world. Under the influence of the Franks, in the beginning of the 8th century, the Catholic Church pressed forward as far as the Saale and the Elbe, but it was not under any ecclesiastical regulations, and was much corrupted by Arianism. British monks, the Goths, and as far as the Main, and among the Alemanni, but they had no connection with Rome. See COLUMBANS; GALL. Winfred, the Anglo-Saxon monk, better known under the name of Boniface (q. v.), was sent from Rome to undertake the conversion of Germany, and finally became the apostle of the German Church and the founder of the German Church. He made the German Church dependent upon Rome, and, in consequence of the plenary powers given him by the Roman see, was looked upon as the general bishop of Germany. The last serious struggle in defence of German paganism was made by the Clovis; but, finally acknowledging their inability to resist Charlemagne, they resolved to adopt the religion of the conquerors, and become one nation with the Franks. The Christianization of Eastern Germany, which at that time was chiefly inhabited by Slavic tribes, was not completed until the 13th century.

When the Roman empire had been revived in the German nation by the Othos, the emperor was regarded as the political head of Christendom in the West, and the holy empire as a divine institution. The old legal principle that God had divided all power on earth between the emperor and the pope was frequently construed in Germany so as to mean that the emperor carried the secular sword as a feudal investiture from the pope. The efforts of medieval popes to enlarge the personal authority of the church, on the material, and even to establish the absolute superiority of the pope over all secular power and the whole world, led to continual wars between the emperors and the popes. The popes entirely failed to carry through their theocratic idea, but the authority of the emperors of Germany, as the first among the Christian rulers, likewise steadily declined.

In the 16th century Germany was the birthplace of the great reformation of the Church, which substituted the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in many countries not only in a large portion of Germany, but in a number of other European countries. It seemed at one time probable that the whole of the German empire might be gained for the Reformation; but, after many wars, or rather, two wars, one against the Turk, one of the fiercest and longest religious wars on record, the activity of the Jesuits and the courts of Austria and Bavaria saved a large portion of Germany, especially in South Germany, for the old Church.

The old German empire was dissolved in 1806. In 1815 the German Confederation was established as a league of independent states. Another great change in the constitution of the German nation was effected by the war of 1866, which united most of the German states into the North-German Confederation, under the leadership of Prussia, while Austria was wholly excluded from the empire. Austria, Wurttemberg, Baden, and part of Hess-Darmstadt were recognised as independent South-German states. The Grand-duchy of Luxemburg was also released from all connection with Germany, and remained a semi-independent state, under the influence of France. In 1866 the little principality of Lichtenstein, in South Germany, was totally ignored at this reconstruction of Germany, and likewise formed henceforth an independent state. Our Cyclopaedia devotes a special article to Austria, Prussia, and each of the smaller German states, in which a full statement of their Church history and ecclesiastical statistics is given.

In 1885, the number of Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews in the North-German Confederation and the South-German states was about as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North German Confederation</td>
<td>18,945,717</td>
<td>6,521,365</td>
<td>365,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South German States</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,514,456</td>
<td>7,187,927</td>
<td>365,576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Gericulus, Johannes, a clergyman of the Reformed Church of Holland, was born at Utrecht. He was settled successively at Delft, Emden, Vlissingen, Ghent, Harlingen, Deventer, Harderwyk, and Utrecht. He died at Utrecht Feb. 14, 1606. He translated into Latin the East Friesland Catechism, and also wrote a defence of the Heidelberg Catechism against Dirk Vollertsz. Coornhert, a translation of Beza's Paraphrase of the Psalms, Advice to the Sick, and an Account of the Reformed Church in Utrecht. (J. F. W.)

Geroch. See GERHOCH.

Gerold, a place mentioned in the Antonine Tables, possibly the modern Jerud, a large village on the great caravan road from Damascus to Palmyra (Porter, Damascus, i, 371).—Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 314.

Gereth'zian (only in the plural, Gerethizen v r). Yorupoi, a term denoting the designation of the inhabitants of a town, which is named in 2 Macc. xii, 24 only as one limit (iuscū turbī) of the district committed by Antiochus Epiphanes to the governor of Judas Maccabaeus, the other limit being Ptolemæis (Acheoi). To judge by the similar expression, this must signify the extent of Simon’s government in 1 Macc. xi, 59, the specification has reference to the sea-coast
of Palestine, and, from the nature of the case, the Ger- 
shenians, wherever they were, must have been south 
of Ptolemais. Grotius seems to have been the first to 
suggest that the town Geresh or Gerara (Γερας, 
Ptolemy, iv, 6, 108 ; Garve, Flinny, Nat. Hist. vi, 29 ; 
Vieillot, Hist. des Peuples, p. 764 ; G. F. Smith in the 
Expositor, viii, 19) was intended, which lay between Pelusium 
and Rhinocolura (wash el-Arish). It has been point- 
• ed out by Ewald (Geschichte, iv, 365, note) that the 
coast as far north as the latter place was at that 
time in possession of Egypt, and he thereon conjectures 
that the inhabitants of the ancient city of Gerarah, south- 
east of Gaza, the residence of Abraham and Isaac, are 
meant. In support of this, Grimm (Uebrig. und Hdb. 
ad loc.) mentions that at least one M. reads Герар, 
which would without difficulty be corrupted to Герар- 
съ. The Syriac version (early, and entitled to much 
respect) has Γεζαρ, by which may be intended either 
(o) the ancient Гезар, which was near the sea—some- 
where about Joppa; or (b) Gaza, which appears 
sometimes to take that form in these books. But 
these are evidently conjectural emendations of the 
text: and the allusion of Ewald is sufficiently met 
by observing that the place in question was not 
included in the Maccabean province of Judas, any 
more than Egypt of the parallel passages (1 Mac- 
xii, 59 ; Josephus, Ant. xiii, 5, 4). See MACCABEES, 
JUDAS.

Gerash'om (Heb. Gerash'om, ג'רָשָׁם [in Chron. usu- 
ally גֵּרָשְׁמ], expulsion [see GERSHOM], an etymology 
alluded to in Exod. ii, 22, where there is a play upon 
the word, as if written גֵּרָש ל, or Gerash, q. d. a 
sojourner there; in which passage the Sept. preserves 
the form Γερασίη [comp. Josephus, Гερασίη = Δελατος, 
Ant. ii, 18, 1], but elsewhere Gerases (Гερασίς or Гер- 
ασίς), the name of three or four Levites.

1. The eldest of son of Levi (1 Chron. vi, 16, 17, 20, 43 
in [the Heb.], 62, 71; xv, 7), elsewhere distinctively 
written Gerash or (q. v.).

2. The elder of the two sons (the second being Elei- 
zer) who were born to Moses in the land of Midian by 
Zipporah (Exod. ii, 22; xviii, 4). B.C. 1698. These 
sons of the great lawgiver held no other rank than that 
of simple Levites, while the sons of their uncle Aa-zai, 
who lived in the prouder neighborhood (1 Chron. 
xxiii, 1, 5, 16; xxvi, 24), a proof of the rare 
disinterestedness of Moses. Shebuel, one of his dec- 
cendants, was appointed ruler (ותיה) of the treasury 
under David (1 Chron. xxvi, 24–28).

3. The son of one Manasseh (according to the text) 
and father of Jonathan, which last acted as priest to 
the tribe of Elah (Judg. xii, 4); but, according to a 
more correct reading, he is not different from 
the son of Moses. See JONATHAN. The Tal- 
mud explains the substitution of "Manasseh" for "Moses" 
in the text by asserting that Jonathan did 
the works of Manasseh, and was therefore reckoned 
in his family (Tosefta, b. 109, b). See MAN- 
NASEH.

A descendant of Phinehas, and chief of his house, 
who returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra vii, 2). 
B.C. 459.

Ger'sh'on (Heb. Gerash'im, גֵּרָשְׁמ, expulsion, from 
גֶּרֶשׁ ל, to drive out; Sept. in Gen. Гερασίη, elsewhere [and 
usually there also in the Cod. Alex.] Гερασίη; Joseph. 
Герасимъ; Ant. ii, 5, 4), the eldest of the three sons of 
Levi, apparently born before the migration of Jacob's 
family into Egypt (Gen. xlvii, 11; Exod. vi, 16). B.C. 
cir. 1895. But though the eldest born, the families of 
Gershon were outranked in fame by their younger 
brathers of Kohath, from whom sprang Moses and 
the priestly line of Aaron (see 1 Chron. vi, 2–16). Ger- 
shon's sons were Libni and Shimri (Exod. vi, 17; Num. 
iii, 18, 21; 1 Chron. vi, 17), and their families were 
duly recognised in the reign of David, when the per- 

manent arrangements for the service of Jehovah were 
made (1 Chron. xxiii, 7–11). At this time Gershon 
was represented by the famous Asaph "the seer," 
whose genealogy is given in 1 Chron. vi, 49–43; and, 
also in, part, 20, 21. The family is mentioned once 
again as in the days of David (2 Chron. xxix, 12, where 
it should be observed that the sons of Asaph are reckoned 
as distinct from the Gershonites). At the census in 
the wilderness of Sinai the whole number of the males of the Bene-Ger- 
shon was 7500 (Numb. iii, 22), midway between the 
Kohathites, 6600, and the Leviites, 2850. At the same date the 
efficient men were 2690 (iv, 40). On the occasion of 
the second census the numbers of the Levites are given 
only in gross (Num. xxvi, 63). The sons of Gershon 
had charge of the fabrics of the tabernacle—the cover- 
ings, curtains, hangings, and cords (Numb. iii, 29, 30; 
vii, 25, 26); for the transport of those they had two 
covered wagons and four oxen (vii, 8, 7). In the en- 
campment their station was behind (תפילה) the taber- 
nacle, on the west side (Numb. iii, 23). When on the 
• march they went with the Merarites in the rear of the 
first body of three tribes—Judah, Issachar, Zebulun— 
with Reuben behind them. In the apportionment of 
The Levitical cities, thirteen fell to the lot of the Ger- 
shonites. These were in the northern tribes—two in 
Manassesh beyond Jordan, four in Issachar, four in 
Asher, and three in Naphtali. All of these are said 
to have possessed "suburbs," and two were cities of 
refuge (Josh. xiv, 27–33; 1 Chron. vi, 41–43). It is not 
easy to see what special duties fell to the lot of 
the Gershonites in the service of the tabernacle after 
its erection at Jerusalem, or in the Temple. The sons 
of Jeduthun "prophesied with a harp," and the sons 
of Heman "lifted up the horn," but for the sons of 
Asaph no instrument is mentioned (1 Chron. xxv, 1– 
5). They were appointed to "prophesy" (that is, 
probably, to utter, or sing, inspired words, נַשָּׁרָי, 
perhaps after the special prompting of David himself 
(xxv, 2). Others of the Gershonites, sons of Laadan, 
had charge of the "treasures of the house of God, and 
over the treasures of the holy things" (xxvi, 20–22), 
among which precious stones are specially named 
(xxix, 8).

In Chronicles the name is, with two exceptions (1 
Chron. vi, 1, 11; xxiii, 6), given in the slightly different 
form of "Gershon." See GERSHONITE.

Ger'shôni (Heb. Gerashamin, גֵּרָשְׁמָנִי, Sept. Ger- 
ashini, but often simply like Gershon, and so A. V. often 
"son of Gershon"), a designation, usually in the plur., 
of the descendants of Gershon, one of the sons of 
Zur and the Merarites (1 Chron. xxii, 11; Numb. 
iii, 21; iv, 24, 27; Josh. xxx, 28; 1 Chron. 
xxiii, 7; 2 Chron. xxix, 12). Their office, during 
the marches in the wilderness, was to carry the vails and 
curtains belonging to the tabernacle, on the western 
side of which they encamped (Numb. iii, 25–26; 
xxvi, 57). In the singular the term is applied to Laadan 
(1 Chron. xxvi, 21) and Jehiel (1 Chron. xxix, 8).

Ger'son (Герсон), the Greek form (1 Esdr. viii, 
29) of the name GERSHOM (q. v.).

Gers'on, Jean Charles (Doctor Christianissimus), 
one of the greatest names in the history of France and 
of the Gallician Church. He was named Gerson from 
a village in the diocese of Rheims, where he was born, 
Dec. 14, 1885. He entered the college of Navarre in 
1877, and passed through some of the most instructive 
that studied theology seven years under the grand master 
Pierre d'Ailly. He then was succeeded as chancellor of 
the university and prebendary of Notre Dame in 1896. 
Here he strenuously devoted himself to improving the 
course of theological study, on which his views may 
be seen in his work De reformatione Theologiae (Opera, vol. i). But the diffi- 
culties of his position were very great. The uni- 
versity was in disorder; the state was torn by contending
factions; the Church was divided by the great papal schism which began in 1409, when Urban VI was elected pope at Rome, and Clement VII at Avignon. Gerson found so much opposition in his efforts to reform theology, and to bring peace to the Church, that he decided to retire from Paris to the quiet charge of the cathedral at Bruges, a premonastery given to him by Philip the Good. For a last time he got together the council, and gave up, with it, the tranquillity of his whole life. Gerson was more than once deputed to the popes during the schism. In a memoir, De unitate ecclesiastica, he defended the Council of Pisa (q. v.), and conducted himself in a firm though prudent manner when the papal claims were taken up in Germany by the Emperor Sigismund and the Council of Constance, and to elect Alexander V. It was during the sitting of this council that he published his famous treatise De auctoritate Papa, to prove that there are cases in which the assembled Church may command two rivals to desert from their strife, and has a right to depose them if they refuse, for the sake of peace and unity. The Council of Constance (q. v.) opened a new field for his talent; he took a place there as ambassador from King Charles VI, from the Church of France, and from the University of Paris, and he directed all the business that were adopted during the pontificate of John XXIII, who had succeeded Alexander V, and whose licentious conduct had tended rather to increase than to allay the schism. In this council Gerson and D'Ailly were the chief leaders in the so-called reforming party. The discourses which Gerson on various occasions delivered at the council, and the conciliations which he published, were intended principally to show that the Church may reform itself, as well in its governors as in its members; and that it has the power of assembling, without the consent of the pope, when he refuses to convoke it; to prove the necessity of holding councils, as well general as special; to present the payment of first-fruits, and to extirpate simony, which had become very common. He had established, as the basis of the decrees of the council, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Church in all which concerns faith and morals, and on this subject a discourse on the Immaculate Conception has been ascribed to him, but which was, in fact, pronounced at the Council of Basle after his death. It was principally through his efforts that the council "declared itself independent of all popes, and superior to them." The piety of Gerson, though sometimes disastrous, was never actuated by envy or celerdous; he denounced, in his treatise Contra sectam Flagellantum, the abuse made of flagellation, of which Vincent Ferrier was the advocate. He also composed a book, De probatione spiriduum, in which he gave rules for distinguishing false revelations from true ones. The pretended visions of St. Bridget, which would have been condemned at his instigation had they not found an apologist in the cardinal Torquemada; and though his theology was professedly mystical as opposed to scholasticism, he opposed the theories of John Ruysbroeck, of the passive union of the soul in the Deity, which is similar to the pure love of the Quietists. He also wrote against D'Ailly on judicial astrology, which was then in high repute among the princes of Europe, and which he combated with great success, even in his old age, against the physicians of Lyons and Montpellier. At the same time, his treatise De astrologia reformata, had procured for him the praise of the learned bishop of Cambrai. In another treatise, De erroribus circa aetem magico, he attacks the superstitious errors of magic and the prejudices of the time. With regard to toleration, Gerson was involved in all the errors of his times. At the trial of John Huss (q. v.), his writings and speeches contributed greatly to the condemnation of that eminent reformer, who was burnt by order of the Council of Constance, July 6, 1415. He took a similar share in the persecution of Jerome of Prague (execrated May 50, 1415). "Cut off," he said, in a letter to the arch-
tending abstractions and syllogism, and the uncertainty and the agonizing doubts which often accompany them. Gerson's is a mild form of mysticism, based on the nicest analysis: it does not lead to the absorption of the personality into the bosom of the Infinite Being, nor exclude the normal exercise of the intellect and volition. Gerson was a determined enemy of scholasticism. He signalized, as the origin of all the evils of theology, that vain curiosity which leads to the disregard of the most reliable authorities, the dangerous taste for novelty in things and in words, the false love of novelty, and the mixing of the different sciences. Revelation, with him, is the limit of theology, and to endeavor to carry it farther by human reasonings is to lead it astray. "If the Scriptures are insufficient as a means of arriving at God, where shall we find anything to lead us higher? Let us then guard against anything which is not founded in the ceremonies and other sciences, and against introducing into it the exercises of the schools." As to practical religion, as we have already said, Gerson was of the moderate mystical school. In his view all the moral and intellectual exercises were to be carried on in conformity with, and directed to, God; but sin destroyed this harmony, and it is the object of mystic theology to restore it. But, in order to effect this, it must first know the nature of the powers of the mind, and the manner of acting upon them. Following Richard de St. Victor (Quesne de St. Victor), Gerson distinguishes the operations of the two orders of faculties three different degrees: in the via cognitiva, 1. the cogitatio, involuntary tendency of the soul to moral consideration; 2. the meditatio, voluntary effort to learn the truth; 3. contemplatio, the voluntary inquiry into spiritual, and especially divine, objects; in the via affectiva, 1. the desire, libido; 2. joy, delectio; 3. loving aspirations, affectio eucharistica, and anagogica, inseparably connected with the contemplatio: these are only separately or theoretically considered. In this union of love with contemplation resides the true essence of the mystic theology of Gerson, and essentially a theology by an admixture of other sciences. Gerson designated it as theologia affectiva, in contradistinction from scholastic theology, which he called theologia speculativa. Love consists only in an "experimentalis Dei perceptio," from which, however, Gerson abstracts all that is material or corporeal. In the definition of it, he says: "By love is the eternal Word born in the soul, and the unity with God achieved." That wonderful book, De Insitutione Christi, is attributed by many of the best critics to Gerson. On this question, see KRAMPS.

There are several editions of Gerson's collected works, but the most complete is Opera Omnia J. Gersonii, op. et et al. L. Eilices de Pin (Antwerp, 1706, 5 vols. fol.). Vol. I contains a life of Gerson, an essay on the authorship of the Insitution of Christ, a critical catalogue of his writings, together with his dogmatical works. Vol. III contains his treatises on ecclesiastical polity, etc.; vol. IV, his writings on moral theology; vol. IV, exegetical writings; vol. V, controversial writings, sermons, etc. Some works are included in this edition which do not belong to Gerson. See Richer, Vie de Gerson; L'Essai de l'Institution de Constance; Lecuy, Essai sur Gerson (Paris, 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); Schmidt, Essai sur Gerson (Strasb. 1880); Thomasmay, Jean Gerson (Paris, 1849, 16mo); Faugère, Rhéo de Gerson (Paris, 1887); Engelhardt, de Gersonii Mysticae (Erlang, 1843, 4to); Illigens Zeitschrift fur d. Kritik der Religionsgeschichte, cent. xiv; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog., T. xxi; Journain, Doctrina Gersonii de theolog. myst. (Paris, 1838, 8vo); Michelet, Hist. de France, vol. iv; BonnaEoseheo, Reformateurs arrive la Riforme, I, 160; Neander, Ch. Hist. vol. v; Neander, History of Christian Dogmas, 1814, 12; Moebius, Ch. Hist. v, 448; Dupin, Hist. de l'Ecclesiastique, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo; Bossard, Ch. Hist. xx, 283 sq.; Hase, Hist. Ch. 250, 251; Hook, Eccles. Biog., v, 806; Schwab, J. Gerson, eine Monographie (Würzburg, 1858, 8vo); Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, v, 89 sq.

Gertrude, St., born in 826, was the daughter of Pepin of Landen, majordomo of the king of Austrasia, France. She was religiously brought up, and finally entered the nunnery of Nivelles, nine miles from Brussels, of which she was abbesse at the early age of twenty. She died there March 17, 659, and that day has since been kept in commemoration of her throughout Brabant. Acta Sanctorum, March 17.

Gertrude, St., was born at Eisleben, Germany, and became in 1294 abbesse of a congregation of Benedictine nuns at Dornburg. She was thoroughly versed in Latin and the holy Scriptures, but is particularly known for the visionary mysticism of her priety. A series of editions of her Issinuonum divina pietas exercitatio appeared during the 16th and 17th centuries. Meges published an edition in 1684, and in 1676 translated it, together with her biography, into French. She died in 1684. Her saint's day is Nov. 15. —Herzog, Real-Encyclop., v, 100.

Geruhima (Moses), the name of a mountain not very far from Jerusalem, mentioned in the Talmud (Rosh hash-Shanah, ii, fol. 22, b) as the third summit distant, on which signal-fires were lighted; held by Schwartz at the most prominent peak near mount Gerizim; the Abayot of a mountain-chain called "Avagum, about three Eng. miles south of Kailet el-Raba, or Ramoth Gilead" (Pfeiff., p. 82); but we find no corresponding name in any other modern authority.

Gervaise, François-Armand, a Trappist monk, was born at Paris in 1796. Having studied under the Jesuits, he then entered among the brethren of Cîteaux and was a prominent abbot of La Trappe in 1806. He was appointed abbot of La Trappe on the death of Abbot Simunis Fisel in 1806. The abbot, however, soon repented of his choice, for the new abbot began, by his austerity and intriguing spirit, to foment divisions among the monks, and to undo all that the abbot had done. He soon resigned, and in leaving La Trappe he drew up a long Apology. When his Histoire générale de Cîteaux (Avignon, 1746, 4to) appeared, the Bernardines, who were violently attacked in it, obtained an order from the court against him, and he was arrested at Paris and conveyed to the abbey of Notre Dame des Reclus, where he died in 1745. He is the author of La vie de St. Cyripère (Paris, 1717, 4to) — La Vie d'Abailard et d'Héloïse (Paris, 1720, 2 vols. 12mo) — La Vie de St. Irenée (Paris, 1728, 2 vols. 12mo) — La Vie de l'Apôtre St. Paul (Paris, 1734, 3 vols. 12mo) — La Vie de St. Epiphane (Paris, 1738, 4to) — L'honneur de l'église défendu contre P. Le Creuxay (1742, 2 vols. 12mo). See Richer, Bibliothèque Sacré; Hook, Eccles. Biog., v; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx, 330.

Gervase andProtais (Gervasieri et Protasius), two saints always named together in the Roman martyrology. Ambrose gives an account of them, and calls them the "first martyrs of Milan." They appear to have suffered martyrdom in the time of Diocletian. Many stories are told of the miracles wrought by their "relics." Their commemoration day is June 19. See Butler, Lives of the Saints, June 19.

Gertrude of Canterbury, a medieval English chronicler, was born about 1150, and died in the early part of the 12th century. We know little of his history. It appears that he was a monk of the priory of Christ's Church, Canterbury, and held the office of sacristan, was present at the burning in 1174 of Canterbury Cathedral, and watched the erection of the new cathedral, until the election of Baldwin as archbishop in 1176. He wrote an account of the construction and rebuilding thereof, entitled Tractatus de combustione Dorobornensis ecclesie. Another work,
Imaginatio de discordia inter monachos Continuatiorem et archiepiscopum Balduinum, written, perhaps, after Hubert became archbishop in 1193, gives a full account of the dissensions between Baldwin and his monks. His next work, Vita Dorotheorum archiepiscoporum, contains lives of the archbishops of Canterbury, ending soon after Hubert's accession. His most valuable work, however, is the Regesta or, in modern English, Histories of England, written in Latin. In 1198, he wrote the Historia novella de rebus gestis, the most valuable of all the chroniclers of this time. His last work, the Historia postrema, is a continuation of his earlier works, and it contains a full account of the reign of King John, who was probably never written. In the library of the University of Cambridge, there is a manuscript of the Historia novella, now known as the Magna Mundi, part 1, which gives a topographical description of England by counties, with lists of the bishops' sees and monasteries in each, and the second part lists of the archbishops of the whole world and their suffragans, and added thereto a chronicle of England from the fabulous times to the death of Richard I. Bishop Nicholson (Eng. Hist. Library) characterizes Gervase as a diligent and judicious historian; and Wright (Brit. Br. Lit.) says his writings show great care in collecting information, and discriminating in the text. In 1891, he published his chronicle of the reigns of Stephen, Henry, and Richard, as one of the most valuable of the historical memorials of the 12th century. His works, except the Magna Mundi, were published in Twysdon's Historia Anglica Scriptores (London, 1664-67, 3 vols. 12mo.), and an English translation of his Tractatus de Camblia, etc., is given in the Report of the Proceedings of the British Archæological Association, at the first General Meeting, held at Canterbury in the month of September, 1844, ed. by Alfred John Dunkin (Lond. 1844, 8vo.).

Genuine. See GARDITE.

Ge'sem (Vieyu), a Grecized form (Judith i, 9) of the name of the land of Goshen.

Gessin, Friedrich Helnrich Wilhelm, a distinguished Oriental scholar, was born at Nordhausen February 3, 1785. After finishing his education at the universities of Helmstedt and Göttingen, he became a private tutor at the seminary at Helmstedt. In 1806 he became private docent at the University of Göttingen, and in 1809 professor of ancient literature at the college of Heiligenstäd. In 1810 he became extraordinary, and in 1811 ordinary professor of Oriental literature. In 1825 he received the degree of doctor of divinity; and in 1829 he made a scientific journey to Paris and Oxford, where he chiefly collected material for his projected Hebrew dictionary. He died Oct. 23, 1842. Gessin was an outstanding adherent of the Rationalistic school. In the study of Oriental languages, his works, which had an almost unprecedented circulation, began a new era. The most important among them are: Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch (Lpz. 1810-1812, 2 vols.; 7th ed. 1868; Latin ed. 1833; 2 ed. by Hoffmann, 1847; Eng. transl. by C. Leo, Cambridge, 1829; by J. W. Gibbes, Andover, 1824, and by Robinson, Boston, 1830); Hebräische Grammatik (Halle, 1818; 20th ed. by Dr. Rödiger, 1866; English transl. by M. Stuart, Andover, 1826, and by Conant, Boston, 1838; also an French transl.); Hebräisches Lexicon (Halle, 1814; 7th ed. by Heidrich, 1868); Hebrew and English Dictionary (2 vols.; 2nd ed. by Dr. Heidrich, 1868); Anti-Semitische Sammlungen (Leips. 1815; 2nd ed. 1827); De Pentateuchi Samalrandio origine inole et motocitar (Halle, 1815); Grammatik-Krit. Lehrbüchlein der hebr. Sprache (2 vols.; Leips., 1817).—Uebersicht des Propheten Jer. mit einem nebst. Krit. u. Krit. Commentarii (3 vols., Leips. 1819-1821; 2nd ed. 1829).
Ibrahim Pasha, flushed with victory, and maddened by the obstinacy of a handful of Druses, attempted to follow them into this stronghold; but scarcely a soldier who entered returned. Every nook concealed an enemy... The Lejah has for ages been a sanctuary for outlaws, and not unfrequently a refuge for the oppressed (Hammouda Pasha, p. 605). See ACRE.

Geshur is first associated with Aram or Syria as among the conquests of Jair, the son of Manasseh. After stating that he had three and twenty cities in the land of Gilead, it is said, Jair took "Geshur and Aram, the towns of the east land, from Hazor to Ke-nath, and the towns thereof, three-score cities" (1 Chron. ii, 23). While these places were taken, they were held only as subject territories, still to a great extent occupied by their original inhabitants. See HAVOTH-JAIR. According to the boundaries of the Holy Land, as defined by Moses, Geshur would have formed part of it; but in Josh. xiii, 2, 13, it is stated that the Israelites had expelled neither the Geshurites nor the Maachathites, but dwelt together with them. That the Hebrews did not afterwards permanently subdue Geshur appears from the circumstance that, in David's time, the king of Geshur had his residence in Tamar, daughter of David, who was one of the wives of David (2 Sam. iii, 8; 1 Chron. iii, 2). She was probably a person of superior beauty, as she became the mother of the two handsomest of David's children, Amnon and Tamar. He should have thought of getting a wife from such a quarter, or what prior link of connection between him and the king of Geshur might have led to such a result, is left unnoticed in the history. But possibly the Geshurites, who are mentioned among the tribes against whom David made incursions while he dwelt in Ziklag (1 Sam. xxvii, 8), and who, from the name being once found in connection with the Philistines (Josh. xiii, 5), are generally supposed to have been a different tribe from the other, may, after all, have been the same. See GESHER. The Geshurites, very probably, from the geographical details of the Bible, in which it is closely connected with Argob. Their chief argument is that Geshur signifies "a bridge," and there is a bridge on the upper Jordan. Porter, after a careful survey of the whole country, was led to the conclusion that Ge- shur embraced the northern section of the wild and rocky provinces now called Jezrulam, and formerly Trachonitis and Argob. It probably also took in the neighboring plain to the north as far as the banks of the Pharpar, on which there are several important bridges; but on the approach of the Israelites, the people may have concentrated themselves in their rugged stronghold, where the Israelites deemed it prudent to leave them than to attempt to expel them. The wild tribes that now occupy that region hold a somewhat similar position, being really independent, but nominally subject to the Porte (see Journ. of Sac. Lit., July, 1854, p. 300; Porteus Demoussos, vol. i, pp. 70, 82). The same reasoning applies to the Aramaeans, who have also held the same position.

2. A people who dwelt on the south-western border of Palestine, adjoining the Philistines (Josh. xiii, 2). They appear to have been nomads, and to have roamed over the neighboring desert, though occupying for a time at least a portion of Philistia. "David went up and invaded the Geshurites, and the Gezrites, and the Amalekites; for those nations were of old the inhabitants of the land as thou goest to Shur, even unto the land of Egypt." (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latter "in the modern village Adakor, one mile from their Dibon, called the Land of the Nofites (1 Chron. xxi, 16). These, however, appear to have been but a branch of the foregoing tribe, settled more or less permanently on the maritime outskirts of Judah. Schwartz finds the latt
Gessius, TIMAN, M.D., was born at Amersfoot near the close of the 16th century. His father, Cornelius Gessius, was rector of the Latin school at that place, but lost his situation in consequence of refusing to subscribe the canons of the Synod of Dort. His son Timan, associate rector, holding his father’s sentiments upon the same and losing his situation as a doctor of medicine, established himself first at Nymegen, and subsequently at Utrecht as a practising physician. He deserves mention here chiefly on account of his labors in Church history. His principal works are: Historia sive et ecclesiastica ordinis chronologica et r e rationem temporum, etc. (Traj. 1630); Historia temporum memoriae in orbe gestorum ab anno mundi usque ad annum Christi 1625 (Traj. 1681). See Gessius, Godgeleerd Nederland, 1 D. blz. 517 en verv. (J. P. W.)

Gesner, SALOMON, D.D., a Lutheran divine, was born in Silesia in 1559, appointed professor of theology at Wittenberg in 1582, and died in 1606. He wrote Commentationes in Psalmo Davidis (Wittenb. 1592, fol.—Darling, Cyclopi, Bibliographica, s. v.; Melchior Adam, Vita Theologorum, etc., i, 352.

Ge(ther) (Heb. id. "כִּחֵר", signif. unknown; Sept. Γαρπ v. r. Γαρσιά), the name of the third of the sons of Aram (Gen. x, 23). B. C. post. 2513. Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 4) makes him the ancestor of the Buctrians (but see Michaels, Speilieg, l. c. 138); and in the traditional legends of the Arabs one Ghathir appears as the source of the Tamudites in Irakj and the Jadi-sites in Jenama (Abulf. Hist. Antiqu., p. 16). The Arab. vern. of the Polyglot has the Geramzahi, a tribe which in the time of Mohammed must have inhabited the district of Mounl. See ARABA. Jerome (ad loc.) confuses the Ghathir or Gethur (l. c. 103), and it is doubtful whether the river Centrites, mentioned by Xenophon (Anab. iv, 8, 1) and Diodorus Sic. (xiv, 27), and which lay between the Carduchians and Armenians, may not have derived its name from Gether; and Le Clerc finds a trace of the name in Cuthara (Κυθήρα), a town on the Tigris (Ptol. v, 18). Kalsch (Commentary, ad loc.) thinks it may be but an Aramean form of Geshar, an identification already proposed by Thomson (Land and Book, i, 386). (See Schulteiss, Parad. p. 282.) See ARAM.

Gethsemane (גֵּתְשֶּמָּן v. r. גְּתְשֶּמָּני, prob. for Aramean גִּתְשֶּמֹא, Oil-press, such being doubtless in the vicinity), the name of a small field (מעְתק, πλατ. A. V. "place," Matt. xxvi, 36) or olive-press (τὸ Μαγνῦν, John of Jerusalem, vii, 35), over the brook Kadron, and at the foot of the Mount of Olives, to which Jesus, as often before (comp. Luke xxii, 39), retired with his disciples on the night of his betrayal (Mark xiv, 32), and which was the scene of his agony (q. v.). The Kasron runs in the bottom of a deep ginn, parallel with the eastern wall of Jerusalem, and about 200 yards distant. Immediately beyond it rises the steep side of Olivet, now, as formerly, cultivated in rude terraces. Somewhere on the slope of this mount Gethsemane must have been situated (see Nitzach, De kerto Gethsemane, Viteb. 1756). According to Josephus, the suburbs of Jerusalem abounded with gardens and pleasure-grounds (μαματιας, War, vi, 1, 1; compare v, 3, 2), now, with the exception of those belonging to the Greek and Latin convents, hardly the vestige of a garden is to be seen. There is, indeed, a favorite paddock or close, half a mile or more to the north, on the same side of the continuation of the valley of the Kasron, the property of a wealthy Turk, where the Mohammedan ladies pass the day with their families, their bright, flowing costumes forming a picturesque contrast to the stiff, sombre foliage of the olive-groves beneath the clusters. But Gethsemane has not come down to us as a scene of mirth; its inextinguishable associations are the offspring of a single event—the agony of the Son of God on the evening preceding his passion. Here emphatically, as Isaiah had foretold, and as the name imports, were fulfilled those dark words, "I have trodden the wine-press alone" (ixii, 3; compare Rev. xiv, 20, "the wine-press ... without the city"). "The period of the war," remarks Mr. Gresswell (Letters, etc. viii, 124), "was the vernal equinox; the day of the month about two days before the full of the moon—in which case the moon would not be now very far past her meridian, and the night would be enlightened until a late hour towards the morning;" the day of the week Thursday, or rather, according to the Jews, Friday, for the sun had set. The time, according to Mr. Gresswell, would be the last watch of the night, between our 11 and 12 o'clock. Any recapitulation of the circumstances of that ineffable event would be unnecessary, any comment upon it useless. Outward and eternal garden, in which are eight venerable olive-trees, and a grotto to the north, detached from it, and in closer connection with the Church of the Sepulchre of the Virgin—in fact, with the road to the summit of the mountain running between them, as it did also in the days of the Crusaders (Saniuti, Secret. Pictol. Orih. lib. iii, p. xiv, c. 9)—both securely enclosed, and under lock and key, are pointed out as making up the true Gethsemane. These may be the spots which Eusebius (Onomast. v. r. Γεθσημανι, "where the faithful still resort for prayer," St. Jerome (Lib. de Sth et Nomina, l. c. 277) has mentioned, and from the 4th century downwards some such localities are spoken of as known, frequented, and even built upon. This spot was probably fixed upon at the wish of Helena, the mother of Constantine, in A.D. 326. The pilgrims of antiquity say nothing about these times, the howled olives-trees, whose sage the poetical minds of Lamartine and Stanley shrink from criticizing—they were doubtless not so imposing in the 6th century; still, had they been noticed, they would have afforded undying testimony to the locality—while, on the other hand, few modern travellers would inquire for and adore, with Antonius, the three precise spots where our Lord is said to have fallen upon his face. Against the contemporary antiquity of the olive-trees, it has been urged that Titus cut down all the trees round about Jerusalem; and certainly this is more than Josephus states in express terms (see particularly War, vi, 1, 1, a passage which must have escaped Mr. Williams, Holy City, ii, 437, 2d edit., who only cites v, 3, 2, and vi, 8, 1). Besides, the tenth legion, arriving from Jericho, were posted about the Mount of Olives (v, 2, 3; and comp. vi, 2, 8), and in the course of the siege a carriage was brought along the valley of the Kemron to the fountain of Siloam (v, 10, 2). The probability, therefore, would seem to be that they were planted by Christian hands to mark the spot; unless, like the sacred olive of the Acropolis (Bahr, ad Horod. viii, 55), they may have reproduced themselves as scions from the old roots, a supposition which their shape and position render not unlikely (Alton, Land of the Messiah, p. 204). Maundrell (Early Tract in Palestine,

Garden of Gethsemane as seen from the North.
by Wright, p. 471) and Quaresmasia (Elucid. T. S. lib. iv, ver. c. 7) appear to have been the first to notice them, not more than three centuries ago; the former arguing against and the latter in favor of their reputed antiquity, but nobody reading their accounts would imagine that there were then no more than eight, the locality of Gethsemane being supposed the same. Parallel claims, to be sure, are not wanting in the cedars of Lebanon, which are still visited with as much enthusiasm; in the terebinth, or oak of Mamre, which was standing in the days of Constantine the Great, and even worshiped (Vales. in Euseb. iii, 58); and the fig-tree (Jesus elation) near Nerbudda, in India, which native historians assert to be 2400 years old (Patterson's Journal of a Tour in Egypt, p. 202, note). Still more appositely, there were olive-trees near Lernaea 2500 years old, according to Pliny, in his time, which were a sight of nudely-cut steps... The middle of the 16th century (Nov. Dict. de Hist. Nat. Paris, 1846, xxix, 61). Can there, indeed, be no certainty as to the precise age of the trees; but it is admitted by all travellers that the eight which still stand upon the spot in question bear the marks of a venerable age, and are planted by the same hand, and probably at about the same time. Several young trees have been planted to supply the place of those which have disappeared (Ollin's Travels, ii, 110). Some years ago the plot of ground was bought by the Latin Church; and, having been enclosed in a wall, the interior is left a wild walk and flower-beds after the fashion of a modern European garden: the guardian padre, however, still points out to pilgrims not only "the grotto of the agony," but also the spot where Judas betrayed Jesus, and that where the three disciples slept (Germain, Pilgrimage to Palestine, i, 132). The Armenian or Greek Church, however, still maintains its own site, and has fixed upon another as the proper one, at some little distance to the north of it. But both sites have been deemed by many writers as too public for the privacy of prayer (Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 284). The Latins, however, have not been left out of the question, and the Latin church, which is strongly commented upon by Bartlett (Walks along Zion, p. 98). Dr. Robinson remarks that there is nothing particular in the traditonal plot to mark it as the garden of Gethsemane, for adjacent to it are many similar enclosures, and many olive-trees equally old (Researches, i, 246). He admits, however, that the probability is that the site which Eusebius and Jerome had in view, and as no other site is suggested as entitled to superior credit, we may be content to receive the traditional indication (Tischendorf, Reise in dem Osten, i, 812). It has been visited and described by nearly every modern traveller in Palestine. Some have even heard the ancient name given in connection with this spot, but this was probably borrowed by the Arabs from the Christian traditions. See Jerusalem.

Gezel (Ghreel, elevation of God; Sept. Mount of God), son of Machi of the tribe of Gad, and one of the commissioners sent by Moses to explore Canaan (Num. xxiii, 15). B.C. 1557.

Geulain, Arnold, a Belgian philosopher, born about 1620 at Antwerp, died about 1686 as professor of philosophy at Leyden. He first taught the classics and the Cartesian philosophy at Louvain, but subsequently went to Leyden, where he abducted Catholicism, and finally obtained the chair of philosophy, which he retained until his death. He was the most remarkable disciple of Descartes prior to Spinosa and Malebranche, and his writings contain the germs of some of the doctrines of these later philosophers. He also developed the hypothesis of occasional causes. He wrote Ethica (Amsterdam, 1666); Logica (Amsterdam, 1663); Metaphysica (Amsterdam, 1681). (A. J. S.)

Gezer. See Locust.

Gezer ( Heb. Gzr, prob. a precipice, from m, to cut off; Sept. Gzer, but in Chron. vi, 67 and xx, 4 Gzer, in 1 Chron. xiv, 16 Gzer; in pause Gzrez, which Ewald, Int. Gesch. ii, 427, note, deems the original form), an ancient city of Canaan, whose king, Horm, or Senn, prominent part in the later struggles of Jerusalem, was defeated and probably killed, with all his people, by Joshua (Josh. x, 38; xii, 12). The town, however, is not said to have been destroyed; it formed one of the landmarks on the southern boundary of Ephraim, not far from the lower Beth-horon, towards the Medes. Mount Gedor, on the western slope of the same mountain (Chron. vii, 28). It was allotted, with its suburbs, to the Kohathite Levites (Josh. xxii, 21; 1 Chron. vi, 67), but the original inhabitants were not dispossessed (Judg. i, 29); so that in the time of David the Philistine territory seems to have included it (2 Sam. x, 20; 1 Chron. xi, 4). It descended to the Canaanites (or, according to the Sept. addition to Josh. xvi, 10, the Canaanites and Perizzites) were still dwelling there, and paying tribute to Israel (1 Kings ix, 16). At this time it must, in fact, have been independent of Israelite rule, for Pharaoh had on some occasion burnt it to the ground and killed its inhabitants, and then presented the site to his daughter, Solomon's queen. But it was immediately rebuilt by the latter king (1 Kings ix, 15-21); and, though not heard of again till after the captivity, yet it played a somewhat prominent part in the later struggles of the nation, being the Gastra (Gzara, 1 Mach. vi, 15; vii, 45), or Gasaara (Gzara, 1 Mach. xxvi, 29, 35; xiii, 58; 2 Mach. x, 82), of the Apocrypha and Josephus (Gzara, 2 Macc. xiii, 9, 2), who once calls it Gadara (Gadoura, 2 Macc. viii, 2; 3 Macc. vi, 280), somewhat arbitrarily, takes Gezer and Gebur to be the same, and sees in the destruction of the former by Pharaoh, and the simultaneous expedition of Solomon to Hamath-zobah, in the neighborhood of the seat of Gebur, a strong indication of the fidelity of whom the Geshurites formed the most powerful remnant, and whose attempt against the new monarch was thus frustrated. In one place Gez is given as identical with Gezer (1 Chron. xx, 4; comp. 2 Sam. xxiii, 18). Gezer was perhaps the original seat of the Gerarites (q. v.) whom David attacked (1 Sam. xxvii, 8), in the vicinity of the Amealekites; and as they are mentioned in connection with the Geshurites, they may have lived a considerable distance north of Philistia. Finally, Mount Gerizim (q. v.) appears to have derived its name from the vicinity of this tribe (compare the name Ar-gerizim, by Tischendorf, in Eusebius, Prepr. Evang. ix, 27).

Gezer must have been between the lower Beth-horon and the sea (Josh. xvi, 3; 1 Kings ix, 17), therefore on the edge of the great maritime plain which lies beneath the hills of which Beth-lahim is the last outpost, and forms the regular coast road of communication with Egypt (1 Kings ix, 16). It is therefore appropriately named as the last point to which David's pursuit of the Philistines extended (2 Sam. xvi, 25; 1 Chron. xiv, 16), and as the scene of at least one sharp encounter (1 Chron. xx, 16, xx, 22), this plain being a peculiar territory (comp. Josephus, Ant., viii, 6, 1, Gdora tiven, τὴν γῆν Παλαιστίνην ὄψας ὑπάρχουσαν); and

GHOST, an old English word of Saxon origin (Gern, get), equivalent to soul or spirit, occurs as the translation of the Heb. נ舍不得, נشهد, and the Greek πνεῦμα, both signifying breath, life, spirit, or living principle, by which and similar terms they are elsewhere rendered (Job xii, 20; Jer. xv, 9; Matt. xxvii, 50; John xix, 30). It frequently occurs in the N. T. in the meaning of spirit or Holy Spirit. See SPIRIT. Many cases in which it occurs are those rendered to give up the ghost, etc., all simply signifying to die, e. g. 27:2, to expire (Lam. i, 19; Gen. xxv, 47; xxxv, 39; xlix, 38; Job iii, 17; xii, 18; xliii, 19; xiv, 10); iex nuxin, to breathe out, etc., one’s life (Mark xxv, 37, 38; Luke xxiii, 46); iex φύσις, to breathe out one’s last (Acts v, 5; xii, 20). Many commentators suppose, from the original terms used in the Gospels (πνεῦμα τοῦ πνεῦμα, Matt. xxvii, 50; πνεῦμα τοῦ πνεῦμα, John xix, 30), something preternatural in Christ’s death, as being the effect of his solution. But there is nothing in the words of Scripture to countenance such an opinion, though our Saviour’s volition is supposed to accompany in his offering himself for the sins of the world. The Greek words rendered yielded up, and gave up, are no other than such as is frequently used, both in the Septuagint (Gen. xxxv, 18; comp. Psa. xxx, 5; Eccles. xii, 7) and the classical writers, of expiration, either with the spirit or the soul (Josephus, Ant. x, v, 2, 8; vii, 18, 9; Elian, H. A. ii, 1; Herod. iv, 100. See Spectres.

Ghostly (v. e. spiritual) occurs in the expressions “ghostly enemy” and “ghostly counsel,” found in the Catechism and in the Communion-service of the Church of England, signifying the one our spiritual enemy Satan; the other, spiritual advice preparatory to partaking of the Eucharist (Eden, a. v.). See Spirit, Holy.

Gî'â'eb (Heb. גי'אך, 'יך, a breaking forth sc. of a fountain; Sept. Πυει ται ται, Vulg. simply voluens), a place (probably marked by a spring) opposite the hill Ammah, on the road to the “wilderness (east?) of Gibeon,” where Joshua and Abishai ceased at sun-down from the pursuit of Abner after the death of Asahel (1 Sam. ii, 24). It is perhaps identical with the “pool” mentioned in ver. 13, although in that case the parties must have become far separated in the rout, since they would thus have returned to the spot where the battle began. See GINZON.

Giant, the names of these beings of unusual height are found in the early history of all nations, sometimes of a purely human origin, but more frequently supposed to have partaken also, in some way, of the supernatural and the divine. The scriptural history is not without its giants, and the numerous theories and disputes which have either in consequence render it necessary to give a brief view of some of the main opinions and curious inferences to which the mention of them leads. The English word has several representations in the original Hebrew.

1. In Gen. vi, 4, we have the first mention of giants (תתית), "Naamah, the height of the peaks of the mountains," but better by אינ in full, אינ, e. vio- lent; Sept. γαέσσα, Vulg. gigantes; but more discriminatingly Aquil. אינ, Symm. Βασάνος—"There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men, which were of old men of renown. And the Lord said, I will destroy man, which is become mighty in the image of God; and the son of man, and the daughter of man, shall hearken unto the mention of the second verse of the same chapter—"The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose" (see Joesue, Lit. Oct. 1867). Wellbeloved (ad loc.) and others translate and interpret the passage so as to make it speak merely of "men of violence; men who beat down, oppressed, and plundered the weak and defenceless." The same this is an agreement in the meaning of the original word (which occurs also in Numb. xxxii, 33, in connection with the Anakim). But these giants, as in other cases, would naturally be designated by a descriptive name, and great strength is generally accompanied by violence and oppression. In our judgment, the bearing of the passage, obviously favours the common notion of giants, and that the rather because their origin is traced to some unexplained connection with "the sons of God," that is, with beings of high endowments, if not of a superior nature. We have here given, in all probability, the true basis of all those mythological heroisms with which the history of ancient nations is found to begin, such as Hercules and others of a like stamp. It is also especially worthy of note that these are ascribed to a similar parentage, half human, half celestial. Their famous deeds have been immortalized by their dedication in every pro- fane system of religion. This appears to us a more substantial interpretation of the Greek and Roman, and even of the Indian and Scandinavian systems of mythology, than the subtle resolution of these semi-fabulous characters into symbols of the various powers of nature, the well-known theory of common writers. It is simply the traditions of these cases of antediluvian prowess and fame that the early poets of each nation have wrought up into the divine personages of their heroic age. We merely add, that, by the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men" in the above passages, we are doubtless to understand the descendants of Seth and Cain respectively (see Genesis, Heb. Thesaurus, p. 96); yet Kitto inclines to regard the former as angelic beings (Daily Illust. ad loc.). See Nephilim.

2. In Gen. xiv, 5, we meet with a race termed Rephaim (רפאים), as settled on the other side of the Jordan, in Ashteroth-Karnaim, whom Chedorlaomer defeated. Of this race was Og, king of Bashan, who alone remained, in the days of Moses (Deut. iii, 10), of the remnant of the Rephaim. A passage, which is obviously from a later hand, goes on to say, "Behold, his bedstead (רפאים, canop, others coffin; see Michaelis, Dathe, Rosenmüller) was a coffin of iron; is it not in Bashan? For the children of Ammon have four cubits its length and four cubits its breadth, according to the cubit of a man," or the natural length of the cubit. See CURT. It does not appear to us to be obvious to say that Og was "no doubt a man of unusual stature, but we cannot decide with accuracy what his stature was from the length of the iron coffin of state or coffin in which he was placed" (Wellbeloved, ad loc.). Whatever theory of explanation may be adopted, the writer of the passage clearly intended to speak of Og as a giant, and one of a race of giants (compare Josh. xii, 4; xiii, 12). See OOG. This race gave their name to a valley near Jerusalem, known by the Sept. γαέσσα υπ’ τίνων. See Rephaim.

The repikim (A. V. "dead") of Job xxvii, 5; Prov. ii, 8, etc., are doubtless the shades of the departed. See DEAD.

3. The Anakim (אַנָּקִים, אַנָּקִים, sons of Anak), in Numb. xiii, the spies sent by Moses before his army tosurvey or reconnoitre the promised land, reported among other things, "The people be strong that dwell in the land; and, moreover, we saw the children of Anak" (verse 29). This indirect mention of the children of Anak shows that they were a well-known gigantic race. In the 32d and 33d verses the monument is enhanced. It is a land that setteth up the inhabitants, the very people that we saw in it are men of great stature. And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak which
GIAN

came of the giants; and we were in our own sight as
grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight." However
ever much of exaggeration fear may have been given
the description, the passage seems beyond a doubt to show
the current belief in a race of giants (Deut. ix. 2).

From Deut. ii, 10, it appears that the size of the Ana-

kim was not unusual, and was usual; a standard

with which to compare others. In the time of Moses they
dwelt in the environs of Hebron (Josh. xi. 22).

They consisted of three branches or clans—"Abiman,
Sheshal, and Talmal—the children of Anak." (Numb.
xxii, 23). They were destroyed by Joshua (Josh. xi.
21) from the mountains of Hebron, from Sihor, from

Aban, and from all the mountains of Judah, and from
all the mountains of Israel; Joshua destroyed them
utterly with their cities. There was none of the Ana-
kim left in the land of the children of Israel: only in
Gaza, in Gath, and in Ashdod, there remained them
(Judg. i. 20; Josh. xiv. 19). See ANAKIM.

From this remnant of the Anakim thus left in Gath
in the Philistines proceeded the famous Goliath (גָּלִּ֔ית),
1 Sam. xvii. 4. This giant is said to have been in

height six cubits and a span. He challenged the army
of Israel, and put the soldiers in great alarm. The

army of the Philistines and that of Israel were, how-
ever, on the point of engaging, when David, the young-

est son of Jesse, came near, bringing, at the command
of his father, the supply of provisions of three eldest

brothers, who had followed Saul to the battle; and,

becoming aware of the defiance which had been again

hurled at the armies of the living God," he at once
went and presented himself as a champion to the king;

was offered, but refused, a cost of mail; and, arming
himself solely with a sling, smeared the Philistine in
his forefront, so that he fell upon his face to the earth,
and was decapitated by David with his own sword. A
general victory ensued. This achievement is ascribed
to the divine aid (xvii, 46, 47). In 2 Sam. xxvi, 19,
"Goliath the giant, the staff of whose spear was like a
weaver's beam," is said to have been slain by Elha-
nan, a chief in David's army. This apparent contra-
diction the common version tries to get over by in-
serting words to make this Goliath the brother of him
whom David put to death. Some suppose that the
former was a descendant of the latter, bearing the
same, perhaps a family name. See, however, the par-
allel passage in 1 Chron. xxvii, 5. Other giants of the
Philistines are mentioned in the passage before cited,
2 Sam. xxii, 16 sq., namely: 1. "Jehish-benoch, which
was as great as a giant, the weight of whose spear
weighed three hundred shekels of brass being gird-
ed with a new sword, thought to have slain David;
but Abishai, the son of Zeruiah, succored him, and
smote the Philistine and killed him." 2. Saph, who
was of the sons of the giant, and was slain by Sibbe-
chaim. 3. A man of great stature, that had on every
hand six fingers and on every foot six toes, four and
twenty in number, and he also was born to the giant;
and when he defied Israel, Jonathan, the son of Shim-
cab, the brother of David, slew him." These four
were sons of the giant in Gath, that is, probably, of the
Giant of Gath whom Sisera a molar tooth (Gen. xix.
8; 2 Sam. xx, 22; 1 Sam. xvii, 4). See each of these
names in their alphabetical order.

4. Another race is mentioned in Deut. ii, 10, the
Emim (ם"ש), who dwelt in the country of the Moab-
ites. They are described as a people "great and
many, and tall as the Anakims, which were also ac-
counted giants." (Gen. xiv, 8). See EMIM.

5. The Zamzummim also (ם"שילש), (Deut. xxii, 20),
whose home was in the land of Ammon—"That also
was accounted a land of giants: giants dwelt therein
of old time, and the Ammonites called them Zamzum-
imms, a people great and many, and tall as the Ana-
kims; but the Lord destroyed them before them, and
they (the Israelites) succeeded them, and dwelt in
their stead." See ZAMZUMMIM.

6. The only other passage where the term "giant"
occurs (except as a rendering of yiqaq in Judith xvi,
6; Wisd. xiv, 7; Ecclus. xvi, 7; xlvi, 4; Bar. iii, 26;
1 Mac. iii, 8) is Job xvi, 14, where the original is
"23, elsewhere "a mighty man," i.e. champion, or
hero. See GIBBON.

All nations have had a dim fancy that the aborigines
who preceded them, and the earliest men generally,
were of immense stature. Berossus says that the ten
entombed ancestors of the Chaldeans were giants, and we
find in all monkish historians a similar statement about
the earliest possessors of Britain (comp. Homer,
Od. x, 119 Augustin, De Civ. Del. xv, 9; Pliny, vii,
16; Varro, ap. Aur. Gelidia, iii, 10; Jerome on Matt.
height; and in the latter descriptive Deluge (2 Esdr.
v, 62-65). That we are dwarfs compared to our ancestors was a common belief among the Latin and Greek poets (H. v, 802 sq.; Lucret. ii, 1151; Virg. AEn. xii, 900; Juv. xv, 69). On the origin of the mistaken supposition there are curious passages in Natales Correr in Mytholog. vi, 21) and Mac Crias (Na-
turn. i, 20). See NIMROD. At an early period and
under favorable circumstances, individuals, and even
tribes, may have reached an unusual height and been
of extraordinary strength. This was in great part, no
doubt, owing to the slight age at which the hardest
work was usually permitted in early times. But many
things concur to show that the size of the race did not
differ materially from what it is at present. This is
seen in the remains of human beings found in tombs,
especially among the mummies of Egypt. To the
same effect is the size of ancient architectural monuments, and the measures of length which have been received from antiquity. Ancient
writers who are free from the influence of fable are
found to give a concurrent testimony. "Homer,
when speaking of a fine man, gives him four cubits in
height, and in a base description, Vitruvius fix the usual

standard of a man at six Roman feet; Aristotle's ad-
measurement of beds was six feet" (Millingen's Curios-
istica of Medical Experience, p. 14). No one has yet
proved by experience the possibility of giant races,
matterly exceeding in size the average height of man.
We have no great variation in our standard. The most
stunted tribes of Esquimaux are at least four feet high,
and the tallest races of America (e.g. the Guayasquilas and people of Paraguay) do not exceed six feet and a half. It was long thought that the Patagonians were men of enormous stature, and further in the voyages of the old voyagers their opinion was positive. For instance, Pigafetta (Voyage round the World, Pinkerton, xi, 314) mentions an individual Patagonian so tall that they "hardly reached to his
waist." Similar exaggerations are found in the voy-
ages of Byron, Wallace, Carteret, Cook, and Forster;
but it is a matter ofcertainty, from the recent vis-
to Patagonia (by Winter, captain Snow, etc.),
that there is nothing at all extraordinary in their size.
The general belief (until very recent times) in the
existence of fabulously enormous men arose from fancied
giants gravestone (See de la Ville's Tragedy 1 Pericles, ii, 89), and, above all, from the discovery of huge bones,
which were taken for those of men, in days when
comparative anatomy was unknown. Even the an-
cient Jews were thus misled (Josephus, Ant. v, 2, 3).
Augustine appeals triumphantly to this argument, and
mentions a tooth which he had seen at Utica a hun-
da times longer than ordinary teeth (De Civ. Del.
, 9). No doubt it once belonged to an elephant.
Vives, in his commentary on the place, mentions a
tooth as big as a fist which was shown at St. Christo-
fer's. In this case it was a tooth recently very
recently been dispelled (Martin's West. Indians, in Pin-
kerton, ii, 681). Most bones which have been exhibi-
lised have turned out to belong to whales or elephants, as was the case with the vertebrae of a supposed giant examined by Sir Hans Sloane in Oxfrodshire. On the other hand, isolated instances of monstrosity are sufficiently attested to prove that beings like Goliah and the behemoth are not mere fables. (R. iii, § 2) mentions Navius Pollio as one, and Pliny says that in the time of Claudius Caesar there was an Arab named Gabbaras nearly ten feet high, and that even he was not so tall as Pusio and Secundilla in the reign of Augustus, whose bodies were preserved (vii, 16). Josephus tells us that, among other boastments, his ancestor, Artabanus sent to Tiberius a certain Eleazar, a Jew, surmounted "the Giant," seven cubits in height (Ant. xviii, 4, 5). Porus, the Indian king, was five cubits in height (Arrian, Ep. Al. v, 19). Nor are we well-authenticated instances wanting in modern times. Delrio says he saw in 1572 a man from Piedmont whose height exceeded nine feet (Not. ad Senec. Ed. p. 30. O'Brien, whose skeleton is preserved in the Museum of the College of Surgeons, must have been eight feet high, but his unnatural height made him weakly. On the other hand, the blacksmith Parsons, in Charles II's reign, was only seven feet two inches high, and also remarkable for his strength (Fuller's Worthies, Staffordshire). The tallest person of whom we have a trustworthy record did not, according to Haller, exceed nine feet. Schreber, who has collected the description of the giant of Lichtenstein in modern times, says he was seven feet and a half, although he mentions a Swedish peasant of eight feet Swedish measure; and one of the guards of the Duke of Brunswick as eight feet six inches Dutch. Such well-known instances as those of Daniel Lambert and others in modern museums probably come fully up to any of the measures of the Biblical giants. See art. Giant in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana: Whiston, "On the old Giants," Auth. Records, ii, 872-906; Prichard, Researches into the Physical History of Mankind, i, 358 (1836).

Glib, Adam, one of the founders of the anti-burgher secession in Scotland, was born in Perthshire in 1713, and educated in Edinburgh. He was a bitter opponent of private church patronage, and in 1733 was dismissed from his pastoral charge. He was made pastor of a secession church in Edinburgh in 1741, and when the Church began the declension of the oaths of burgesses, Mr. Gib was considered the ablest advocate of the anti-burgher party. He died in 1738. He published A Display of the Secession Testimony (1744, 2 vols. 8vo):—Sacred Contempurations, with an essay appended on Liberty and Necessity in reply to Lord Kinghorn (1746).—Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 660:—Rose, New General Biographical Dictionary, viii, 18.

Gib'bar (Chalda. Gibbar,' גִּבֹּר, for Heb. גִּבּ, a hero, as inDan. lii, 20; Sept. Φαλις, Vulgate Gебbar), given as the name of a man whose descendants to the number of 59 returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezra ii, 20), probably an error for the remnants of the natives of Gireon ( Nah. vii, 20).

Gibb'ethon (Hebrew Gibbethon,' גִּבְעַתָּן, a height; Sept. Γίμαθων v. r. Γίμαθων, Γιμαθών, Γιμαθών, and Βυζαντόν, a city of the Philistines, which was included in the territories of the tribe of Dan (Josh. xix, 44), and was assigned, with its " suburbs," to the Kohathite Levites (Josh. xxv, 28). It was still in the hands of the Philistines in the time of David, who subdued it, and who knew it, and acquainted his sons with the necessity of pursuing the usurper Zimri (1 Kings xvii, 15). B.C. 926. It is said by Eusebius and Jerome (apparently even to their time) to be inhabited by Gentiles (τὸν Ἀλλοτρόφων Γαβαζών), but they expressly distinguish this from the Danite town, and they seem uncertain whether to identify it with a village (παλίγγισ) called Gaba (Γαβά), about 10 r. m. south of Cesaarea, near the great plain of Lagis, or with one of the two or three other places named Gaba (Γαβά, Γαβάθων, s. v. Γαβαζών, Gabathoen). Josephus (Ant. viii, 12, 5) calls it Gabathone (Γαβαθόνη). The signification of the name and the great strength of the place seem to fix it upon the hills west of Gibeah of Benjamin (with which M. D. Saulcy confounds its locality, Narratur, i, 96). It is only the modern Gib'ath, a little less than a short distance beyond the well S. E. of Ramleh (Robinson, Researches, iii, 21). Van de Velde calls it also Shelh Musa (Muson, p. 114).

Gibbites, The, a small fanatical sect in Scotland about 1861, named from their leader, John Gibb, a sailor. They never exceeded thirty persons. Their doctrines were a compound of Quaker ideas, with some of the extreme speculative views of the strict Covenanters. They were seized as a body, put into the House of Correction, and soon ceased to exist as a sect. —Hetherington, Church of Scotland, ii, 114. See Sweet Singers.

Gibbon, Edward, historian, was born at Putney, in Surrey, April 27, 1737. He was sent to Oxford too young, and did not learn much there. At sixteen he embraced Romanism. He was immediately placed under the care of a Jesuit priest; but after a few months the Jesuits' instructions led him in a few months back to Protestantism. "The five years he spent at Lausanne, closing in 1768, when he was just of age, formed the real commencement of his education; and at their close, he was not only a ripe scholar in French and Latin, but possessed of an amount of learning, as well as of good sense, and other information. He found leisure, however, for falling in love, unsuccessfully, with a young lady, who afterwards became the wife of M. Necker, and the mother of Madame de Stael. For several years after Gibbon's return to England he lived chiefly at his father's house in Hampshire, and, failing in attempts to obtain diplomatic employment, he accepted a military commission, attended zealously to his duties, and rose to be lieutenant-colonel. But the studious habits and literary ambition which he had acquired never flagged. In 1761 he published, in French, a short essay on The Study of Literature. He extended his acquaintance with English authors, and, beginning to learn Greek thoroughly, pursued the study zealously, when, in 1763, he was allowed again to visit the Continent. In Rome, next year, he conceived the design of his great historical work. Returning home in 1765, he passed some years unsatisfactorily to himself, but not without much improvement both in knowledge and in skill of writing. In 1774 he entered the House of Commons, in which he sat for eight sessions; and he was rewarded for his silent votes in favor of Lord North's administration by holding for three years a seat at the Board of Trade. In 1770 he published, in answer to Warburton, his spirited Dissertation on the Sixth Book of the Aeneid. In the same year, the death of his father placed him in possession of a fortune, which, though he was embarrassed, he was able to extricate so far that it afforded him a handsome competence, and enabled him to devote himself exclusively to study and composition. In 1776 he published the first volume of The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, the first edition of which was sold in a few days, and was rapidly followed by other places. The 20 volumes, appearing in 1781, brought down the narrative to the fall of the Western Empire; and for a while the author hesitated whether he should not here allow the work to drop' (Rich, Biog. s. v.). He resumed the design, however, and many years after he had fixed his decision to pursue the same, and prepared the remaining volumes, the last of which appeared in 1788. He died January 16, 1794, during his last visit to England. His posthumous
works were published by his friend Lord Sheffield. The best editions of the "Decline and Fall" are that of Milman (Lond., 1846, 6 vols., 8vo, 2d edit.), and that by Dr. Wm. Smith (1855, 8 vols., 8vo). In a literary point of view, the merits of this history are very great; its style has a harmony in it nearly or remotely touched on. Its skepticism leads him into manifold displays of unfaithfulness and even into inaccuracies, which are corrected in Milman's notes. Dr. J. M. Macdonald wrote an able article in the Bibliotheca Sacra (July, 1868), defending Gibbon from the charge of infidelity, and seeking to account for the opposite opinion about his so generally adopted. The attempt is very ingenious, but will not shake the established opinion.—Milman, Life of E. Gibbon (Lond. 1839, 8vo); Quarterly Review, xxi., 375; ixii., 196; Literary and Theol. Review, ii., 38; Christian Review, xiii., 94; National Review, Jan. 1868.

Gibbon, Thomas, D.D., a pious and eminent English historian, was born at Reay, near Caithness, Dec. 5, 1737, and died at St. Alban's, Dec. 17, 1794. He was a member of a Congregational church at Olney, in Bucks, gave him the best education his circumstances would permit. In 1742 he became acquainted with Dr. Isaac Watts; and by showing him a volume of poems in manuscript, an intimate friendship was formed between them, which continued unabated to the close of Dr. Watts's life. In 1748 Dr. Gibbon was called to the pastoral charge of the Independent church meeting in Haberdashers' hall, Cheapside, which he held till his death, Feb. 27, 1786. He wrote Memoirs of Dr. Watts (1780, 8vo); Poems, on several Occasions (1784); Egotistic; or, a View of its principal Tropes and Figures, in their Origin and Power (1767, 8vo); Hypena (1769): Hypena, second series, entirely original (1784); Lives and Memoirs of eminent Pioua Women (1777, 2 vols. 8vo). After Dr. Gibbon's death, three volumes of sermons by him were published in 8vo by subscription. Some of his hymns are still used, and will continue to hold their place in Christian song.—Jones, Christian Biography, p. 177; Darlington, Cyclop. Bibliography, 1. 244.

Gibbonism, plur. of "Gibbon," a warrior ( Isa. iii, 2; Ezek. xxxix, 20); especially spoken of David's noted braves or "mighty men" (2 Sam. xxiii, 8; 1 Chron. xvi, 24; xxv, 24). See Chaldea, in the marines of the U.S. Navy, as specified in Gen. vi, 1-4, are called "Gibbonism" (דֵּנֶּבָרָה, from וּדֵנֶּב, to be strong), a general name meaning powerful (יִשֶׁבֶת) and powerful (יִשָּׁב בַּּהֲלֹה) in a twofold power or strong and powerful (יִשָּׁב בַּּהֲלֹה), Philo, De Orig., p. 270; comp. Isa. xlix, 21; Ezek. xxvi, 21). They were not necessarily giants in our sense of the word (Theodoret, Quart. 49). Yet, as was natural, these powerful chiefs were almost universally represented as men of extraordinary stature. The Sept. renders the word γίγαντες, and call Nimrod a γίγας ουρηρακόα (1 Chron. 1, 10): Augustine calls them Satan's companions (Civ. Dei, xvi, 4): Chrysostom ὡσαμὲν ὁμομοῦ, Theodoret ἐκμιμέχας (comp. Bar. iii, 25, ἐκμιμέχας, ἐκτασιναίον πρόκλυμα). These beings are chiefly interesting as connected with the question, Who were their parents, "the sons of God" (טַנְנִי עָשָׂרָה)? The opinions respecting the import of this latter title are various: (1) Mem of power (τῶν ἐναρκτών), Symm., Jerome, Quest. Hebr. ad loc. (יוֹדַע וְיִפְּנָהו, Onk. יְפִיוּנֵהו וְבַּד, Samar. יַפְנָהו וְבַּד, Hosea, 2, 10), (comp. Psa. li, 7; 1xxii, 6; 1xxxix, 27; Mic. v, 6). The expression will then exactly resemble Homer's Διονυσίων θεοί, and the Chinese Tián-tiēu, "son of heaven," as a title of the emperor (Geussius, s. v. 33). But why should the union of the high-born and the low-born produce offspring unusual for their size and strength? (2) Mem with great gifts, "in the image of God" (Ritter, Schumann); (3) Cainites arrogantly assuming the title (Paulus); or (4) the pious Sethites (comp. Gen. iv, 20; Maimon. De Nativ. Lib. i, 14; Suid. s. v. πανταξένης καὶ μυστήρια; Clemen. Hist. Comp. 10; Augustinus, De Civ. Dei, xv, 28; Chrysost. Hom. 29, in Gen.; Theol. in Gen. Quatt. 47; Cyril, c. Jul. ix, etc.). A host of modern commentators catch at this explanation, but Gen. iv, 26 has probably no connection with the subject. So the word was quoted in the favor of the view are Deut. xiv, 1, 2; Psa. lxix, 15; Prov. xv, 26; Hos. i, 10; Rom. viii, 14, etc. Still the mere antithesis in the verse, as well as other considerations, tend strongly against this gloss, which indeed is built on a foregone conclusion. Compare, however, the Indian notion of the two races of men Surs and Asturas (children of the son of the moon, Nork, Brann. und Robb. p. 204 sq.), and the Persian belief in the marriage of Jamshed with a sister of a der, whence sprang black and impious men (Kalisch, Gen. p. 175). 5. Worshipers of false gods (ποιήματα τῶν θεῶν, Chrysostom, Hom. 29, De Civ. Dei, xvi, 4, Prov. xiv, 26; Deod. xxvi, 11; Deut. iv, 28, etc.). This view is only supported by Poole in Genesis of Earth and Man, p. 59 sq. (6). Devils, such as the Incubi and Succubi. Such was the belief of the Cabbalists (Valenius, De S. Philo. cap. 8). These beings can have intercourse with women of pure heart Augustus declares it to be folly to doubt, and it was the universal belief in the East. Mohammed is the one of the ancestors of Belkis, queen of Sheba, a demon, and Damir says he had heard a Mohammedan doctor openly boast of having married in succession four demon wives (Bochart, Hieros. l. p. 474). Indeed, the belief still exists (Lane's Mod. Aram. Lexicon, p. 17 1). (7) Closely allied to this is the oldest opinion, that they were angels (Sept. δυνάμει τῶν θεῶν, for such was the old reading, not vic.), and perhaps was手续费的 (De Civ. Dei, xv, 28; so too Josephus, Ant. i, 5, 1: Philo, De Veg. 2, 346; Clem. Alex. Strom. iii, 7, 99; Sulp. Sever. Hist. script. in Orat. 1, i, etc.; compare Job i, 6; i, 11; Psa. xxix, 1, Job iv, 16). The rare expression "sons of God" certainly means angels in Job xxxviii, 7: i, 6; ii, 1; and that such is the meaning in Gen. vi, 4 also, was the most prevalent opinion both in the Jewish and early Christian Church. It seems, however, to be directly negatived by Matt. xxii, 30. Seethe. 39, 40 sqq., 14, 15 sqq.

It was probably this very ancient view which gave rise to the spurious book of Enoch, and the notion quoted from it by Jude (6), and alluded to by Peter (2 Pet. ii, 4; compare 1 Cor. xi, 10; Tertul. De Virg. Vel. 7). According to this book, certain angels, sent by God to guard the earth (Gen. vi, 1-4), were perverted by the beauty of women, "went after strange flesh," took sorcery, finery (lumina lapilliarum, circulos ex aure, Tertullian, etc.), and, being banished from heaven, had sons 3000 cubits high, thus originating a celestial and terrestrial race of demons." Undoubtedly the valli subventrum corporis multa" (Commendoni Instr. III, Cultus Daemonum, i. e. they are still the source of epilepsy, etc. Various names were given at a later time to these monsters. Their chief was Leuizas, and of their number were Machaela, Aza, Shemchzazai, and (the word is given in them) in great-like angels (Gen. i, 13, 14, 22, 40). And Azazel, Lev. xvi, 8; and for the very curious questions connected with this name, see Bochart, Hieros. l. 652 sqq.; Rab. Eliezer, cap. 23, Bereshith Rab. ad gen. vi, 2; Sennett, De Gigantibus, iii. See Asmodoeus. Against this notion (which Havericks calls "the slightest whim of the Alexandria, historic and literal history), De Pormpaeus, p. 845) Heidegger (Hier. Patr. 1, c. 6) quotes Matt. xxii, 30; Luke xxiv, 39, and similar testimonia. Philastro (Anas, Hares.)
GIBBS

BIBLICAL CHALDEE; 1828; 2d edit. enlarged, New Haven, 1882, 8vo.
In 1824 he was called to be lecturer of sacred literature in the theological school of Yale College.
In 1826 a professorship in that branch was founded, to which Mr. Gibbs was called. He remained in this post until his death, March 25, 1861, at New Haven.
Professor Gibbs was a constant contributor to periodicals,
Bib'ele (Heb. Gbha', גֵּבֵה, hill; Sept. Taphad à
r. Taphādā, a place built or occupied in connection
with Machach, son of Caleb's grandson Machach (1 Chron. ii. 49); hence probably the same with Gibeáh (q. v.) of (Judg. xix. 57).
Gib'ēth (Heb. Gbēhə, גִּבְּהָ, a hill; as the word is sometimes rendered; likewise the Sept., which usually has Gbēsa', but in Josh. xviii Gbēsa'ēz; Josephus Gbēsa'ēz, Ant. vi. 4, 6), the name of three cities, all doubtless situated on hills. The term is derived, according to Gesenius (Thes. p. 269, 260), from a root, גֵּב, signifying to be round or humped (compare the Latin gibbus, Eng. gibbous; the Arabic jabūb, a mountain; and the German gipfel). It is employed in the Heb. Bible to denote a "hill," that is, an eminence of less considerable height and extent than a "mountain," the term for which is גֵּרָה, kar. For the distinction between the two terms, see Psalms xi; Prov. viii, 29; Isa. ii, 1; xl, 4, etc. In the historical books gibesah is commonly applied to the bald, rounded hills of Central Palestine, especially in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Stanley, Palest. App. p. 25). There is no lack of the corresponding name among the villages of Central Palestine. Several of these are merely mentioned as appellatives: 1. (Lev. vii, 31; Jer. 19, 3; 121, 2; etc.) the "hill of the forebears" (Josh. v, 3), between the Jordan and the Jezreel; it derives its name from the circumcission which took place there, and the vicinity seems afterwards to have received the name of Gilgal (q. v.).
2. ("The" hill of Kerith-jearim, a place in which the ark remained from the time of its return from the Philistines till its removal by David (2 Sam. vi, 3, 4; comp. 1 Sam. vii, 1, 2). See Kerith-jearim. 3. The place of the routes in the desert of Sharu, which is so difficult to travel in. In Judges i. 10 and 13 it is called "the hill," and in Judges x. 40, 41, it is called "the great high place." See El-ohim. 4. The hill of Hachilah (1 Sam. xxiii, 19; xxvi, 1). See Hachilah. 5. The hill of Ammah (2 Sam. ii, 24). See Ammah. 6. The hill of Gareb (Jer. xxxi, 38). See Gareb. 7. The hill of Geb (Jer. xxxi, 39). See Gereb.

—Smith, s. v.

I. Gibeah of Benjamin is historically the most important of the places bearing this name. It is called 1. "Gibeah of Benjamin" (1 Sam. xiii, 15; 2 Sam. xxii, 29) and "Gibeah of Saul" (1 Sam. xiv, 19; lóphiρ Σαλάου, Josephus, War, v, 2, 1); also "Gibeath of God," rendered hill of God (1 Sam. x, 5); and Gibeath (Josh. xviii, 28, where it is enumerated
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among the last town of the groups of Benjamin, next to Jerusalem). This last name (גִּיבְיָה, which frequently appears elsewhere in the original), being the form of Geibe in the construct state, has been joined by some to the following name, i. e., Geibe of Kirjath-jearim (Schwarz, Phys. Descrip. of Palestine, p. 132); but these two cities are evidently counted separately in the text. Others regard “Geibe” here as a mere appellation denoting one or more houses near Kirjath-jearim (compare 1 Sam. vii. 1, 2). This city is often mentioned in Scripture (Hos. v. 8; ix. 9; x. 9; 1 Sam. x. 26). It was the scene of the atrocious crime which involved in its consequences almost the entire extirpation of the tribe of Benjamin (Judg. xix. 12-30; xx. 1-48). It was never recovered from that time. It was a place of songs and sack. It was the birth-place of Saul, and continued to be his residence after he became king (1 Sam. x. 26; xi. 4; xv. 8; xxiii. 19; xxvi. 1); and it was doubtless on account of this its intimate connection with Saul that the Gibeonites hanged up here seven descendants (2 Sam. xxvi. 6). An erroneous transla-
tion of the name has led to the misapprehension that this was the scene of Jonathan’s romantic exploits against the Philistines (1 Sam. xiv). See Geba. Like Bethel, it seems to have been reckoned among the an-
cient five cities of Judah (Jos. i. 18; Josh. xiv. 19; xx. 24; xxiii. 19; xxvi. 1; 2 Sam. xxii. 6-10). The inhab-
tants were called Geibonites (1 Chron. xii. 8). Jos-
ephus locates it twenty-two miles (Av. v. 2, 8) or thirty (War. v. 2, 1, גִּבְיָה) south of Jerusalem. Je-
ron was twenty-four miles to the west of Geibe and had a hill called Bethel, which Josephus places near the ground (Jos. xv. 10, ad Euseb.). See also on Gibeon.

Dr. Robinson at first identified it with Jeba, a half-ruined place about five miles north of east of Jerusalem (Researches, ii. 114); but he afterwards re-
tracted this position as being that of Bethel (Bibl. Sacra, 1844, p. 598), and he has finally fixed upon Tell el-Ful, about four miles north by west of Jerusalem, as the site of Gibeon of Saul (new ed. of Research-

ces, ii. 260). Tell el-Ful (“hill of the bean”) is a high knoll, with a curiously knobbed and double top, having a large heap of stones on it. Originally there had been here a square tower, fifty-six feet by forty-eight, built of large unhewn stones, and apparently ancient; this has been thrown down, and the stones and rubbish, filling outside, have assumed the form of a pyramidal mound. Some of our foundations is to be seen. The spot is sightly, and commands a very extensive view of the country in all directions, especially towards the east. There are no other remains around the hill itself; but a few roads further west, directly upon the great road as it en-
ters the city, there is a pair of ruined columns, and a number of ancient substructions, consisting of large unhewn stones in low massive walls. Probably the ancient city extended down from the hill on this side and included this spot (Robinson, in Researches and Biblioth. Sacra, at sup.; Stanley’s Pal. i. 114, p. 210). The ancient road from Jerusalem to Bethel and Shechem passes close along its western base, and Ramah is in full view on another hill two miles further north (Hand-
book of S. and P. p. 925). The narrative of the Levite’s journey is thus made remarkably graphic. He left Bethel in the afternoon to go home to Mount Ephraim. Two hours’ travel (six miles) brought him alongside Jerusalem. Evening was now approaching. His servant advised him to lodge in Jebus, but he de-
clined to stop with strangers, and said he would pass on to Gibeah or Ramah. The “sun went down upon them when they were by Gibeah,” and they resolved to pass the night there (Jud. xiv. 1). The site of Gibe-
ah was well adapted to form the capital of Israel dur-
ing the troubled times of Saul, when the whole country was overrun by the hostile bands of the Philis-
tines. It was naturally strong, it was on the very crest of the mountain range, and it commanded a wide

view, so that Saul’s watchmen could give timely noti-
ces of the approach of the enemy.

2. GEIBEH OF JUDAH, situated in the mountains of that tribe (Josh. xv. 57, where it is named with Maon and the southern Carmel; compare 1 Chron. ii. 49), which, under the name of Geba (גֵּבָא), Eusebius and Jerome (in their Roman miles) made it part of Gal-

apolis, and state that the grave of the prophet Habak-
kuk was there to be seen (Onomasticon, s. v. גֵּבָא, Gebaath; although they there confound it with the Gibeath of Phinehas in Ephraim, and elsewhere [s. v. קְרָח, Cella] state that Habakkuk’s tomb was shown in Keil (in the roomed by him). Probably, one of the “nebaim, by the Jewish name” (לֵבַע, the Nebiim, or Nebiim proper, for Nebiim, the Nabim, or Nabim)), was the prophet Nahum, whose proper name was Nebiim (1 Sam. xxiv. 33, where the name is rendered “hill of Phinehas”). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomasticon, s. v. גֵּבָא, Gebin) probably mention this place by the name of Geba (although they incorrectly identify it with Gibeath of Artas and the Gebim of Isa. x. 26 in Ephraim, where “Gebim”), five Roman miles from Gophna, on the road to Neapolis (Shechem), which was itself fifteen Roman miles north of Jerusalem. Josephus appears also to allude to it (1 Sam. v. 1, 20). Dr. Robinson (Researches, iii. 90, note) finds it in a narrow valley called wady el-Musawir, the bed of Mannat (Geba), just midway on the road between Jerusalem and Shechem; the indication of direction in the Onomasticon agrees with the position of the village Gbe (located on that wady), west of the Natilus road, half way between Bethel and Shiloah (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 215), but the distance still better suited that of the Moslem-

ruined village Jibeh, west of this (Robinson, Researches, iii. Append. p. 123; Van de Velde, Map).

Gib’eith (Jos. xvii. 28). See GIBEON I.

Gib’skhitha (Heb. with the article ha-Gib’skhitha, כְּפַסְקִית, Sept. אֶפֶּר גִּבְּשְׁקִית v. גַּבְּשְׁקִית, גִּבְּשְׁקִית, the designation of a native of Gibeon, Chris. xvii. 3); in this case, Shemaiah, or “the Shemaiah,” father of two Benjamites, “Saul’s brethren,” who joined David. See GIBEON I.

Gib’eon (Heb. Gib‘on, גִּבְיָן, hilly city; Sept. Go-

baou, Josephus Gebaou, one of the four cities of the Hivites, the others being Beeroth (omitted by Josephus, Av. v. 2, 16), Chephirah, and Kirjath-jearim (Josh. ix. 17). See CANAANITE. Its inhabitants made a league with Joshua (x. 2-15), and thus escaped the fate of Jericho and Ai (comp. xix. 19). See GIBEONITE. It appears, as might be inferred from its tak-
ing the initiative in this matter, to have been the largest of the four—“a great city, like one of the royal cities”—larger than Ai (x. 2). Its men, too, were all practiced warriors (Josh. v. 22), and they yielded within the territory of Benjamin (xxxv. 23), and with its "suburbs" was allotted to the priests (xxxvi. 17), of whom it afterwards became a principal station, where the tabernacle was set up for many years under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxxvi. 39; xxxv. 2; 2 Chron. i. 3), the ark being at the same time at Jerusalem (2 Chron. i. 4). See also other notices in Works and Books of Scripture, see below. From Jer. xii. 16, we may infer that after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, Gibeon again became the seat of government. It produced prophets in the days of Jeremiah (Jer. xxviii. 1). After the captivity we find
the "men of Gibeon" returning with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii. 25: in the list of Ezra the name is altered to Gib-
bar), and assisting Nehemiah in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem. Here too the spring, called the "pool of 
great waters" (or the many waters, יָם רָאשִׁים), of Gibeon (both here and in 1 Kings iii. 4, Josephus substitutes 
Hebron for Gibeon, Ant. x. 9, 5; viii. 2, 1), at which Jo-
hanan, the son of Kareth, found the traitor Ihaamal (Jer. xii. 12). Round this water also, according to 
the notice of Josephus (qui enim juxta res sacras, אֶּרֶץ הָעָרָו), the five kings of the Amorites were 
encamped when Joshua set them on fire from Gilgal. The "wilderness of Gibeon" (2 Sam. ii. 24)—the Mid-
bar, i.e. rather the waste pasture-grounds—must have 
been to the east, beyond the suburb of cultivated fields, 
and towards the neighboring swells, which bear the 
terms of the Arabs for the Neathah. Such is the descri-
bution of Gibeon, fulfilling in position every require-
ment of the notices of the Bible, Josephus, Eusebius, 
and Jerome. Its distance from Jerusalem by the main 
road is as nearly as possible 65 miles; but there is 
more direct road reducing it to 3 miles (Robinson, Res. ii. 127, 135; Mem. ii. 249; Porter, H. B. F. S., p. 
225).

Scriptural Incidents.—Several of these are of such 
deepest interest as to call for a detailed notice.

(1.) The name of Gibeon is most familiar to us in 
connection with the story of the five kings. The in-
habitants obtained their safety at the hands of Joshua, 
and with the memorable battle which ultimately resulted 
therefrom. (See Kitto's "Daily Bible Illustr. at loc.) 
This is the first mention of the place in Scripture, and 
the story of Joshua as the battle is considered "one of the 
most important passages in the history of the world." By 
Stanley, whose graphic de-
scription (Jewish Church, 1266 sq.) we condense, slight-
ly modified and illustrated.

The kings of Palestine, each in his little fastness, 
were roused by the tidings that the approaches to their 
territory in the Jordan valleys were blocked by the 
troops of Joshua. The point of at-
tack, however, was not the invading army, but the 
trials at home. Gibeon, the recreant city, was 
beseiged. The continuance or the raising of the siege 
became the turning question of the war. The sum-
mons of the Gibeonites to Joshua was as urgent as 
words could express, and gives the key to the whole 
movement (Josh. x. 6). Not a moment was to be 
lost. On the former occasion of Joshua's visit to 
Gibeon (Josh. ix. 16, 17), it had been a three-days' jour-
ney from Gilgal, as according to the slow pace of easter-
ners armies and caravans it might well be. But, 
now, by a forced march, "Joshua came unto them suddenly, 
and went up from Gilgal all night." When the sun 
rose behind him, he was already in the open ground at 
the foot of the heights of Gibeon, where the kings were 
encamped (according to Josephus, Ant. v. 1, 17) by a 
spring in the neighborhood, which bears the name of 
That foot of which Gibeon lay, rose before them on the west. 
The besieged and the besiegers alike were taken by 
surprise (in the Samaritan version of Joshua, the war-
cry is given, "God is mighty in battle," ch. xx, xxii).

As often before and after, so now "not a man could 
stand before them", the Hebrews being in a panic of 
terror at the mere mention of that terrible shout. The 
Cananites fled down the western pass, and "the Lord discomfited them before 
Israel, and slew them with a great slaughter at Gib-

eon, and chased them along the way that goeth up to 
Beth-horon." This was the first stage of the flight. It 
is a long, rocky ascent, sinking and rising more than 
one before the summit is gained. From the summit, 
which is crowned by the village of Upper Beth-horon,
a wide view opens over the valley of Ajalon, which runs in from the plain of Sharon.

"And it came to pass, as they fled before Israel, and were in the going down to Beth-horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah." This was the second stage of the fight. The fugitives had outstripped the pursuers; they had crossed the high ridge of Beth-horon the Upper; they were in full flight to Beth-horon the Nether. It is a rough, rocky road, sometimes over the upturned edges of the limestone strata, sometimes over sheets of smooth rock, sometimes over loose rectangular stones, sometimes over steps cut in the rock. It was as they fled down this slippery descent that a fearful tempest, "thunder, lightning, and a deluge of hail" (Josephus, Ant. v. 1, 17), broke over the disordered ranks; and "they were more which died of the hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword." Then follows the poetic version of the story, taken from the ancient legendary "Book of Jasher." On the summit of the pass, where is now the hamlet of the Upper Beth-horon, looking far down the deep descent of the western valleys, with the green vale of Ajalon stretched out in the distance, and the wide expanse of the Mediterranean Sea beyond, stood, as is intimated, the Israelitish chief. Below him was rushing down, in wild confusion, the Amoritishe host. Around him were "all his people of war, and all his mighty men of valor." Behind him were the hills which hid the now rescued Gibeon from his sight. But the sun stood high above those hills, "in the midst of heaven" (it was the middle of the forenoon, or at most midday), for the day had now far advanced since he had emerged from his night-march through the passes of Ai; and in his front, over the western vale of Ajalon, may have been the faint crescent of the waning moon, visible above the hail-storm driving up from the sea in the black distance. Was the enemy to escape in safety, or was the speed with which Joshua had "come quickly, and saved and helped" his defenseless allies, to be rewarded, before the close of that day, by a signal victory? It is doubtful so standing on that lofty eminence, with outstretched hand and spear, that the hero appears in the ancient record: "Then might Joshua [he heard to] speak to Jehovah in the day of Jehovah's giving [up] the Amorites before the sons of Israel, when he said in the eyes of Israel:

"Sun, in Gibeon stand still;
And moon, in Ajalon's vale!"

So the sun stood still, and moon stayed until a people should take vengeance [upon] its enemies. [Is] not this written on [the] Book of the Upright?

A wide view opens over the valley of Ajalon, which runs in from the plain of Sharon.

"And it came to pass, as they fled before Israel, and were in the going down to Beth-horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah." This was the second stage of the fight. The fugitives had outstripped the pursuers; they had crossed the high ridge of Beth-horon the Upper; they were in full flight to Beth-horon the Nether. It is a rough, rocky road, sometimes over the upturned edges of the limestone strata, sometimes over sheets of smooth rock, sometimes over loose rectangular stones, sometimes over steps cut in the rock. It was as they fled down this slippery descent that a fearful tempest, "thunder, lightning, and a deluge of hail" (Josephus, Ant. v. 1, 17), broke over the disordered ranks; and "they were more which died of the hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword." Then follows the poetic version of the story, taken from the ancient legendary "Book of Jasher." On the summit of the pass, where is now the hamlet of the Upper Beth-horon, looking far down the deep descent of the western valleys, with the green vale of Ajalon stretched out in the distance, and the wide expanse of the Mediterranean Sea beyond, stood, as is intimated, the Israelitish chief. Below him was rushing down, in wild confusion, the Amoritishe host. Around him were "all his people of war, and all his mighty men of valor." Behind him were the hills which hid the now rescued Gibeon from his sight. But the sun stood high above those hills, "in the midst of heaven" (it was the middle of the forenoon, or at most midday), for the day had now far advanced since he had emerged from his night-march through the passes of Ai; and in his front, over the western vale of Ajalon, may have been the faint crescent of the waning moon, visible above the hail-storm driving up from the sea in the black distance. Was the enemy to escape in safety, or was the speed with which Joshua had "come quickly, and saved and helped" his defenseless allies, to be rewarded, before the close of that day, by a signal victory? It is doubtful so standing on that lofty eminence, with outstretched hand and spear, that the hero appears in the ancient record: "Then might Joshua [he heard to] speak to Jehovah in the day of Jehovah's giving [up] the Amorites before the sons of Israel, when he said in the eyes of Israel:

"Sun, in Gibeon stand still;
And moon, in Ajalon's vale!"

So the sun stood still, and moon stayed until a people should take vengeance [upon] its enemies. [Is] not this written on [the] Book of the Upright?

So Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, to the camp at Gilgal." (Josh. x, 12-15). See Joshua.

(2.) We next hear of Gibeon at the encounter between the men of David and of Ishbosheth, under their respective leaders Joab and Abner (2 Sam. ii, 12-17). The meeting has all the air of having been premeditated by both parties, and we suppose that Joab had heard of the intention of the Benjamites to revisit from the distant Mahanaim their native villages, and had seized the opportunity to try his strength with Abner. See Abner. The place where the struggle began received a name from the circumstance, and seems to have been long afterwards known as the "field of the strong men." See Helkath-Hazzurim.

(3.) We again meet with Gibeon in connection with Joab; this time as the scene of the cruel and revolting death of Amasa by his hand (2 Sam. xxi, 5-10). Joab was in pursuit of the rebellious Sheba, the son of Bichri, and his being so far out of the direct north road as Gibeon may be accounted for by supposing that he was making a search for this Benjamite among the towns of his tribe. The two rivals met at "the great stone which is in Gibeon"—some old landmark now no longer recognisable, at least not recognised—and then Joab repeated the treachery by which he had murdered Abner, but with circumstances of a still more revolting character. See Amasa.

It is remarkable that the retribution for this crowning act of perfidy should have overtaken Joab close to the very spot on which it had been committed. For it was to the tabernacle at Gibeon (1 Kings ii, 28, 29; comp. 1 Chron. xvi, 39) that Joab fled for sanctuary when his death was pronounced by Solomon, and it was while clinging to the horns of the brazen altar there that he received his death-blow from Beniah, the son of Jehoiada (1 Kings ii, 28, 30, 34). See Joab.

(4.) Familiar as these events in connection with the history of Gibeon are to us, its reputation in Israel was due to a very different circumstance—the fact that the tabernacle of the congregation and the brazen altar of burnt-offering were for some time located on the "high place" attached to or near the town. We are not informed whether this "high place" had any fame for sanctity before the tabernacle came there; but if not, it would probably have been erected elsewhere. We only hear of it in connection with the tabernacle; nor is there any indication of its situation in regard to
the town. Stanley has suggested (Sinai and Pal. p. 212) that it was the remarkable hill of neby Samwil, the most prominent and individual eminence in that part of the country, and to which the special appellation of “the great high-place” (1 Kings iii, 4; 4, 7-15) would perfectly apply. Concerning the “great” is uncertain whether as resembling in height or size, there is no other hill which can so justly claim the distinction. But the word has not always that meaning, and may equally imply eminence in other respects, e.g. superior sanctity to the numerous other high places—Bethel, Ramah, Mizpeh, Gibeon—which surrounded it on every side. The main objection to identification is the distance of neby Samwil from Gibeon—more than a mile—and the absence of any closer connection thither with any other of the neighboring places. The most natural position for the high place of Gibeon is the twin mound immediately south of El-Jilli—so close as to be all but a part of the town, and yet quite separate and distinct. The testimony of Epiphanius, by which Stanley supports his conjecture, viz. that the “Mount of Gabaon” was the highest point of Jerusalem (Adv. hæres. i, 584), should be received with caution, seeing that it does not alone, and in any case, to an age which, though early, was marked by ignorance, and by the most improbable conclusions.

To this high place, wherever situated, the “tabernacle of the congregation”—the sacred tent which had accommodated the children of Israel throughout the whole of their wanderings—and had been transferred from its last station at Nob. The exact date of the transfer is left in uncertainty. It was either before or at the time when David brought up the ark from Kirjath-jearim to the new tent which he had pitched for it on Mount Zion, that the original tent was superseded for the last time at Gibeon. The expression in 2 Chron. i, 5, “the brazen altar be put before the tabernacle of Jehovah,” at first sight appears to refer to David. But the text of the passage is disputed, and the authorities are divided between OnChange_2, “he put,” andOnChange_3, “was there.” Whether king David transferred the tabernacle to Gibeon or not, he certainly appointed the staff of priests to offer the daily sacrifices there on the brazen altar of Moses, and to fulfill the other requirements of the law (1 Chron. xxvi, 40), with no less a person at their head than Zadok the priest (ver. 35), assisted by the famous musicians Heman and Jeduthun (ver. 41).

One of the earliest acts of Solomon’s reign—it must has been while the remembrance of the execution of Joab was still fresh—was to visit Gibeon. The ceremony was truly magnificent: he went up with all the congregation, the great officers of the state—the captains of hundreds and thousands, the judges, the governors, and the chief of the fathers—and the sacrifice consisted of a thousand burnt-offerings (1 Kings iii, 4). This glimpse of Gibeon in all the splendor of its greatest prosperity—the smoke of the thousand animals rising from the venerable altar on the commanding height of “the great high place”—the clang of “trumpets, and cymbals, and musical instruments of God” (1 Chron. xvi, 42) resounding through the valleys far and near—is virtually the last we have of it. In a few years the Temple at Jerusalem was completed, and then the tabernacle was once more taken down and removed. Again “all the men of Israel assembled themselves” to king Solomon, with the “elders of Israel,” and the priests and the Levites brought up both the tabernacle and the ark, and “all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle” (1 Kings viii, 3, Joseph. Ant. viii, 4, 1), and placed the venerable relics in their appropriate places; there to remain until the plunder of the city by Nebuchadnezzar. The introduction of the name of Gideon in 1 Chron. ix, 35, which seems so abrupt, is probably due to the fact that the preceding verses of the chapter contain, as they appear to do, a list of the staff attached to the “tabernacle of the congregation” which was erected there; or if these persons should prove to be the attendants on the “new tent” which David had pitched for the ark on its arrival in the city of David, the transition to the place where the old tent was still standing is both natural and easy.

It would be very satisfactory to believe, with Thomson (Land and the Book, i, 547), that the present wadi Suleiman, i.e. “Solomon’s valley,” which is the most prominent of the rills of Gibeon, and leads down to the Plain of Sharon, derived its name from this visit. But the modern names of places in Palestine often spring from very modern persons or circumstances, and, without confirmation or investigation, this cannot be received with certainty.—Smith, s. v.

Gibonite (Heb. Gibonî, גיבון; Sept. Γαβῶνας, Gavonas), the designation of the people of the Canaanitish city Gibeon (q. v.), and perhaps also of the three cities associated with Gibeon (Josh. ix, 17)—Hibites; who, on the discovery of the stratagem by which they had obtained the protection of the Israelites, were condemned to be perpetual bondmen, hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, and for the house of the Lord at Jerusalem (Deut. xxviii, 6-9). The compact, although the punishment of fraud, was faithfully observed on both sides (see Benzel, Symtgem. dissertation. iii, 122 sqq.). Saul, however, appears to have broken this covenant, and in a fit of enthusiasm or patriotism to have killed some, and devised a general massacre of the rest (2 Sam. ii, 4). This was expiated many years after by David, at the suggestion of the priestly oracle, giving up seven men of Saul’s descendants to the Gibeonites, who hanged them or crucified them “before Jehovah”—as a kind of sacrifice—in Gibeon, Saul’s own town (4, 6, 8). At this time, or, at any rate, at the time of the composition of the narrative, the Gibeonites were so identified with Israel that the historian is obliged to insert a note explaining their origin and their non-Israelite extraction (xxi, 2). The actual name “Gibeonites” appears only in this passage of 2 Sam. There is no authentic evidence for the allegation which has been sometimes made against David, that he purposely contrived or greedily fell in with this device, in order to weaken the house of Saul and place it under a darker stigma. On the contrary, David’s conduct throughout to that house was in the highest degree generous and noble; and at the very time when this fresh public calamity befell it, he took occasion to have the bones of Saul and Jonathan, along with the bones of the seven now publicly hanged, gathered together and honorably buried in the sepulchre of Kish. See David. From this time there is no mention of the Gibeonites as a distinct people; but most writers suppose they were included among the Nethinim, who were appointed for the service of the Temple (1 Chron. ix, 2). Those of the Canaanites who were afterwards subdued and had their lives spared were probably added to the Gibeonites. We see in Ezra viii, 20; ii, 68; 1 Kings ix, 20, 21, that David, Solomon, and the princes of Judah gave many such to the Lord; these Nethinim being carried into captivity with Judah and the Levites, many of them returned with Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah. Nehemiah continued, as before, the work of the Temple, under the priests and Levites. (See De Platen, De religione Giboniarum, Rost. 1708; Fecht, ad. ib. 1781.) See Nethinim.

Individual Gibeonites named are (1) Issaiah, one of the Benjamites who joined David in his difficulties (1 Chron. xii, 4); (2) Melatiah, one of those who assisted Nehemiah in repairing the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 7); (3) Hamaniah, the son of Azur, a false prophet from Gideon, who opposed Jeremiah, and shortly afterwards died (Jer. xxviii, 1, 10, 13, 17).
Gibb’lite (Heb. with the art. in the sing. hag-Gidí’th, ḫāḏīṯ, Josh. xiii, 5; Sept. ḫaḏīṯ [v. r. ḫaḏūṯ] ḫaḏāḏāṯ, Vulg. merely confusio; plural, ḫaḏīṯim, ḫaḏīṯim], 1 Kings v, 18; Sept. Alex. of ḫaḏīṯ, other MSS. omit; Vulg. ḫaḏīṯ, ḫaḏīṯ], a word used in the Bible to denote a place which people’s land is crossed with “all Lebanon,” as together belonging to the territory of the Israelites on the northern side, in the enumeration of the portions of the Promised Land remaining to be conquered by Joshua (Josh. xiii, 5). The ancient versions give no help here, but there is no reason to think that the allusion is to the inhabitants of the city Geβāl (q. v.), which was on the sea-coast at the foot of the northern slopes of Lebanon, and from which the name is a regular derivative (see Genesius, Theoœras. p. 258 b). The whole passage is instructive, as showing how very far the limits of the country designed for the Israelites exceeded those which they actually occupied. The people in question, who plainly belonged to the Phoenician territory, are understood to have been the people of Byblos, a city of the Phoenicians between Tripoli and Beirut. The inhabitants of Geβal are mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). The Giblites are again named (in the Heb.) in 1 Kings v, 18 as assisting Solomon’s builders and Hiram’s builders to prepare the trees and the stones for building the Temple. That they were clever artisans is evident from this passage, and from the connection between the manufacture and merchandize of Tyre, the prophet Ezekiel mentions “the ancients of Geβal” as furnishing carvers, or perhaps generally ship-carpenters (Ezek. xxvii, 9). The Giblites are not mentioned in immediate connection with the affairs of Israel, if they did come into direct contact with these, it must have been for evil, and not for good; for Byblos was the seat of the worship of the Syrian Tammuz or Adonis, a worship which certainly found its way, among other corruptions, into the later idolatries of the Jewish people (Ezek. viii, 14), but which was directly from Byblos, or from other parts of Phœnicia, we have no means of ascertaining. See Phœnicia.

Gibson, Edmund, D.D., bishop of London, was born at Bampton in 1669, and was educated at Queen’s College, Oxford. He early devoted himself to the study of the languages of North Britain and of British antiquities. At twenty-two he prepared an edition of The Saxon Chronicle, with Latin translation and Indexes (Oxford, 1632, 4to). In 1634 he became M.A., and soon after was ordained, and made fellow of his college. In 1639 he published an English translation of Camden’s Britannia (2 vols. fol.). In 1646 he was appointed a prebend in Ripon, archbishop of Canterbury; and in 1697 he was appointed morning preacher at Lambeth church. In the same year he published Vitæ Thomaæ Bodleii, together with Historia Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ, both prefixed to the Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum, in Anglicæ et Hibernalæ in usum collecti (2 vols. fol.). In 1658 he published Successiones Angliae, in quibus situ historici praebent, and in 1718 he published Successiones Angliae, with the life of the author (fol.). He was now made domestic chaplain to the archbishop, through whose means he obtained, about the same time, the lectureship of St. Martin’s-in-the-Fields, and in 1718 a pension was presented to the rectory of Stisted, in Essex, a rectory still the seat of learning. In 1703 he was made rector of Lambeth, and residential of the cathedral of Chichester. He was soon after appointed master of the hospital of St. Mary, and in 1710 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Surrey. While he was chaplain to archbishop Tenison he engaged in the controversy with the Quakers in the houses of Convocation, See Atterbury. Gibson enlisted on the side of the upper house, and published ten pamphlets on the subject in three years, to which he added another in 1707. And to the interest he took in this controversy we may trace the origin of his great work, Codex Juris Ecclesiasticæ Anglicæ, or the Statutes, Constitution, Canons, Rubrics, and Articles of the Church of England, etc. (1715, 2 vols. reprinted at Oxford in 1761). In 1716 he succeeded to the deanery of Lincoln, and in 1728 he was translated to the see of London. He subsequently became chief adviser of Sir Robert Walpole in ecclesiastical affairs, and foolishly disappointed his former Whig friends by his intolerance of the Nonconformist opposition to the Test Act, and also the measures adopted against the Quakers. His better qualities appeared in his opposition to the demoralising masquerades of the time, by which he lost the favor of George II. Towards the close of his life he made a collection of the best treatises that were written against Popery during the reign of James II, and published them with a preface in 1788 (3 vols. fol.); recently republished under the title of A Preservation against Popery, etc., edited by Dr. Cumming (London, 1849–9, 18 vols. 8vo); there is also a Supplement (London, 1849, 8 vols. 8vo). He died at Bath in 1745.—Hook, Eccld. Biog. v, 314; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographiciæ, 1, 1250.

Gibson, Robert, a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born at Ballymena, Ireland, Oct. 1, 1793. His parents migrated to the United States in 1797, and his father, the Rev. William Gibson, settled as pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, Oct. 6, 1797. He received his classical and theological training at the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, and was licensed to preach in 1818. On Sept. 6, 1819, he was ordained and installed as pastor of the church at Beaver Dam, where he labored with great success for twelve years. In 1831 he became pastor of the Second Reformed Presbyterian church in the city of New York, and occupied that position till his death. In this new and extensive field he labored with great diligence, and his influence grew rapidly. He bore a prominent part in the controversy which resulted in the disruption of the Church in 1837, and published three pamphlets vindicating the character of the Synod. In 1838 he showed symptoms of declining health. All efforts to arrest his disease were unavailing, and he died in the midst of his people, Dec. 22, 1837. We have from him only the three pamphlets above mentioned.—Sprague, Annals (Ref. Presb.), ix, 71.

Gibson, Tobias, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Liberty County, S. C., Nov. 10, 1771, entered the itinerant ministry in 1792, and died at Natchez, Miss., April 5, 1804. He traveled and preached in the most important appointments of the Carolinas until the year 1806, and then went to Natchez as a missionary of the Methodist Episcopal church, in the Louisiana Conference, and died there in almost a wilderness. After penetrating the forest for six hundred miles to the Cumberland River, Mr. Gibson took a canoe, and alone navigated that stream to the Ohio, and thence down the Mississippi in a boat. He made four trips through the wilderness to the Cumberland while missionary at Natchez, and laid the foundations of Methodism in that vast and now so important region. His fellow-laborers in Carolina testify that "he did for many years preach, profess, possess, and practise Christian perfection; and that those who were acquainted with him must be impressed with his depth of piety; and "that infidelity itself would stagger before the life of so holy, loving, and devoted a man of God."—Minutes of Conferences, 1, 125.

Gibson, William, a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born near Knockbracken, County Down, Ireland, in 1735. He studied at Glasgow, and was licensed as a minister of the two presbyteries of Derry and Down in 1769. In the political ferment of Ireland towards the end of the century he joined the United Irishmen, and on the failure of the rebellion he fled to America, where he arrived in 1779. Finding a number of his own people there, he formed a congregation; and the Reformed Presbyterian Church to North America was constituted
In 1798. In 1799 he became pastor at Raygata, Vt., and remained there till 1817, when he accepted a call to Canonsburg, Pa. In 1830 his infirmities compelled him to resign his charge. His latter years were spent in Philadelphia, where he died, Oct. 16, 1838.—Wilson, Proph. Hist. Almanac, 1832, p. 274; Sprague, Annals, (Rev. ed. 1838), p. 329; (N. T. P. 1869, p. 335). Gichtel, Johann Georg, a German mystic, was born at Ratisbon in 1688. He studied theology and law at the University of Strasburg, and was afterwards distinguished as a lawyer. He became a follower of Jacob Böhme, and prepared for publication the first edition of his works (Amsterdam, 1682). He finally resolved to cast himself to the propaganda of his speculative and ascetic views. Gichtel considered his own announcements of divine commands as superior to the Scriptures in authority. He was imprisoned as a dangerous visionary, struck off the list of barristers, and finally exiled. He retired in 1667 to Holland, where he died poor in 1710. His opinions have found occasional adherents to this day at Amsterdam, Leyden, and even in Germany. They were called Gichtellians, or Brothers of the Angels (Engelbrüder), and believed themselves equal to the inhabitants of heaven on account of their celibacy, peculiar exaltation of life, etc. One of the most zealous adherents of Gichtel was professor Alandt de Raadt, who, however, subsequently fell out with him, when a merchant, by the name of Ueberfeldt, became intimate with Gichtel. Bands of adherents were found in Berlin, Halle, Magdeburg, Altona, where Glätting (died 1798) was at their head, and other places, and partly maintained themselves to the 19th century. Gichtel's 'Letters were published by Gottfried Arnold (1701, 2 vols.; 1708, 8 vols.;) and finally a complete collection of his writings, under the title Proctische Theosophie (Leyden, 1725, 2 vols.). See Reinbeck, Gichtel's 'Leben und Lehren' (Berlin, 1739). Harless, Gichtel's Leben u. Irrthümte, in Evangel. Kirch. Zeit. 1831, No. 77; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx., 454; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v. 145.

Giddal'ti (Heb. id. גידלתי, whom I [Jehovah] have made great; Sept. Γεδουαλαίας, and Γεδουλίας; Vulg. Gedideli and Gediditi), the ninth named of the fourteen musical sons of Samson, and head of the twenty-second course of Levitical musicians in the tabernacle under David (1 Chron. xxxv. 4, 29). B.C. 1018. The office of these brothers of Samson was to sound the horn in the Levitical orchestra (ver. 5, 7). First (who reduces the sons of Heman to five) suggests (Heb. Lex. s. v.) that the appended "names probably formed together ( hãngר הגר יא" גידלתי, have deus, the victorious and victorious, or delightful in vain; in finisbajet) an old protracted saying with which an oracle began, whose words were applied to the five [as soubriquet]; the tone itself [as a name it would regularly be Giddal'ti] pointing to this explanation:"

See Heman.

Giddel (Heb. Giddel, גידל, perhaps giant; Sept. Τιθήνα, Γεδιθήν, Σωδεία, the name of two men whose descendants are related (Gissid Gode) and accounted for in the captivity with Zerubbabel; perhaps Gideonites (Q. V.).

1. One of the Nethinim (Ezra ii, 47; Neh. vii, 49).

B.C. ante 588.

2. One of Solomon's servants," i. e. perhaps of the Canaanitish tribes enslaved by Solomon (Ezra ii, 56; Neh. vii, 58; compare 1 Kings ii, 21). B.C. ante 588.

See Solomon.

Giddings, Rockwood, a Baptist minister, was born in Plymouth, N. H., Aug. 8, 1812, graduated at Waterville College in 1838, and then went to Victoria, where he commenced the study of medicine. He was about 1839 called as a physician in Missouri when he felt called to preach the Gospel. He was shortly afterwards ordained, and in 1835 became pastor of the Baptist church in Shellyville, Ky., where his ministries were very successful. In 1838 he was appointed president of the Baptist College of Georgetown, then in a most destitute condition. He accepted the nomination, and in less than eight months secured more than eighty thousand dollars towards an endowment. But the work which he had imposed on himself undermined his health, and he died Oct. 29, 1839.—Sprague, Annals, vi., 318.

G'id'on (Heb. Gideon, ג'דנ, tree-feller, i. e. warrior, comp. Isa. x. 88; Sept. and N. T. P. Diodor.), a Manassite, youngest son of Joash of the Abiezrites, an undistinguished family, who lived at Ophrah, a town probably on the western side of Jordan (Judg. vii. 15). He was the fifth judge recorded of Israel, and for many reasons the greatest of them all, being the first of them whose history is circumstantially narrated (Judg. viii-viii). B.C. 1382-1822.

1. When we first hear of him he was grown up and had sons (Judg. vi. 11; vii. 20), and from the apostrophe of the angel (vi. 12) we may conclude that he had already distinguished himself in war against the roving bandits of the Amalekites and other nomadic tribes, who had infested the land of Israel for seven years, and whose countless multitudes (compared to locusts from their terrible devastations, vi. 5) annually destroyed all the produce of Canaan, except such as could be concealed in mountain-fastnesses (Deut. ii. 20). Gideon was a man of the Midianites, in conjunction with the Amalekites and other nomadic tribes, invaded the country every year, at the season of produce, in great numbers, with their flocks and herds, robbing in the country after the manner which the Bedouin Arabs practise at this day. It was probably during this disastrous period that the emigration of Elimelech took place (Ruth i. 1, 2; Jahn's Hebr. Comm. § 2x). Some have identified the angel who appeared to Gideon (פָּעַרְגָּעַ נַעַרְיָו מְזוּרְיָו, Josephus, Ant. v. 6, with the mention in vi. 5, which will remind the reader of the legends about Malachi in Origen and other commentators. Paulus (Escr. Com. ii, 190 sq.) endeavors to give the narrative a subjective coloring, but rationalism is of little value in accounts like this. When the angel appeared, Gideon was threshing wheat with a flail (Sept.ὶ ἔκωρος) in the wine-press, to conceal it from the predatory tyrants. Such was the position and such the employment in which he was found by the angel of the Lord, who appeared to him and said, "Jehovah is with thee, thou mighty man of valor." It was a startling address, and one that seemed rather like a bitter irony, when viewed in connection with the existing state of affairs, with the words of soberness and truth. Therefore Gideon replied, "Oh! my Lord, if Jehovah be with us, why then is all this befallen us? and where be all the miracles which our fathers told us of, saying, Did not Jehovah bring us up from Egypt? But now Jehovah hath forsaken us, and delivered us into the hands of the Midianites." The desponding tone of the reply was not unnatural in the circumstances, and what followed was designed to reassure his mind, and brace him with energy and fortitude for the occasion. Jehovah comforted him, for instead of the angel of the Lord appearing to him as formerly, it is now Jehovah himself—"Jehovah looked upon him, and said, Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites; have not I sent thee?" Gideon still expressed his fear of the result, mentioning his own comparative insignificance and that of his father's family. He again met with a word of encouragement, "Surely I will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man." Gideon's heart now began to take courage; but to make him sure that it really was a divine messenger he was dealing with, and that the Lord had not committed to Belshazzar, who had requested a sign from heaven, and it was given him in connection with an offering, which he was allowed to
present, of a kid and some unleavened cakes. These and the parched wheat were the tip of the staff, and the fire burned out of the rock and consumed them. Immediately the angel himself disappeared, though not till he had by a word of peace quieted the mind of Gideon, which had become agitated by the thought of seeing the face of the Lord (comp. Exod. xx. 19; Judg. vi. 11-17).

The family of Josiah had fallen into the prevalent idolatry of the times, which was characterized by backsliding from the true worship of the Lord; and it was the first task of Gideon as a reformer to rebuke this irreligion, and his first sphere was at home. In a dream the same night he was ordered to the north and cut the wood down before the altar of Asherah (A. V., "grove") upon it [see ASHERAH], which his father had caused, or at least suffered, to be erected on the family grounds; and with the wood of this he was to offer in sacrifice his father's "second bullock of seven years of age," an expression in which some see an allusion to the seven years of servitude (v. 18, 1). Perhaps that particular bullock was specified because it had been reserved by his father to sacrifice to Baal (Ro- senmüller, Schol. ad loc.), for Josiah seems to have been a priest of that worship. Bertheau can hardly be right in supposing that Gideon was not able to offer two bullocks (Rieck, p. 115). At any rate, the minute touch is valuable as an indication of truth in the story (compare Ewald, Gesch. ii, 498, and not). Gideon, assisted by ten faithful servants, obeyed the vision. He deemed it prudent, however, to do this under cover of the darkness. The same night, apparently, he built on the spot desecrated by the idolatrous shrine the altar of Jehovah-shalom (q. v.), which existed when the book of Judges was written (v. 24). As soon as the act was discovered, and the perpetrator suspected and identified, which was immediately on the following morning, he was ordered to put the risk of being stoned; but Josiah appealed the popular indignation by using the common argument that Baal was capable of defending his own majesty (compare 1 Kings xvii. 27). This circumstance gave to Gideon the surname of Jerubbaal (קְרֵבְעָבָא, "Let Baal plead," v. 22; Sept. Ἰεροβαλ), a standing instance of national irony, expressive of Baal's impotence. Winckler thinks that this irony was increased by the fact that קְרֵבְעָבָא was a name of the Phoenician Hercules (comp. Movers, Phön. i, 454). We have similar cases of contempt in the names Nychar, Baal-zebul, etc. (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad Matt. xii. 24). In consequence of this name, some have identified Gideon with a certain priest, Jerubbaal (דַּרְבָּעָל), mentioned in Exod. iii. 18; Exod. iv. 10) as having given much more accurate information to Saxonianthe the Berytian (Bochart, Phæg. p. 776; Huetius, Dem. Exag. p. 84, etc.), but this opinion cannot be maintained (Ewald, Gesch. ii. 498). We also find the name in the form Jerubbaal (2 Sam. x. 21); probably indicative of contempt for the heathen deity (comp. Eshbaal, 1 Chron. viii. 33, with Ishboobath, 2 Sam. ii sq.). The mind of Josiah, at all events, was confirmed by this bold act of his son, and he seems resolved to leave the solution of the controversy to divine Providence.

2. Gideon soon found occasion to act upon his high commission. The allied invaders were encamped in the great plain of Jezreel or Edraelon, when, "clothed by the Spirit of God (Judg. vi. 34; comp. 1 Chron. xii. 18; Luke xxiv. 49), he blew a trumpet, and thus gathered together a daily increasing host, the summons to arms which it is supposed Gideon was authorized by the tents of Midian. Mount Gilboa, indeed, is named in the movement of Gideon against Midian, but probably only as the first place of rendezvous for his army (Judg. vii. 8). For the sake of security, he might be obliged to assemble the people on the mountainous lands to the north of Jordan. Stanley in his Life of Ewald (p. 342), after Le Clerc, without any authority from MSS., would substitute Gilboa for Gilead in the passage referred to. This is otherwise objectionable, as one does not see how thousands from Asher, Naphtali, about and beyond Esdraelon, could have been able to march to the Midianite camp with the Midianites, with whom they had no connection. Ewald is perhaps right in regarding the name as a sort of war-cry and general designation of the Mnsamites. (See, too, Gesenius, Thes. p. 804, n.)

The inquietude connected with great enterprises is more sensibly felt some days before than at the moment of action; and hence the two miraculous signs which, on the two nights preceding the march, were required and given as tokens of victory. The first night a fleece was laid out in the middle of an open threshing-floor, and in the morning it was quite wet, while the ground all around was dry; and the wonder was reversed, the soil being wet and the fleece perfectly dry. Strengthened by this double sign from God (to which Ewald gives a strange figurative meaning, Gesch. ii. 500), Gideon advanced to the brook Harod, in the valley of Jezreel. See Harod. Note on Harod. At the head of 30,000 the least large a host should assume the glory of the coming deliverance, which of right belonged to God only, two operations, remarkable both in motive and procedure, reduced this large host to a mere handful of men. First, by divine direction, the usual proclamation (Deut. xx. 9; compare the order of Joshua) that all the faint-hearted might withdraw; and no fewer than 22,000 availed themselves of the indulgence. The remaining 10,000 were still declared too numerous: they were therefore all taken down to the brook, when only those who lapped the water from their hands, like the men in haste, were reserved for the enterprise, while all those who lay down leisurely to drink were excluded. The former numbered no more than 300, and these were the appointed vanquishers of the huge host which covered the great plain. This marked circumstance, however, not only enforces the difference between them and the others, but still it indicated a specific quality; they were the persons that took the more expeditious method of quenching their thirst, and thereby gave proof of a nimbleness and alacrity which bespoke a fitness for executing quick movements in attacking or pursuing an enemy. This affords a perfectly sufficient and natural explanation, and there is no need for resorting, as many do, to peculiar usages in the East, and no one who knows anything of the manners of people in rural and highland districts can need to be told how common it is for them, when wishing to get a hasty refreshment at a running stream, to lift the water to their mouths in the palm of their hand, instead of leisurely bending down, or laying themselves along to get a fuller draught. Josaphus, however, explains these men to have been the most cowardly in the army (Ant. v. 6, 9).

Finally, being encouraged by words fortuitously overheard (what the later Jews termed the Bat-Kol) (compare 1 Sam. xiv. 9, 10; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad Matt. iii. 14), in the relation of a significant dream, Gideon framed his plans, which were admirably adapted to strike a panic into the huge and undisciplined nomad host (Judg. viii. 15-18). We know from history that large and irregular Oriental armies are especially liable to sudden outbursts of uncontrollable terror; and when the stillness and darkness of the night were suddenly disturbed in three different directions by the flash of torches and by the reverberating
eche of which the trumpets and the shouting wok among the hills, we cannot be astonished at the complete rout into which the enemy were thrown. It must be remembered, too, that the sound of 800 trumpets would make them suppose that a corresponding number of lances and pincers were attacking them; and it is curious to find "lamps and pincers" in use for a similar purpose at this very day in the streets of Cairo. The Zabi or Agba of the police carries with him at night "a torch which soon after it is lighted, without a flame, excepting what is is waved through the air, when it suddenly blazes forth; it is used under the same purpose as our dark lantern. The burning end is sometimes concealed in a small pot or jar, or covered with something else, when not required to give light" (Lamb's Mod. Egy. 1, ch. iv.). For specimens of similar sort that we read not in ii. 37; Frontinus, ii, 4; Ballast, Judg. 99; Niebuhr, Desc. of the Arabie, p. 804; Journal As. 1841, ii, 516. The custom of dividing an army into three seems to have been common (1 Sam. xi, 11; Gen. xiv, 15), and Gideon's war-cry is not unlike that adopted by Cyrus (Xen. Anab. vii, 10). It adds also the war-cry, as suited both to inspire confidence in his followers and strike terror in the enemy. His stratagem was eminently successful, and the Midianites, breaking into their wild peculiar cries, fled headlong "down the descent to the Jordan," "to the Ausa," "to the head-bow of the dance" (Abel-melahob), but were intercepted by the Ephraimites (to whom notice had been sent, Judg. vii, 24) at the fords of Beth-barah, where, after a second fight, the princes of Oreb and Zeeb ("the Raven" and "the Wolf") were detected and slain—the former at a rock, and the latter concealed in a wine-press, to which their names were afterwards given. The Ephraimites took their heads over to Gideon, which amounted to an acknowledgment of his leadership; but still the always haughty and jealous Ephraimites were greatly annoyed by this. The first Philistines, sent up, was summoned to the field; and serious consequences might have followed but for the tact of Gideon in speaking in a lowly spirit of his own doings in comparison with theirs. Gideon's "soft answer," which pacified the Ephraimite warriors, became a proverb (Judg. viii, 3), and he himself, in the 12th chapter, 9: the Hebrews, in the victory, and the Levites, in the service, were summoned to the field; and serious consequences might have followed for the tact of Gideon in speaking in a lowly spirit of his own doings in comparison with theirs. Gideon's "soft answer," which pacified the Ephraimite warriors, became a proverb (Judg. viii, 3). He addressed his, Zebah and Zalmunna, had already escaped," and Gideon resolved to pursue them into eastern Manasseh, and burst upon them among the tents of their Bedouin countrymen. On that side the river, however, his victory was not believed or understood, and the people still trembled as much as before. The two warriors, Zebah and Zalmunna, could obtain no succor from the places which he passed, and town after town refused to supply even victuals to his fatigued and hungry, but still stout-hearted troop. He denounced vengeance upon them, but postponed its execution until his return. Continuing his pursuit of the Midianites southward, he learned that they had encamped with the remnant of their army in fancied security at Karkor, just without the limits of Palestine; he therefore resolved to surprise them by a rapid detour through the edge of the nomadic region of the Haranites and the Abiezrites, who had accomplished so successfully that, falling suddenly upon them from the east by night, he utterly routed them, and by sunrise was on his way to the Jordan. In this his third victory he avenged on the Midianites the massacre of his kingly brethren whom they had slain at Minot. In these days of captivity taken in war were almost invariably slain. Zebah and Zalmunna had made up their minds to this fate; and yet it was Gideon's humane intention to spare them till he learned that they had put to death his own brothers under the same circumstances; and when they were shades of their blood, he slew the captives with his own hand. In these three battles only 15,000 out of 120,000 Midianites escaped alive. It is indeed stated in Judg., viii, 10, that 120,000 Midianites had already "fallen;" but here, as elsewhere, it may merely be intended that such was the original number of the routed host. During his triumphal return Gideon took signal and appropriate vengeance on the coward and apostate towns of Succoth and Peniel. The memory of the summer's deliverance took deep root in the national traditions (1 Sam. xii, 11; Psal. lixxii, 11; Isa. ix, 4; x, 26; Heb. xi, 32). After this there was a peace of 40 years, and we see Gideon in peaceful pursuits, and of his well-earned honors, as set down by the dignity of a numerous household (viii, 29-81). It is not improbable that, like Saul, he had owed a part of his popularity to his princely appearance (Judg. viii, 18). In this stage of his life occur alike his most noble and his most questionable acts. Gideon magnanimously rejected, on theocratic principles, the proffer of hereditary royalty which the rulers in the warmth of their gratitude made him. He would only accept the golden ear-rings (q. v.) which the victors had taken from the ears of their slaughtered foes, and with these he made an ephod, and put it in his city Ophrah (Judg. viii, 22-27). But whether Gideon intended it as a commemorative trophy, or had a Levitical priest in his house, as Micah on Mount Ephraim, and the Danites at Laish, it is difficult to determine (Judg. xvii, 5-15; xviii, 15-31). The probability is that the worship rendered there was that of the Phoenicians (Judg. viii, 23), and the Hebrews in the vicinity, who, thus having an ephod and worship in their own country, would not so readily give over to the talismans at Shiloh, and consequently fell into idolatry by worshiping the gods of the Phoenicians (Judg. viii, 33). Genius and others (Thea. p. 135; Bertheau, p. 138 sq.) follow the Peshitto, in making the word ephod here mean an idol, chiefly on account of the vast amount of gold (1700 shekels) and other rich material appropriated to it. But it is simpler to understand it as a significant symbol of an unauthorized worship. (See Crit. Sac. Theo. i, 425.) See EPHOD. The evil consequences of this false step in religion were realized in the miserable sequel of Gideon's family. After his death his numerous sons were destroyed by Abimelech—the brother, who afterwards reigned at Shechem (Judges viii, 35), 3; (See Evans, Script. Bibl. ii, 55; Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, ad loc.; Stanley, Jewish Church, i, 874; Duncan, Gideon, Son of Jodge, London, 1860.) See ABIMELECH. Gideou (Heb. Gidod), "5704 or 5707, another form of Gideon; Sept. Sacedon), the father of Ailina, which suggests a prominent man of the tribe of Benjamin at the Exodus (Num. i, 11; ii, 22; vii, 60; 15; x, 24). B.C. 1657. Gidad. See Hor-Hagidadd. Gil'dom (Heb. Gidon), 5707, a falling; Sept. Ga'dor, a place east of Gibeath, towards the wilderness (of Bethel), where the routed Benjaminites turned to escape to the rock Rimmon (Judg. xx, 45); hence probably in the plain lying north-east of Michmash, and perhaps so called from being a clearing in the woods that anciently covered this tract (2 Kings ii, 24; 1 Sam. xiv, 25). See MEMRAH. Gier-eagle [1. e. vulture-eagle] (כָּנָה, rock-ans, Lev. xi, 18, and [with עב paragoge] račkam, כָּנָה, Deut. xiv, 17, prob. so called from its tenderness to your young; Sept. ĕkōn and πορφυρίας, Vulg. porphyria), probably a smaller species of vulture, the Vultur percnopterus of Siam (Bochart, Hieros, iii, 56). It is about the size of crows, has an almost round head, with a wrinkled head, a strong pointed beak, black at the tip, large eyes and ears, the latter entirely on the outside, and long feet. The male is white, with black wings; the female has a brown body. It lives entirely upon
Egyptian Vulture (Pernebatus Neophron).

The bird of the question, Gesner had already figured (De Aquila quem Pernebatus vocant, p. 193) the Barbary variety, and pointed out the rackam of Scripture as the identical species; but Bruce first clearly established the fact of its agreement with the Egyptian variety, popularly called "Pharaoh's chicken." The rackama of the former writer is apparently the Ab-Bokha ("white father") of the Turks, and forms one of a small group of vultures, sub-universally distinguished by the name of Pernebatus and Neophron, differing from the other vultures in the bill being longer, straight, more attenuated, and then uncinated, and in the back of the head and neck being furnished with longish, narrow, sub-recteile feathers, but, like true vultures, having the pouch on the breast exposed, and the sides of the head and throat bars and livid. The great wing-covers are partly, and the quill-feathers entirely, of a black and blackish ash-color; those of the head, nape, smaller wing-covers, body, and tail, in general white, with tinges of buff and rufous; the legs are flesh-color, and rather long; and the toes are armed with sharp claws. The females are brownish. In size the species is little bulkier than a raven, but it stands high on the legs. Always soiled with blood and garbage, offensive to the eye and nose, it yet is protected in Egypt both by law and public opinion, for the services it renders in clearing the soil of dead carcasses putrefying in the sun, and the cultivated fields of innumerous rats, mice, and other vermin. Pious Moslems at Cairo and other places bestow a daily portion of food upon them, and upon their associates the kites, who are seen hovering conjointly in great numbers about the city. The rackam extends to Palestina in the summer season, but becomes scarce towards the north, where it is not specially protected; and it accompanies caravans, feasting on their leavings and on dead camels, etc. Mr. Tristram says it breeds in great numbers in the valley of the Kedron (Jbiv, i. 29). Naturalists have referred this vulture to the πτερυγοντες or ψυκτεριοι of Aristotle (Hist. An. ii. 22, 2, ed. Scholrii.). The species indicated in the Scriptures is now generally admitted to be the white carrion vulture of Egypt, Pernebatus Neophron Egyptianus, which differs but slightly from the above description. With respect to the original imposition of the name Rackam, as connected with any unusual affection for its young, there is no modern ornithologist who assigns such a quality to pernepoerti more than to other birds, although it is likely that as the pelican emplaces its bag of fish, so this bird may void the crop to feed her brood. For the Arabian fables of the bird rackam, see Bochart, Hieroc, iii. 56. The Pernepoerti is somewhat what shrewd and unscrupulous, both in Egypt and in Syria, being infested with this disgusting but useful bird (Haselquist, True, p. 193). See EAGLE. As to the identity of this species, it is clear that it is the Pernepoerti of the French naturalists, and was formerly with the name of Vultur, the turkey-buzzard or carrion-crow of America, and even the ants, have been found abstaining from its carrion in Egypt to dry up in the sun, and to swarm around and give it a smell of every other animal substance. See VULTURE. The Rev. G. E. Post, M. D., of Tripoli, Syria, suggests (Am. ed. of Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, a. v.) that the Rackam of Moses may rather be a kind of pelican (Neocolis onocrotalus). For the great numbers in Egypt it is chiefly to be found near the lake Huleh, and which he says is likewise called by the Arabs rackam; but this needs confirmation. See PELICAN.

Giesel, Johann Karl Ludwig, one of the greatest of modern Church historians, was born at Wurzbiach, near Minden, March 3, 1795. His father and grandfather, from both of whom he received instruction in childhood, were Lutheran ministers, somewhat of the Pietistic school. In 1808 he went to study at the Latin school of the Orphan House at Halie, and was made over to the care of the master of the school, who entered the "liberating" army as a volunteer; at the peace in 1815 he returned to his mastership; in 1817 he became co-rector of the gymnasmium at Minden; in 1818 rector of that in Cleve; and in 1819 professor ordinarius of theology in the newly-founded University of Lubeck. For this he was soon regarded as indolent to his Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien (Historico-critical Essay on the Origin and earliest History of the written Gospels). In 1824 he began the publication of his Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Text-book of Church History), a further account of which is given below; and his studies were thenceforward almost wholly devoted to this science. In 1831 he accepted a call to the University of Göttingen, where he spent the remainder of his life. The university repeatedly conferred on him the honor of professor, and he was almost unceasingly a member of one or more of the academical boards. He was devoted to the interests of the Göttingen Orphan House, of which he was curator, and which he visited almost daily. He also gave much time and labor to a masonic history, in which he was a member of the various offices his high administrative talent found full play. He died July 8, 1854. His Church History is the chief work on which his reputation rests. The 4th ed. of vol. i appeared in 1844 and 1845; the 4th ed. of vol. ii, carrying the history down to A.D. 1468, appeared 1846-49; vol. iii, reaching to 1648, appeared in two parts in 1840 and 1853. The 1vth vol. (1648-1814), the vth (1814 to the present time), and the vth, containing Dogmengeschichte (History of Doctrines), were issued posthumously, 1856-1857. The history, as a whole, and beyond question, the most learned, faithful, and impartial compendium of Church History that has ever appeared. Its most marked features are the judicious arrangement of the periods of history; the close, compact narrative in the text; and, most of all, the abundant sources of information given in the notes. In the main, the work resembles it; it does not merely give references, but on all difficult or controverted points the quotations bearing on the subject are given at length, thus enabling the reader who has not at command the treasures of a vast library, to consult, in no slight degree, the original sources for himself. It is a treatise, but Gieseler moves through the field of Church History "with critical acumen and cold intellect" (Schaff), and not, like Neander, in the spirit of faith and devotion. The rationalism of the age in which he was educated leaves its traces, if not in his pages, at least between the lines. But his biographer, Redepenning,
denies that he ever was a Rationalist in the ordinary sense of the term, and affirms that from the beginning to the end of his career he held fast the fundamental Christian doctrine of justification by faith alone. A translation of the first three volumes of the Church Dogmatics (Blackie, Edinburgh, 1848; 2nd ed., 1851; 3rd ed., 1859) was made from the earlier editions, and has been superseded by a new one from the fourth edition by Davidson (Edinburgh, 1848-56), of which five volumes have appeared. A better edition still is the American one, edited by Dr. H. B. Smith, of which four volumes have appeared (N. Y., Harper & Brothers, 1860). Of his other works, we mention those on the disturbances in the Dutch Reformed Church between 1838 and 1839 (Unuren in de misd-erf. Kirche, etc., Hamb., 1840); on the Lehren (v. 9.') prophecy (Uebcr d. Lehmnische Weiatsagen, Gottingen, 1840); and Die Lehmnische Weiatsagung als ein Gedicht des Abts von Huybrock nachge- wiesen, Elberfeld, 1849); on the difficulty between the archbishop of Cologne and the Prussian government (Uebcr die kln. Altebegnede, Leips., 1888). He was also one of the assistant editors of the Studien und Kritiken, one of the best theological journals of Germany.—Redepenning, in vol. v. of the Church History, translated in the Journal of Sacred Literature, Jan., 1856; Herzog, Real-Encyklop., v. 152 sq.

Gift, David Flud Van, was born at Sneek. He belonged to an honorable family. Following the bent of his own mind, though in opposition to the wishes of his relatives, he devoted himself to the study of theology, which he pursued at the University of Harderwyk. In 1674 he became pastor of the Reformed church at Wykell. He fully embraced the views of Cocceius. The sentiments which he held he boldly proclaimed. He did not, however, blend the Cartesian philosophy with his Cocceian sentiments, but gave a practical direction and tendency to his interpretation of the Scriptures, and even to those of the prophecies, to whose elucidation he devoted special attention. To him, and his followers and successors of the same school, was applied the epithet serious, in distinction from those who were denounced by Leyden Cocceians. His Cocceianism excited the prejudice and opposition of many to his preaching during the early part of his ministry, and involved him in unpleasant ecclesiastical proceedings. Finally, all further ecclesiastical and civil proceedings against him were stayed by the multitudes who supported him, to which he had appealed. He died in 1701. An edition of his works was given to the public by professor A. Vogt in 1735, under the title Versamling van alle de Wreken, nagezet en uitgegeven van den hoogvoerden en god- erwaardigen bee Dr. David Flud van Giffen (Groningen, 1736).

Gift, the rendering of seven Heb. and four Greek terms (with their variations from the same root) in the A. V., besides being the importer of others differently rendered. Several of these have a distinct and special meaning, indicative of the relation of giver and receiver, or of the motive and object of the presentation. They are as follows.:

1. Properly and simply mutam, a gratuity (Prov. xiv. 6), to secure favor (Prov. xvii. 16; xx. 14), in religious thankfulness (Num. xviii. 11), or in dowry (Gen. iv. 12). From the same root in the widest sense are also: mutam, a present, e. g. a divine bestowal (Psa. lxv. 21), in eternity (Isa. xxv. 4), in religious consecration (Exod. xxviii. 38; Lev. xxviii. 32; Num. xxviii. 6, 7, 29; Deut. xvi. 17; Ezek. xx. 26, 31, 89), in inheritance (Gen. xxxv. 6; 2 Chron. xxii. 2; Ezek. xliv. 16, 17), or as a bribe (Prov. xv. 27; Eccles. vi. 7), with its corresponding Chald. mut'am, mut' am, e. g. a royal bounty (Dan. ii. 6, 48; v. 17); and the synonymous mut't hak, e. g. a reward (Exod. xxviii. 37), or fee (Exod. xxviii. 14), or simple conferment (Eccles. iii. 13, v. 19) or contribution (Ezek. xi. 6, 11). From the same root likewise the Nethinim (see notes, i. e. consecrated, Num. viii. 19).

2. From the root nii', mazeth, to ruin, in the "Fiel" sense of giving, by a gift, come nii', mazeth, pah, pah, pah, pah, pah, pah, in v. in various altered significations, and with different renderings; and nii', mazeth, a present in token of respect (2 Sam. xiv. 42). Perhaps the inherent idea of these terms, however, is rather that of obligation to a superior, i. e. honorary gift; hence the former is also used of a dish of honor sent to special guests ("mess," xili, 34; 2 Sam. xi. 6), and of a tax or fixed contribution towards the sanctuary ("collection," 2 Chron. xxiv. 6), or voluntary first-fruits offered ("oblation." Ezek. xx. 40); like the cognate nii', mazeth ("tribute," 2 Chron. xvii. 11).

3. More distinctly in the sense of a votive offering is nii', minshah, an offering or propitiatory gift (2 Sam. viii. 26, 6; 1 Chron. xvii. 6, 2; 2 Chron. xvii. 8, xxi. 23, 28; Psa. xlv. 12, "present," Gen. xxx. xiv. 18, 20, 21, xxvii, 10; xili, 11, 10, 25, 26; Judg. iii. 15, 17, 18, viii. 18; 1 Sam. xvi. 7; 1 Kings iv. 21, 2 Kings vii. 8, 9; 2 Chron. ix. 24, xvii. 6, 11; Psa. lxxix. 10, in several of which passages the word has the accessory idea of tribute; elsewhere usually rendered offering). Kindred in meaning with the last, but from an entirely different root (sli, shur, to travel about with a commodity offered for sale), is nii', serek, a consolatory present, e. g. to a seer (Isa. ii. 7). Different still is nii', serumak (from nii', tim, to be high), an oblation (Psa. xxix. 4), especially a peace-offering (as usually rendered). The word nii', blessing, is sometimes used of a present (Gen. xxxii. 11; 1 Sam. xv. 27; 2 Kings v. 15), munificence (Psa. xxvi. 25), or benefaction (Gen. xlix. 25; Isa. xix. 24).

4. Mercenary in character are the following: nii', shoch, a bribe, especially given to a judge to obtain a favorable verdict (Exod. xxiii. 8; Deut. xvii. 19; 2 Chron. xiv. 7; Prov. vi. 30; xvii. 18, 23; Isa. i. 28; 2 Kings xxi. 18), rendered bribe, or reward, present, e. g. to a seer (Psa. lxxix. 10; 1 Kings iv. 21, 2 Kings xvii. 15). Also nii', alilchum (literally sending away), dotal presents (1 Kings ix. 16) [see Dowry]; but nii', ne deb (lit. liberally), signifies the profligate wages of a harlot (Ezek. xvi. 30).

5. In Greek the usual terms are some derivative from dudou, to give, namely dudoun, a gift, simply, i. e. the thing given (Matt. vii. 11; Luke xi. 13; Eph. iv. 8; Phil. iv. 17), dudou, the act of giving (James i. 17), dudoun, a present, in toto, in toto (Matt. ii. 7; Eph. ii. 8; Rev. xi. 10), or sacrificial (Matt. v. 23, 24; iv. 8, xiii. 18, 19; Heb. v. 1; viii. 4, ix. 9, xi. 4), or merely eleemosynary (Luke xx. 11) or in consecration (Matt. xv. 5; Mark vii. 11) [see Corban]; whereas dudoun, a gift (John iv. 10; Acts ii. 38; iii. 19, 20; xx. 46; xi. 17; Rom. v. 16, 17; 3 Cor. ix. 8; Eph. iv. 7; iii. 17; Heb. vi. 4), and dudoun, endowment (Rom. v. 16; James i. 17), refer to spiritual bestowments, i. e. grace. These significations are distributed in diudou, a votive offering (Luke xx. 5) as being liling aum and eudou, a present, e. g. to a 1 Cor. xv. 3, benefit. 2 Cor. i. 15, grace (as elsewhere usually rendered), and its cognate auidou, an impartation which is spoken of spiritual and unmerited
The refusal of a present was regarded as a high indignity, and this constituted the aggrieved insult noticed in Matt. xxii, 11, the marriage robe having been offered and refused (Trench, Parables). No less an insult was it not to bring a present when the parties demanded it (1 Sam. x, 27). Compare Present.

Gift of Tongues. See Tongues, Gift of.

Gifts, Spiritual (γαυνήματα, charisma). On this subject we make the following extract, by permission, from Schaff, History of the Apostolic Church, § 116: "By the expression spiritual gift or charismata, μεταφράσας, χάρισματα, the apostle means 'a revelation of the Spirit for the common good' (Φανεροῦ τοῦ πνεύματος πρὸς τῷ σωμάτων, 1 Cor. xii, 7; τὸς τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, xiv, 12; compare Eph. iv, 12); that is, not faith in general, which constitutes the essence to which the whole Christian is disposed, but a particular energy and utterance of the believer's life, prompted and guided by the Holy Ghost, for the edification of the Church; the predominant religious qualification, the peculiar divine talent of the individual, by which he is to perform his function, as an organ of divine communication in the vital functions of the whole Church, and promote its growth. It is, therefore, as the name itself implies, something supernaturally wrought, and bestowed by free grace (comp. 1 Cor. xii, 11); yet it forms itself, like Christianity in general, upon the natural basis prepared for it in the intuitive intellectual and moral capacities of the man, which are in fact themselves gifts of God. These natural gifts it baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire, and roves them to higher and freer activity. The charisms are many, corresponding to the various faculties of the soul and the needs of the body of Christ; they are vocal and nervous and divine and human gifts, and they reveal the riches of divine grace (σωματικά χάρισμα, 1 Pet. iv, 10). As, however, they all flow from the same source, are wrought by the Holy Ghost, and are gifts of free grace, so they all subserve the same end, the edification of the body of Christ. Hence the apostle applies to them the beautiful simile of the bodily organism, the harmonious co-operation of different members (Rom. xii, 4-6; 1 Cor. xii, 12 sq.). To this practical design the term administration or ministry (diakonia, 1 Cor. xii, 5; comp. Eph. iv, 12; 1 Pet. iv, 10) no doubt refers. Everyone has 'his proper gift,' which bears expression to his natural peculiarity and is indispensable for his sphere of activity (1 Cor. vii, 7; xii; Rom. xvi, 6; 1 Pet. iv, 10). But several charisms may also be united in one individual. This was the case particularly with the apostles, whose office in the Church abundantly included all the others. Some of their offices and their functions, even to the deaconate (comp. Acts iv, 35, 37; vi, 2). It is true they all had not these gifts in equal measure. John seems to have possessed especially the charisms of love, profound knowledge, and prophecy; Peter, those of Church government and discipline, miracles, and discernment of spirits (comp. Acts v, 1 sq.); James, those of the faithful episcopal superintendence of a congregation, and silent, patient service at the altar. Most variously endowed in this respect was St. Paul, eminent alike in knowing and in setting forth divine mysteries, both for the labor of the preacher, and for preserving and confirming established order; at home among visions and revelations; exalting all the Corinthians in the gift of tongues (1 Cor. xiv, 18); and accredited among them by signs and wonders (2 Cor. xii, 12). The greatest measure of this appears in the history of the Church. They pass from individuals uncommonly gifted, in whom the scattered mental energies of their age are harmoniously concentrated. Of course, however, the number or strength of the charisms establish no merit or preference as to the attainment of salvation. For this, living faith in Christ is sufficient. The charisms are free gifts of grace; and the man is responsible, not for
the possession, but for the use of them. Every spiritual gift is liable to abuse. Spiritual knowledge may puff up (1 Cor. viii. 1). The gift of tongues may foster vanity and the disposition to monopolize the benefit of worship in self-exalting rapture (xiv. 2 sq.). And every gift is attended with heavy responsibility. Is the gift to be used for the comfort of others, or to satisfy love of praise, which alone would prevent such abuse of other gifts, and make their exercise pleasing to God. The value of the gifts varied; not depending, however, as many of the Corinthians thought, on their splendor and outward effect, but on their practical utility for building up the body of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 6). This extraordinary operation of the Spirit showed itself first in the apostles on the day of Pentecost, the birthday of the Church. Some of these gifts, as those of prophecy and miracles, meet us, indeed, even in the Old Testament; and before the resurrection of Christ we find the disciples healing the sick and casting out devils (Matt. xi. 8; Mark xvi. 18). But the permanent possession of the Holy Ghost as the Spirit of Christ was attached to his glorification and exaltation to the right hand of the Father (John vii. 39). Thence it follows that the days of the Spirit are a holy time, a high energy, awakening in every susceptible soul a depth of knowledge, a power of will, and a jubilee of heavenly joy, which formed a glowing contrast with the surrounding paganism. For the Lord had promised (Mark xvi. 17, 18) that the gifts of speaking with tongues would pass away. And the apostles, while they must be not confined to a few, but bestowed on the mass of believers. This blooming glory of the infant Church unfolded itself most luxuriantly among the intellectual, excitable, gifted Greeks, especially in the Corinthian Church. But there, too, the dangers and abuses attended the gift most frequently appeared. The medium of communicating spiritual gifts was the laying on of the apostles’ hands (Acts viii. 17; xix. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14); yet on Cornelius and his company the Holy Ghost fell immediately after the simple preaching of the Gospel, and they began to speak with tongues and prophesy. But Christ in his brother, before Peter had baptized them (Acts x, 44, 46).

"It is the prevailing view that the charisms, some of them at least, as those of miracles and tongues, became essentially the heritage of the Church, but were merely a temporary adventitious efflorescence of the apostolic period, an ornamental appendage, like the wedding-dress of a youthful bride, and afterwards disappeared from history, giving place to the regular and normal kind of moral and religious activity. So, among modern compare, for example, Glaubemann (Comment. iii. 253), who makes the charismatic form of the Spirit’s operation cease with the third century. With special distinctness, this view is expressed by Trummann as follows (Die Apostol. Kirche, 1848, p. 809) : ‘As, in the case of marriage, the festivity of the wedding-day cannot always last, any more than the inspiration of the first love when the seriousness and steady activity of the common pilgrimage just begun comes on; as, according to the universal order of nature, the blossom must fall away if the fruit is to thrive—though, on the other hand, the fruit does not appear without the blossoming—so that gush of heavenly powers on the day of Pentecost could not, must not continue in the Church. It could not—because the earthly human nature is not able constantly to bear the bliss of ecstasy and such mighty streams of power from above, as is shown by the example of the three chosen disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration. It must not—because the continuance of the blossom would have hindered the development of the fruit. The splendor of these higher powers would unavoidably have fixed the eye and the heart too much on externals, and the proper object and work of faith, the inward conquest of the world, would have been neglected.’ The Irvingites, on the contrary, in the second century, look upon these apostolic gifts and offices as the necessary conditions of a healthy state of the Church at any time; make their disappearance the fault of Christianity; and hold it impossible to remedy the defects of the Church without a revival of the charisms and the spiritual gifts. They appear as the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 27-31; Eph. iv. 11-18, where under emphasis is laid on ‘till’; and to 1 Thess. v. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xii. 31; xiv, 1, where the apostle not only warns Christians against quenching the holy fire of the Spirit, but also positively requires them to strive earnestly after his miraculous gifts. So this, with the only scientific theologian of the Irvingite community, in his Vorlesungen über Katholizismus und Protestantismus, § 50 (2d ed.); compare my article on ‘Irvingism and the Church Question in the Deutsche Kirch. Briefe, vol. ii. Nos. 2, 5, 6, 6, particularly p. 225 sq. The Irvingites, too, look upon the Church of Jesus Christ as the ‘Church of the Day Saints,’ whose rise (April 6, 1830) was almost simultaneous with the appearance of Irvingism in England, notwithstanding their radical difference in spirit and conduct, likewise claim to possess all the offices and spiritual gifts of the apostles. They believe not to be confined to a few, but bestowed on the mass of believers. This blooming glory of the infant Church unfolded itself most luxuriantly among the intellectual, excitable, gifted Greeks, especially in the Corinthian Church. But there, too, the dangers and abuses attended the gift most frequently appeared. The medium of communicating spiritual gifts was the laying on of the apostles’ hands (Acts viii. 17; xix. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14); yet on Cornelius and his company the Holy Ghost fell immediately after the simple preaching of the Gospel, and they began to speak with tongues and prophesy. But Christ in his brother, before Peter had baptized them (Acts x, 44, 46).
them, moreover, particularly of the mass of legends of the Roman Church, which still lays claim to the perpetual possession of the gift of miracles, we must proceed with the greatest caution and critical discrimination. In view of the over-valuation of charisms by the apologists, and the responsible writers of the age, we must never forget that Paul puts those which most shun free inspection, and most rarely appear, as the gift of tongues, far beneath the others, which pertain to the regular vital action of the Church, and are at times present in larger or smaller measure, as the gifts of wisdom, of knowledge, of teaching, of the giving of government, and, above all, of love, that greatest, most valuable, most useful, and most enduring of all the fruits of the Spirit (1 Cor. xiii).

"Finally, as to the classification of the charisms. They have often been divided into extraordinary or supernatural, according to whether they are due to the direct operation of an angel, or to the special grace of soul, and of the Spirit (1 Cor. xiii).

(See by Neander; also by Conybeare and Howson, Salt and Light of Christ.)

The Life and Epistles of St. Paul [London, 1838. I. 459.] But this is improper, for, on the one hand, they are all present as natural, on the other, these same charisms, which are supernatural, are an essential part of the Church, and on the other hand, they are all present as natural. St. Paul derives them all from one and the same Spirit, and it is only their supernatural, divine element, that makes them charisms. Nor, according to what has been already said, can the division into permanent and transient, or which belongs to the Church at all times, and transitory, or such as are confined to the apostolic period, be strictly carried out. We therefore propose a psychological classification, on the basis of the three primary faculties of the soul; all being capable and in need of sanctification, and the Holy Ghost, in fact, leaving none of them untouched, but turning them all to the edification of the Church. With this corresponds also the classification according to the different branches of the Church-life, in which the activity of one or other of these faculties thus supernaturally elevated predominates. This would give us three classes of charisms, and one which relates specially to feeling and worship.

1. Those which relate to knowledge and theology. 2. Those which relate to will and Church government. To the gift of feeling belong speaking with tongues, interpretation of tongues, and inspired prophetic discourse; to the theoretical class, or gifts of intellect, belong the charisms of wisdom and of knowledge, of teaching and of discerning spirits; to the practical class, or gifts of will, the charisms of ministration, of government, and of miracles. Faith lies back of all, as the motive power, taking up the whole man, and making all his faculties into contact with the divine Spirit, and under his influence and control.

On the special gifts, see further in Schaff, Hist. of the Apost. Church, § 117—120. On the gift of tongues, See Tongues, Gift of. See also Jorin, Remark on Ecclesiastical History; Doddridge, Lectures on Theology; Neander, Placing and Training, ch. 1; Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology, part 2; Martensen, Christian Dogmatik, § 238—239; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv. 735 sq.; and the art. Catholic Apostolic Church; Pliny, xviii. 95.

Giffthell, Leodio Friedrich, a native of Suebia, made himself a name in the 17th century by his fanatical denunciations of the State Church and its ministers. The date of his birth is not known, but he began to write during the Thirty Years' War. Giffthell not only opposed the religious institutions of his day, but he himself civilized himself to turn the government against war and bloodshed. For this reason he wrote to the king of England, in 1643—1644, Zweine Briefe, gerichtet auf die Mächte in England, etc.; then, in 1647, Eine neue Declaration aus Orient, etc. He continued his warnings also to Cromwell, and, amongst other things, called the protector "field-marshall of the devil, highwayman, thief, and murder." After wandering over more than half of Europe, he died at Amsterdam in 1611. See Arnold, Kirchen- u. Ketzertist. iii, 10; Böhme, 8 Bücher v. d. Reformations der Kirche in England (Altona, 1734, p. 941 sqq.); Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v. 155. (J. N. F.)

Giger, George M. (1830—1914), an eminent divine and scholar in the Presbyterian Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa. He graduated with the highest honors at Nassau Hall in 1841, and studied divinity in the Theological Seminary at Princeton in 1844. "Soon after finishing his college course he was chosen tutor in New Jersey College. This position he held till 1846, when he was elected adjunct professor of mathematics. In the following year he was also elected adjunct professor of Greek, and in 1854 professor of the Latin language and literature. He held this chair till 1865, when failing health obliged him to resign. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 11, 1865. Dr. Giger was heartily attached to the interests of the college with which he was so long connected. He bequeathed to its library, and it is also a residuary legatee to the extent of thirty thousand dollars." He also left legacies to "Clio Hall," one of the college societies, and to the order of Masons.—Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, ix, 146.

Gihon (Heb. Gihôôn), הַגִּהְוָן, in 1 Kings 7, 19, a stream, as breaking forth from a fountain; Sept. in 1 Chron. iii. 18; 1 Macc. v. 13; 2 Chron. xxxii, 30; Ecclus. undistinguishable in 2 Chron. xxxiii, 14; Vulg. Gihon), the name of two water-courses. Gessenius compares Job xli, 23, and the Arabic jaghnum and jaghnum, spoken of several larger Asiatic streams, as the Ganges, Araxes, etc. 1. The second source of the river Gihon, said to flow around the land of Cuza or Ethiopia (1 Gen. ii, 15). What river is actually denoted here is matter of great dispute and uncertainty; perhaps the face of the country in question has been so greatly changed since that time (although the present tense is used by Moses in the description) as to efface the distinctive marks given. See Paradise. We may here remark, however, that the usual interpretation, and the one adopted by Gessenius, is that of Josephus (I. Antiq. i, 8), which identifies the Gihon with the Nile; so also the Sept., which in Jer. ii, 19, for Sion or the Nile, has γηνανην and in Ecclus. xxiv, 27, puts γηνανην (A. V. "Geon") for the Nile. The Mohammedans likewise reckon the Nile as one of the rivers of Paradise (Fund. der. des Ortes, i, 304). Others regard the Oxus as meant (Rosenmüller, Aetheria, i, 1, p. 384; Bitter, Erdk. ii, 490; Hengstenberg, i, 221), designating it as the Ganges (Ewald, Jer. Gesch., i, 833).—Winer, 1, 428.

The second river of Paradise presents difficulties not less insurmountable than the first, or Pison. Those who maintained that the Pison is the Ganges held also that the Gihon was the Nile. One great objection to this theory, that although in the books of the Old Testament frequent allusion is made to this river, it nowhere appears to have been known to the Hebrews by the name Gihon. The idea seems to have originated with the Sept. rendering of יָנֹּ֣שׁ by פִּנֹּ֣שׁ in Jer. ii, 18; but it is clear, from the manner in which the translators have given the latter clause of the same passage, that they had no conception of the true meaning. Among modern writers, Berthelot (quoted by Delitzsch, Genesis) and Kalisch (Genesis) have not hesitated to support this interpretation, in accordance with the principle they adopt, that the description of the garden of Eden is to be explained according to the most ancient conceptions of the earth's surface, without reference to the advances made in later times in geographical knowledge. If this hypothesis be adopted, it certainly explains some features of the narrative, but, so far from removing the difficulty, it introduces another equally great. It has yet to be proved that the opinions of the Hebrews on these points were as
contradictory to the now well-known relations of land and water as the recorded impressions of other nations at a much later period. At present we have no categorical assertion. Pausanias (ii, 5), indeed, records a legend that the Euphrates, after disappearing in a marsh south of the Pyramus, again appeared, flowing through Egypt as the Nile. Arrian (Hist. Alex. vi, 1) relates that Alexander, on finding crocodiles in the Indus, and beans like those of Egypt on the banks of the Acesines, imagined he had discovered the sources of the Nile; but he adds, what those who make use of this passage do not find convenient to notice, that on receiving more accurate information Alexander abandoned his theory, and cancelled the letter he had written to his mother Olympias on the subject. It is but fair to say that there was at one time a theory afloat that the Nile rose in a mountain of Lower Mauretania (Pline, H. N. v, 10).

The etymology of Gibon (?3, to burst forth) seems to indicate that it was a swiftly-flowing, impetuous stream. According to Golius (Lex. Arab.), Ichimön is the name given to the Oxus, which has, on this account, been assumed by Rosenmüller, Hartmann, and Michaelis to be the Gibon of Scripture. But the Araxes is the name given to a lake near the Girgara, inhabited by people belonging to a Semitic race, and from this circumstance it has been adopted by Roland, Calmet, and colonel Chesney as the modern representative of the Gibon. It is clear, therefore, that the question is not to be decided by etymology alone, as the evidence of the ancients is highly meagre. That the Gibon should be one of the channels by which the united stream of the Tigris and Euphrates falls into the Persian Gulf, was essential to the theory which places the garden of Eden on the Shat el-Abab. Bochart and Huet contended that it was the easternmost of these channels, while Calvin considered it to be the most westerly. Hopkinson and Junius, conceiving that Eden was to be found in the region of Auranitis (Auranitis, quae Edeinita), on the Euphrates, were compelled to make the Gibon coincide with the Nahrarar, the Marshes of Amm. Marc. (xxiii, 6, § 25). That it should be the Orontes (Leclerc), the Ganges (Buttmann und Ewald), the Kur, or Cyrus, which rises from the side of the Saghanlo mountain, a few miles northward of the sources of the Araxes (Link), necessarily followed from the exigencies of the several theories. Reclus (Notes on the Geographical Arrangement of the Ancients (Herod, i, 183)), now called the Diyâlah, one of the tributaries of the Tigris. Abram Petoel (Ugolino, vol. vii) was of opinion that the garden of Eden was situated in the region of the Mountains of the Moon. Identifying the Pison with the Nile, and the Tigris with the Orontes, on which the Euphrates is explained to be the Niger, he avoids the difficulty which is presented by the fact that the Hiddeskel and P̲r̲añ̲ are rivers of Asia, by conceiving it possible that these rivers actually take their rise in the Mountains of the Moon, and then run under ground till they make their appearance in Assyria. Equally unsatisfactory is the explanation of Ephraim Syrus that the four rivers have their source in Paradise, which is situated in a very lofty place, but are swallowed up by the surrounding districts, and, after passing underneath the sea, come to light again in different quarters of the globe. Inasmuch as the sacred narrative makes it evident that all the rivers in question took their origin from the head waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris, we must look to Gibon to one of the streams of the same region, namely, that of the lake system of Central Armenia, in the vicinity of Lake Van. As the Euphrates and Tigris flow southerly, so we may naturally conclude that by the Pison and Gibon are intended rivers flowing northerly, probably one towards the Caspian, and the other towards the Caspian Sea. No representative of the Gibon can be found in this region than the Araxes (Apodizi) of antiquity, which, as we have seen, to this day bears the same name among the Arabs. This is a large river in Armenia Major, which takes its rise from a number of sources in Mount Abus (the present Bin-Gol), nearly in the centre of the space between the east and west branches of the Euphrates (Strabo, p. 828, § 1, 10, 1, 11, 2, 6, 9). The general course may be described as east, then south-east, and, after flowing in a north-easterly direction, it resumes its south-east course, and, after its junction with the Cyrus (Kur), it discharges itself into the Caspian Sea (Col. Monsteith, in the London Geogr. f. 495). It is the modern Aras (Smith, Dict. of Class. Geo., s. v.). See EDK.

2. A fountain near Jerusalem, to which the young Solomon was taken to be anointed king (1 Kings i, 33, 38), out of sight, but within hearing of En-rogel, with the city between (ver. 2, 41), but its direction is not indicated. Subsequently Hezekiah stopped the upper water-course (or upper outflow of the waters) of Gibon, and brought it straight down to the west side of the city of David" (2 Chron. xxxii, 30; xxxiii, 14). This was, perhaps, on occasion of the approach of the Assyrian army under Sennacherib, when, to prevent the besiegers from finding water, great numbers of the inhabitants were hurried on in a direction which carried them into the midst of the water of the fountains without the city, and in particular of the "brook that ran through the midst of the land" (2 Chron. xxxii, 3, 4). The author of the book of Sirach (xiv, 17) also states that Hezekiah "brought water to the city by the hand of the Lord, he ironed into the rock, and built fountains for the waters." The fountain of Gibon is also mentioned by Josephus as lying outside the city (War, Ant. vii, 14, 5). From a comparison of these passages, the editor of the Septuagint Bible (on 2 Chron. xxxii) arrived at the conclusion, since confirmed by Dr. Robinson (Researches, i, 313), that there existed anciently a fountain of Gibon on the west side of the city, which was "stopped" or covered over by Hezekiah, and its waters brought by subterranean channels into the city. Before that time it would naturally have flowed down through the valley of the Gibon, and probably formed the brook which was stopped at the same time. "The fountain may have been stopped, and its waters thus secured very easily by digging deep and erecting over it one or more vaulted subterranean chambers. Something of the very same kind is still seen in the fountain near Solomon's Pools beyond Bethlehem, where the water rises in subterranean chambers, to which there is no access except down a narrow shaft like a well. In this way the waters of Gibon would be withdrawn from the enemy and preserved in the city, in which they would not have been of use, as from the plains to the Niger, he avoids the difficulty which is presented by the fact that the Hiddeskel and P̲r̲añ̲ are rivers of Asia, by conceiving it possible that these rivers actually take their rise in the Mountains of the Moon, and then run under ground till they make their appearance in Assyria.

Inasmuch as the sacred narrative makes it evident that all the rivers in question took their origin from the head waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris, we must look to Gibon to one of the streams of the same region, namely, that of the lake system of Central Armenia, in the vicinity of Lake Van. As the Euphrates and Tigris flow southerly, so we may naturally conclude that by the Pison and Gibon are intended rivers flowing northerly, probably one towards the Caspian, and the other towards the Caspian Sea. No representative of the Gibon can be found in this region than the Araxes (Apodizi) of antiquity, which, as we have seen,
Gihon, a new bore to the Pool of Siloam, which Mr. Williams thinks was the Lower Pool of Isai, xxxi, 9, 11. Schwarz (Palest. p. 266) likewise confounds the lower spring of Gihon with Siloam. This latter, he says, has the same peculiar qualities as the water of a cistern found between the castle of David and the Temple Mount, showing the course of the now closed upper pool Gihon. From the terms of the first passage in which Gihon is mentioned (1 Kings i, 38, 39, 45), it is evident it was at a lower level than the city—"Bring him down (מָשַׁבֶּהוּ) upon (מַעְתָּה) Gihon"—"They are come up (עָלָה) from thence." With this agrees a later mention (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14), where it is called "Gihon-in-the-valley," the word rendered valley being σακαί (σακαί). In this latter place Gihon is named to designate the direction of the wall built by Manasseh—outside the city of David, on the west of (rather to) Gihon-in-the-valley to the entrance of the fish-gate. It is not stated in any of the above passages that Gihon was a spring; but the only remaining place in which it is mentioned suggests that idea, or at least that it had given its name to some water—Hezekiah also stopped the upper source or issue (מָשַׁבֶּהוּ, from מַעְתָּה), to rush forth; incorrectly ‘water-course’ in A.V. of the waters of Gihon" (2 Chron. xxxiii, 80). If this place of Solomon was brought down on the king's mule was Gihon-in-the-valley—and from the terms above noticed it seems probable that it was—then the "upper source" would be some distance away, and at a higher level. Josephus also speaks of water brought to the tower of Hippicus (War, v, 7, 8), which could only have come from the west. The following are therefore the views propounded as to its real import and locality: (1) Some affirm that Gihon was the ancient name of the valley of Jeboshaphat, and that it is compounded of the words נֶבֶן, "a valley," and יִתְּנָה, "beauty." The fountain of the Virgin, which rises at the bottom of the valley, had originally flowed into the brook Kidron, but was artificially carried by a conduit across the ridge of Zion (?) to the Pool of Siloam. This was the lower water-course of Gihon. More to the north was anciently another spring, called the upper water-course of Gihon, which was stopped or sealed in the time of Hezekiah, and conveyed to the west side of the city of David (Lewin, Jerusalem, p. 11 sq.). It will be seen that in this theory the "city of David" is identified with Moriah. (2) Others think that Gihon was the old name of the Tyropean valley; that the Pool of Siloam was the "lower Gihon;" and that the "upper outflow" was at the head of that valley west of the city (Robinson, B. E. i, 446). (3) An English engineer, recently sent out to survey the waters of Jerusalem, has reported that there is not, and from the position of the city and the character of the strata there could not be, any perennial fountain in or around Jerusalem. The so-called Fountain of the Virgin, he says, is a concretion by the pressure of the water seeping through the west cisterns under the Temple area; and the peculiar taste of its water is occasioned by stagnation and filth (MS. Report). If this be so, then Gihon could neither be a fountain nor a perennial stream. The results of this examination of authorities may be thus stated. The upper pool of Gihon was in the head of the valley of Hinnom, and a stream from it ran down through that valley. The fountain was covered by Hezekiah, and the water brought into the city of David by a concealed channel, partly hidden in the rock. There was an "upper" and a "lower" pool in this valley. A close examination of the place tends to confirm these views. No fountain has yet been discovered, nor could it be without extensive excavations; but a section of an old aqueduct was laid bare when sinking the foundations of the new church on the northern summit of Zion. It was twenty feet beneath the surface, in places excavated in the rock, and its direction was from west to east (Bartlett, Walks about Jerusalem, p. 94). This may be a portion of Hezekiah's aqueduct. One of the channels ran from the Temple area as well as to Zion. In the valley of Hinnom are still two great "pools," one at the head, called Birket el-Malumia; another west of the present Sion gate in the bottom of the glen, called Birket el-Azizi. The fountain or rivulet in question is doubtless a part of the aqueduct of the city of Jeru- sam, all of it probably traceable to the supply from the pools of Solomon at Bethlem. See Jeau- salm.

Gil, Juan, commonly called Dr. Egidius, was one of the early converts to the Reformation in Spain. He was born at Oliena, in Aragon, and was eclec- tated at the University of Alcalá, where he devoted himself especially to the Scholastic theology. After his ordination he became canon-preacher at the cathedral of Seville, and professor of theology at Sigüenza. Under the influence of Rodrigo de Valer (q. v.) he was led into the study of the Bible, and the effect appeared in the life and power of his preaching, which was soon noised abroad. He united with Vargas (q. v.) and Ponce de la Fuente in a plan for dif- fusing practical religious life. In 1550 he was nominated by the emperor to the bishopric of Tortosa, and this preference excited the anger of his enemies. He was seized and imprisoned by the Inquisition on a charge of heresy. The emperor and the chapter of Seville interfered in his behalf: but, after a singular trial (for details, see M'Crie), he was condemned to imprisonment (1551), from which he was released in 1555. He died soon after. His remains were taken from the grave by order of the Inquisition, and burned, as those of a Lutheran heretic.—M'Crie, Reformation in Spain, ch. iv.

Gih'alai (Heb. גִּהלָי, "אֱלַי, perhaps dānug [Ge- senius], or ze'shapy [Furst]; Sept. Γελάω), one of the priests appointed by Nehemiah to aid Zechariah in the musical services under Ezra at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 36). B. C. 446.

Gilbert de la Porree (Gidebertus Porretanus), a Scholastic theologian and follower of Abelard, was born at Poitiers in 1070. He studied philosophy under Bernard of Chartres, and theology under Anselm and Radulfo of Laon. He began to lecture at Chartres, and became a well-known and eminent teacher as a profound logician and an original teacher. In 1142 he was made bishop of Poitiers, but did not give up his metaphysical pursuits. He treated theology more as a metaphysician than as a divine, making more use of Aristotle than of Scripture, or at the fa- thers. His style was very obscure. He was a thor- ough Realist in philosophy. For his theories with re- gard to the divine nature he was accused at the Coun- cill of Rheims in 1148, where Bernard of Clairvaux headed the prosecution against him. The charges were founded on the following propositions: 1. That the divine nature, the substance of God, is not God. 2. The properties of the divine persons are not the persons themselves; and the persons of the Trinity are one only in virtue of their divinity. 3. It was not the divine nature, but only the person of the Word, that became incarnate. 4. There is no more possible but the merit of Christ. Gilbert was condemned, though some of the cardinals voted with him. He submitted to the decision of the council, and remained afterwards unmolested in his diocese. He died in 1154. Gilbert wrote several works of which are yet in MS. Among those printed are Commentarius in quatuor libros de Trinitate of Boethius, published in
Gilbert, Ephraim Wheeler, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, and president of Delaware College, was born at Lebanon, Columbia Co., N. Y., Dec. 19, 1793, and graduated at Union College in 1818. After completing his theological course at Princeton, he was licensed in 1817, and in 1818 he went on a mission to the West, and on his return was elected pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Wilmington, Del. He was frequently engaged in missionary labors; and, on being released from his charge at Wilmington in 1824, he became agent for the American Educational Society, but resigned on being chosen president of Delaware College. In 1835 he returned to Wilmington, where he remained till 1841, when he was recalled to the presidency of Delaware College. After a second resignation of this office in 1847, he was installed pastor of the Western Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and died July 31, 1858. He published The Letters of Paul and Amos; two tracts, viz., Regeneration and Perseverance; three articles in the Prob. Review, viz., Geology, The Apocalypses, and Millenarianism.—Sprague, Annales, iv, 586.

Gilbert, Gad Smith, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Haven, Connecticut, September 22, 1814. He studied at Wesleyan University with a view to the ministry, but for several years he turned his attention to secular pursuits. In 1842 he joined the New York Conference, and was stationed at New Milford, Connecticut. Subsequently he was stationed at Woodbury and Wolcottville. In 1847 he located, and removed to Louisiana on account of the sickness of his wife, who died during the same year. While at the South, however, he had charge of the Methodist Church at Opelousas, La. In 1848 he re-entered the New York East Conference, and was stationed at Greenport, L. I. After that he was stationed at Southport, Conn., First Place, Brooklyn, and Rye, N. Y. In 1855 he was agent for the Wesleyan University. In 1856 he was stationed at Port Chester, N. Y., and afterwards at Second Avenue, New York City, Sag Harbor, L. I., De Kalb Avenue, Brooklyn, Tompkins Avenue, Brooklyn, which society he organized. His last appointment was Southport, Conn. He died in New Haven, August 1, 1866. Shortly before his death he prayed God, saying, "This house is as that of Odell-Eodum, where the ark of the Lord rested; it is the gate of heaven; heaven has come down to earth; the angels are here. This disease is drawing my body down to earth, but Jesus is drawing my soul up to heaven; I shall soon be there." And just before he ceased to live on earth he said, "Is this dying? It is a felicity! O how precious Jesus is! Glory, hallelujah!"—Minutes of Conferences, 1866, p. 77.

Gilbert, Joseph, an English Independent minister, was born in 1714, and was for many years pastor at Nottingham; died in 1852. He wrote The Christian Atonement (Cong. Lecture, London, 1836, 8vo: 2d edit. 1802). See Brit. Critic, xxii, 450; Life of Gilbert, by his widow (Lond. 1833, 12mo); Darwin, Cyclopaedia Bibliographicæ, i, 1254; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 668.

Gilbert of Sempringham (Gilbert), St., founder of the order of Gilbertines, was the son of Josselein, lord of Sempringham and Tringtong, and was born in 1085. After completing his studies at Paris, he was ordained priest at the bishopric of Lincoln, and for many years pastor. He then founded a house for seven poor maidens who had resolved to lead a life of chastity, and who made vows of absolute seclusion. They were attended only by a few servants, from whom they received all they required through a window. The property with which he had endowed this institution was attended to by poor laborers, whom he also subjected to certain rules and observances. As similar institutions were soon erected in other places, Gilbert requested pope Eugene III to incorporate his foundation with the Cistercians. Eugene not complying with the request, he was obliged to provide in some other way for the guidance of his congregations, and in that view attached a convent of canons to each nunery, framing at the same time very strict rules to keep them each separate; he placed the nuns under the rule of St. Benedict, and the canons under that of St. Augustine. The institution counted some 2200 men and several thousand women among its members, and hospitals for the poor, the sick, widows, and orphans were connected with their regular establishments. Gilbert died in 1189, aged 106 years. The strictness of his life had not protected him from calumny. He was, however, canonized by pope Innocent III in 1202. At the time of the Reformation the order possessed 21 houses, and 11 double convents inhabited by both nuns and monks, but they were so strictly divided that the nuns received even communion through a window, and the canons administered the extreme unction to dying nuns without seeing them. Whenever it became absolutely necessary that a nun and monk should hold communication with each other, a witness was obliged to attend; hence a body of ten canons was appointed, together with a number of lay brethren, subjects to the rule of Citeaux. The order was never propagated outside of England. The rule of the order is given in full by Holstenius (tom. ii). See Hurter, Innocens III us. Zügengemessn, iv, 230; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 413 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xx, 488.

Gilbertines. See Gilbert of Sempringham.

Gilboa. [many Gilboa] (Heb. Gilbo’a, מְגַבּוֹא, Gáb; 2 Sam. vii, 17-20, bolling spring, prob. from a neighboring fountain; Sept. and Joseph. Am. vi, 14, 2, also Euclid. Onom. Γίλβοα), usually called Mount Gilboa (בָּאֶר בַּיְתָא, Gāḇār biṯā’), a mountain near Hebron which (according to some) Gideon pitched the eves of his overthrow with the Midianites (Judg. vii, 1 [see GLIEAD, 2]), but especially memorable for the defeat of Saul by the Philistines, where his three sons were slain, and where he himself died by his own hand (1 Sam. xxviii, 4; xxxi, 1-8; 2 Sam. i, 6-21; xxii, 12; 1 Chron. x, 8). When the tidings were carried to received from his father the stewardship of two estates, He then founded a house for seven poor maidens who had resolved to lead a life of chastity, and who made vows of absolute seclusion. They were attended only by a few servants, from whom they received all they required through a window. The property with which he had endowed this institution was attended to by poor laborers, whom he also subjected to certain rules and observances. As similar institutions were soon erected in other places, Gilbert requested pope Eugene III to incorporate his foundation with the Cistercians. Eugene not complying with the request, he was obliged to provide in some other way for the guidance of his congregations, and in that view attached a convent of canons to each nunery, framing at the same time very strict rules to keep them each separate; he placed the nuns under the rule of St. Benedict, and the canons under that of St. Augustine. The institution counted some 2200 men and several thousand women among its members, and hospitals for the poor, the sick, widows, and orphans were connected with their regular establishments. Gilbert died in 1189, aged 106 years. The strictness of his life had not protected him from calumny. He was, however, canonized by pope Innocent III in 1202. At the time of the Reformation the order possessed 21 houses, and 11 double convents inhabited by both nuns and monks, but they were so strictly divided that the nuns received even communion through a window, and the canons administered the extreme unction to dying nuns without seeing them. Whenever it became absolutely necessary that a nun and monk should hold communication with each other, a witness was obliged to attend; hence a body of ten canons was appointed, together with a number of lay brethren, subjects to the rule of Citeaux. The order was never propagated outside of England. The rule of the order is given in full by Holstenius (tom. ii). See Hurter, Innocens III us. Zügengemessn, iv, 230; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 413 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xx, 488.
direct our attention to the mountains which bound the
great plain of Edraelen on the south-east, and are
interposed between it and the Jordan valley. (See Stan-
ley’s Sinai and Palestine, p. 337.) Here there are a
number of ridges, with a general direction from north-
west to south-east, separated by valleys running in the
same direction. The largest of these valleys is the
southernmost: it is a broad, deep plain, about two
miles and a half wide, and leading direct into the Jor-
dan valley. This is supposed to be distinctively (for
the plain of Edraelen is sometimes so called) the Val-
ley of Jezreel. The higher mountains which bound
it on the south undeniably form Mount Gilboa. Eu-
sebos mentions the mountains of Gilboa as lying six
miles from Scythopolis, with a large village upon them
called Gilon (γιλον). There is still, indeed, an in-
habited village, in whose name is Jobemos of that of Gilboa
may be recognised (Robinson’s Researches, iii, 157, 170).
The fountain implied in the name Gilboa may be that
mentioned by William of Tyre (xxii, 26) under the
title of Tabula (טבולה), being the large fountain
still found at the north-eastern base, half a mile from
the ruins, which he says was the “Wall of Ha-
rud” (Judg. vii, 1) and “the fountain of Jezreel” (1
Sam. xxix, 1), and now called Ain-Jalud. See Ha-
rud.
A knowledge of the topography of this region gives
great vividness to several of the Scripture narratives,
but especially to that of the fatal battle in which Saul
fell. The range about six miles north of Gilboa, and
of nearly equal elevation and length, was anciently
called the “hill of Moreh” (Judg. vii, 1), but now
Jebo ed-Dahy (and by travellers “Little Hermon”).
The intervening valley, named from the city of Jez-
reel at the western extremity of Gilboa, has its east-
ern end, overlooking the Jordan, the mound and ruins
of Bethshean. On the other side of the valley, and
near the base of Moreh, stands Shunem; and away
behind the latter hill, hidden from view, is the village
of Endor. The Philistines encamped on the north side
of the valley at Shunem; and Saul took up a position
by the fountain of Jezreel, at the base of Gilboa (1
Sam. xxi, 4; xxix, 1). From the brow of the hill
above the camp Saul had a full view of the enemy,
and he was struck with terror at their numbers (xxvii,
6). The position he had chosen was that of one. There
is a gradual descent in the valley from Shunem to the
base of Gilboa at the fountain, while immediately be-
hind it the hill rises steep and rocky. The Philistines
had all the advantage of the gentle descent for their
attack, and both front and flanks of the Israelites were
exposed to a sort of almost impossible pressure at the
steep hill side. On the night before the battle Saul went
to Endor.
The battle seems to have begun early in the
morning, when the king was wearied and dispirited
(xxviii, 19). The Israelites were broken on the
by the fierce onset of the enemy, and the slaughter
was terrible as they attempted to flee up the sides of Gil-
boa. While the terror-stricken masses were clamber-
ing up the rugged slopes, they were completely
exposed to the arrows of the Philistine archers. “They
fell down slain in Mount Gilboa” (xxxi, 1); “The
Philistines pursued hard upon Saul and upon his sons,
probably when they tried to rally their discomfited
forces. The three sons fell beside their father; “and
the battle went sore against Saul, and the archers hit him; and
was he sore wounded of the archers” (ver. 9). David
caught the peculiarity of the position in his ode:
“The plain of Jezreel is slain from wall to wall; and
Jonathan, thou wast slain upon the high places” (2
Sam. i, 19, 25). The stripping and mutilating of the slain is characteristic of the Arab tribes
to this day, and Porter witnessed some fearful instances
of it in 1858, as described in this same spot (Hand-book for S. and
P. p. 325). The Philistines seized the lower end of Saul
and fastened it to the wall of the neighboring fortress of Bethshean, from whence it was snatched by a few
brave men from Jabesh-Gilead, on the opposite side of the
mountain (Judson, J ewish Chrest., ii, 30 sq.). See Saul.
The ridge of Gilboa is bleak and bare (Wilson, Lands of
Bible, ii, 83; Furst derives from this fact the name of the
mountain, q. d. bare land, from מַעַר, Heb. Lxx. a. v. ). The soil is scanty, and the gray limestone
rocks crop out in jagged cliffs and naked crowns, giv-
ing the whole a look of painful barrenness. One
would almost think, on looking at it, that David’s
words were prophetic (Van de Velde, Narrations, ii, 889).
The highest point of Gilboa is said to have an eleva-
tion of 1,100 feet above the sea, and 1,200 above the
valley of Jezreel (Van de Velde, Advancement, ii. 184).
The range of Gilboa extends in length some ten miles
from W. to E. The modern local name is Jebel Fakhaba,
and the highest point is crowned by a village and wely
Gildas the Wise, the first British historian, was
born in the year 511 (according to Bede, 493), became
scholar at Iona, and spent the last 27 years of his life in
Monmouth, and was made abbot of Bangor. The time of his death is
uncertain. The legendary accounts of him suffer so
much that Bale and Usher suppose there were two of
the same name, while others doubt the existence of
any such person. “In truth, as Mr. Stevenson ob-
serves, his introduction to the Latin text of Gildas de
Excidio Britanniae: ‘We are unable to speak with
certainty as to the parentage of Gildas, his country, or
even his name, when he lived, or the works of which
he was the author.’ Mr. T. Wright attempts to show
that Gildas was a fabulous person, and his his-
tory the forgery of ‘some Anglo-Saxon priest of the
7th century’ (Biog. Brit. Lit. Anglo-Saxon
period, p. 115-118). But Stevenson, Lappenberg,
and others, while admitting the fabulous character of
the common accounts, are inclined to believe that Gil-
das really existed somewhere near the time usually
stated” (English Cyclop. a. v.). The writings which
pass under his name are valuable for their antiquity,
and as containing the only information we have of the
times in which he wrote; although Gibbon describes
him as “a monk who, in the profound ignorance of hu-
man life, has presumed to exercise the office of histori-
an, and strangely disfigures the state of Britain at the
time of its separation from the Roman empire.” They
are, (1) Liber Quernus de excidio Britanniae, etc.,
a picture of the evils of the times of and the previous
ages of British history.—(2) Cantigas Ordin. Eccles. (Reprinted
in the Clergy, a sad account of abomina-
tions and vices imputed to the clergy. They are given
in Gale’s Hist. Brit., etc., Scriptores xe (Xon. 1691,
fol.), and in the Works of Gildas and Nemesius,
translated by J. A. Giles (Lond. 1841, 8vo); also in Gale, Re-
rum Angl. Script. Veteres (1636-87, 8 vols. fol.), but the
best edition is that published in 1888 by the Historical
Society, and edited by Mr. Joseph Stevenson. There
are three English translations of it: one by Habling-
ton (Lond. 1636, 8vo); another, entitled A Description of the State of Great Britain, written eleven hundred
years since the Conquest, 1659, 12mo); and a verse trans-
ation by Mr. Giles, but based on that of Hablington, and published
in Bohn’s Antiquarian Library (1848). See Wright,
1. c.; Poste, British Researches; English Cyclopedia;
Clarke, Sac. of Sacred Literature, vol. 1.
Gilder, William H., a minister of the Methodist
Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia Sept. 17,
1812, and was educated at the Wesleyan University.
He entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1845, and
after three years preaching was compelled by ill health
to retire from active service. About 1840 he estab-
lished at Philadelphia the Pearl and Repository, an
independent Methodist paper. For some years he was
principal of the Female Institute at Flemington, N. J.
He afterwards became president of Franklin College,
at St. Thomas’s Hall, Fluelling, L.I. While
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at Bordentown he established the Literary Register, which he edited for several years. In 1862 he became chaplain of the 40th New-York Regiment, and shared in all its campaigns, following his charge into every battle. In 1863 he was taken with typhoid fever, which greatly impaired his strength. He returned to his post before he was in fit physical condition to do so, and, while attending to his duties in the regimental hospital, he contracted small-pox, of which he died at Culpepper, Va., April 13, 1864. No chaplain in the army had a stronger hold upon the affection and confidence of the men than Mr. Gilder. Shortly before his death he said to his son, "I am in the hands of one whom I can trust; I feel that I am perfectly safe;" and when he could no longer speak, he intimated by signs that all was well. — Minstes of Conferences, 1866. p. 81.

Gilead (Heb. Gil'ād, גילה, generally with the article prefixed, when applied to the region or mountain; properly a stony district, hence, according to Gen. xxxi, 41, heaph or hill of testimony; Sept. Γάλα¬κτος), the name of several men, also of a region and mountain, and perhaps a city. The name Gilead, as usual, is derived from the physical aspect of the country. It signifies "a hard, rocky region;" and it may be regarded as standing in contrast with Bashan, the other great trans-Jordanic province, which is, as the name implies, a "level, fertile tract." The statement of Gen. xxxi, 48, is not confirmed by this etymology. The old name of the district was גילה (Gil'ēd), but, by a slight change in the pronunciation, the radical letters being retained, the meaning was made beautifully applicable to the "heap of stones." Jacob and Laban had built up— and Laban said, this heap (גילה) is a witness (תוא) between me and thee this day. Therefore was the name of it called Gilead (גילה, "the heap of witness"). Those acquainted with the modern Arabs and their literature will see how intensely such a play upon the word would be appreciated by them. This Gilead could not have been far from Mahanaim, and was doubtless one of those round edifices to the northward which overlook the broad plateau of Bashan (Gen. xxxi, 23; xxxii, 1, 3). See GALKH.

A mountainous region east of the Jordan; bounded on the north by Bashan, on the east by the Arabian plateau, and on the south by Moab and Ammon (Gen. xxxi, 21; Deut. iii, 12-17), properly extending from the parallel of Rabbath-Ammon on the south to the river Hieromax on the north. The same name, however, was given by the Arabs extending from these parallels. With the exception of the narrow strip of plain along the bank of the Jordan, the mountains, in fact, cover the whole region; hence it is sometimes called "Mount Gilead" (Gen. xxxi, 25, לבה עדון, "the mountain of Gilead") (comp. Deut. iii, 12; Jer. 1, 19), sometimes "the land of Gilead" (Num. xxxi, 1, לבה עדון; compare Deut. xxxiv, 1; Numb. xxxiv, 29; Zech. x, 10), and sometimes simply "Gilead" (Ps. ix, 7; Gen. xxxvii, 25; Num. xxxiv, 19; Josh. xxii, 1; Amos viii, 14); but a comparison of the several passages shows that they all mean the same thing. There is no evidence, in fact, that any particular mountain was meant by Mount Gilead more than by Mount Lebanon (Judg. ii, 5)—they both comprehend the whole range, and the range of Gilead embraced the whole province, or group of mountains vaguely stated by Eusebius (Onomat. s. v. Γαλαδί) to be connected with Lebanon by means of Mount Hermon. It begins not far from the latter, and extends southward to the sources of the brooks Jabok and Arnon, which divide the western part of the land beyond the Jordan (Gen. xxxi, 21; Cant. iv, 1). According to Michaelis (Mose Recht, i, 86), this mountain, which gave its name to the country so called, must even be situated beyond the region sketched in our maps, and somewhere about the Euphrates. But this is fanciful. Strictly, the name comprehends the mountainous region south of the river Jabok, where is the highest part of the mountains on the east of the Jordan. The name גילה, when applied to the region of the Jordan, or גילה, from the ruined towns so called upon it (Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 345; Robinson's Researches, ii, 243, 806; App. p. 167). The inhabitants were called Gileadites (Judg. x, 3; 2 Kings xv, 23).

1. Division of the Territory.—(a.) Gilead is usually, the name of a large district beyond the Jordan, continually mentioned in the Scriptures in contradistinction to, or apart from, Bashan (Deut. iii, 13; Josh. xii, 5; xiii, 11; xvii, 1; 2 Kings x, 33; 1 Chron. xvi, 16; Micah vii, 14); though, to judge from its geographical position (as given Numb. xxxii, 26; Deut. iii, 12), it must have comprised the entire possessions of the two tribes of Gad and Reuben, and even the southern part of Manasseh (Deut. iii, 13; Numb. xxxii, 40; Josh. xvii, 2-9); corresponding to the region now called el-Beka and Jedel-Ajam. Sometimes it is put for the territory of Gad and Reuben alone (Psa. lx, 9; xvi, 10); at others for the tribe of Gad only (Judg. v, 17; comp. v, 16), although this usage is not constant, and in 1 Sam. xii, 7, the land of Gad and Gilead are joined. The cities Ramoth, Jabelah, and Jazer are usually joined as lying in Gilead.

There is a special descriptive term, which may at least be regarded as a proper name, used to denote the great plateau which borders Gilead on the south and east. The refuge-city Bezer is said to be "in the country of the Mishor" (Deut. iv, 49); and Jeremiah (xxvii, 21) says "the Mishor is come upon the mountain of Bashan." (see also Josh. xiii, 9, 16, 17, 21; xx, 5). Mishor (מישור, מישור) signifies a "level plain" or "table-land;" and no word could be more applicable. This is one among many examples of the minute accuracy of Bible topography. See Mission.

The extent of Gilead in this general sense we can ascertain with tolerable exactness from incidental notices in the Holy Scriptures. The Jordan was its western border (1 Sam. xii, 7; 2 Kings viii, 30). A comparison of a number of passages shows that the river Hieromax, the modern Sheriat el-Mandehur, separated it from Bashan on the north. "Half Gilead" is said to have been possessed by the Edomites, king of the Edomites, and the other half by Og, king of Bashan; and the river Jabok was the division between the two kingdoms (Deut. iii, 12; Josh. xii, 1-5). The half of Gilead possessed by Og must therefore have been north of the Jabok. It is also stated that the territory of the tribe of Gad extended along the Jordan valley to the sea of Galilee (Josh. xiii, 27); and yet "all Bashan" was given to Manasseh (ver 20). We therefore conclude that the deep glen of the Hieromax, which runs eastward, on the parallel of the south end of the Sea of Galilee, was the dividing line between Bashan and Gilead. North of that glen stretches out a flat, fertile plateau, such as the name Bashan (בשון, like the Arabic muskhah, signifies "soft and level soil") would suggest; while on the south we have the rough and rugged, yet picturesque hill country, for which Gilead is the fit name. (See Porter, in Journal of Soc. Lat. July, 1834, p. 284 sq.; compare 18. 16. 1832, p. 364.)

On the east the mountain country is separated from the high plateau of Arabia. The boundary of Gilead is here not so clearly defined, but it may be regarded as running along the foot of the range. The southern boundary is less certain. The tribe of Reuben occupied the country as far south as the river Arnon, which forms the western boundary of Moab (Deut. ii, 86; iii, 12). It seems, however, that the southern section of their territory was not included in Gilead. In Josh. xiii, 9-11, it is intimated that the "plain of Medeba" ("the Mishor" it is called, north of the Arnon, is not
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in Gilead; and when speaking of the cities of refuge.

Moses describes Bezer, which was given out of the tribe of Reuben, as being "in the wilderness, in the plain country" (i.e. "in the country of the Midianites"), whereas Ramoth is said to be in Gilead (Deut. iv, 45). This southern plateau was also called "the land of Jazer" (Num. xxxi, 1; 2 Sam. xxiv, 5; comp. also Josh. xiii, 16-25). The valley of Heshbon may therefore, in all probability, be the southern boundary of Gilead. Gilead thus extended from the parallel of the south end of the Sea of Galilee to that of the north end of the Dead Sea—about 60 miles; and its average breadth scarcely exceeded 20.

(b.) While such were the usual limits of Gilead, the northern boundary is wider seen in two or the parts of Scripture. Moses, for example, is said to have seen, from the top of Pisgah, "all the land of Gilead unto Dan" (Deut. xxxiv, 1); and in Judg. xx, 1, and Josh. xxi, 9, the name seems to comprehend the whole territory of the Israelites beyond the Jordan. A little attention shows that this is only a vague way of speaking, in common use everywhere.

(c.) The district corresponding to Gilead is now divided into two provinces, separated by the Jabbock. The section lying between the Jabbock and the Hieromax is now called Jebel Ajlun; while that to the south of the Jabbock is the modern province of Beika. One of the most conspicuous peaks in the mountain range still retains the ancient name, being called Jebel Jittad, "Mount Gilead." It is about seven miles south of the Jabbock, and commands a magnificent view over the whole Jordan valley and the mountains of Judah and Ephraim. It is probably the site of Ramath-Mizpeh of Josh. xiii, 26; and the "Mischeph of Gilead," from which Jephthah "passed over unto the children of Ammon" (Judg. xii, 29). The spot is admirably adapted for a gathering-place in time of invasion or war. The neighboring village of es-Salt occupies the site of the old "city of refuge" in Gad, Ramoth-Gilead (q. v.).

II. History.—The first notice we have of Gilead is in connection with the history of Jacob (Gen. xxxii, 21 sq.). That patriarch, having passed the Ephraimites, "set his face toward Gilead," he struck across the desert by the great fountain at Palmyra; then traversed the eastern part of the plain of Damascus, and the plateau of Bashan, and entered Gilead from the north-east. "In the Mount Gilead Alan overtook his baggage, and went down by the border of the whole district; for when they separated again, Jacob went on his way and arrived at Mahanaim, which must have been considerably north of the river Jabbock (Gen. xxxii, i, 2, 22). See JACOB.

Gilead is not mentioned again in the patriarchal history; but it is possibly this same region which is referred to under the name Ham (q. v.); and was inhabited by the gigantian Zuzim. The kings of the East who came to punish the rebellious "cities of the plain," first attacked the Rephaim in Ashteroth Karkain—I. e. in the country now called Haurân; then they advanced southwards against the "Zuzims in Ham;" and next against the Emim in Shaveh-Kiriatim, which was subsequently possessed by the Moabites (Gen. xiv, 5; Deut. ii, 9-19). See EMM; REPHAIM.

We hear nothing more of Gilead till the invasion of the country by the Israelites. One half of it was then in the hands of Sihon, king of the Amorites, who had a short time previously driven out the Moabites. One, king of Bashan, had the other section north of the Jabbok. The Israelites defeated the former at Jahaz, and the latter at Edrei, and took possession of Gilead and Bashan (Num. xxii, 28 sq.). The rich pasture-land of Gilead, with its shady forests and copious streams, attracted the attention of Reuben and Gad, who "had a very great multitude of cattle," and was allotted to them. The future history and habits of the tribes that occupied Gilead were greatly affected by the character of the country. Rich in flocks and herds, and now the lords of a fitting region, they retained, most unchanged, the nomad pastoral habits of their patriarchal ancestors. Like all Bedawin, they lived in a constant state of warfare, just as Jacob had predicted of Gad—"a troop shall plunder him, but he shall plunder at the last" (Gen. xlix, 19). The sons of Ishmael were subdued and incorporated in the time of Salim (1 Chron. v, 9 sq.), and the children of Ammon in the days of Jephthah and David (Judg. xi, 52 sq.; 2 Sam. x, 12 sq.). Their wandering tent life, and their almost inaccessible country, made them in ancient times what the Bedawin tribes are now—the protectors of the refugee and the outcast. The sons of Salim and the sons of Gad dwelt together while they vainly attempted to re-establish the authority of their house (2 Sam. ii, 8 sq.). Here, too, David found a sanctuary during the unnatural rebellion of a beloved son; and the surrounding tribes, with a characteristic hospitality, presented the best token to the fallen monarch (3 Sam. xvii, 22 sq.). Blishh the Tishbite was a Gileadite (1 Kings xvii, 1); and in his simple garb, wild aspect, abrupt address, wonderfully active habits, and movements so rapid as to evade the search of his watchful and bitter foes, we see the characteristics of the genuineness of the Bedawin, ennobled by a high prophetical mission. See GAD.

Gilead was a frontier land, exposed to the first attacks of the Syrian and Assyrian invaders, and to the unconquering raids of the desert tribes. But Machir, the first-born of Manasseh, was a man of war; therefore he and the Gadites and the Gileadites (Josh. xxii, 1 sq.) became the wild and wayward Jephthah, Misipeh of Gilead became the gathering-place of the trans-Jordanic tribes (Judg. xi, 29); and in subsequent times the neighboring stronghold of Ramoth-Gilead appears to have been considered the key of Palestine on the east (1 Kings xxi, 28; 12, 1). Under the Roman dominion the country became more settled and civilized; and the great cities of Gadara, Pella, and Gerasa, with Philadelphia on its south-eastern border, speedily rose to opulence and splendor. In one of these (Pella) the Christians of Jerusalem found a sanctuary when the armies of Titus gathered against the city (Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, V, 5). Under Mohammedan rule the country has again lapsed into semi-babarianism. Some scattered villages amid the fastnesses of Jebel Ajlun, and a few fierce wandering tribes, constitute the whole population of Gilead. They are nominally subject to the Porte, but their allegiance is lightly upon them. The inhabitants, like the old Gadites, are semi-nomads, whose wealth consists in flocks and herds. Like them, too, they are harassed by the desert tribes; they are inured to arms, and they are noted for their hospitality. The capital of the whole country is es-Salt (Burchard, Trav. in Syria, p. 276; Buckerbach, A. C. Trav. in Tribes, p. 21 sq.; Lord Lindsay's Travels, i, 108 sq.).

III. Description of modern Country.—The great body of the range of Gilead is Jura limestone, but there are occasional veins of sandstone. The oak and the terebinth flourish on the former, and the pine on the latter. The mountains of Gilead have a real elevation of from two to three thousand feet, but their apparent elevation on the western side is much greater, owing to the depression of the Jordan valley, which averages about 1000 feet. Their outline is singularly uniform, resembling a massive wall running along the horizon. From the distance, to the south, close to the border, on the side they meet the plateau of Arabia, 2000 feet or more in height. Though the range appears bleak from the distance, yet, on ascending it, we find the scenery rich, picturesque, and in places even grand. The summit is broad, almost like table-land "tossed into wild
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confusion of undulating downs" (Stanley, Sinaï and Pal. p. 314). It is everywhere covered with luxuriant herbage. In the extreme north and south there are no trees, as we advance towards the centres they soon begin to appear, at first singly, then in groups, and in length, each side of the valley, in forests, chasms, thickly prickly oak and terebinth. The rich pasture-land of Gilead presents a striking contrast to the nakedness of Western Palestine. Except among the hills of Galilee and along the heights of Carmel, there is nothing to be compared with it as a place for pasture (Neh. xxxii. 1) "The hills passing through the country, one can hardly get over the impression that he is roaming through an English park. The graceful hills, the rich vales, the luxuriant herbage, the bright wild flowers, the plantations of evergreen oak, pine, and arbutus; now a tangled thicket, and now a grove scattered over the gentle slope, as if intended to reveal its beauty; the little rivulets fringed with oleander, at one place running lazily between al- luvial banks, at another dashed madly down rocky ravines. Such are the features of the mountains of Gilead. Here, too, we have the cooing of the wood-pigeon, the trilling call of the passerine, the pleasant hum of myriads of insects, and the cheerful chirp of grasshoppers to give life to the scene. Add to all the crumbling ruins of town, village, and fortress, clinging to the mountain-side or crowning its summit, and you have a picture too rich for the imagination. No doubt it was the poet's true effect when he described the abode of Gerasa" (Porter, Handbook for S. and P. p. 310). Such a picture, too, illustrates at once the fertility ascribed to it by Jeremiah (xxii. 6; i. 19), and the judgments pronounced against it by Amos (i. 8, 13).

Gilead anciently abounded in spices and aromatic gums, which were exported to Egypt (Gen. xxxvii. 25; Jer. viii. 22; xli. 11). The balm of Gilead seems to have been valued for its medicinal properties from the earliest times. The Midianish merchants to whom Joseph was sold were passing through the valley of Jerseel on their way from Gilead to Egypt (Gen. xxxvi. 17). Josephus often mentions, as if balm, or balsam, but generally as the product of the rich plain of Jericho, for example (Ant. xiv. 4): "When Pompey had pitched his camp at Jericho (where the palm-tree grows, and that balsam which is an ointment of all the most precious, which upon any incision bares the wood of the partridge, as it were an ambrosic substance, as if with a knife, he marched in the morning to Jerusalem." Dr. Thomson found in the plain of Jericho some thorn-bushes called the saxum, "which is like the crab apple-tree, and bears a small nut, from which a kind of liquid balsam is made, and sold by the monks as a sort of oil, so famous in ancient times, and it is supposed that the balm which Jacob sent to Joseph (Gen. xlvii, 11), and that which Jeremiah (viii. 22) refers to in his medicinal qualities, were the same which the trading Ishmaelites were transporting to Egypt, and that it was some resinous extract from the forest trees of Gilead" (v. in and Book, ii, 192, 194). See below.

GILEAD, BALM OF. Our English word balm, and its French equivalent baume, are the contracted forms of balasam, a word (βαλασάμων) which the Greeks have adopted from the Hebrew words בַּלַש-ם and תַלְשׁ, lord or chief of oils. In ordinary language the word is used very loosely, but here we are only concerned with the substance to which the English translation of the Bible has given this name. As early as the days of Jacob the district of Gilead yielded aromatic substances which were in great request. After casting Joseph into a pit, we are told that his brothers espied a caravan on its way from Gilead to Egypt, "with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh" (Gen. xxxvii. 25). Afterwards, when Jacob dispatched his embassy into Egypt, it is said they brought him "the balasam" (Gen. xlii. 11); and at an interval of more than 1000 years later we find that the same region was celebrated for the same production, for we find Jeremiah asking, "Is there no balm in Gilead? or from an expression in the prophet Ezekiel we find still later that balm was one of the precious stones which the merchants carried to the market of Tyre (Ezek. xxv. 17). In all these passages the original word is צְרִי, tosr. During the interval, however, between Jacob and Jeremiah, we are told by Josephus that the queen of Shaba brought "the root of the balasam" as a present to Solomon (Ant. vii. 6, 6); and there can be no doubt that, in the later days of Jewish history, the neighborhood of Jericho was the only place in the country where true balsam grew, and even there its culture was confined to two gardens, the one twenty acres in extent, the other much smaller (Theophrastus).

Many attempts have been made by different writers to identify the tosr, not one of which, however, can be considered altogether conclusive. The Syrian version in Jer. viii. 22, and the Samaritan in Gen. xxxvii, 25, suppose cera, "wax," to be meant; others, as the Arabic version in the passages cited in Genesis, conjecture theriac, a medical compound of great supposed virtue in serpent bites. Of the same opinion is Castell (Lex. Hier. s. v. **22). Luther and the Swedish version have "salve," or "ointment," in the passages in Genesis, but in Ezekiel, as also in Jeremiah, they make it "mastic." The Jewish Rabbinus, Junius and Tremellius, Deodatus, etc., have "balm" or "balasam," as the A. V.; Celsius (Hier. ii. 180) identifies the tosr with the mastic-tree (Pistacia lentiscus). Rosenmüller (Bibl. Bot. p. 160) believes that the pressed juice of the fruit of the saum-tree (Elonacus cyprius folius; Lin. [??], or narrow-leaved oleaster, is the substance denoted; but the same author, in another place (Schoel. in Gen. xxxvii. 25), mentions the balsam of Mecca (Amyris obolesi zamam, Lin.), referred to by Strabo (xvi. p. 778) and Dioscorides Sicilus (ii. 132) as being probably the tosr (see Kitiyo, Phys. Hist. lib. Pal. p. 373; Hasselquist, Travels, p. 293).

Hasselquist has given a description of the true balasam-tree of Mecca. He says that the exudation from the plant "is of a yellow color, and may be said to have a most fragrant smell, which is resiny, balsamic, and very agreeable. It is very tenacious or glutinous, sticking to the fingers, and may be drawn into long threads. I have seen it at a Turkish surgeon's, who had it immediately from Mecca, described it, and was informed of its virtues; which are, first, that it is the best stomachic we know of; if taken in moderate doses, it strengthens a weak stomach; secondly, that it is a most excellent and capital remedy for curing wounds, for if a few drops are applied to the fresh wound it cures it in a very short time" (Travels, p. 293).

The trees which certainly appear to have the best claim for representing the scriptural tosr—supposing, that is, that any one particular tree is denoted by the term—are the Pistacia lentiscus (mastic) and the Amyris obolesi zamam, Linneus, the Balsamodendron obolesi zamam, or Gileadense of modern botanists (Balm of Gilead). One argument in favor of the first-named tree rests upon the fact that its name in Arabic (diarrac, đarrâ) is identical with the Hebrew; and the Arabian naturalists have attributed great medicinal virtues to the resin afforded by this tree (Diocides, i, 90, 91; Pliny, xxiv, 7; Avicenna, ed. Arab. p. 204 and 277, in Celsius). The Pistacia lentiscus has been recorded to occur at Joppa, both by Psalms and Josephus (Strand. Flor. Palmt. No. 561). The derivation of the word from a root, "to flow forth," is opposed to the theory which identifies the pressed oil of the saum with the tosr, although this oil is in very high esteem among the Arabs, who even prefer it to the balm of Mecca, as well as to that of the tosr (see Marrit, ii, 353, ed. London). Maundrell (Journey.
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from Alep. to Jerusa. p. 86), when near the Dead Sea, saw the zizam-tree. He says it is a thorny bush with small leaves, and that "the fruit, both in shape and color, resembles a small unripe walnut. The kernels of this fruit the Arabs bury in a mortar, and then, putting the pulp into scalding water, they skim off the oil which rises to the top: this oil they take invari-ably for bruises, and apply it outwardly to lessen wounds. . . . I procured a bottle of it, and have found it upon some small trials a very healing medicine." "This," says Dr. Robinson (Bib. Rel. ii, 291), "is the modern balsam or oil of Jericho." From Maundrell's description of the amber Dr. Hooker unhesitatingly identifies it with Aeginaerargyritis, which he found abund-antly at Jericho (Kew Garden Misc. i, 257).

In the region of Gilead, the only production now which has any affinity to balm or balsam is a species of Elaeagnus, from the kernels of which a balsamic oil is extracted (Journal of Deputation of Malta Protestant College, p. 400); and even the balsam gardens of Jericho have perished and left no trace. There is little reason, however, to doubt that the plants with which they were stocked were the Amyris Gilodensis, or A. opobalsamum, which was found by Bruce in Abyssinia, the fragrant resin of which is known in commerce as the "balsam of Mecca." Like most plants yielding gum or gum-resin, the amyris requires a high tempera-ture to elaborate its peculiar principle in perfection; and in the deeply depressed and sultry valley of the Jordan it would find a climate almost as congenial as that of Yemen, where we find it now. Nor is it impossible that there may have existed in Gilead at an early period a plantation of the same amyris; but, yielding to the superior qualities of the queen of Sheba's newly-imported specimens, the growth of Gilead may have become obsolete, and bequeathed its name and honors to its more favored rival. The Amyris Gilodensis is an evergreen shrub or tree, belonging to the natural order Amyridaceae. Its height is about fourteen feet, with a trunk eight or ten inches in di-ameter. The wood is light and open, and the small ter standing some time, it becomes pellucid, and deepens to an almost golden color. With its pleasant appearance, its aromatic odor, and its great rarity—being worth twice its weight in silver—it has always been highly valued in the East as a remedy. It is consid-ered very efficacious in the cure of wounds, and the Egyptians esteem it as a preventive of the plague. As a valuable incense, it is, indeed, mentioned in the 25th chapter of Jeremiah (ch. viii. 22); and, could it be procured as easily as the balsams of Peru and Tolu, it is likely that it would find a place in European pharmacy. In de-scribing Palestine, Tacitus says that in all its produc-tions it equals Italy; besides possessing the palm and the balsam (Hist. v. 6); and the famed tree excised the cupididity of successive invaders. By Pompey it was exhibited in the streets of Rome as one of the spoils of the newly-conquered province, B.C. 66; and one of the wonderful trees graced the triumph of Ves-pasian, A.D. 79. During the invasion of Titus, two battles took place at the balsam groves of Jericho, the last being to prevent the Jews in their despairing frenzy from destroying the trees. They then be-came public property, and were placed under the protec-tion of an imperial guard; but history does not record how long the two plantations survived. See BALM.

2. Possibly the name of a mountain west of the Jor-dan, near Jerseel (Judg. vii. 3). Michaeilis and others are inclined to agree with the suggestion of Clericus (ad loc.), that the true reading in this place should be "Gilead, the mountain of Gilead," and that the "mountain of Gilead" was encamped at the "spring of Harod," which is at the base of Mount Gilboa. Gesenius, however, thinks (Theaesaur. Hebr. p. 804) that the passage merely implies that all those who should not feel inclined to prosecute the war against the Midianites farther than the mountain from which the latter had emerged, were at liberty to return home ("גניב, "per montem"). A better solution, how-ever, is that suggested by Schwarz (Pulvel. p. 164, note), that the northernmost spur of Mt. Gilboa was also call-ed Gilead; and this is confirmed by the actual exis-tence of the name Jaldob to this day in this spot. See Harod.

3. A city of this name is apparently mentioned Hos. vi. 8 (comp. Sept. Judg. xii. 7); so, at least, it is given in most of the ancient and modern versions, though the meaning may only be that Gilead is (like) a city full of iniquity, i.e. a union of iniquitous people. This city (if one be meant) is perhaps the same with Ramoth-Gilead.

4. The son of Machir (apparently by Maachah), and grandson of Manasseh; his descendants bore his name as a patronymic (Num. xxxvi. 29, 30). B.C. prob. be-tween 1874 and 1658.

5. The father of Jephthah the judge, a descendant of the above (Judg. xi. 2). B.C. ante 1236. It is not clear, however (comp. ver. 7, 8), whether this Gil-ead was an individual, or a personification of the community.


Gileadite (Hebrew prop. Gilodite, "Gilead,", Sept. גלדאי or גלדנָי; but often the same as Gilead simply), a descendant of one of the men, or an inhabi-tant of the region called Gilead (Num. xxxvi. 29; Judg. x. 3; xi. 10; xii. 7; 2 Sam. xvii. 27; xix. 31; 1 Kings ii. 7; 2 Kings xv. 25; Ezra ii. 51; Neh. vii. 68), or perhaps of the tribe of Manas-sheh, descended from Gilead. There appears to have been an old standing feud between them and the Ephraimites, who taunted them with being deserters. See Judg. xii. 4, which may be rendered, "And the men of Gilead smote Ephraim, because they said, On-sagites of the west are ye (Gilead is between Ephraim and Manasseh)."

"Balm of Gilead" (Amyris Gilodensis), with enlarged view of the Flower and Fruits, and section of the latter.

and scanty leaves resemble rice. After the dog-days, when the circulation of the sap is most vigorous, incisions are made into the bark, and the balsam is re-ceived in small earthen bottles. The supply is very scanty. Three or four drops exude in a day through a single orifice, and the entire amount yielded by the gardens of Jericho did not exceed six or seven gallons a year.

and the balsam is of a whitish tinge, inclining to yellow, and somewhat turbid, and its odor is almost as pungent as volatile salts; but, af-
Gilgal, Sr. (Lat. Auglia; Fr. Gilles; Span. Gil), patron saint of woodlands, also of Edinburgh. The Roman Catholic Church has set apart Sept. 1 for the commemoration of a saint of this name, though it is doubtful whether such a person ever lived. The hagiographers describe two such persons; the first an Athenian of the 6th century, who wrought various miracles, and finally took up his abode in a cave near the mouth of the Rhone, living upon the milk of a hind, and upon herbs and fruits. The king's hunters once wounded the hind, and the arrow also passed through the hand of St. Gilles (who, as an attribute, in legendary art, is a wounded hind). He died in his cave, and the noble monastery of St. Gilles was erected near the spot. The other claimant to the name of St. Gilles was abbot of a monastery near Arles in the 6th century. The first legend, as the more striking and poetical one, is naturally the most popular. St. Gilles has been especially venerated in England and Scotland. In spite of the Reformation, the name of this legendary saint is still retained in the English calendar.—A. Butler, Lives of Saints, Sept. 1; Mrs. Jamieson, Legends of the Monastic Orders, p. 26.

Gil'gal (Heb. Gilgâl), הִלְגַּל, a wheel, as in Isa. xxviii, 26; according to Josh. v, 9, a rolling away; with the article a prop. name, Sept. רֵוי פַּלַיָּה, but Tókây v. r. Pokây (in Deut. xi, 30 and Josh. xiv, 5), the name of at least two places in Palestine.

1. The site of the first camp of the Israelites on the west of the Jordan, the place at which they passed the first night after crossing the river, and where the twelve stones were set up which had been taken from the bed of the stream (Josh. iv, 19, 30; comp. 8) [see Stone].

2. Where also they kept their first passover in the land of Canaan (v, 10). It was in the "end of the east of Jericho" (בַּנֵי יְרוּשָׁלָיָם; A. V. "in the east border of Jericho"), apparently on a hilltop or rising ground (v, 8; compare 9) in the Arboth-Jericho (A. V. "the plains"), that is, the hot, depressed district of the Ghôr which lay between the town and the Jordan (v, 10). Here the Israelites who had been born on the march through the wilderness were circumcised, an occurrence from which the sacred historian derives the name: "This day I have rolled away (גִּלַּל) the reproach of Egypt from off you." The present of the place is called Gilgal to this day.

The meaning does not seem to be that a new name was given, but rather that a new meaning and significance were attached to the old name. The word Gilgal means a "circle," and also a "rolling away." A similar play upon a word was noticed in the case of Gilgal: and Bethel is an example of an old name having attached to it a new significance (Gen. xxviii, 19; xxxi, 15). By Josephus (Ant. v, 1, 11) it is said to signify "freedom" (ἄλεθινος). It would appear that Gilgal was the name of the place before the Exodus, for Moses describes the Canaanites as dwelling "over against Gilgal" (Deut. xi, 30). The difficulties connected with this passage have already been explained under EMAL.

Kell supposes that this Gilgal was near Shechem (Comm. on Josh. p. 219, 223). The camp thus established at Gilgal remained there during the early part of the conquest (Josh. ix, 6; x, 6, 7, 9, 15, 43); and we may probably infer from one narrative that Joshua retired thither at the conclusion of his labours (xix, 6; comp. x, 10). Some fifteen years later, from the highlands by the Philistines, collected his feeble force at the site of the old camp (1 Sam. xiii, 4, 7). The tabernacle appears to have remained there at least until its removal to Shiloh (Judg. xviii, 1). It was one of the places to which Samuel regularly resorted, where he administered justice (1 Sam. vii, 17), and where burn-offerings and peace-offerings were accustomed to be offered "before Jehovah" (x, 8; xi, 15; xiii, 8, 9-12; xv, 21); and on one occasion a sacrifice of a more terrible description than either (xv, 33). The air of the site is arid; through all ages the conclusion that at the time of these occurrences it was the chief sanctuary of the central portion of the nation (see x, 8; xi, 14; xv, 12, 21). But there is no sign of its being a town; no mention of building, or of its being allotted to the priests or Levites, as was the case with other not in towns, Bethel, Shechem, etc.

In the history of David's return to Jerusalem (2 Sam. xix), the men of Judah came down to Gilgal to meet the king to conduct him over Jordan, as if it were close to the river (xix, 10), and David arrived there immediately on crossing the stream after his parting with Barzillai the Gileadite (xix, 14, 40). After the foundation of the Temple, Gilgal appears to have been utterly neglected. Perhaps, when Jericho was rebuilt, the traditional sanctity of Gilgal was transferred to it, and there a school of the prophets was established and remained until a later period (2 Kings ii, 3). See Jerusalem.

How Gilgal became appropriated to a false worship we are not told, but certainly, as far as the obscure allusions of Hosea and Amos can be understood (provided they refer to this Gilgal), it was so appropriated by the kingdom of Israel in the middle period of its history (Hos. i, 15; ix, 15, 9; x, 5). These idolatrous practices are specially mentioned by Eiphanius and others (Reland, Palæst. p. 732 sq.).

The utter desolation of its site, and the whole surrounding region, shows how fearfully the prophecies have been fulfilled.

The place is not mentioned in the Apocalypse nor the N. T. Later authorities are more precise, but unfortunately discordant among themselves. By Josephus (Ant. vi, 1, 4) the encampment is given as fifty stadia, rather under six miles, from the river, and ten from Jericho. In the time of Jerome the site of the camp and the twelve memorial stones was still sufficiently distinguishable, if we are to take literally the expression of the Epist. Pauli (§ 12). The distance from Jericho was then two miles. According to Eusebius, the spot (Γαλαγῶν) was left uncultivated, but regarded with great veneration by the residents (Onomast. s. v. Γαλαγῶν).

When Arcul was there at the end of the 7th century, the place was shown at five miles from Jericho. A large church covered the site, in which the twelve stones were ranged (Early Travels in Pal. p. 7). It is probable, however, that the ecclesiastical architects had not been very particular about their sites (Robinson, Research, ii, 257). The church and stones were seen by Willibald thirty years later, but he gives the distance as five miles from the Jordan, which again he states correctly as seven from Jericho. The stones are mentioned also by Thietmar, A.D. 1217 (according to whom John the Baptist was born here, in 1796); and he said that God was "able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (Peregr. 81); and, lastly, by Ludolf de Suchem a century later. These specifications show that Gilgal must have been near the site of the modern village of Riha (Porter, Handbook for Sinai and Palestine, p. 190). See Framlingham, a spot named Alcorah, a little south-east of er-Riha, is marked as probable. Schwartzes...
(Physical Description of Palestine, p. 128) asserts that there is at present found near the Jordan in this vicinity a hill, which appears like a heap of stones, and is called Gilead; but this last confirmation is probably this Gilgal that is called Gilead. In Joshua, xviii. 17, where, as well as in the parallel passage, xvi. 7, the position is given with more minuteness than elsewhere.

2. A royal city of the Gileadites, whose sovereign ("king of the nations of Gilgal") or, rather, perhaps the "king of Gilgal-at-Gilgal," is mentioned in the catalogue of the chiefs overthrown by Joshua (Josh. xii. 23), appears to have been situated on the western plain, as it is connected with the "region of Dor" (verse 22). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Γαλγαλι) say that it was in their time that Elisha reconstituted the temple (2 Kings, iv, 5), about six Roman miles north of Antipatris (Keft Saba); and this is probably the present ruined village Nijjilich of the same neighborhood (Robinson, Researches, iii, 47; Schwartz, Palest. p. 92), although this is only two miles from Keft Saba, and east-south-east (E. Smith, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1843, p. 492), rather than the Kiltich, about two miles east of Keft Saba (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 136, 138).

The Gilah, or original inhabitants of this place, evidently were in some distinctive sense heathen (q. v.). By that word (Judg. iv. 2) or the name Galgal (Gen. xiv. 1, etc.) it is generally rendered in the A. V.; and as in the well-known phrase, "Galilee of the nations" (Isa. i, 1; comp. Matt. iv. 15). Possibly they were a tribe of the early inhabitants of the country, who, like the Gerizites, the Avim, the Zemarites, and others, have left only a faint, casual trace of their existence there (Smith, s. v.). See GALILEE.

3. A town, evidently in the mountainous interior, wherein Eliphaz and Elisha are said to have gone down to Bethel (2 Kings ii, 2), which is itself 3000 feet above the Gilgal in the Jordan valley. It was perhaps here that Jericho was passed (2 Kings, iv, 38); he may even have resided here (2 Kings ii, 1; iv, 8). It lay in the vicinity of Baal-sheanah (2 Kings iv, 42). This is probably the Beth-Gilgal (A. V., "house of Gilgal") mentioned (Neh. xii, 29) as occupied by the Levitical singers after the exile; and it is evidently also the Galala (Γαλαλιας) on the route of the victorious Bacchides (1 Macc. ix, 3). See GALALA.

Kell (Comment. on Josh. p. 219, 292) and Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 315), after Winer (s. v.), unnecessarily identify this with the Gilgal of Joshua's camp, etc. It is doubtless the Galala (Γαλαλιας) stated by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v.) to be located near Bethel; and is the large village Nijjilich, one hour west of Sinijil, on the road from Jerusalem to Nablis, situated so high on the brow of the central mountain tract as to afford an extensive view of the great lower plain and the sea, and even a view of Mount Hermon (Robinson, Researches, iii, 81).

Gill, Alexander, an English philologist and theologian, was born in Lincolnshire Feb. 27, 1564. He studied and graduated in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1588 he became principal of St. Paul's school, which post he filled until his death, Nov. 17, 1685. He gained much reputation as a philologist and theological critic by his Treatise concerning the Trinity (1601, 8vo); Logomarion Anglice (1621, 4to); Sacred Philosophy of Holy Scripture, or a Commentary on the Creed (1630, 8vo). See Wood, Athene Oxoniensis, vol. i (London, 1621, 2 vols. fol.); Hoeffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xii, 521; Bright, Life of Cotet; Allibone, Dict. of Auth., i, 671.

Gill, John D., an eminent Biblical scholar, was born at Kettering, England, Nov. 29, 1697. He received his education at the grammar-school in his native town. But the tuition of the school was only one of the means of education that he availed himself of. "As sure as that John Gill is in the bookseller's shop, became a proverbial expression. He left school and began preaching at the age of nineteen, and was called to the pastorate successively in Leominster, Hightown, Fellers and Kettering. In 1719 he was settled at Horsleydown, Southwark, where he ministered for fifty-one years. He died Oct. 14, 1771. Short as was his term of preparatory study, he must have laid a good foundation, and have been diligent in his subsequent studies. He made himself a competent Latin and Greek scholar, and a learned Orientalist. His Rabbinical studies were extensive and profound. The fruits of his learning are chiefly deposited in his commentary, a work valuable to consult, but so heavy and prolix in style as to repel any but very courageous readers. He was a voluminous author. For a time he exerted a commanding influence in his own denomination, and enjoyed high consideration with the religious public generally. In theology he was a Calvinist of the Supralapsarian type, and his peculiar doctrine concerning the relation of Christians to the law of God occasioned, though it scarcely justified, the charge of Antinomianism. His principal writings are, 1. Exposition of the Song of Solomon; 2. Specimens respecting the Messian fulfilled in Jesus; 3. The Cause of God and Truth, being an examination of the several passages of Scripture made use of by the Arminians (4 vols. 8vo, London, 1733); 4. The Exposition of the Old Testament (8 vols.); 5. Exposition of the Old Testament (8 vols.); 6. Dissertation on the Antiquity of the Hebrew Language, Letters, Vowel Points, and Accents; 7. A Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity; 8. Sermons and Tracts. He also wrote several tracts on Baptism, one of which, entitled Infant Baptism a Part and Pillar of Popery, has been republished in America. His Body of Divinity has also had some circulation in this country, and has been abridged. He received the degree of Doctor of divinity from the University of Glasgow (c. E. S.).

Gill, William, one of the early Methodist ministers in America, was born in Delaware, Nov. 28, 1697. He entered the itinerant ministry in 1777, filled a number of important stations successfully, and died Oct. 14, 1789. He was a man "of very quick and solid parts," and, although he had not enjoyed great advantages of early education, he became so skilled in theology that Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia, pronounced him "the greatest divine he ever heard." Minutes of Conference, i, 33; Wakeley, Heroes of Methodism, p. 199.

Gilles (Colonna). See EODIUS, vol. i, p. 89.

Gilles de Vitribo. See EUGANDO ANTONTI.

Gilles, Pierre, a pastor of the Vaudois Church at La Tour, was born in one of the valleys of Piedmont in 1571. He was appointed to collect and arrange all the documents he could find on the origin, history, beliefs, and religious customs of the Vaudois. He devoted his entire life to this work, which he published at the age of seventy-two. The title is Histoire ecclésiastique des églises reformées recueillies en quelques vallées du Piémont et circonscriptions, autrefois appellees églises Vaudoises (Genève, 1644, 4to). - Hoeffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx, 544.

Gillespie, George, minister at Edinburgh, was born January 21, 1613. He was one of the four sent as commissioners from the Church of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly in 1648. He died Dec. 17, 1648. He wrote (1) Aaron's Red blooming, or the divine Ordinance of Church Government vindicated (London, 1616, 4to); (2) The Ark of the Testament opened; a Treatise of the Church of Scotland (London, 1611, 57 vols. 4to); besides other smaller treatises. A new edition of his entire works, edited by Hetherington, was published at Edinburgh in 1846 (2 vols. 8vo), with a memoir of his life. - Darling, Cyclopa. Bibl., i, 1288; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 671.
Gillies, John, a Scotch divine, was born in 1712, ordained minister of the Calv. Church in Glasgow in 1742, and continued to labour there until his death in 1796. His works are, *Historical Collections relating to remarkable Periods of the Success of the Gospel,* etc. (Glasg. 1754, 2 vols. 8vo.);—*The N. T., with devotional Reflectors* (London, new ed. 1810, 2 vols. 8vo.);—*Hints to Ministers* (2nd and 3rd editions republished);—*Essay on the Messianic Prophecies* (London, 1778, 8vo.).

Two supplements to the *Historical Collections* appeared in 1761 and 1796; and a new edition of the original work, with the two supplements and an additional one by El. Bonar, appeared at Kelso, 1845, 6vo. —Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. i. 1290; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 672.

Gillies, John, LL.D., was born at Brechin, Scotland, Jan. 18, 1747, and was educated at the University of Glasgow. In 1778 he became historiographer royal for Scotland; in 1808 he removed to Clapham, near London, where he died, Feb. 13, 1806. He wrote several historical works, now of little value, and translated several Greek authors, among them Aristotle (Ethics, Politics, Rhetoric), very badly.

Gilly, David, a Protestant divine who became a Roman Catholic, was born at Niamas in 1648. He studied at Niamas, Montauban, and Saumur, and was appointed tutor at Baugs. His life was quiet and studious until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when, to save himself from the dragonades, he abjured his faith, and allied himself with the Roman Catholics. The Protestants ordered public fasts to avert the wrath of God on account of this apostasy, but the king gave Gilly a pension of 1000 livres, which was increased by the clergy 400 livres more. He was sent to Langue- doc by the court to preach against his old faith, and afterwards was brought to Paris to confirm the newly converted in their faith. He died at Angers Dec. 27, 1711.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx. 557.

Gilly, William Stephen, D.D., a pious and exemplary English clergyman, and patron of the Vaudois Christians. He was born in 1789, and educated at Cambridge, where he passed A. B. in 1812, A. M. in 1817, and D. D. in 1833. In 1817 he became rector of North Farmbridge, Essex. In 1825 he became a canon of Durham and rector of St. Margaret's in that city. He died Sept. 10, 1855. In the year 1829 Dr. Gilly paid his first visit to the Vaudois Christians, which has been attended with such important results, not only to himself, but likewise to that interesting people, who for so many centuries have maintained their independence against all the power and persecution of papal Rome. The following year he published a vol. 8vo. entitled *A Narrative of an Excursion to the Mountains of Piedmont in the Year 1828, and Researches among the Vaudois, or Waldenses, Protestant Inhabitants of the Cottian Alps.* This work attracted great attention, and the interest it produced was shown by its reaching a fourth edition in less than three years. A fund of over £7000 was raised, and devoted, in part to the maintenance of a college and library at La Tour, in Piedmont. Dr. Gilly ceased his labors on behalf of the Vaudois only with his life. See Va- dois. His works are, among others, published the *Spirit of the Gospel,* or the *Four Evangelists elucidated* (Lond. 1818, 8vo.):—Horsa Catachetica, or an *Exposition of the Duty and Advantages of Public Cathexis in the Church* (Lond. 1828, 8vo.):—Waldensian Researches, a *second Visit to the Vaudois* (Lond. 1831, 8vo.):—*A Monograph on the Life of Friz. Nфф.* (Lond. 1832, 8vo.);—*Travels and of his Labors among the French Protestants of Dauphine* (Lond. 1832, 8vo.):—*Our Protestant Forfathers* (London, 1885, 12mo: twelve editions before 1844):—*Vigilantissima et His Times* (London, 1844, 8vo.):—*Gentleman's Magazine* Oct. 1830: Quar. Rev. xxiii. 194.

Gilman, Samuel, D.D., an eminent Unitarian minister, was born in Gloucester, Mass., Feb. 16, 1791, and graduated at Harvard College in 1811. From 1817 to 1819 he was connected with Dartmouth College as tutor. In the year last named he accepted an invitation of the Unitarian church at Charleston, S. C., and was soon afterwards ordained. He continued to serve that church with great popularity up to the year of his death, which took place Feb. 9, 1868. He was a frequent contributor to the *New Englander,* of which he was a founder; and his papers showed a wide range of scholarship, as well as great skill in execution. A number of his essays, etc., are collected in his *Contributions to Literature* (Boston, 1856, 12mo). See *Monthly Religious Magazine* (Boston, 1856): Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* i. 674; *New American Cyclopedia,* viii. 395.

G'loh (Heb. *Gilo*), 575a, *exile* [Gesenius] or *circle* [*Farrar*]; Sept. in Josh. *Gile* v. r. *Gilem* and *Gilem,* in Sam. *Gile* v. r. *Gilo,* the last named (after Goshen and Holon) in the first group of eleven cities in the south-western part (Kell, Josh. p. 384) of the hill-country of the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 51); and afterwards the native place or residence of Ahihophel (hence called "the Gilonite" [q. v.], 2 Sam. xv. 12, xxiii. 8), whence Absalom, on his way from Jerusa- lem to Hebron, summoned him (perhaps from a temporary banishment or disgrace at court) to join his rebellious standard (2 Sam. xv. 12), and whither he returned to commit suicide on the failure of his colleagues to adopt his seditious counsels (2 Sam. xvii. 20). Josephus calls it Gilion (Γηλώνιον, Ant. B.C. 170, 2, 10). De Saucley (*Dead Sea,* 1, 463) and Schwartz (*Palet.* p. 105) both make it to be the modern Beit-Jala, near Bethlehem; but this is rather the ancient Zelah or Zezah (q. v.), and the scriptural notices require a different position, perhaps at Beth, a village with extensive ruins one hour twenty minutes south of Hebron (Van de Velde, *Memoir,* p. 252).

G'lonite (Heb. with the art. *ang-Giloom,* 8477, 8478; Sept. *Gileumoc,* 2 Sam. xv. 12, or 8477, Sept. *Gileumoc,* 2 Sam. xxiii. 84), an epitaph of the traitor Ahihophel (q. v.), doubtless from his city Gilon (q. v.).

Glipin, Bernard, called the apostle of the North, an eminent English reformer and itinerant preacher, was born at Kentmire, in Westmoreland, in 1517. At sixteen he was sent to Queen's College, Oxford, where he stimulated the works of Erasmus and the beginings of the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek his chief study. In 1541 he became M.A., and about the same time was elected fellow of his college, and ordained. His reputation for learning soon after led to his being solicited by cardinal Wolsey's agent, to accept an establishment in his household, but Dr. Chipman's father, who authorized him to return, he removed from Queen's College. The university was divided between those who asserted the necessity of a reformation and those who resisted it. Gilpin was for some time opposed to the reformers, maintaining the Romish side in a dispute with Hooper, afterwards bishop of Worcester. But his mind was open to conversion, and in preparing himself for this dispute, he began to suspect that the peculiarities of Ro- manism were not supported by Scripture or by the fathers. This truth was still further forced upon him when, on the accession of Edward VI, Peter Martyr was sent to Oxford, and Bernard Gilpin was selected as one of the champions on the Romish side to oppose him. The result was that he embraced the Reforma- tion. In 1532 he was made vicar of Norton, and in the same year obtained from Edward VI a license as "general scholar," which authorized him to preach in any diocese. He resigned his living soon after, and went to Louvain, where the priests sought in vain to reclaim him to Romanism. He returned to England in 1556, and found the Church oppressed and persecu- ted by queen Mary with blood and fire. His uncle, bishop Townall, gave him the living of Easington, and
pin, was born at Carlisle, 1744. He became master of the school at Chasem, in Surrey; afterwards vicar of Bolder, and prebendary of Salisbury. He died at Bolder, April 5, 1804. Among his numerous publications are, An Exposition of the N. T. intended as an Introduction to the reading of the Scriptures (Lond. 1811, 2 vols. 8vo); Sermon on the Day of the Rectory (Lond. 1809, 2 vols. 8vo); —Sermone a Country Congregation (Lond. 1802-5, 4 vols. 8vo); —Life of Bernard Gipdin (Glasg. 1824, 12mo, new ed.).- Lectures on the Church Catechism (Lond. 1779, 2 vols. 8vo); —Observations on Picturesque Beauties (1790, 2 vols. 8vo); —Moral Contrasts (Lond. 1798, 2 vols. 8vo); —Desips. Bibliogr. s. v.; Rose, New Gen. Biol. Dic. viii., 30.

Gills, Antonius Van, D.D., was born July 29, 1758, at Tilburg. His parents were Roman Catholics. He graduated at Louvain with high honors. In 1788 he received spiritual consecration at Antwerp. After this he was appointed to give instructions in theology, and in 1795 he received his licentiate in theology. Not approving the changes made in the University of Louvain by order of the emperor Joseph II, he resigned his position there, and in 1786 was made chaplain at Eindhoven. From December, 1786, to April, 1790, he labored zealously among the Reformed Church at Houtenbeek. He returned to Louvain in 1790 to Louvain, where he was made president of the College of Maider and canon of St. Peter. In November of the same year he was taken prisoner by the Austrian troops, and conveyed to Mechlin. Released from confinement, he defended the liberty of the city before the French, and took the lead in the regulation of Belgian affairs. In 1791 he was appointed professor, and in 1794 was promoted to the degree of doctor of theology. The French, making themselves masters of Louvain soon after, conveyed him and other professors to prison. On his return to Louvain he composed the reply to the magistrates of the city, declining, on the part of himself and his colleagues, to attend the opening of the temple of reason. From 1795 to 1813 he experienced various fortunes, being sometimes imprisoned, and for most of the time an exile. After the overthrow of Napoleon he again stood at the head of the University of Louvain. He died at the university June 10, 1884. His principal works are, De twee coëns: Eenzame ammurenpreken over de religiënkaam van destem tijd (Leu. 1796, 12mo); —Mouf de concéense die emphëts de ministrés de culte (1794); —Provolat de frater cathólicos de ferbra le déclaration ençs par la lou de 7 Vend. om. IV (Leu. 1797; this was also translated into Flemish): —De gronden van het Christen-cath. geloof, tegemener de gronden der philosophie (s’ Hertogenb. 1800); —Analyse épistolarii B. Pauli apostoli ad uram seminarii Syden-Ducenas (Louv. 1815, 3 vols. 12mo); —See Glaubis, Godsdienst Nederl. Nederl. 4, 677 et seq.; and also F. V. Gotha, Lectures relatives à l’histoire des sciences, des arts, des mœurs, et de la politique en Bel- gique, etc., ii. 298 suiv. (J. P. W.)

Gimzo (Heb. Gimzo), הִימֹז, a place fertile in oye- amores; Sept. Γύμνους v. Γύμναμου, a city in the plain of the kingdom of Judah, mentioned in connection with Timnah, and taken, with its dependent villages (Heb. doughs), by the Philistines in the time of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii., 18); now Jimsa, a common and rather large village, on an eminence, on the south side of the road, about an hour south-east of Ludd (Lydda or Ramleh); with many threshing-floors and ancient cisterns used as magazines for grain (Robinson’s Residences, iii. 56). It is mentioned in the Tal- mud (Schwarz, Palest., p. 186).

Gin, an old English word for trop, stands as the rendering of two Hebrew words in certain passages: פֶּן-מַרְחָק, a noise or “maré” (as elsewhere rendered), Psa. cxix. 5; cxix. 9; Amos iii. 5; and מִיתָכָה, lit. a plate or thin layer, hence a net or trop, Sept.
GINA • GIOBERTI

GIOBERTI (Nello), a brook or winter-stream (Nellus-mentioned in the Talmud as being not far from En Gammim (q. v.) (Schwarz, Palest. p. 52).

G'нат (Heb. Hà'נת), ג"נת, a garden (Genesis) or protection (Purim); Sept. Γάνα v. r. Γάνάνα, the father of Tobi (q. v.), king of the northern tribes of Israel (1 Kings xxvi, 21, 22). B.C. ante 926.

Gin'netho (Heb. Gīn netḥo, יגננת, Sept. Γίνέον, Vulg. Genovum), a corrupt reading (Neh. xii, 4) for the name Ginnetехал (q. v.)

Gin'netho (Heb. Gīn netḥo, יגננת, garden or garden land; Sept. Γίνεον, Vulg. Genovum), one of the "chief" priests that returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Neh. iv, 4, where the reading is "Ginnetho"), and subscribed the covenant with Nehemiah (x, 6); his son Meshullam is mentioned as contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (xii, 16). B.C. 536-410.

Gioberti, Vincenzo, a distinguished Italian philosopher and statesman, was born at Turin, April 5, 1801. He studied theology in the university of his native city, was received doctor in 1823, and in 1825 was ordained priest and appointed professor of theology in the university. He acquired great reputation, and was soon after (1831) called to the see of Genua. He was implicated in a republican conspiracy (said to have been instigated by the Jesuits, in order to destroy the liberal sympathies of the king), was thrown into prison, and then exiled without trial. He went first to Paris, thence to Brussels, where he remained until 1848, in the humble position of tutor in a private school. Some time after he declined a professorship of philosophy offered him by cardinal Waleham, preferring to devote all his time to his literary labors. His first publication was the Teoria del Sovranatole (Capolago, 1839). In 1842 he published his Introduzione allo studio della Filosofia. This remarkable work was followed in 1841 by his Del Bili, in which the author analyzes Christian eoppe, and especially Dante's Divina Commedia. Gioberti next employed himself against the modern German philosophers and the French encyclopedists, whose ideas outlined the Evoluition. He wrote successively the Lettres polemiques contre La Menami (Paris, 1840); Del Buono, and Errore filosofici di Antonio Rosmini (Capolago, 1842). In opposing the pantheistic tendencies of La Menaschi and Rosmini, Gioberti evinces great argumentative talent, and his argumentation is as clear and as homogeneous as a jeer thrown off the yoke of foreign doctrines, with the ultimate view of enabling her subsequently to expel foreign political interference. He was careful always to profess orthodox opinions, so as not to give either the Italian princes or the pope any hold against him. His new catholic system found many adherents. In order to raise the clergy in the popular esteem, he advocated such reforms as the spirit of the times required, and advised the priests to lead the social movement and to disseminate instruction among the people. He also called on the laity in Italy, inviting them to regain their former ascendancy by uniting faith with science and art. In this view he wrote his II Primo civile e morale dell'Italia (Paris, 1845). This remarkable work, which proposed the plan of a Roman confederacy headed by the pope, and which has had great influence on the recent constitutional tendencies in Italy, was the more remarkable with public opinion. The substance of the book is as follows: "Italy has been twice at the head of European civilization; once in antiquity, and again in the Middle Ages. In the latter period Italy owed its supremacy to the popes, who were then the natural authors of the national ambitions and aspirations of the nations. The downfall of Italy is due to the downfall of the papacy. The problem now is to restore the papal power, as a moral dominion based on religion and public opinion." Gioberti aims at "restoring the papal arbitration between the sovereign and the people; he wishes to lead it back to the time of Gregory VII and of Alexander III, and in this restoration of the past finds the best means of re-establishing funds for the papacy by the unaided efforts of Italy alone. As for the form of government, he inclines to a constitutional monarchy, and, like Aliferi, considers Piedmont as the most compact, best organized, and most vital state of Italy; calls it to closer union with the other provinces, and by showing the unification of Italy the perspective of a united Italy invites it to become the champion of national independence." The work was published under the most unfavorable circumstances, during the last years of the pontificate of Gregory XVI. The Jesuits, despite a few compliments to their order, which the author had skilfully introduced, signed an appeal against it, and condemned its tendencies. Gioberti, however, answered their objections in I Progressi (1846); II Genuina moderna (Capolago, 1847, 8 vols.; German transl. by Cornet, Lpz. 1849, 8 vols.). This work, written ab initio, had an immense echo, and on its arrival was expropriated and countermounted, and from all the other states of Peninsular Italy. After the events of 1848 Gioberti was recalled from exile, and his return was a triumph. He went to Milan, started the project of union between Lombardy and Piedmont, and traversed central Italy, inviting all parties to make common cause for the rights of the Italian nation. He declined the office of senator which was offered him by Charles Albert, but was elected to the House of Representatives by the inhabitants of Turin, and at once chosen for its president. In 1848 he was minister of public instruction, and president of the so-called Democratic council. Austrian intrigue defeated Gioberti's plans, and he was obliged to withdraw from the cabinet. He then advocated his views in a newspaper entitled II Sogno (1851). The misfortunes of Italy and the abdication of Charles Albert rendered it necessary for him to take again an active part in state affairs. Victor Emmanuel appointed him in the Delavay-Pennelli cabinet, without any special department; yet the conservative party managed soon after to have him appointed ambassador to Paris, as a means of getting rid of him. He understood it so, went in his resignment, and on the arrival of his successor Count Gallina, returned to private life. He afterwards published his Del Rinnovamento civile dell'Italia (Paris and Turin, 1851, 2 vols.). In this work he examines with great impartiality into the causes of the present position of Italy. Among the chief obstacles to its independence, he attributes, on the one hand, the exaltation of the principles of municipal and ecclesiastical power, and on the other, the dangerous influence of Mazzinism. Sympathizing with the liberty and liberalism of Victor Emmanuel, he, so to say, traces out for him the line to be followed to arrive at the regeneration of Italy. Gioberti was preparing a philosophical work, entitled Protologia, when he died suddenly at Paris, Oct. 25, 1851. His most important work is the Introduzioni, which has been translated into French under the title Introduction à l'étude de la Philosophie (Paris, 1847, 3 vols.). The Remembrancer (July, 1855, art. 1) remarks upon it as follows: "With regard to the Introduction to Philosophy, it is extremely difficult to express an opinion, because (speaking with the utmost seriousness) we have a great difficulty in deciding, upon internal evidence, whether or not it was written in the author's mind. The excitement visible throughout; the lofty tone in which he passes judgment upon others, and pours forth his own utterances; the virulence with which he treats some who differ from him, combined with the obscurity and dreaminess of the opinions expressed; the extraordinary virtual domination of the mind he assumes, and his dogmatism, not the less arrogant from his entire unconsciousness—all these things on
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he one hand, and, on the other, his acuteness, depth, information, and power of argument, leave us as much at a loss for what is the original meaning and sense of his several words as when he declares himself, 'I am that I am;' and the mind beholds him, and has him made known to it internally, through the reason, independently of all external sensations. God being the only being, all other things are only existences; and man learns of these existences or things from the God himself, and the heavenly beings which he gives it is 'I, Ideas,' or Thought. This divine thought is communicated to man in proportion as he is capable of receiving it; and it is the light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world. Man receives it by means of his reason, which is a kind of receptivity of the divine thought, and not by corporeal sensibility or holding (or intuition) of the 'Ideas' is the origin and first cause of all the knowledge of natural things which the mind of man possesses. It is innate, inasmuch as it rises to the mind at the same moment as the thought which apprehends it; but it does not arise within the mind, but enters it from without. It is the principle of knowledge to the human mind, from the very first exercise of its powers as a thinking being. The similarity of this view to that of Plato, revived and modified by Malebranche and Leibnitz, is sufficiently evident. The intuition of the 'Ideas' is the origin of the mind, or at least it is the cause of the mind; and the intuitions of the 'Ideas' are distinct and separable. By the reason, although the origin of all thoughts in the soul, is by itself but insipid and imperfect. In order to render it available, it requires that this intuition should be reflected on; and this can be done only by means of language, for man cannot reflect on and (so to speak) repeat in his mind the original intuitions except by means of language, which renders determinate what was before imperfect. For this purpose language was given to man, and by means of language God originally reveals to man that which he has caused him to behold by internal and direct intuition; and by means of language this same revelation is repeated and carried on from generation to generation; and by the same medium, employed analogously, the knowledge of the divine thought is more and more revealed. Yet language is not the cause of human knowledge, nor is it, in the case of ordinary knowledge, the medium of the exhibition of the divine thought to the mind (for that abides immediately upon the mind), but it is the occasion of its being completely revealed. For the purposes of ordinary and natural knowledge this combination of intuition with language is the method ordained by God. In the case of divine knowledge, however, it is only by means of language; and divine truths are not seen by intuition, but believed. Yet all knowledge of every kind has its source in the divine thought, and consists of such views of it as the individual is capable of. The word 'thought' is capable of conveying the meaning of all knowledge, but the divine thought, man has likewise internal and spiritual feelings or emotions, which are modifications of the mind, and preserved by feeling; and, in addition, he possesses material and external feelings, having reference to the properties of bodies, and perceived by sensation and the outward senses. The ordinary range of modern metaphysics is confined to these internal and external feelings; and it is a common error to substitute the internal feeling as a first principle, instead of that which is apprehended by the reason through direct intuition, and revealed to the soul by language, through the word. It is likewise an equally common error to substitute reflection on these internal and external feelings for reason, as the initiatory instrument of that knowledge which is the basis of philosophy. (Here he is evidently alluding to Locke and his followers.) But it is by the view or intuition of the 'Ideas' that meaning is given to these various feelings, external and internal, and to the various sensible objects by which they are surrounded. The basis of all knowledge is the knowledge of being; yet not of an abstract idea, but of the concrete personal Being, God himself, acting as a cause and producing existences, which is, in fact, the only being, because he alone has being in himself. The knowledge of this being is gained by intimation, by means of the word, which he declares himself, 'I am that I am;' and the mind beholds him, and has him made known to it internally, through the reason, independently of all external sensations. God being the only being, all other things are only existences; and man learns of these existences or things from the God himself, and the heavenly beings which he gives it is 'I, Ideas,' or Thought. This divine thought is communicated to man in proportion as he is capable of receiving it; and it is the light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world. Man receives it by means of his reason, which is a kind of receptivity of the divine thought, and not by corporeal sensibility or holding (or intuition) of the 'Ideas' is the origin and first cause of all the knowledge of natural things which the mind of man possesses. It is innate, inasmuch as it rises to the mind at the same moment as the thought which apprehends it; but it does not arise within the mind, but enters it from without. It is the principle of knowledge to the human mind, from the very first exercise of its powers as a thinking being. The similarity of this view to that of Plato, revived and modified by Malebranche and Leibnitz, is sufficiently evident. The intuition of the 'Ideas' is the origin of the mind, or at least it is the cause of the mind; and the intuitions of the 'Ideas' are distinct and separable. By the reason, although the origin of all thoughts in the soul, is by itself but insipid and imperfect. In order to render it available, it requires that this intuition should be reflected on; and this can be done only by means of language, for man cannot reflect on and (so to speak) repeat in his mind the original intuitions except by means of language, which renders determinate what was before imperfect. For this purpose language was given to man, and by means of language God originally reveals to man that which he has caused him to behold by internal and direct intuition; and by means of language this same revelation is repeated and carried on from generation to generation; and by the same medium, employed analogously, the knowledge of the divine thought is more and more revealed. Yet language is not the cause of human knowledge, nor is it, in the case of ordinary knowledge, the medium of the exhibition of the divine thought to the mind (for that abides immediately upon the mind), but it is the occasion of its being completely revealed. For the purposes of ordinary and natural knowledge this combination of intuition with language is the method ordained by God. In the case of divine knowledge, however, it is only by means of language; and divine truths are not seen by intuition, but believed. Yet all knowledge of every kind has its source in the divine thought, and consists of such views of it as the individual is capable of. The word 'thought' is capable of conveying the meaning of all knowledge, but the divine thought, man has likewise internal and spiritual feelings or emotions, which are modifications of the mind, and preserved by feeling; and, in addition, he possesses material and external feelings, having reference to the properties of bodies, and perceived by sensation and the outward senses. The ordinary range of modern metaphysics is confined to these internal and external feelings; and it is a common error to substitute the internal feeling as a first principle, instead of that which is apprehended by the reason through direct intuition, and revealed to the soul by language, through the word. It is likewise an equally common error to substitute reflection on these internal and external feelings for reason, as the initiatory instrument of that knowledge which is the basis of philosophy. (Here he is evidently alluding to Locke and his followers.) But it is by the view or intuition of the 'Ideas' that meaning is given to these various feelings, external and internal, and to the various sensible objects by which they are surrounded. The basis of all knowledge is the knowledge of being; yet not of an abstract idea, but of the concrete personal Being, God himself, acting as a cause and producing existences, which is, in fact, the only being, because
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came court preacher of Henry II. He accompanied Henry's son John as adviser in the expedition against Ireland, and in 1188 accompanied archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury on a tour through Wales, for the purpose of conserving a crusade. Richard III appointed him legate of Wales, but at the fall of the latter he returned to his studies. He was again elected bishop of St. David's, but failed again to be recognised as such. He "passed the last seventeen years of his life in study, revising his former literary works and composing others, of which he bequeathed a most copious indication." In the midst of these occupations he received once more an offer of the bishopric of St. David's, and would have met with no opposition from the court; but, from the dishonorable terms on which it was offered, he refused the ecclesiastical dignity which had so long been the object of his earnest labors. He died at St. David's in the seventy-fourth year of his age, and was buried in the cathedral church, where his effigy still remains upon an altar-tomb beneath an ornamental arch. Giralus appears to have been an upright and able man. As an ecclesiastic he was zealous, active, and in maintaining the rights and dignities of his Church; but he was, at the same time, honest and disinterested. As a scholar he was learned, and as a collector of historical materials diligent, far beyond the measure of his age. As a historian, however, he was full of credulity, and as a man, as a poet, one of the vainest upon record. Giralus has himself given a catalogue of his works, as well as a long history of his actions, both printed by Wharton. Other lists will be found in Fabricius, Bibliotheca Med. et Inf. Latinitatis (edit. Patav. 4to, 1714), iii, 52, and in the notes to his life in the Biog. Brit. (1779), i. 648; 642, 644. Sir Richard Colt Hoare has given a full account of such MSS. of his works as exist in the several libraries in the British Museum, in the Archi-episcopal Library at Lambeth, at Bene's (Corpus Christi) College, in the public library at Cambridge, and in the Bodleian Library. Those printed in the Cambridge (Lond. 1668, 8vo), and in Camden's Anglia Norm., &c., script. (Francof. 1602, fol.), p. 818-878: Topographia Hiberniae (Camden, ut sup.), p. 629-754: Exemplaria Hiberniae (ibidem), p. 755-815: Descrip. Cambri. (ibid.), p. 879-892. Several short pieces by Giralus are printed in the second volume of Wharton's Anglia Sacra. The Gemma Ecclesiastica, published at Mentz in 1649, without the author's name, under the title of Gemma Animac, is ascribed to Giralus. Sir Richard Colt Hoare, in 1808, published the Itinerary of Arch- bishop Baldwin through Wales, translated into English, and illustrated with views, annotations, and a life of Giralus (2 vols. 4to). A new edition, Giralum Cambrensis Opera, is now publishing, under the direction of the master of the rolls, edited by J. F. Dimock; 5 vols. were issued up to 1868. See Wharton, Anglia Sacra, ii. 457-518; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Med. et Inf. Latinitatis; Engl. Cyclopedia, s. v. Barri; Biog. Britan- nica, s. v. Barri; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, v. 164; Wright, Biog. Brit. Literatnr, Anglo-Norman Period, p. 880-897.

Girdle, an essential article of dress in the East, and worn both by men and women. The corresponding Hebrew and Greek words are: 1. נַּשַּח, nashch, or נַשָּח, (fem.), neshchah, girdle (Prov. xxxi. 24; Ezek. xxiii, 15; Gen. iii. 7; 2 Sam. xviii, 11; Isa. xxxii, 11), which is the general term for a girdle of any kind, whether worn by soldiers (1 Sam. xviii, 4; 2 Sam. xx, 8; 1 Kings ii, 5; 2 Kings iii, 21), or by women (Isa. iii, 24). 2. יַּסָּר, yassar, something bound (Isa. xi, 5), especially used of the girdles worn by men; whether by prophets (2 Kings i, 8; Jer. xiii, 1), soldiers (Isa. vi, 27; Ezek. xxiii, 15), or kings in their military capacity (Job xlii, 18). 3. מִּשָּׁח, mishch, or מִּשָּחַ, mishch, a band ("strength," Job xii, 21), used of the girdle worn by men alone (Psa. cix, 19; Isa. xxiii, 10), 4. Those, as well as the general term נַּשַּח, a ñash, Matt. iii, 4; x, 9; Mark i, 6; vi, 8; Acts xxii, 11; Rev. i, 18; xv, 6, require no special elucidation. Besides these were the following peculiar terms: 5. מַשְׁמָל, mishmol, used by the ancients, as in the Sanscrit भक्ष, a ñam, the girdle of sacerdotal and state officers (Exod. xviii, 4, 39, 40; xxix, 9, xxxix, 29; Lev. vii, 13; xvi, 4; Isa. xxii, 21). See Priest. It was especially worn by the priests about the close-fitting tunic (Exod. xxviii, 39, xxxix, 29), and is described by Josephus (Ant. iii, 7, 2) as made of linen so fine of texture as to look like the slough of a snake, and embossed with flowers of scarlet, purple, blue, and fine linen. It was of about four fingers' breadth, and was wrapped several times round the priest's body, the ends hanging down to the feet. When engaged in sacrifice, the priest threw the ends over his left shoulder. According to Maimonides (De Yas. Sacrt. c. 8), the girdle was worn both by the high-priest and the common priests was of white linen embroidered with wool; but that worn by the high-priest on the day of atonement was entirely of white linen. The length of it was thirty-two cubits, and the breadth about three fingers. It was worn just below the arm-pits to avoid perspiration (comp. Ezek. xlii, 18). Jerome (Ep. ad Fabiolum, de vest. Sac.) follows Josephus. With regard to the manner in which the girdle was embroidered, the "needlework" (נַּשָּׁחַ הָסָּרִים, Exod. xxviii, 39) is distinguished in the Mishna from the "cutting-work" (נַּשָּׁחַ חָסָרִים, Exod. xxxvi, 31) as being worked by the needle with figures on one side only, whereas the latter was woven work with figures on both sides (Cod. Yoma, c. 8). So also Maimo- nides (De Yas. Sacrt. viii, 15). But Jarchi, on Exod. xxxvi, 31, 36, explains the difference as consisting in this, that in the former case the figures on the two sides are the same, whereas in the latter they are different. See Ezek. xlii. This ñam may be consid- ered as fairly represented by those girdles which we observe on such persons in the Egyptian paintings.

Ancient Egyptian Sacred Girdles.

In all passages, except Isa. xxii, 21, מַשְׁמָל is used of the girdle of the priests only, but in that instance it appears to have been worn by Sheba, the treasurer, as part of the insignia of his office; unless it be sup- posed that he was of priestly rank, and wore it in his priestly capacity. He is called "high-priest" in the
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In consequence of the costly materials of which girdles were made, they were frequently given as presents (1 Sam. xviii, 4; 2 Sam. xviii, 11) in token of honor (Rev. i, 15), as it is still the custom in Persia (comp. Morier, p. 93). Villages were given to the queens of Persia to supply them with girdles (Xenoph. Anab. i, 4, 9; Plato, Alc. i, 125).

GIRGASHITE

They were used as pockets, as among the Arabs still (Niebuhr, Desp. p. 56), and as purses, one end of the girdle being folded back for the purpose (Matt. x, 9; Mark vi, 8). Hence “zonam perdere,” “to lose one’s purse” (Jer. Epist. ii, 40; compare xiv, 29). Ink horns were also carried in the girdle (Ezek. ix, 2).

“Girdle” is often used figuratively in the Scriptures (see Ps. cix, 19; compare I Sam. ii, 4; Ps. xxxi, 11; lxv, 12; Eph. vi, 14). The girdle was a symbol of strength, activity, and power (Job xii, 18, xxxi, 11; Isa. xiii, 10; xlv, 15; xi, 5; xxii, 21; 1 Kings xx, 11). The perfect adherence of the people of God to his service is figuratively illustrated by the “cleaving of the girdle to a man’s loins” (Jer. xili, 11). In the same view, “righteousness and faithfulness are called the girdle of the Messiah (Isa. xi, 5). See ARTINE.

Girgašite (Hebrew invariably in the sing. and with the art. kag-Girgašiti, (נְגֶדֶּר), in a collective sense; dwelling in a valley or flat; Sept. Γυργάσιον and Τυγγασαίων, Vulg. Gergeseni and Gergaesus; A. V., “Girgasite” in 1 Chron. i, 14, “Girgasite” in Gen. x, 16; elsewhere “Girgasites”), a designation of one of the nations who were in the land of Canaan before the entrance thither of the children of Israel. In Gen. x, 16, they are mentioned as the descendants of the fifth son of Canaan; in other passages the tribe is merely referred to, and that but occasionally, in the formula expressing the doomed country (Gen. xvi, 21; Deut. vii, 1 [and xx, 17 in Samarit. and Sept.]; Josh. iii, 10; xxxv, 11; 1 Chron. i, 14; Neb. ix, 8). The Girgasites are conjectured to have been a part of the large family of the Hitites, as they are omitted in nine out of ten places in which the nations or families of Canaan are mentioned, while in the tenth they are mentioned, and the Hitites omitted. Josephus states that nothing but the name of the Girgasites (Ὑγγασαίων) remained in his time (Ant. i, 6, 2). In the Jewish commentators of R. Nahman and elsewhere, the Girgasites are described as having retired into Africa, fearing the power of God; and Procopius, in his His- tory of the Vandals, mentions an ancient but doubtful inscription in Mauritanit Tingitana, stating that the inhabitants had fled thither from the face of Joshua, the son of Nun. A city Girga (גירגה) existed among the Phoenician tribes in Northern Africa at the Syrtes Minor (Pâris, Reb. Lesc. p. 298). The notion that the Girgasites did migrate seems to have been based on the circumstance that, although they are included in the list of the seven devoted nations either to be
drives out or destroyed by the Israelites (Gen. xv, 20, 21; Deut. vii, 1, Josh. iii, 10, xxiv, 11; Neh. ix, 8), yet they are omitted in the list of those to be utterly destroyed (Deut. xx, 17), and are mentioned among those with whom, contrary to the divine decree, the Israelites lived and intermarried (Judg. iii, 1-6). See CANANA. The expression in Judges xxxiv, 22 seems to indicate that the district of the Girgasites was on the west of Jordan. By most writers, however, they are supposed to have been settled in that part of the country which lay to the east of the lake of Gennesaret (Journ. Soc. Lit. Dec. 1851, p. 167). This conclusion is supported by the identity of the word ʿ̲γ̲ας̲ατ̲ος̲, which the Septuagint gives for Girgasites, and by which Matthew (vii, 28) indicates the land of the Gergesenes (ʿγ̲ε̲ρ̲γ̲ε̲ς̲α̲ν̲ο̲ς̲). But as this last reading rests on a conjecture of Origen, on which little reliance is now placed, the conclusion drawn from it has no great weight, although the fact is peculiar on other grounds, especially the probability that some actual city of this name must have been the focus of the reading in question. Indeed, the older reading, "Gerasenes," has sufficient resemblance to direct the attention to the country beyond the Jordan; and this also (Nom., s. v. Gerasa) affirms that the Girgasites dwelt. See GERASA.

Girgasite (Gen. x, 16). See Girgasite.

Girl (גֵּלָּתָא, "gulah"). Fam. of טִנָּה, "a boy," lit. one born, i.e., a female child (Joel iii, 3; Zech. xiii, 5), spoken of a marriageable "damsel" (Gen. xxiv, 4). See Child.

Girzite. See GEZIRITE.

Gisborne, Thomas, A.M., prebendary of Durham, a distinguished divine and author, was born at Derby in 1738, entered at Harrow School in 1753, and at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1758; was made perpetual curate of Barton-under-Needwood, Staffordshire, in 1758, and removed in the same year to Yoxall Lodge, near Barton, where he ever after resided. He obtained the prebend of Durham in 1758, and died in 1846. His works were written in a clear and nervous style; his sermons have been recommended as models for young students in divinity. He strongly opposed Paley's Ethics, of which he published an Examination (2d edit. 1790). Among his works are, A Familiar Survey of the Christian Religion as Connected with the Introduction of Morality (London, 1758, 2d ed. 1790); The Principles of Moral Philosophy investigated and applied to the Constitution of civil Society (London, 1798, 4th ed. 1809); The Testimony of Natural Theology to Christianity (London, 1818, 12mo); An Inquiry respecting Love as one of the divine Attributes (London, 1798, 9vols.); Sermon (London, 1808, 1809, and 1810, 3 vols. 8vo); A Familiar Exposition of Colossians, in eight Sermons (London, 1816, 12mo).—Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1267; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 675; Whewell, History of Moral Philosophy in England, lect. xi; Gent. Magazine, June, 1846.

Gischala (גִּשְׁכַל), a small city (גִּשְׁכַל), often mentioned by Josephus in his account of the last struggle of the Jews with the Romans, especially as being the scene of the operations of the famous "John (q. v.) of Gischala" (War, iv, 1, 3). It was situated in Galilee (6, ii, 1); and, after having been destroyed by the Jewish zealots, it was rebuilt by John (4, 10), and further fortified by the advice of Josephus himself (War, ii, 20, 6), and was the last stronghold of Galilee captured by Titus (6, iv, 2). It is doubtless the גַּחַל Chalab (גַּחַל) of the Talmud (Maasch. viii, 3), famed for its oil (Erach. ix, 6), named in connection with Meron and Capernaum (Gemara, Pa. xxviii, 7, 2, and also by Pseudo-Philo (De cresc. Hierosol. p. 68). Jerome, on several occasions, states a tradition that the parents of the apostle Paul emigrated thence to Tarsus (Reland, Pal eat. p. 818).

The same Hebrew name likewise occurs in Hottines (Uppers Herodici, p. 56) and in Benjamin of Tudela (p. 106). Schwarz erroneously identifies it (Palaest. p. 198) with the Ahal (q. v.) of the tribe of Asher (Judg. i, 31). Dr. Robinson found the site in the modern El-Jisr, on a hill about two hours north-west of Safed; and had there been totally destroyed by an earthquake, but was then partly rebuilt (Researches, iii, 586 sqq.).

Gislebert. See GILBERT.

Gislebertus Forretanus. See GILBERT.

Gis'pa (Heb. גִּשְׁפָּא, Gispa, flatterly or heartening; Sept. Ἰσπασί, Vulg. Gospa), one of the two overseers of the Nethinim in Opel at Jerusalem, after the captivity (Neh. xi, 21); but whether he was himself also of that class is not stated, although this is probable from the fact that his associate Ziba was (Ezra ii, 43). B.C. 446.

Gitta (רַדְוּרְר), a town of Samaria, mentioned by Justin Martyr (Apol. ii), Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. i, 13), Zonaras (from Justin, xi, p. 567), Theodoret (Compend. heort. fab. i), and i Epiphanius (Adv. Haer. p. 55) and Athanasius (Hist. Eccl. p. 15), as the birthplace of Simon Magnus; thought by some to be the Gath (q. v.) of Scripture (Reland, Palaest. p. 818, 814), but discovered by Robinson (Researches, iii, 144) in the modern Kerjat-Uil, a village rather more than two hours west of Nahlia (comp. Schwartz, Palaest. p. 184).

Another Gitta (רַדְוּר) is mentioned by Josephus (Wars, i, 17, 2) as a fortress at Machaerus (q. v.).

Giti'ah-he'pher (Heb. גַּתִּיעַ-בּהֵפֶר, Ὀηηήα, Sept. Γίτταςπα, Vulg. Gethsifer), a prolonged form (Josh. xix, 18) of the name GATH-HEPHKER (q. v.).

Giti'ah-in (Heb. גַּתִּיעַ-י, Νιάον, two wine-presences, Sept. Γιτιασα and Gi3a(i), a place incidentally mentioned in 2 Sam. iv, 3, where the meaning appears to be that the inhabitants of Beeroth, which was allotted to Benjamin, had been compelled to fly from that place, and had taken refuge at Gittaim. Beeroth was one of the towns of the Gibeonites (Josh. ix, 17); and the cause of the flight of its people may have been Saul's persecution of the Gibeonites allowed to 2 Sam. xxii, 2; although the above text seems to intimate that the flight was through consternation at the death of Abner, and fear of vengeance for the murder of Ishboeth. See BEER. The inhabitants, doubtless, soon returned.

Gittaim is again mentioned in the list of places inhabited by the Benjamites after their return from the captivity, with Ramah, Neballat, Lod, and other known towns of Benjamin to the north-west of Jerusalem (Neh. xi, 38). Schwartz (Phys. Descr. of Palaest. p. 194) identifies Gittaim with Ramelek (Arm. Mathikia) on the strength of certain Jewish traditions; which is not impossible, since Lydda was occupied by the Benjamites, and other associated cities seem to have been located in this neighborhood. See LOD; HADAD.

"Gittaim occurs in the Sept. version of 1 Sam. xiv, 23—'Out of Getthaim roll me a great stone.' But this is not supported by any other of the ancient versions, which unanimously adhere to the Hebrew text, and probably proceeds from a mistake or corruption of the Heb. word צַלָּעָה; A. V. 'ye have transgressed.' It further occurs in the Sept. in Gen. xxxvi, 35, and 1 Chron. i, 41; which represents the native of Avra, a change not so intelligible as the other, and equally unsupported by the other old versions."

Gittin. See TALMUD.

Gittit'he (Heb. גִּיתִיתֶה, "Gittoth; Sept. Πέλατος"); an inhabitant or native property of the Philitine city Gath (Josh. xiii, 8). Obad-Edom, in whose house the ark was for a time placed (2 Sam. vi, 10), and who afterwards served in Jerusalem (1 Chron. xvi, 88), although
Githit (Heb. Githith), גיתית, prob. for גיתת, and so kindled with נקינת, a stringed instrument of music (Ps. viii. i.; xxxi. 1; xxxxi. 1; xxxii. 1). The term seems to be derived (with the Targums) from the city גית, nor (with the Sept. אשת גת) from a vessel (as a sangle-ring, Michael, Sped. p. 382); nor from the root גת, to strike (Redehol. De praecorpo Mus., etc., Lips. 1831, p. 24), Gesenius, Theor. Hebr. p. 849. On the other hand, Flütsch (Concord. p. 256) derives it from גית, to de pen, and calls it "a musical instrument curved and hollow (syn. בצל)," whereas in his Heb. Lex. p. 304, he says it is the name of "a musical body of Levites who had their chief seat in the Levitical city of Gath-rimmon, the words in the title of Psalms not being capable of an interpretation referring to instruments or airs." See Psalms.

Gisoh. See GIZONIT.

Gisont (Hib. with the art. Ap-Gizoni, גיסונית; Sept. εἰς θυρεύς τ. Τούρι, Vulg. Gismonita), an inhabitant of GISON (Heb. גיסון, perhaps grapy); a place unknown except as the residence of Hashek, the ancestor of two of the sons of David's warriors (1 Chron. xi. 34). As these are called Hararites (i.e. "mountaineers") in this as well as the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii. 22, 34), we may perhaps infer that the city in question was situated somewhere in the mountains of Judah. The conclusion of Kennicott, who examines the passage at length, is that the name should be Gison, a proper name, and not an appellative (Disert. p. 199-200). See GUMI.

Giżrast. See GEZIRTA.

Glagolita, Glagolitsa, Glagolitcs (derived from the Slavonic Glagol, a word), "an ancient Slavonic alphabet, principally used in several Roman Catholic dioceses of Istria and Dalmatia, in the psalms, liturgies, and offices of the Church. The use of this liturgy was confirmed to the priesthood by a bull of pope Innocent IV, 1248. Of the antiquity of this alphabet the savans have maintained a great variety of opinions. Dobrovolsky laid the foundation of a critical investigation of the subject, and has been followed by Bobo, Grab Graham, Lek, Ivan Preis, Schafarik, etc. In former times the invention was sometimes ascribed to St. Jerome; while the Orientals, according to Neale, consider it as a mere corruption and Latinization of the Cyrillic alphabet. According to the recent researches of Schafarik, it was invented by Cyril, and is, language and form no less as an instrument of the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillizer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Weltiza (died 916). Grimm found in some Glagolitic letters Runic characters. The Glagolitic literature embraces all South Slavic works which are written in the Glagolitic alphabet. According to language and form no less as an instrument of the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillizer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Weltiza (died 916). Grimm found in some Glagolitic letters Runic characters. The Glagolitic literature embraces all South Slavic works which are written in the Glagolitic alphabet. According to language and form no less as an instrument of the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillizer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Weltiza (died 916). Grimm found in some Glagolitic letters Runic characters. The Glagolitic literature embraces all South Slavic works which are written in the Glagolitic alphabet. According to language and form no less as an instrument of the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillizer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Weltiza (died 916). Grimm found in some Glagolitic letters Runic characters. The Glagolitic literature embraces all South Slavic works which are written in the Glagolitic alphabet. According to language and form no less as an instrument of the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillizer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Weltiza (died 916). Grimm found in some Glagolitic letters Runic characters. The Glagolitic literature embraces all South Slavic works which are written in the Glagolitic alphabet. According to language and form no less as an instrument of the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillizer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Weltiza (died 916). Grimm found in some Glagolitic letters Runic characters. The Glagolitic literature embraces all South Slavic works which are written in the Glagolitic alphabet. According to language and form no less as an instrument of the Cyrillic alphabet (Kyrillizer), the author of which was bishop Clement of Weltiza (died 916).
GLYPHYRA

Bayle, General Dict. v. 455; Lecky, History of Ration-
ali.sm, i. 121 sq.

GLYPHYRA (Γλυφύρα, elegant), daughter of Arche-
laus, king of Cappadocia; married to Alexander, son of
Herod the Great (Josephus, Ant. xvi. 1, 2). She
quarreled with his half-brother Herod, because of Herod's
jealousy against Alexander (War, i. 24, 2, 3), which eventuated in the death of the latter. See ALEXANDER 9. She remained faithful to her hus-
band (Ant. xvi. 10, 7), and after his execution she re-
turned to her father (17, 1), although her two sons by
Alexander were brought up by Herod (23, 19). She af-
terwards married Juba, king of Lydia, and at his death again returned to her father, but subsequently mar-
rried Herod Archelaus, who divorced for her sake her
future wife Marianne, but she soon died in, accord-
pance with a dream in which her first husband re-
proached her for her repeated inconstancy (xvii. 13, 4).

GLAESINUS, Heinrich Loritt, was born at Mol-
ia, in the canton of Glarus (hence his name), in Swit-
erland, June, 1488; studied philosophy, belles-lettres,
and theology at Rottweil and Cologne, and in 1513 became poet laureate of the emperor Maximil-
ian I. He took part in the controversies between
Beuclin and the old-school systems; went to Basel in 1514, to Italy in 1515, and in 1517 visited Paris, where he gave private instruction in the classics; returning afterwards to Basel, he opened a school there. He
showed himself at first favorably disposed of the
Reformation, but abandoned them afterwards; and when Protestantism gained Basel, he retired with Exa-
mus to Freiburg, where he became professor of litera-
ture and history. He gave up this situation in 1560,
and died March 27, 1563. Glaesinus was a very learn-
ed man, and especially in the theory and history of
music. His Dodereckordon (Basel, 1547) is valuable
as a picture of the state of music in his age.—H. Schrei-
ber, Lebensbeschreibung (Freib. 1887); Pfliger, Univer-
sal-Lexikon, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopaedie, v. 163.
(J. N. F.)

GLASS OR GLASS. John, founder of the sect of Glas-
sites, was born at Archiernymy, Sept. 21, 1898. He
was educated at St. Andrew's, and in 1719 became minister
of Teaching. In 1727 he published a book to prove that
Church establishments are inconsistent with the Gosp-
el, for which he was deposed by the General Assem-
bly. He imbibed a number of other peculiar opinions
and gathered followers, who were called by his name in
England and America; they were denominated Sandemansians. Glass died at Dunce in
1772. His works were published at Edinburgh in 4
vols. 8vo, and in a second edition at Perth (1782, 6
vols. 8vo). Among the most celebrated members of
the sect was Michael Faraday. For the peculiar opin-
ions of the sect, see SANDEMAN.

GLASS (the material is perhaps denoted by מַכָּר, ἡ καραβί, rock "crystal," Job xxxvii. 17; יַלוֹאכ, κρυ-
tal, "glass," Rev. xxii. 18, 21; and hence the adj.
יאָכָר, κρυταλίνη, "of glass," Rev. iv. 6; xv. 2
[see CRYSTAL]; the instrument or looking-glass by יַלְוָא, γιλαών, a tablet, "roll," Is. viii. 1; "glass," 1.
κρυταλίς, κρυταλίνη, a mirror, Is. iii. 23; יָלֹא, יָלֶה, "vision," as usually rendered; "looking-glass," Exod. xix. 8; יָלְוָא, a mirror, "glass," I Cor. xiii. 12; Is. i.
33 [see MIRRORS]), according to Plien (Hist. Nat. xxvi.
26), was discovered by what is termed accident. Some
merchants kindled a fire on that part of the coast of
Phoenicia which lies near Ptolemais, between the foot of
Carmel and Tyre, at a spot where the river B LSU
casts the fine sand which it brings down; but, as they
were without the usual means of suspending their
cooking vessels, they employed for that purpose logs
of nitre, their vessel being laden with that substance: the
fire fusing the nitre and the sand produced glass.

He proceeds to state that the Sidonians, in whose vi-
cinity the discovery was made, took it up, and, having
in process of time carried the art to a high degree of
excellence, gained thereby both wealth and fame; other nations followed their pupils; the glassmakers espe-
cially attained to very high skill in the art of fashion-
ing, blowing, and coloring glass; finally, even glass
mirrors were invented by the Sidonians. This account of
Pliny is in substance corroborated by Strabo (xvi.
15) and by Josephus (War, ii. 9). But this account
is less likely than the supposition that vitreous matter
first attracted observation from the custom of lighting
fires on the sand "in a country producing natron or
subcarbonate of soda" (Rawlinson's Herod. ii. 82). It
has been pointed out that Pliny's story may have orig-
ninated in the fact that the sand of the Syrian river
Belus, at the mouth of which the incident is supposed
to have occurred, "was esteemed particularly suitable
for glass-making, and exported in great quantities to
the workshops of Sidon and Alexandria, long the most
famous in the ancient world" (Smith, Dict. of Class.
Ant. s. v. Vitrum, where everything relevant to the il-
lustration of the classical allusions to glass may be
found). Some find a remarkable reference to this lit-
tle river (respecting which, see Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 17;
xxxvi. 63; Josephus, War, ii. 10, 2; Tacitus, Hist. v.
1) in the blessing to the tribe of Zebulun, "they shall
suck of the sources of the sea, and of the springs in
the sand" (Deut. xxxiii. 19). Both the name Belus
(Reland, Pustest. p. 267) and the Hebrew word בּשׁ, "sand," have been suggested as derivations for the Greek ιάλος, which is, however, in all probability,
from an Egyptian root. See BElUs. Some suppose that
the proper name בּשׁיָה־יַלְוָא ("burnings by the
waters") contains an allusion to Sidonian glass-facto-
ries (Meier on Jos. xi. 8; xiii. 6), but it is much more
 probable that it was so called from the privilege of the
Egyptian chariots at that place (Lord A. Hervey, On the
Genealogies, p. 228), or from hot springs. See MISCH-
PHOES-MAIM.

Yet, notwithstanding the above explicit statement,
it was long denied that the ancients were acquainted
with glass properly so called; nor did the denial en-
tirely disappear even when Pompeii offered evidences
of its want of foundation. Our knowledge of Egypt
has, however, set the matter at rest. Wilkinson, in his
Ancient Egyptians (iii. 88 sq.), has adduced the
fullest evidence that glass was known to and made by
that ingenious people, at least a thousand years prior to
their national existence. Upwards of 3500 years
before the reign of the first Osirites, they appear to have
practised the art of blowing glass. The process is rep-
resented in the paintings of Beni-Hassan, executed in
the reign of that monarch. In the same age images of
glazed pottery were common. Ornaments of glass
were made by them about 1500 years B.C.; for a bead
of that date has been found, being of the same specific
gravity as that of our crown glass. Many glass bot-
tles, etc., have been met with in the tombs, some of
very remote antiquity. Glass vases were used for
holding water, these being early as the Exodus. The
Israelites had the advantage not only of an earlier application to the art, but also of a peculiar earth, which appears to
have been necessary to the production of some of the
more valuable and brilliant kinds of glass (Beckman,
History of Inventions, ii. 543, Eng. transl.; a ii. 398 sq.; iv. 54). Yet the primary clear and transparent glass was considered the most valuable (Pliny, xxxvi. 26).
Indeed, a great part of the glass-ware used at Rome about the Christian era
and subsequently came from Alexandria; and the em-
peror Hadrian was presented by an Egyptian priest
with some vases which were reckoned so fine that they
were produced only on grand occasions (Strabo, i.
17vii; Vopiscus in Vita Saturnini, c. 8). Wilkinson
states respecting the Egyptians, "Such was their skill
in the manufacture of glass, and in the mode of staining it of various hues, that they counterfeited with success the amethyst and other precious stones, and even arrived at an excellence in the art which their successors have been unable to retain, and which our European workmen, in spite of their improvements in other branches of this manufacture, are still unable to imitate. For not only do the colors of some Egyptian opaque glass offer the most varied devices on the exterior, distributed with the regularity of a studied design, but the same hue and the same devices pass in right lines directly through the substance; so that in whatever part it is broken, or wherever a section may chance to be made of it, the same appearance, the same colors, and the same device present themselves, without being found ever to deviate from the direction of a straight line, from the external surface to the interior (Ancient Egypt, iii, 198). Winckelmann is of opinion that glass was employed more frequently in ancient than in modern times. It was sometimes used by the Egyptians even for coffins, and in wainscoting ("vitrice camera," Hist. Nat. xxxvi, 64; Stat. Sylv. i, 1).

The art of manufacturing glass was also known to the ancient Assyrians (Layard, Ninev., ii, 49), and a glass bottle was found in the north-west palace of Nimrud which has on it the name of Sargon, and is therefore probably older than B.C. 702 (ib. Ninev. and Bab., p. 167). This is the earliest known specimen of transparent glass. Opaque colored glass was manufactured by the Assyrians at a much earlier period, and some specimens exist of the 15th century B.C. The Sargon vase had been blown in one piece, and turned and hollowed out afterwards. In the mounds of Babylon were likewise found small glass bottles, some colored, others ribbed and otherwise ornamented, and vases of earthen-ware of various forms and sizes, sometimes glazed with a rich blue color (ib. p. 429).

Other glass vessels of the Roman period were elsewhere discovered (ib. p. 504). With the glass bowls was discovered a rock-crystal lens, which must have been used as a magnifying or burning-glass (ib. p. 167). In later times glass was abundant for similar purposes among the Romans, as is evident from the specimens disinterred from the ruins of Pompeii. See Bottle.

That glass was known to the Hebrews appears beyond a doubt; but whether they brought a knowledge of its manufacture with them out of Egypt, or learned it from their Sidonian neighbors, is uncertain. Whether they used it for mirrors is doubtful. In Job xxviii, 17, מטול is believed to mean glass, though it is ren-
Glass Vases from Pompeii.

ded "crystal" in the English version. It comes from τραχύς (to be pure), and, according to the best authorities, means a kind of glass which in ancient days was held in high esteem (A. D. Michaelis, Hist. Vitr. apud Hebr.; and Hamberger, Hist. Vitr. ex antiquitate eruta, quoted by Gesenius, s. v.). Symmachus renders it κρύσταλλος, but that is rather intended by ἴαυλος (Job xxxviii, 18, A. V. "pearls," Sept. γάνθος, a word which also means "ice;" comp. Pliney, H. N. xxxvii, 2) and πέντε (Ezek. i, 22). It seems, then, that Job xxxviii, 17 contains the only allusion to glass found in the O. T., and even this reference is disputed. Besides in symmachus, others also render it δαμάς ἴαυλος (Schleusner, Thesaur. s. v. ἴαυλος), and it is argued that the word ἴαυλος frequently means crystal. Thus the Schol. on Aristoph. Nub. 764, defines ἴαυλος (when it occurs in old writers) as δαμάς ἴαυλος, and Hesychius gives as its equivalent λίθος ἱδρυμα. In Herodotus (ii, 24) it is clear that ἴαυλος must mean crystal, for he says, η διά σφαλλυ καὶ τεσσαρος ἱδρυκατον, and Achilles Tatius speaks of crystal as τοῖς ἵαυλοις ἄριστον, (ii, 3; Bähr, On Herod. ii, 44; Heerem, Ideen, i, i, 388). Others consider πεντεντούομιν to be amber, or electrom, or alabaster (Bochart, Hieros. ii, vi, 672). In the New Testament the word employed is ἱδρυς, compare Aristoph. Nubae, 768). In Rev. xxii, 9, 18 we read, "The city was pure gold, like unto clear glass." ver. 21, "as it was transparent glass" (compares iv, 6). Mention is made in Rev. iv, 6, and xv, 2, of a sea of glass like unto crystal, concerning the meaning of which interpreters vary; but it is probably an allusion to the brazen sea spoken of in 1 Kings vii, 23, and elsewhere, containing water for the priests to wash with, that they might not minister before God under any pollution. "Molten looking-glass" also occurs in Job xxxviii, 18; but the original "N., spectandum, and its corresponding word in Exod. xxxviii, 8, authorize the translation "mirror"—that is, of some metal. Indeed, Beckman (Betragt zur Gesch. der Erfindung, iii, 819) erroneously denies that glass mirrors were known till the 18th century, adding that they are still seldom seen in the East. It is certain, however, that glass was not applied in ancient times to windows: when these were not, as they commonly were in the East, simply open apertures by day, with wooden doors placed on them by night, a kind of semi-transparent stone, a sort of tali, called ἵαρα ἴαυλορα, was generally used, and continued to be so for centuries after the Christian era. See Wissow.

It is a singular fact, that although the ancients were aware of the reflective power of glass, and although the Sidonians used it for mirrors (Pliny, H. N. xxxvi, 66), yet for some unexplained reason mirrors of glass must have proved unsuccessful, since even under the Roman empire they were universally made of metal, which is at once less perfect, more expensive, and more difficult to preserve. See Smith, Dict. of Glass, Ant. s. v. Speculum. Accordingly, the mirrors found in Egypt are made of mixed metal, chiefly copper. So admirably did the skill of the Egyptians succeed in the composition of metals, that their mirrors were susceptible of a polish which has been but partially revived at the present day. The mirror was nearly round, having a handle of wood, stone, or metal. The form varied with the taste of the owner. The same kind of metal mirror was used by the Israelites, who doubtless brought it from Egypt. In Exod. xxxviii, 8, it is expressly said that Moses "made the laver of brass of the looking-glasses (brazen mirrors) of the women." In the East mirrors had a connection with the observances of religion; females held them before the images of the goddesses, thereby manifesting their own humility as servants of the divinities, and betokening the prevalence in private life of a similar custom (Callimach. Hymn. in Philaup. 21; Senec. Ep. 95; Cyrill. De Adorat. in Spiri. ii, 04). That in the New Testament a mirror is intended in James i, 23, "keeping his natural face in a glass," appears certain; but the other passage, in which the word ἱδρυμα occurs (1 Cor. xii, 12), seems to require an imperfectly transparent medium, through which objects are beheld. What the precise substance was which the apostles thought of when he used the words it may not be easy to determine. It could not well be ordinary glass, for that was transparent. It may have been the ἵαρα ἴαυλορα, or a kind of tali, of which the ancients made their mirrors. This opinion is held by Schleusner, who says that the Jews used a similar mode of expression to describe a dim and imperfect view of mental objects (Schöttgen, Hor. Heb. ad loc.). (See Michaelis, Hist. Vitr. ap. Hebr. in Comment. Soc. Gott. ii, 57; also Dr. Falconer on the "Knowledge of the Ancients respecting Glass," in the Miscell. of the Lit. and Phil. Soc. of Manchester, ii, 96; Becker's Chrestien, i, 132; Michaelis, Suppl. p. 618; Pareau, Comment. on Job xxviii, p. 516; Hamberger, Vitr. Hist. in the Comment. Soc. Gott. 1754; Hirsch, Geschicchte der baukunst, iii, 66.) See Looking-Glass.

Glass-painting is of three kinds: (1) the mosaic, in which pieces of differently-colored glass are cut out and arranged as to represent figures or scenes, the pieces being joined together with lead; (2) the enameled, in which the colors are laid on a plate of glass and then burnt in; and (3) the mosaic-enamel, which is a union of the other two, and is by far the most beautiful and durable kind of glass-painting. The art probably had its origin in France or Germany during the tenth century. The mosaic style prevailed till the fourteenth century. Glass-painting reached its highest state in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. After the rise of the Renaissance around the sixteenth century, glass-painting fell into decadence. It has been quite successfully revived during the last thirty years in Germany.——Warrington, History of Stained Glass (London, 1850); Wackernagel, Geschichte der deutschen Glassmalerei (Leipzig, 1855). (G. F. C.)

Glass or Glassius, Salomo, a German theologian, eminent both for piety and learning, was born at Sonderhausen in Thuringia, in 1588. He was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena, and devoted himself at an early period specially to the study of Hebrew and its cognate languages. He became in 1637 professor of theology at Jena, and in 1640 was made superintendent of the churches and schools in Saxe-Gotha. In this office he acquired himself with great zeal and success, laboring for the spiritual as well as intellectual well-being of the churches of the duchy. He died at Gotha July 27, 1656. His works are, Philosophia Sacra (4to); Iconographia Medica Physica (Jena, 1624, 4to); Disputationes in Augustam (from Confessio), et Evangel. Evangelii utraque s. 285), Ernst. Theolog. E impartum (Gotha, 1647, 4to; Kuremb, 1664, fol.).——Christologia Mosaeica (Jena, 1649, 4to); Christologia Davidica (Jena, 1658, 4to).—Loch Theologici (posthumous, Go.
GLASTONBURY, "an ancient municipal burg and market-town in the county of Somerset, twenty-five miles south-west of Bath, is built on the site of a cross and occupied by a peninsula formed by the river Brue or Brent, called the Isle of Avalon. Pop. (1861) 3559. The town owes its origin to its celebrated abbey, which, according to tradition, was founded in A.D. 60, and was one of the earliest seats of Christianity in Britain. Its fragments remain. The Chapel of St. Mary is the "miraculous thorn," which flowered on Christmas-day, was, till the time of the Puritans, believed by the common people to be the veritable staff with which Joseph aided his steps from the Holy Land. The tree was destroyed during the civil wars, but grafts from its stock are under the care of the neighbors. In A.D. 605 the monks adopted the dress and rules of the Benedictine order. This magnificent pile at one time covered sixty acres; but as most of the houses in Glastonbury, and also a causeway across Sedgemoor, have been destroyed, we have now only one-fourth of the materials, the extent of which was now much diminished. The most interesting remains are the Abbey Church, with St. Joseph's Chapel, St. Mary's Chapel, and the Abbot's Kitchen. St. Joseph's Chapel is one of the most elegant specimens in existence of the transition from Norman to early English architecture, and is supposed to have been erected during the reigns of Henry II and Richard I. It is now roofless, and the vaulting of the crypt is nearly destroyed. The entrance is adorned with sculpture. Below the floor is a Norman crypt, within which is St. Joseph's Well. Of the Abbey Church a few fragments remain. The Chapel of St. Mary is roofless, but the remains of its pointed windows and arches are exceedingly elegant. The Abbot's Kitch- en, now separate from the rest of the ruins, is a square massive structure, the walls strongly buttressed, and dates from about the 12th century. Glastonbury has the honor of ranking St. Patrick (A.D. 415) and St. Dunstan among its abbots. In 1539 Henry VIII summoned abbot Whiting to surrender Glastonbury and all its treasures; and on his refusal, condemned him to be hanged and quartered, and the monastery completely destroyed, which the king's agents immediately carried into execution. According to tradition, king Arthur and his queen Guinevere were buried in the cemetery of the abbey; and Giraldus Cambrensis states that a leaden cross, bearing the following inscription, "Hic jacet sepultus Inclutos Hec Arthurus in basilis Avalonis," was found under a stone seven feet below the surface, and nine feet below this was found an oaken coffin, containing dust and bones. This disinterment took place by order of Henry II. The only other objects of interest at Glastonbury are the Church of St. Benedict; the Church of St. John the Baptist, with a tower 140 feet high; the Wasy- all Hall, where Joseph of Arimathia rested from his weary pilgrimage; and the Tor Hill, where the last abbot of Glastonbury was put to death, five feet above the sea-level, crowned by a beautiful tower, the ruin of a pilgrimage chapel of St. Michael.

GLATZ, Jacob, a Protestant clergyman of Hungary, was born in 1776 at Poprad, studied theology at the university of Jessen, became in 1797 professor at Saltz, and in 1804 professor of the Lutheran Protestant school of Vienna, in 1806 minister of the Lutheran congregation in the same city, resigned in 1836, and died in 1831 at Pragstein. He wrote numerous ju-
GLEDE 884 GLORIA IN EXCELSIS

... both passages γῆ, vultures, the Vulg. has μίμης, kites, in both. The Codex Samar., however, reads Πήγω in Deut. xiv. 18, which favors the supposition that this is the proper reading; but it still remains uncertain whether by this term we are to understand the glede or the vulture. The A.V. makes it the one in the one passage and the other in the other. As the Πήγω is distinguished from the Πήγω (Deut. xiv. 18), and as the latter is probably one of the vulture genus (comp. Isai. xxxiv. 14), it is probable that the former belongs to the kites. The kite has, in comparison with its bulk, very long wings, and a forked tail extending beyond them. It is a species that rises to a towering height, hangs apparently motionless in the sky, and darts down with immense velocity; but the legs and claws being weak, it is cowardly, and feeds upon carrion, fish, insects, mice, and small birds. About Cairo kites are particularly abundant, mixing with the carrion vultures in their wheeling flight, and coming in numbers to the daily distribution of food awarded them. But the question whether the kite of Europe and that of Egypt are the same species is not decided, though there is no want of scientific names for both species found in the valley of the Nile, one of which is certainly distinct from the European, and the other, if not so, is a strongly-marked variety. We find it not

tercus, Dandin; Elmus Cettius, Savigny; Falco Somnemnis, Lath.; Le Bleu, Le Vaill, and the Kowkib of the Arabs. It has the head, neck, and back dark rusty gray; scapulaires bordered with rusty; wing-coverts and primaries black, the last-mentioned tipped with white; tail rusty gray above, white beneath, outer dark; legs yellow. The manners of both species are much the same; it is likely that they are equally abundant at Cairo, and spread into Palestine. See Hawk.

Glenly, John, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Derry, Ireland, June 4, 1755, and was educated in the University of Glasgow, where, after some time to the study of theology, he was licensed and ordained. He subsequently accepted a call from the Church in Londonderry, where he remained till the Irish insurrection of 1788 obliged him to leave his native land. He arrived in Norfolk, Va., in 1799, and shortly after supplied the congregations of Staunton and Bethel, in Augusta Co., for nearly two years. He made the acquaintance of Washington and Jefferson, and was held in high estimation as a minister. In 1808 he was inducted as pastor of the Second Presbyterian congregation at Baltimore, and served the House of Representatives and the Senate as chaplain. He died Oct. 4, 1832. He published An Oration in Commemoration of Washington, 1800:—A Prayer offered on the 4th of July, 1821.—Sprague, Annals, iv, 229.

Glenorchy, Lady Wilhelmina Maxwell, distinguished for her benevolence and piety, was born at Preston, Scotland, Sept. 2, 1741. Her early years, though sedulously watched over by her kind and intelligent mother, were nevertheless too much devoted to the follies and gayety of fashionable life. When she had attained the age of twenty-three years, her mind was aroused by a serious illness to reflections on her present character and future prospects; and musings on the first question in the Assembly's Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?"—"It is to glorify God, and enjoy him forever," she asked herself, Have I answered the design of my being? Have I glorified God? Shall I enjoy him forever? Thus reflecting, she gradually felt the sinfulness of her nature, perceived the total alienation of her heart from God, and applied to her heavenly Father through Christ for pardon and grace. The remainder of her life was distinguished by the consistency of her deportment. She employed much of her time in acts of benevolence, in wise and benevolent contributions; in an extensive, judicious, and profitable correspondence; and in every other means for promoting the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints. For such benevolent actions, she was called a Methodist, and represented as a wild enthusiast; but such opposition her principles enabled her patiently to endure, and, through evil and good report, to pursue her work of faith and labor of love. She was an intimate friend of Darcy Lady Maxwell, and, like her, a friend to Mr. Wesley and his preachers. In 1774 she opened a chapel in Edinburgh called "Lady Glenorchy's chapel," where Mr. Jones, of Plymouth, preached for over fifty years. She built also several places of worship in the country. Though her health declined, her activity and usefulness were unabated, till, on the 17th of July, 1786, she was summoned to her reward. She bequeathed, by her will, five thousand pounds for the education of young men for the ministry in England; five thousand pounds to the society in Scotland for the propagation of Christian knowledge; and the greatest part of the residue of her property to charitable and pious purposes. See Memoirs of Glenorchy, in Burder's Pious Worthy. In Jones, Christian Biography; Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 228; Stevens, History of Methodism.

Gloria in Excelsis ("Glory be to God on high"), the name of one of the most ancient doxologies of the Church. It is called doxologia major, to distinguish it

Egyptian Kite (Milvus Aegyptius).

Common Kite (Milvus ater).
from the Gloria Patri; and is also called hymnus angeli cus (the angelic hymn), because the first part of it was sung by the angels at Bethlehem. The latter portion is ascribed to Telephorus, about A.D. 139; but this is doubtful. The word hymn may have very little difference, to be found in the Apostolical Constitutions, and was established to be used in the church service by the fourth Council of Toledo. It is used by both the Greek and Latin churches. "In the Eastern Church," says Palmer, "this hymn is more than 1500 years old, and the Church of England has used it, either at the beginning or end of the liturgy, for above 1300 years." In the Roman Missal it stands at the beginning of the Office for the Communion, as it does also in the first Common Prayer of King Edward VI, where it immediately follows the Collect for Purity. In the present prayer-book of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church it stands after the communion, as it does also in the Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Greek form of the hymn, as restored by Bunsen (Auseleca Antiscenna, iii, 87), is as follows: "Δοξάσατε τὸν θεόν ὑμῶν, τὸν κύριον, τὸν εστίν αἰώνιον, καὶ λογικά, καὶ θρασύνως καὶ συνεισφέροντες τῷ πατρί, ὑμεῖς καὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη μεῖζον τὸ κέρι τοῦ θεοῦ." ("Praise the Lord, all ye heavens, praise him, all ye hosts of his palace!""); some here assign the similitude of "liver," but the liver is never (like the heart and reins) assumed as the seat of the mind and affections. (3) Splendor, brightness, glory, majesty—of all my glory," i.e. splendor (Gen. xiv, 18; Isa. iv, 2); splendor (Jer. vii, 11; 19, 13); "also glory" (Isa. xxiii, 1; 1 Pet. iv, 4); "the glory of Lebanon," its magnificence of height or extent (Isa. xxxv, 2; 11, 10). Some here assign the similitude of "light," but the sun, stars, etc. (1 Cor. xv, 40, 41); of Moses's face (2 Cor. iii, 7); also of the celestial light which surrounds angels (Rev. xiv, 3), or glorified saints (Luke ii, 32; 1 Cor. xv, 40, 48; Col. i, 14; 2 Thess. ii, 10; Heb. iii, 3); when he showed himself at Sinai to Moses and the people (Exod. xvi, 7, 10; xxiv, 17; xix, 18; xxiii, 6, 23), or appeared in the tabernacle (Exod. xxi, 34), or in the Temple (1 Kings viii, 11; 2 Chron. vii, 1, 2; compare Luke ii, 9, 15, 32; Acts vii, 55; 8, 31; Rev. i, 12); 2 Cor. iv, 4; 1 Cor., when he appeared to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. i, 10, 11). See also of Jehovah (Isa. lix, 19, 11; xxii, 2; 2 Thess. i, 9; 2 Pet. i, 17; Rev. xxxi, 11, 28), that fiery splendour surrounded with dark clouds in which Jehovah is represented as appearing, or God himself as surrounded by this effulgence, from which lightnings proceed (Lev. ii, 28, 24; Num. xii, 25; Prov. xix, 23; 24, 24; 1 Pet. iii, 24, 24; 24, 24; 24, 24). Some here assign the similitude of "sight"; and sinners are said to "prove the eyes of his glory," i.e. of him as thus appearing in his glory for their punishment (Isa. iii, 8). Spoken also of the expected temporal reign of the Messiah (Mark x, 37; comp. Matt. xx, 21); and also of the glory of his second coming (Matt. xxv, 27; xxi, 28; xxiv, 30; Mark xiii, 26; viii, 88; Luke ix, 36; xxii, 37; Titus ii, 13). (4) Of internal character, i.e. glorious moral attributes. Spoken of God, infinite perfection, divine majesty and holiness (Pss. xix, 13; Isa. xi, 5; Acts vii, 2, Rom. i, 25; Eph. i, 17); so of the divine perfections as a manifestation in the power of God (John x, 40; Rom. vi, 4; Col. i, 11), or in his benevolence and beneficence (Rom. ix, 28; Eph. i, 12, 14, 18; iii, 10). So of Jesus, as the effulgence of the divine perfections (Heb. i, 3; John i, 14; ii, 11); also of the Spirit (1 Pet. iv, 14). (5) Of that exalted state of blissful glory which is the portion of those who dwell with God in heaven; e.g. spoken of Christ, and including also the idea of his regal majesty as Messiah (Luke xxiv, 26; John xvii, 5, 22, 24; 2 Thess. ii, 14, 1 Tim. iii, 16, 1 Pet. i, 11). Spoken of glorified saints, i.e. salvation, eternal life, etc. (Rom. ii, 7, 10; 7, 2; vii, 18; 1 Cor. i, 7; 2 Thess. ii, 17; 1 Thess. ii, 12; 2 Tim. ii, 10; Heb. ii, 10; 1 Pet. v, 1, 10). So to glorify, when spoken of God and Christ, is to render conspicuous and glorious the divine character and attributes of God as glorified by
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the Son (John xii, 23; xiii, 31, 32; xiv, 13; xv, 8; xvi, 1, 4); of Christ as glorified by the Father (John viii, 54; xiii, 10, 11, 18; xiv, 28; xix, 14); of Moses (John x, 31, 32). See BEAT-

tow, n. v. See GLORIFIED.

Other terms less frequently rendered "glory," "glorious," etc., are: 大名, large; 得孝, to seed; 得孝, honor; 美好, beauty, etc.; 永年, renown; 足音, to boast. On these and the above, consult the Heb. and Gr. Lexicons.

We may be said to give glory to God when we confess our sins, and when we love him supremely, when we commit our cause to his service, walk humbly, thankfully, and cheerfully before him, and recommend, proclaim, or set forth his excellencies to others (Matt. v, 16; John xv, 8; Gal. ii, 20). In Exod. vii, 2, we read, "And Moses said unto Pharaoh, Glory over me." The margin has for "glory" honor, and for "over me" at Pharaoh's seat. Pharaoh had besought Moses to pray that the Lord might take away the frogs, and Moses wished the king to have the glory and honor (in preference to himself) of appointing a time when he should thus pray to the Lord to take them away. This was not only complimentary, but, if he had a sanguine tendency to convince him that the Lord had heard the prayer of Moses, because he himself had appointed the time.

As man's real glory on earth consists in submitting to the will of God, and in doing it, so will his glory in heaven consist in being eternally pleased and satisfied, and in finding in him perfect happiness. There can be no real glory, either in this world or in the next, aside from virtue. The glory we seek here consists in the esteem of our fellow-men, and it would never be a false or a dangerous glory if men were wise enough not to esteem anything but what is virtuous. Verily I say thereof to convince him that the Lord had heard the prayer of Moses, because he himself had appointed the time.

At the first glance his instructions on this point may appear somewhat contradictory. He says: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Then: "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them; otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven." Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, thou hast a reward of thy Father which is in heaven. And if any men know, they are the most excellent sort of knowledge, viz. that of God and his glory. The existence of the created universe consists as much in it as in any thing: yea, this knowledge is one of the highest, most real, and substantial parts of all created existence, most remote from nonentity and desert. As there is an infinite fulness of all possible good in God, a fulness of every perfection, of all excellency and beauty, and of infinite happiness, and as this fulness is capable of communication or emanation ad extra, so it seems amiable and valuable in itself that it should be communicated or flow forth, that this infinite fountain of good should send forth abundant streams, that this infinite fountain of light should diffuse its excellent fulness, pour forth light all around —and as this is in itself excellent, so a disposition to bestow this, in the next place, must be looked on neither as an imperfection nor an excellent disposition, such an emanation of good is, in some sense, a multiplication of it; so far as the communication or external stream may be looked upon as any thing besides the fountain, so far it may be looked upon as an increase of good. And if the fulness of good that is in the fountain is itself excellent and worthy to exist, then the emanation, or that which is as it were an increase, repetition, or multiplication of it, is excellent and worthy to exist. Thus it is fit, since there is an infinite fountain of light
and knowledge, that this light should shine forth in beams of communicative knowledge and understanding; and as there is an infinite fountain of holiness, moral excellence, and beauty, it should flow out in communicative holiness. And as there is an infinite fulness of joy and happiness, so these should have an emanation, and become a fountain flowing out in abundant grace. Sometimes, sometimes, in the scheme of all things, it appears in another way to be a thing in itself valuable that there should be such things as the knowledge of God’s glory in other beings, and a high esteem of it, love to it, and delight and complacence in it: this appears say, in a certain way, viz. as the things that are but the fruits and evidences of God’s own knowledge, holiness, and joy. Thus it appears reasonable to suppose that it was what God had respect to as an ultimate end of his creating the world, to communicate of his own infinite fulness of good; or, rather, it was his last end, that there might be a glorious and abundant emanation of his infinite fulness of good ad extra, or without himself; and the disposition to communicate himself, or diffuse his own fulness, which we must conceive of as being originally in God as a perfection of his nature, was what moved him to create the world” (p. 219).

"...in this case of a emanation of the divine fulness, are not properly set in opposition, or made the opposite parts of a disjunction. Nor ought God’s glory and the creature’s good to be spoken of as if they were properly and entirely distinct; that God’s dominion is in his glory, and the communication of good to his creatures, are things altogether different; that God’s communicating his fulness for himself, and his doing it for them, are things standing in a proper disjunction and opposition; whereas, if we were capable of having more full and perfect ideas of God and divine things, which are so much above us, it is probable it would appear very clear to us that the matter is quite otherwise, and that these things, instead of appearing entirely distinct, are implied one in the other—that is, in seeking his glory, therein seeks the good of his creatures. Because a good emanation of his glory (which he seeks and delights in, as he delights in himself and his own eternal glory) implies the communicated excellency and happiness of his creatures. And in communicating his fulness for them, he does it for himself; because he seeks, which he seeks, much in union and communion with himself. God is their good. Their excellency and happiness is nothing but the emanation and expression of God’s glory. God, in seeking their glory and happiness, seeks himself, and union with himself, i.e. himself diffused and expressed (which is a delight in, as he delights in, his own infinite beauty and fulness), he seeks their glory and happiness” (Dissertation on the End of God in Creation, § 2, 3).

In thus manifesting his power, wisdom, holiness, and goodness, we say that God has established his “glory;” and so, also, when men acknowledge and worship these divine perfections, they “glorify” God. In this language there is nothing absurd or injurious to the divine majesty. In Scripture the object of divine revelation is stated sometimes to be the sanctification of man, sometimes the glory of God, as these are identical, whether considered from the divine or the human point of view. Moreover, it is an effect of the divine wisdom, holiness, and goodness, that man should find happiness in virtue, not in vice; in submission to the physical and moral laws, as it is so much by God, not in violating them. And when we submit to these laws he glorifies God, since he renders homage to the divine perfections. Hence it cannot be wrong to say that the glory of God consists in the submission of all creatures to his law, and that the glory of all rational creatures consists, as it were, in the submission of the subordinates to God. If we are to recognize the glory of God as one of his rights, as one of his regal prerogatives, it takes so "ipo the form of a duty, which becomes obligatory for us. The heavens declare the glory of God, but they only declare it to reasonable beings, for the glory of God is only realized when its revelation is understood by moral beings, willingly received by them, and independently reflected. "The Lord hath made all things for himself" (Prov. xvi. 4). Not that he makes all things for himself, for his own use, but for the use of his own creatures, or for the use of those creatures which he has appointed for his own use, or to increase his own essential happiness, but that he made all in accordance with the requirements of his divine perfections, and so as better to manifest his glory. When the adversaries of Christianity reflect upon things in this world, they see that man, holding himself vain, thirsting for praise and increase, they fall themselves into the very error which they denounce. They say: "If man seeks for glory, it is because he needs it; because he is weak; hence, if God seeks his own glory, it is also from need and weakness." This is pure sophistry: man is weak and poor because finite; God is self-sufficient because essentially happy and perfect; and it is on account of this very perfection that he acts for his glory, because he could not have any higher or more worthy aim.

"But," it is said, "to speak of glory" accruing from man to God, is not in the books. And a proper emanation of the divine fulness, are not properly set in opposition, or made the opposite parts of a disjunction. Nor ought God’s glory and the creature’s good to be spoken of as if they were properly and entirely distinct; that God’s dominion is in his glory, and the communication of good to his creatures, are things altogether different; that God’s communicating his fulness for himself, and his doing it for them, are things standing in a proper disjunction and opposition; whereas, if we were capable of having more full and perfect ideas of God and divine things, which are so much above us, it is probable it would appear very clear to us that the matter is quite otherwise, and that these things, instead of appearing entirely distinct, are implied one in the other—that is, in seeking his glory, therein seeks the good of his creatures. Because a good emanation of his glory (which he seeks and delights in, as he delights in himself and his own eternal glory) implies the communicated excellency and happiness of his creatures. And in communicating his fulness for them, he does it for himself; because he seeks, which he seeks, much in union and communion with himself. God is their good. Their excellency and happiness is nothing but the emanation and expression of God’s glory. God, in seeking their glory and happiness, seeks himself, and union with himself, i.e. himself diffused and expressed (which is a delight in, as he delights in, his own infinite beauty and fulness), he seeks their glory and happiness” (Dissertation on the End of God in Creation, § 2, 3).
patera of the Catacombs, about the 3d century, being in them applied to the head of Christ. About the close of the 6th century it was first applied to angels, and to the apostles and saints. The present art to signify power and dominion. In this sense it was occasionally used in Christian art, as when it was placed around the head of Constantine, of the empress Theodora, around six heads of the beast of the Apocalypse, and even around that of Satan. But usually it signified holiness and purity. The olden glory, or the "vesica piscis," envelops the whole person only in representations of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or other saints who are represented as ascending to heaven. The glory had many forms: thus it was a simple circle of light, or it contained a cross in the monogram A or X. It was sometimes applied to the head of a dove, a lamb, or other symbol of the Saviour.—Mrs. Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art; Martigny, Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chretiennes. (G. F. C.)

Gloss, Glossary. A gloss is a note appended to any word or phrase for the purpose of interpretation or illustration. "Sacred glosses" are such notes appended to words or phrases occurring in the Scriptures. A glossary is a collection of such explanatory notes properly arranged.

The word gloss is borrowed from the Greek γλῶσσα, a tongue. In the above explanation it has no support from classical usage. The process, however, by which the word passed from its original meaning to that in which it was used by medieval writers, and in which it is now used, may be traced. The Greek word γλῶσσα, may mean a tongue or speech, may be used by the Greek grammarians in the sense of a word requiring to be explained. In process of time words often become obsolete, or come to be used in senses different from those in which they were originally used; new words are introduced; and words frequently have special or proper use. In such cases the grammarians of ancient times made the technical character, familiar only to a portion of the community. To the multitude such words need to be explained; and such words the Greek grammarians called γλῶσσαν. Thus Plutarch speaks of certain expressions in the poets which were not commonly understood, and which for this reason, the idiom of particular regions or tribes, as τὰς λεγόμενα χάλκους (De audiend. post. c. 6). Galen applies the same name to the antiquated words of Hippocrates, and explains the term thus: δέος τοῖν τῶν ἀναμνηστικῶν ἡ μὲν τοῖς ἑκατονταῖς, ἡ δὲ μὴ ἀναμνηστικὴς καλοῦσιν (Exeges. Gloss. Hippocr. Proem.). Aristotle applies the same term to provincialisms (De arte poet. c. xxii, §§ 4–6; xxii, 3, 4, etc.). And, not to multiply quotations, a scholiast on Dion. Halicarn., quoted by Wetstein on 1 Cor. xii, 10, expressly says γλῶσσαν φωναί ἑρμηνεύει, and αὐτοὶ ἀργοὶ μελῳδοὶ, Quintilian also says of the synonymous word glossamass, “It est voces minus usitatass.” (Instit. Orat. i, 8, 15; comp. also i, 1, 35).

The next step was from calling a word needing explanation a gloss, to apply this term the explanation itself. These explanations at first consisted merely of the explanation in itself; in abbreviating the word in common use (ὁμώμα εἰρήμ., Aristot.) to the obsolete and peculiar word; and thus the two viewed as one whole came to be called a gloss; and ultimately this name came to be given to that part which was of most interest to the reader, viz. the explanation.

These explanations constituted the beginnings of Greek Lexicography. They did not continue, however, to be merely lexical; they often embraced historical, geographical, biographical, and such like notices. Hence, they were used at first in an alphabetical order; nor did they embrace the whole range of the language, but only such parts of it as the glossographer was interested in (hence such works as the Ἀντίκαι Γλώσσας of Theodorus, etc.); nor were the words presented in their uninflected forms, but in the form in which they occurred in the course of the glossographer's reading. More methodical collections of these explanations began to be made in the Middle Ages, and such works, by ignorance preserved to us an alphabet of Hezychius, Suidas, Phavorinus, Zonaras, Photius, and in the Etymologikon Magnum.

I. The first class of extant scriptural glosses consists of explanations drawn from the Greek glossarists, a large number of the notes collected by whom are on words occurring in Scripture. Their works thus become valuable as exegetical aids, especially as they convey not the individual opinion of the collector so much as opinions which he had gathered from older writers. A Glossarium Groecum in N. T., collected by two of the most learned of these glossarists, Valckenaer, was published by Alberti in 1780. It was sometimes taken from the works of Hezychius the explanations of scriptural words (Opp. i, 173 sqq.); but this has been best done by J. Ch. Gottil. Ernesti, in his Glossa Sacra Heschylis Graece, etc. (Lips. 1786), which was followed by a similar collection from Suidas and Phavorinus, with the codex, in the Etymologicum Magn. (Lips. 1786). These are extremely convenient books of reference. Comp. Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. iv, 540 sq.; Rosenmüller, Histor. Interpret. iv, 306 sq. Suicer's Theaurus Ecclesiasticus (Amst. 1685, 1728, 2 vols. fol.) contains nearly all these explanatory words or glosses, and the manuscript of which it is the record is one of the best modern Greek Lexicons of the N. T.

II. The second class of glosses is due to the habit, as old perhaps as the art of writing itself, of readers inscribing on the margin of MSS. or books observations of their own, which were written by the glossator of the text. This was especially the case with the sacred books, partly because after the establishment of Christianity they were more read than other books, partly because their contents gave abundant occasion for theological, historical, or philological annotation. Hence, from an early period, marginal notes have been added on the text. In the oldest Greek codex, the marginal notes were the source of not a few of the Keri readings; and the glosses on the margins of the codices of the Sept. and the N. T. have given rise to many of the various readings which exist in both of these. It is believed also, as marginal notes are transferred from a margin to the text, or from a careless copyist, into the text, that some such interpolations are to be found in the received text of the N. T., and it is considered to be one of the problems which criticism has to solve to detect these, and eliminate them. The exercise of a sound and cautious judgment, however, is required to preserve over this, lest rash and unauthorized alterations be made (Valckenaer, Dissert. de Glossis Sacris [Franq. 1787]; J. A. Ernesti, De vero usu et indole Glossariorum Gr. [Lug. Bat. 1742]; Tittmann, De Glossis N. T. metonymias at justicis [Wittenb. 1783]; Waser, De Glossis N. T. [pref. to Valckenaer's Schola Lebrum quodam N. T. [Amst. 1785]; Bornemann, De Glossemate, N. T. causis justicis, in his Schola ad Luc. Exeg. 1800]. It has been proposed to restrict the term gloss to the marginal annotations as such, and to use glossa to designate those which are supposed to have been introduced into the text; but the usage of writers is not uniform in this respect.

The longer marginal annotations (Glossae Marginales) were made principally on the text of the Vulgate. These were of various kinds; some grammatical, some historical, some theological, and even allegorical and mystical. The most famous collection of these is that made in the 9th century by Walfrid Strabo in the writings of Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory, Isidore, Bede, Alcuin, and Rabanus Maurus, with addi-
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tions by himself. This became the great exegetical thesaurus of the Middle Ages, and was known as the Glossa Ordinaria. Of notes written between the lines (Glossae Interlineares), a collection was made by Anselm of Lucca (1118-87) and David of Hesse in the 12th century. Both of these works were printed together about the end of the 15th century, 4 vols. fol., they have often been reprinted since, with the commentary of Lyra. Other glossaries are those of Peter the Lombard on the Psalms (Par. 1353), and Hugo of St. Caro (Psalterio in universa Biblia, Verona, 1487). David of Hesse's Introci, 252; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v. 188.

Glosses and Glossatores of the Roman and canon law. In the 12th century the Roman law, which after the downfall of the Western Roman empire had been neglected but little, but was of great importance, again was brought into notice, and studied with great zeal. The law school of Bologna, founded towards the end of the 11th century or the beginning of the 12th by 1 Mercuri (Warnerius, Guerius), was the centre of this new movement. The reputation of the school, and of its professors, spread from all parts of Europe to Bologna. The activity of the teachers did not confine itself to the expounding of the sources of the law, but also made these researches the foundation of a literary activity, and created a body of Glossatores (Glossarii), so called. The written interpretations of the Corpus juris were in the form of glosses, consisting sometimes in the explanation of some particular word or expression, sometimes in full and complete elucidations, and this sometimes between the lines of the text (interlineae glosses), sometimes on the margin (marginal glosses). Besides these the glossatores also wrote summae, reviews of the contents of some particular chapter of law; casali, real or imaginary cases intended as illustrations of particular points in connection with questions and distinctions; and also brocarda or brocardica, etc. (see Saveny, Grecius, decret. ii. c. 537-553). This literary activity of the glossatores of Roman law was an example for scientific treatment of canon law, which afterwards (in the 12th century) gave rise in Bologna and in Paris to lectures on the subject, and thus by the side of the logists the schools of the canonists, head of his professors, emerged. A number of the pupils and disciples of Gratian (q. v.) composed glosses (probably interlinear) on his Decretum. Among the oldest of these glossatores was Sicardus of Cremona, who was made bishop of Cremona in 1165. When the number of glosses in different MSS. became very great, the faculty of collecting and arranging them was undertaken by John Tetoconus, who wrote in 1212 a commentary on the Decretum, compiled from the glosses of his predecessors, and this Apparatus, augmented and improved, by Bartholomew of Breola about 1236, became the Glossa ordinaria; i.e. was indorsed by the school, appended to the M.3. copies of the Decretum, and subsequently printed with it. Glosses on the collection of decretales of Gregory IX were written by Vincentius Hispanus (about 1240), Goffredo Traniensis (+1245), and Simplicius Fiesco, who afterwards sat on the pontifical throne (1243-54) under the name of Innocent IV. From these glosses Bernhard de Botone of Parma (+1260) compiled his Apparatus, which was also recognised as glossa ordinaria. Among the glossatores of the Liber sextus are to be named Johannes Monachus (+1313), Guido de Bavario, and Petrus Andreas (+1548). The glosses of the latter were originally written in his youth; he afterwards improved them, and they have been copied and printed as glossa ordinaria. He also wrote the first glosses on the Clementini in Latin, and he was also the first to commence the collection of glossæ ordinariae. Among the other glossatores of the same collection we remark Zenzelinus de Cassania, a teacher of Toulouse, Johannes de Lignano, Petrus de Anchariano, Franciscus Zabarella (+1417), etc. The glosses on the Extravaganza were the work partly of Guillerma de Monte Lauduno, and partly of Johannes Monachus. Those on the collection of John XXII were chiefly by Zenzelinus de Cassania. The glosses have to this day a great scientific value; for the historians, who have also exerted an important influence in the practice of the law. See Sarti, De claris archipresbyteriis Bonon. professoribus, t. i., p. i, ii (Bonon. 1769, folio); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v. 191. (J. N. P.)

Glocester, a cathedral city of England, on the Severn, 48 miles northwest of London. The cathedral is of several different eras of ecclesiastical architecture, 427 feet in length, and 144 in width; the height of the central tower, its greatest external ornament, is 225 feet; the cloisters, also of great beauty, form a large square. Formerly the church of a Benedictine abbey, it was converted into a cathedral in 1541. Gloucester is the official residence of the bishop of Glocester and Bristol, whose diocese embraces Gloucestershire, and parts of Somersetshire and Wiltshire. The diocese belongs to the province of Canterbury, and in 1829 had 13 deaneries, 465 benefices, 190 curacies, and about 210,000 church sittings. The incumbent (1899) is Charles John Elliott, D.D. (consecrated in 1888).

Gloves, part of the insignia of a bishop. See BISHOP.

Gluttony (Guttur, gulla), Deut. xxi. 20; Prov. xxiii. 21; a "riotous" person, Prov. xxiii. 20; xxviii. 7. Is prodigal, voluputous debauchee, πειχω, given to eating, "gluttonous," Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34.

Gphneus (or Follonius), Willelmus, was born at the time when the English victory over the French at Poitiers was achieved. He was a man of learning, and specially versed in Latin literature. He shared in the afflictions of his friends, Jan de Wicet, and Bakker and others, who became victims to Roman Catholic intolerance and persecution. Released from captivity, he was again seized and condemned to spend three months in a monastery on bread and water. He was permitted to see the cause of the Reformation prosper, and to enjoy the esteem and confidence of his countrymen. He died in 1688, at Norden, of which he was burgomaster. He wrote several works in Latin, which bear evidence of his familiarity with the writings of Erasmus. His most important work is his Life of Johannes Pictorius. It was probably written in 1686, because it was published at Prahaux in 1628. His native city is J oh. Pictorius
eos, ob ecclesiae veritatis asseritum, apud Holendros primum ommium eustati martyrium. A new edition was brought out in 1649 by Prof. Reinsen of Leyden. See Glaucus, Godgeleer Nederland, I d. blz. 531, 532; Tpej Johannes Pictorius, Kerk, I d. blz. 104, Assentiek. blz. 60 (79); also, Haren roth, Vita Gaphnorum descriptio, in Bibl. Brunse., chris, viss., fasc. i. p. 111 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyk. xix. 566. (J. P. W.)

Gnath (Gnath, Gnarb), to grate the teeth. Ψιγύω, Acts vii. 54; τριψίω, Mark ix. 18. "To gnash with the teeth," and "gnashing of teeth," are expressions that occur in several parts of Scripture, denoting rage or sorrow (Job xvi. 9; Psa. xxii. 10; Lam. ii. 16; Matt. viii. 12). See TOOTH.

Gnat (Gnata, Vulgat Culex), occurs only in Matt. xxiii. 24, a small two-winged stinging fly, belonging to the genus Culex (Linn. diptera, Latronne culex), which includes the mosquitoes. The common gnat scarcely yields to any insect in regard to the interestiing facts to be proved. The following outlines will recall the chief of them to the reader: the boat-shaped body of eggs, which the parent gnat forms and leaves upon the water, so admirably constructed that, though hollow, it neither becomes...
The weapon with which the gnat or mosquito makes its attack is a long and slender tufted proboscis, projecting from a socket on the mouth like a very fine bristle, and appearing to the naked eye quite simple. Under the magnifying power of the microscope, however, it is seen to be a flexible spear-like sheath of six distinct pieces, two of which are cutting blades or lancets (g), two notched like a saw with reversed teeth (f), a tubular canal (e), and the central one an exceedingly acute point (d). When the attack is made, the gnat brings the tip of the organ within its sheath to press upon the skin, into which it presently enters, the sheath remaining without and bending into an angle as the lancets descend. When the weapon has penetrated to its base—a distance of one sixth of an inch or more—the lancets slide laterally, and then cut the flesh on either side, promoting the flow of blood from the superficial vessels; at the same moment a highly irritant fluid is poured into the wound, which has the effect of diluting the blood, and thus of making it more suitable for flowing up the slender central tube into the throat of the insect. It then sucks, if undisturbed, till its stomach is filled to repletion, leaving a painful tumor accompanied with an intolerable itching. It is the female gnat alone which is noxious; the male, whose proboscis is feathered, has no power of sucking blood.

Gnesen, a town in the Prussian province of Posen, with (in 1885) 15,760 inhabitants. It is believed to be the most ancient town of the former Polish empire. The cathedral church contains the relics of St. Adalbert, the apostle of the Prussians, which were purchased and deposited there by Duke Belaslav 1. Soon after, at the beginning of the 11th century, Gnesen was made the see of an archbishop, Gaudentius, the brother and companion of St. Adalbert, being the first incumbent of that dignity. The archbishops of Gnesen were primates of the Polish church, and the archbishop of Gnesen was created archbishop of the Prussians during the vacancy of the throne. In 1821 the united archbishopric of Posen and Gnesen was organized, the archbishop residing at Posen, but Gnesen remaining the seat of a chapter. See Neher, Kirch. Statistik, vol. ii.

Gnost machi (γνωστής and μίκρον), a name given to those in the 4th century who were the arvored enemies of the Gnostics. A certain rhetorician is said to have formed a sect on the principle that matters of doctrine are indifferent, as no certainty can be obtained as to doctrine; but that a good life is all that is essential to Christianity. "It may be a question whether there was ever a regularly constituted sect professing such indifference to doctrine; whether the fact ever amounted to anything more than this, that individuals at different times and in different places were led by the same opposition and the same tendency of mind to entertain these views, of which individuals of the above-mentioned Rhetoricians may have been one."—Neander, Church History (Torrey's), ii, 702.

Gnostics. See Gnosticism.

Gnosticism. A. Gnostics. The New-Testament writers were occasionally determined in their choice of prominent words by the expressions which were current among the people they addressed. Such words as logos and gnostics, having acquired a peculiar significance in the schools, were recognised by them, and
appropriated to a sacred use. We concede, indeed, that the latter word (γνῶσις) usually denotes in their writings simply what its etymology implies, the mere act of knowing, or the objective knowledge thus acquired. In those primitive times it was seldom that any question of faith was urged, except in the dire straits when Christian truth was demanded. The contest was with reference to the simple facts of the Gospel, and Christianity was fast to secure an existence in the world before it had leisure to speculate upon abstract points. Not only was it unwise to divert men’s minds from practical religious duties by pushing the question of the individual to be intrusted with a higher wisdom. Paul, therefore, and his fellow-laborers determined to confine their apostolic ministrations to such a historical presentation of Jesus Christ and him crucified as might be called the simplest milk of the word. He declares, however (1 Cor. ii. 6), that he sometimes made known a higher wisdom among such as were perfect, though a wisdom, he is careful to say, very different from that which some heathen and Jewish philosophers had claimed. In other passages he applies the word gnōsis to this kírion, and the term impart of knowledge among those peculiar gifts of the Spirit which were possessed by the more eminent teachers (1 Cor. xii. 8), and commends a knowledge through which the more discerning believers rose above the fear of the heathen gods, and ate of the things offered to idols as of the true bread of life (cf. 1 Cor. x. 4). In this exercise of faith, (1 Cor. viii. 7). He speaks also of a gnōsis falsely so called, and thus implies that there was another which truly deserved the name (1 Tim. vi. 20). In subsequent times this use of the word became common, and great pains were taken to make obvious the distinction between the true (γνῶσις) and many a believer was taught the true (γνῶσις). A late (1715) discovered treatise of Irenæus (entitled γνώσις, ἀληθῆ), and an extended description of the true Gnostic at the close of the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria, have preserved to us the views of the Church on this subject near the close of the 2d century.

It was admitted on all sides that there was a knowledge of divine things superior to that of the multitude, not in its importance to the salvation of the soul, but in its intellectual power. It belonged not so much to the personal salvation as to the comfort and growth of believers, and to the acceptance of the Gospel among the more educated classes. It took up those facts which were objects of the common faith, and made them subjects of speculation and profound thought. It endeavored to make these objects of human knowledge, to reconcile their apparent discrepancies with each other and with the conclusions of science, and applied them to long-agoed questions which were only hinted at, but not solved, in the Christian Scriptures. At this point, however, the true and the false gnostics separated, and took different directions. The former submitted itself without reserve to the authority of the Scriptures, and professed never to venture beyond what was written. It presented itself to all men without discrimination of natural talents or social position. It was open to every man to come to the reach of the vulgar, and to be derived from sources superior to the written word. Clement describes the true Gnostic as one who grows grey in the study of the Scriptures. A scientific culture may be indispensable to the higher departments of that study, and a trend which has been known to be attended with a divine grace, but the natural talents which must be used in its acquisition have been given to all, and each one’s success will be propounded to his prayerful diligence. The sources of knowledge, too, were the same for the humblest believer and the most eminent Gnostic. for he had access to the Scriptures and the common tradition (παραδόσεις) which had been transmitted in all the churches. The gnōsis was simply a faith made perfect, an expansion of what faith had received, a building constructed wholly of materials supplied by faith. Its advocates made much use of a passage in Isa. xlii. 9 (Sept.): ‘‘If ye believe not, neither shall ye understand:’’ from which they inferred not only that any one who is capable of knowing is also capable of knowing, but that this knowledge should spring from faith. And yet it cannot be denied that many, especially of the Alexandrian school, gave an undue prominence to this higher knowledge, as if it were indispensable to all religion, and disparaged the great body of believers (πεπιστευκότας) as incapable of a just idea of belief, and to be intrusted with a Christ of an earthly and sensible existence, and as actu- ated only by a fear of punishment and a desire of personal benefits. The true Gnostic, on the other hand, they believed to be favored with such an intellectual faculty for the Gnostics had ceased to exist, and such a perpetual tuition under the divine Logos, that he could dispense, in a great degree, with outward demonstrations; and they claimed that his love of knowledge was so intense and disinterested, that if it could even be separated from his eternal salvation he would not hesitate still to afford all that his in- lightened to expiate were chiefly: God, as he must be conceived of in his absolute being, the incarnation and redeeming work of Christ, the influence of these upon our race and upon other beings, the vast chain of existence between man and God, the fall of some links of their being, and the restoration of the Church, as a part of this world, the source of moral evil and its elimination from the universe, and the future history and destiny of all things. In the discussion of such themes, we need not be surprised to find that they not infrequently transcended the province both of reason and of faith, and that some of their speculations were con- demned by their more temperate brethren (Neander, Hist. i. 544-52; Hase, Hist. § 85; Schaff, Hist. Christ. Church, vol. i, p. 79).

B. Historical Gnosticism.—I. General Character. —The name has been applied to a variety of schools which had sometimes little in common except the assumption of a knowledge higher than that of ordinary believers. Most of them claimed a place in the Church, and complained bitterly when this was denied them; and yet they generally spoke of Christianity as insufficient to afford absolute truth, and not infrequently they assumed a hostile attitude towards it. They seldom pretended to demonstrate the principles on which their systems were founded by historical evidence or logical reasonings, since they rather boasted that these were discovered by the intuitive powers of the human mind, and that the materials thus obtained, whether through faith or divine revelation, were then worked up into a scientific form according to each one’s natural powers and culture. Their aim was to construct not merely a theory of redemption, but of the universe—a cosmogony. No subject was beyond their investigations. Whatever God could reveal to the finite intellect, they looked upon as within their range. What to others seemed only speculative ideas, were by them hypostatized or personified into real beings or historical facts. It was in this way that they conceived the system, of the relation on subjects entirely beyond the range of human knowledge, which started us by their boldness and their apparent consciousness of reality.

II. External Origin.—And yet we have reason to be- lieve that Gnosticism originated in some speculations which were essential and natural. It is not impossible that what seemed to it to come in earlier systems, and then combined these fragments in new relations—not in the way of a crude syncretism, but with mutual affinities and living power. No question, however, has more perplexed those who held that while the direct origin of Gnosticism, we are in possession of scarcely any authenticated documents which have come down to us from persons living at the time and
in countries in which it had its birth. We are dependent for our information respecting it almost entirely upon the representations of opponents, who knew almost nothing of Oriental systems, and were acquainted with it only in its maturity. Unfortunately, too, the attention of the origin of Gnosticism has recently become complicated with others on which violent party feelings have been exercised. Those who have denied the apostolic origin of the epistles in which traces of Gnosticism have been discovered, have felt an interest in the question of the origin of Gnosticism that must at least a period as possible. From the discussion of this subject, however, there are some facts which may now be regarded as incontrovertible. 1. Ever since the conquests of Alexander the Great, an intense interest had been felt throughout Asia Minor and Egypt in Hellenistic philosophy and Interpenetration, and while the old mythologic fables and professed systems of positive revelation had lost their authority, many thoughtful persons had discovered under these what they looked upon as a uniting bond of truth and the elements of a universal religion. 2. The result was that, near the time of the first promulgations of Christianity, a number of new systems of religious philosophy sprang up independently in different countries, and exhibited similar characteristics. They were usually formed by incorporating with the national religion the elements of foreign systems, and softening down what was harsh and incredible in the popular faith and worship. In this way we discover a nearly simultaneous origin of the Judaistic philosophy at Alexandria, of Esseneism and Therapeutism in Egypt and southern Palestine, of the Cabbalistic literature in Syria and the East, and of New Platonism among the Hellenistic nations. These were all offshoots from the same general root, and not necessarily deriving anything original, but unquestionably drawing much assistance from one another. Similar circumstances everywhere called forth similar phenomena with results parallel from their origin, and are thus account for the origin of Gnosticism, and easily reconcile the conflicting views of different writers respecting it. As the early ecclesiastical writers were themselves acquainted almost exclusively with Occidental literature, they were in the habit of ascribing the rise of Gnosticism to the study of Greek philosophy, and especially of Platonism, and they appeal to the cosmogonies of Hesiod and others for the exemplars of the Gnostic speculations. Modern historians, however, have found in most of the Gnostic systems such a penetration of Judaisms, of Oriental and ascetic notions, have been led to infer a direct influence not merely from Alexandrian Judaism, but dualistic Persians, and even from pantheistic Buddhism. There can, in fact, be no question regarding the influence of all these systems. The Platonic doctrines of a God, without distinctions in his nature, withdrawn entirely within himself, intelligible only to the initiated, and that only through the mediation of the Nous, a higher ideal sphere reflecting itself in a lower phenomenal world, a hyle (i.e.) and an undefined dualism between it and God, a fallen spiritual being born from the divine to the sensuous sphere, the derivations of sin from contact with the material element; the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers; the Brahminic doctrine of emanation and hypostatizing of the divine attributes; the Parsee representation of the divine essence as light, of a dualism in which the material is the chief thing, the sensation of evil, a world of matter, and of a good principle in eternal conflict with the prince of darkness; and the Buddhist notions of a God in process of development, of souls longing to be freed from the bonds of matter, and to be united with all sensible things, and reunited with the divine source of life, are all unmistakable, and indicative of their respective sources. We need not, however, suppose that these elements were derived directly from their original sources. The Alexandrian literature, in which most of these elements had found a place, was diffused among the educated classes in all those countries in which Gnosticism flourished, and might have been the mediating agency through which the primitive Gnostic was brought into connection with that of the West. From the heterogeneous combining of such diverse systems, and especially from their contact with the young energies of Christianity, the Gnostic spirit might easily draw forth such materials as suited its purpose. The sources of Gnosticism, however, like those of the Nile, are concealed, and those who imagine they have discovered its principal head not infrequently learn that another remains far beyond. As its friends boasted, there were secret agencies by which truth was conveyed to the elect race under symbols and an outward letter which only initiates could understand. (See Dr. Tattmann, in the Amer. Theol. Review for 1862, p. 565-76.)

111. Classification.—It has been found very difficult to arrange the several Gnostic sects according to any principle of classification. They have been grouped together by different writers according to their origin, and their speculative views. Naander (Hist. Christ. Religion, i. 370-86) divides them into Judaizing and anti-Judaizing Gnostics, according to their agreement or opposition to ancient Judaism. Gieseler (Ecc. Hist. vol. i, § 44) arranges the sects according to their geographical distribution, as Alexandrian, Syrian, and miscellaneous. Hase (Hist. Chr. Ch. § 76) makes four classes, Syrian, Hellenistic, Judaizing, and specially Christian. Similar to this is Matter's division into those of Syria, Asia Minor, Egypt, and the rest of the Roman world (Hist. crit. du Gnost., Basle, 1838) arranges the several sects into three principal classes, according to their relation to the three earlier religions with which they came in contact: 1. Those who combined Christianity with Judaism and heathenism; 2. Those who entirely separated it from them, and opposed it to them; and, 3. Those who combined Judaism and Mithraism with heathenism. This ingenious, and, in many respects, satisfactory division, fails to bring out the historical progress and internal development of the Gnostic systems, and offers no suitable place for Manichaeism. It has, however, found much favor on account of its simplicity, as well as the judicious classification by Niederer, Marheineke (Wechtler. ii, p. 246), Tenennall (Manual of the Hist. of Phil., § 200), and others. Dr. Schaff proposes a classification, according to an ethical point of view, into the speculative and the practical, and according to the influence of the ancient philosophy and libertinism (Hist. of the Chr. Ch. i. 294). It is evident that no classification can combine together a chronological, local, and logical distribution, and hence we shall probably gain something by presenting these separately.

IV. History.—In attempting to give a historical outline of the course of Gnosticism, our object is not so much to present particular details of the several schools, since these will be found, as far as possible, under their several heads in this work, but to indicate in general the order and position of each. Lippincott, in a recent article on "Gnostics, Gnosticism, and Development," endeavors to show that this course of development was a curve which commenced with only a slight departure from orthodoxy, and, after diverging more and more from it, finally comes back again, and subdues the previous position of the Pauline (B. M. Smith in Schaff's History of the Christian Church) has attempted a distinct definition of the three stages of this development. It is difficult to discover in the actual history the regularity of departure and return implied in such a figure, and yet we may derive from it a correct notion of the general direction. In the first stadium we have the Jewish, or the fundamental, and then the several classes who, in their opposition to Judaism, defied nearly all the godless characters of the Old Testament. In the second we have not merely
Old Testament history, but Greek philosophy, a contempt of the common faith, the opposition of the psychic and pneumatic natures, and mystical personifications of speculative ideas. In the third and last stadium this opposition between the pneumatic and psychic natures begins to be modified, and finally, under the influence of Gnostic speculation appears. So it is very nearly that of the more liberal Catholic teachers. It is in this last stadium that we find the greatest difficulty in seeing how the curve approximates with much uniformity the orthodox highway, for some classes of the later Marcionites, and, above all, the Marcionites of the Gnostic speculations. So it is material to be aware of the extreme consummation of Gnosticism.

As there were strong tendencies towards Gnosticism both in Judaism and heathenism, we might reasonably infer that the Gnostics must have been powerfully attracted by Christianity. It is more, however, the current with the essential spirit of that movement to attempt to mould the new system to its fancy than to submit with docility to the exclusive authority of the Gospel. Among the remnants of Oriental tribes in Samaria we are not surprised to find such a man as Simon, who succeeded the Magi in the multitude of cults of the great power of God. It is said that he called himself the creative world-spirit, and his female companion the receptive world-soul. We have here a likeness of the Gnostic doctrine of souls and syzygies. In the tradition of the subsequent Church, this half-mythical figure is often paired with the Godhead, in especial of the Gnostics (Irenaeus, Adv. haer. lib. i, c. xxvii, § 4; Hippol. i, 62 sqq.). During the twenty years which intervened between the first Christian Pentecost and the later epistles of Paul, we know that theosophical speculations were everywhere prevalent in Syria and Asia Minor, and that these were strangely mingled with Christian doctrines. Great freedom was allowed to religious thought, even among the early Christians, as long as the moral and religious life of the people was not perverted. But Paul very soon discovered dangerous tendencies in the churches which he had recently established in Asia Minor. Josephus tells us that Alexander the Great had sent into the provinces of Lydia and Phrygia 2000 Mesopotamian and Babylonian Jews to garrison the disaffected towns there, and we are informed that the inhabitants of that region were upside down in their ideas, and that there was a great deal of Gnostic and Oriental superstitions (Alford, How to use the Epistles, Epistle to the Colossians, Sunday Mag. 1867, p. 829). The errors which he reproved at Colossae were doubtless a curious mixture of Jewish and heathen heresies, but they were of a very ancient historical growth. This forms us (Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iii, 82) that the heretical gnostics did not make its appearance with an uncovered head until after the death of the apostles, but that it previously worked in secret. After all the contentions of various writers on the question how far this error prevailed in apostolic times, there is a general agreement that, while most of the heresies of that period were Judaistic, there was an obvious difference between those reproved in the Galatian churches and those noticed in the epistles to the Colossians and Timothy. The latter are treated much more mildly, and we are to believe that they must have been much less developed and less subversive of the Christian system. They are expressly called (1 Tim. vi, 20) a false gospel, and were characterized by empty sounds without sense and subtle oppositions to the truth, a dispensation of meaning to be interpreted, as the gnostics of the second century, but the manifest gers of Docetic emanations and Gnostic dualism. Immanuel, the author of one of Gnostic speculation (Adv. haer. i, 26) that John was acquainted with Cerinthus, and wrote the fourth gospel to refute his errors. Both he and Epiphanius (Haer. p. 28) say that Cerinthus taught that the world was not made by the Most High God, but by a lower power, or by angels, and that Jesus was an ordinary man, whom the supreme Logos united with him at his baptism, but forsook during his last sufferings, to rejoin him in the future kingdom of temporal glory. So it is that the Gnosticism becomes plainly perceptible, and we can certainly understand a number of passages in John's Gospel and Epistles better if we suppose a reference in them to these and similar errors. The Nicolaitanes are a Apocalypse and the false teachers of the Apocalypse, the Gnostic spirit of Judas Iscariot and Judas of the works. What angels, ridiculed and trampled upon the law that they might insult these limited powers, and thus fell into a strange complication of gross licentiousness and bodily mortifications (Burton, Heresies of the Apost. Age; Potter in they are called themselves simply Gnostics; Kitto's Cyclop., Conybeare, in Conybeare and Howson's Life of St. Paul, note at the end of vol. i. Comp. C. C. Tittmann, De eostis Gnosticas in N. T. frustas quaedam, Leips. 1778; transl. and publ. in Contributions to Foreign Literature, New York, 1827). No sooner had the tradition of the direction of the Church been lost than the Gnostic sects lost their impress, and the Gnostics became so much more prevalent as the speculative interest and numbers of the Gnostics began to increase mightily. Real the commencement of the 2d century, flourished about the same time Basilides in Alexandria and his son Iaids [see BAZILIDUS], the dualistic and ascetic Gnosticism of Saturninus, Celsus, and other Gnostics, but more especially of the Gnostics (Irenaeus, Adv. haer. i, c. xxvii, § 4; Hippol. i, 62 sqq.). During the twenty years which intervened between the first Christian Pentecost and the later epistles of Paul, we know that theosophical speculations were everywhere prevalent in Syria and Asia Minor, and that these were strangely mingled with Christian doctrines. Great freedom was allowed to religious thought, even among the early Christians, as long as the moral and religious life of the people was not perverted. But Paul very soon discovered dangerous tendencies in the churches which he had recently established in Asia Minor. Josephus tells us that Alexander the Great had sent into the provinces of Lydia and Phrygia 2000 Mesopotamian and Babylonian Jews to garrison the disaffected towns there, and we are informed that the inhabitants of that region were upside down in their ideas, and that there was a great deal of Gnostic and Oriental superstitions (Alford, How to use the Epistles, Epistle to the Colossians, Sunday Mag. 1867, p. 829). The errors which he reproved at Colossae were doubtless a curious mixture of Jewish and heathen heresies, but they were of a very ancient historical growth. This forms us (Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iii, 82) that the heretical gnostics did not make its appearance with an uncovered head until after the death of the apostles, but that it previously worked in secret. After all the contentions of various writers on the question how far this error prevailed in apostolic times, there is a general agreement that, while most of the heresies of that period were Judaistic, there was an obvious difference between those reproved in the Galatian churches and those noticed in the epistles to the Colossians and Timothy. The latter are treated much more mildly, and we are to believe that they must have been much less developed and less subversive of the Christian system. They are expressly called (1 Tim. vi, 20) a false gospel, and were characterized by empty sounds without sense and subtle oppositions to the truth, a dispensation of meaning to be interpreted, as the gnostics of the second century, but the manifest gers of Docetic emanations and Gnostic dualism. Immanuel, the author of one of Gnostic speculation (Adv. haer. i, 26) that John was acquainted with Cerinthus, and wrote the fourth gospel to refute his errors. Both.
New Testament. They opposed heathen religions as the work of the devil, and Judaism as the product of an inferior and wrathful deity, who was to be put down by Christ and the revelation through him of the supreme God. Kindred with him were Apelles of Alexander, and his pupils Lucas and Marcus, who approximated still nearer a Christian orthodoxy, though with a singular inconsistency. Tatian, a Syrian, a rhetorician in Rome, during the latter part of his life is said to have fallen into Gnostic errors, and to have prescribed a system of extreme abstinence as the only means of dispensing ourselves from the world. A party of the system was preserved in the church as a schism, called by that of his pupil Severus, continued as late as the 4th century. A class of persons represented by the Clementine Homilies at Rome, and sometimes reckoned among the Gnostics, ought rather to be classed with the Ebionites and Valentinians. We now come in contact with several classes of the Gospels, many of whom, according to Origen, went so far in their opposition to ordinary views that they admitted none to their assemblies who did not curse Christ (Neander, ii, 446 sq.). The whole system of the God of the Old Testament, according to them, was a deception by man, and whoever is represented in the scriptural history as rebelling against it were regarded as saints. Hence some of the worst characters of the Old and New Testament were held in the highest honor. Even Jesus was reckoned among agents of the Jewish Jehovah, who, having no conception of an absolute deity, made of man, and whoever is represented in the scriptural history as rebelling against it were regarded as saints. Those who maintained this position were called Caietines, while such as dissented from such extravagances were distinguished as Sethites. The Peresites, who have recently become known to us through the Philostratus, the latter of which, appear to have approximated much nearer the Catholic doctrine. During the 3rd century Gnosticism appears to have lost its power, for the orthodox party had now attained more scientific precision of thought, and their formulas of faith presented scriptural doctrine in a style consistent with the highest culture of the age. Towards the close of that century, however, arose in the distant East one more attempt to combine Christianity with Oriental theosophy. Manichaeism sprang up in a region where neither Hellenism nor Judaism was familiar; and its object appears to have been the essential evil of evil, the good. It was an attempt to constitute a god of this day by incorporating with the original system of Zoroaster numerous elements taken from a gnosticized Christiani- ness and Buddhism. To Christianity, however, it seems to have been indebted more for its names and symbols than for its essential history or characters. Perseverance and facts taken from an era is that in that system an entirely new significance. Its founder (Mani or Manes, a Magian banished from Persia) discovered many points of agreement between the doctrines of Parseism, Buddhism, and Gnostic Christianity, and endeavored to combine these three systems into one universal religion. He accounted for all things on dualistic principles. His followers were soon driv- en by persecution from their earliest seats, but were numerous during the fourth century in every part of the East, and in Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Many per- sons of noble and influential seat, were attracted by it, but it soon fell into gross licentiousness by its professed exaltation above outward things, and of course lost its place in common esteem, and fell into contempt. Some vesti- tures, however, both of Marcionism and Manichaeism, remained even into the Middle Ages, and by means of the Priscilliansists, the Paulicians, Bogomiles, and the Cathari, transmitted the leading features of Gnos- ticism to distant ages and countries.

Many of these sects can hardly be recognized as within the pale of Christianity. While some of them claimed a place within the Church, and refused to leave it when they were discovered by its authorities, others openly adjured the Christian name. Certain such complete subverters of the essentials of the Gospel as the Carpocratians, Peraeans, Sethites, Cainites, and Manichaeans deserve to be called rather gnostized heathen than Christian Gnostics. In history of the Church they deserve a place only because they, like other heathen, influenced it from without. In a general way it is certain that the history of the Church has been the history of the Church and Gnosticism, except in the singular position. Indeed, no history of this system is quite complete without embracing some still more remote systems — Cabbalistic Judaism, Neo-Platonism, etc., which had their origin under Gnostic influences.
born) of the Ophites. He came into being from the commingling of the light-nature in the Sophia (the πνευματικόν στίγμα) with matter. As the fruit of such a parentage, he was possessed of a nature neither psychical nor material, but psychical, and he occupies an intermediate position between the supreme God and the material world. He is not, of course, an evil, but only a limited and imperfect being, and yet evil springs from the defects of his work and of his plans. He acts in general according to his own will, but the plan by which he was transformed into an organized universe. The planetary heavens, and the sidereal spirits who are over them, and the whole course of the world, are under his control. In all this, however, he is the unconscious instrument of higher powers in the world of light, who secretly influence all his movements. Of this control he finally and gradually became aware, and by some teachers he is said to have become vexed and goaded into opposition by the discovery, and by others to have gladly welcomed and submitted to it. He was the author of Judaism, and the successor of the Mandaeus, and hence by many Gnostics the former system was looked upon as defective, if not false, and even the latter, especially in its mere letter, as incapable of imparting the highest wisdom. Only by Marcion was he regarded as entirely independent of the supreme God in their conflict; the rest of his life, to the end, was a burden and a provocation, and he was banished to a department which belonged wholly to him. He remained the God of this world until the coming of Christ, who vanquished him at the crucifixion.

4. With respect to anthropology, the Gnostics held that the world was created by a fallen God. He was himself the creature of a fallen soul, and the world he created and rules is subject to imperfection. From his connection with matter there was produced a human race, which in its totality is a microssom, representing within itself the three principles of the great universe, the light, the darkness, and matter. This was in consequence of the creation of three classes of men, higher or lower in proportion to their freedom from matter. Marcion alone made this distinction dependent upon the will of man himself; the other Gnostics made it a result of creation, or of a divine communication, or some part of light and life from the upper world. The highest of these, i.e., the spiritual (πνευματικόν), share largely in the nature of the lowest soul (σοφία), who originally fell from the Pleroma, and hence they are the only ones who can attain perfection in the world of light, are capable of mingling and receiving the light which is communicated from above.

The second class, the psychical (ψυχικόν), have the nature of the Demiurge himself, who has power to raise them to some extent above the debarment of matter, and, by giving them legal form, to impart to them a legal righteousness, but not to afford them a recognition of those divine mysteries which are beyond his own reach. The third class are the fleshly or hylic (σαρκικόν, ζωοικόν) natures, in whom matter has usurped a human form and passion (σαρκογούς), has entire control, and who are therefore destined to share the former natures. The psychical are capable of renaissance, spiritual predominating under the Christian dispensation, the psychical under the Jewish, and the fleshly among the heathen of all ages. Individuals, however, of each class are numerous under all these dispensations. In the last-mentioned spirit of ancient Platonism, many of the Gnostics allowed of no transition from the one to the other of these classes, while others looked upon it as possible for the lower to rise to the higher in consequence of a divine communication of special powers. 5. The Gnostic idea of redemption was simply that of a liberation of the light-spirits from its contact with matter. Of course it is confined to the two higher classes of our race in whom that spirit is found. In every condition of humanity, some favored individuals are represented as sighing for deliverance. In this way were explained some glimpses of a higher knowledge, which break forth at intervals in the prophecies and psalms of the Jewish Scriptures, and in the writings of pagan philosophers. Some sparks of light were supposed to have been thrust into the breasts of noble persons, and the rational creation, as a whole (προδόσης), is represented as sighing for redemption (Rom. viii, 22).

A recently discovered work (Pistis Sophia) contains the penitential sighings and longings of the soul of the man who has himself fallen from her original condition of divine intuition to the world of flesh. In pity for this sighing spirit, Christ, one of the highest of all the souls, descends, and brings her, after innumerable sufferings, back to the Pleroma, and undertakes the deliverance of all pneumatic natures. To accomplish this, he assumes, not a material form, since he can have no contact with matter, but only the appearance of one. In answer to the longings of the Jews, the Demiurge had promised and actually sent among them a Messiah with only psychical powers. Most of the Gnostics suppose that the heavenly Christ (Soter) took the form of a man who had a lower himself unable to accomplish what had been promised in his behalf, and that from the baptism by John until the crucifixion this true Redeemer acted through this personage. Some, however, held that the man Jesus, with whom the son Christ then became connected, in the name of the united God, and he was henceforth endowed with the powers of an astral spirit. As this Christ cannot suffer, everything in him which seemed like it, or like any imperfection, was either a doctric illusion, or wholly in the human personade with which he was united. This work of Christ, however, commenced not wholly with the life of Jesus, but, to some extent, with creation itself, in which the Redeemer inspired the unconscious Demiurge with many divine ideas, and during the whole process of the world's government he is drawing carnal spirits to himself, and making the error of the world an object of redemptive work. In the second, the psychical natures, capable of redemption will be gathered and raised to the Pleroma. Valentinus supposed that all psychical natures are destined to a lower degree of blessedness in a peculiar kingdom of the Demiurge. Matter with all fleshly natures will either be consumed by its own powers, or sink back into its original condition of utter deadness and absolute separation from all light, all life, and all feeling. The sources from which the Gnostics professed to derive their knowledge were, (a.) Tradition, not so much that of the Church, which they generally looked upon as unphilosophical, and fit only for the multitude, but that which was said to have been communicated by Christ to a narrow circle of cerebral spirits, and by them transmitted to others. Marcion alone made this tradition accessible to all. (b.) The ordinary Christian Scriptures were only partially received among them. Marcion and the more strenuous Judaistic Gnostics entirely rejected the Old Testament, and the more orthodox rejected the spiritual parts of the Pneumatic, psychical, and hylic elements. Many of them disregarded portions of the New Testament also, while others accepted only of Paul's writings and an expurgated gospel of Luke. (c.) Other writings of the evangelists were highly esteemed belonging to particular sects. Thus Marcion's writings were most cherished among his followers, and the prophecies of Cain and of a pretended seer named Parchor among the followers of Basilides, and the apocryphal books of Adam, Enoch, Moses, Elias, Issiah, Baruch, and others. (d.) Even the writings of the heathen philosophers were much used by some, who, by a course of allegorical explications, like those which they applied to the Scriptures, discovered ineffable mysteries under the most unpromising outward letter. 7. With the
exception of the followers of Manes, we have no evidence that the Gnostics ever attempted a distinct ecclesiastical organization. Many of them were never excluded from the orthodox churches, within which they only sought to form schools and social circles. They practised baptism, and believed that in this rite, as in the baptism of C. T. H. 6, the spirit of life was abundantly imparted, and the human spirit was emancipated from the power of the Demiurge. Most of them were inclined by their poetical fancies and their love of symbols to a gorgeous style of worship, but the ascendancy of the Church and the Church's neglect as useful only to such as were on the ground of mere faith. 8. Their ethics and practical morality were usually dependent upon dualistic principles. Among the Hellenistic Gnostics it took the form of a struggle against matter, which not infrequently ran into asceticism. The use of charms and astrological practices. The Oriental Gnostics, on the other hand, are said in many instances to have plunged into immorality, sometimes with the view of showing their contempt for the Demiurge and his laws, or because they regarded the body as an insubstantial thing to a spirit subject to the supreme God, and subject to no inferior law. Saturninus, Marcion, and Manes rejected marriage; but many Gnostics not only submitted to it, but looked upon it as the highest law of pneumatic natures. We have no evidence that the standard of morality was lower among the Gnostics generally than among orthodox Christians in general.

One is amazed at the boldness, the fanciful nature, and the high pretensions of Gnosticism. In the course of a century and a half it comes and goes before us like a splendid vision. And yet its influence upon Christianity was profound and permanent. It gave occasion to a great expansion of Christian thought, to a clearer idea of the historical relation of Christianity to earlier and surrounding religions, and to a better definition of the basis of true faith. It deserves a more careful study than it has usually received. The violation of the law.

VI. Literature.—The original authorities are the ecclesiastical writers of the period generally, but especially Irenæus and Epiphanius, Ado. hæresis; Tertullian, De praescr. her., contra Gnost. scorp., ad. Valentinianos, ad. Marcionem; Hippolytus, Karo sive. H up. Zëgòs, and the Philosophy. Hippolytus is generally regarded as the author of the Doxa Gnostica; Quadratum is a long work translated from a Greek work by the father of Petermanus (Berolin, 1851); Cerdus Nazarenus (ed. by Norberg, and sometimes called the Bible of Gnosticism); Barbrienses Gnostici Syrum virum primam Hymnologiam, and Antitheses Marcionis Gnosticæ (two Gnostic works published by Aug. Hahn, Leipzig, 1819, 1823); and the Neo-Platonist work of Plotinus, Hicr. r. yewreusiv (Emend. ii. lib. ix). The English reader can gain access to many of these ecclesiastical writers by means of the Ante-Nicene Chr. Lib., edited by Drs. Roberts and Donaldson, now in course of publication at Edinburgh.


GOAD, the largest of the Portuguese possessions in India, embracing the provinces of Saffete and Kaniska and six islands. Its population was, in 1869, about 264,000, of whom two thirds were Catholics, with Roman Catholic Church. The city of Goa, the capital of Portuguese India, is the seat of an archbishop. The jurisdiction of the archbishop of Goa has been in modern times the subject of a violent dispute between the popes and the kings of Portugal. See Portugal.

Goad (γάος, malnad'), an instrument for guiding: the Greeks, the taxo (βιβλίον, i. c. v. 139, also βιβλίον, or simply κιβρόν); see Schöttgen, De simulato buno, Francol. 1717; Hager, De ποιος κιβρόν λαξεύεται, Lips. 1738. "Shamgar, the son of Anath, slew of the Philistines six hundred men with an ox-goad" (Judg. iii. 31). Maenardes gives us the account of the ox-goad, which is no doubt the same as that used in the days of Shamgar. "At Khan Leban the country people were now everywhere at plough in the fields in order to sow cotton. Two observable in that in ploughing they used goads of an extraordinary size; upon measuring several I found them to be about eight feet long, and at the bigger end six inches in circumference. They are armed at the lesser end with a sharp prickle for driving the oxen, and at the other end with a small spade or paddle of iron, strong and massive, in order to clear the plough from the earth, that encumbers it in working" (Journal of a Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 110). This was in the north of Syria. Prof. Hackett says, "The ox-goads that I saw in the south I should judge to be Zewsiin made, of such an instrument, wielded by a strong arm, would do no mean execution. It is easy, therefore, to credit the account of Shamgar's achievement. We may suppose, however (so fragmentary is the notice), that he was not entirely alone; that some others connected with his service of labor as they could snatch at the moment" (Illustrations of Scripture, p. 155). See Agriculture.

In the other passages where the word "goad" occurs it is the representative of a different term in the original; τῆς, d'orban', something pointed (1 Sam. xiii, 21), or της, d'orban', d'orban' (Eccles. xii, 11), which is, perhaps, properly the iron point to which the rod or handle, denoted by the previous term, was fixed. This, at least, is the explanation adopted by Jahn (Archaeol. s. v. 394). According to others, it may refer to anything pointed, and the tenor of Eccles. xii means the sense of a peg or nail—anything, in short, which can be fastened; while in 1 Sam. xiii the point of the plough-iron is possibly indicated (which is Zewsiin made, of a spear, and Vulg. at Judg. iv της ἀργυραμονίου, onomat.), There are undoubted references to the use of the
goad in driving oxen in Plutarch, xxxviii, 25, and Acta xxi, 14. The expression "to kick against the goads" (Acts ii, 5; A. V. "the pricks") was proverbially used by the Greeks for unavoidable resistance to superior power (comp. Eschyl. Agam. 1633; Prom. 928; Eurip. Bacch. 791). The same means of inciting animals to greater speed is probably alluded to in 2 Kings iv, 24. (See generally Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, i, 81; Kitto, Bibl. Bibl. iii, 41; Thomson, Land and Book, i, 501.) See Ox.

Goad, Thomas, D.D., a learned English divine, was elected to King's College, Cambridge, in 1592. He became rector of Milton, Cambridgeshire, and after wards, successively, prebendary of Winchester and Canterbury, preacher of St. Paul's, rector of Nettle, Essex, and vicar of Sudley, Suffolk. He died in 1598. He was one of the deputies to the Synod of Dort in 1618, as a Calvinist, but he afterwards altered his opinions. His principal works are, A Disputation concerning the Contingency of Events in respect of God's eternal Decree (to be found in the Cambridge Tracts, and in Wunneck, Revisc. of False Principles).—Darling, Cyclo. Bibliog. Soc., i, 1726.

Godby, Robert, a printer and publisher of Sherborne, Dorsetshire, who died in 1778. He compiled and published a commentary under the title An Illustration of the Notes of Dr. Baxter on the O.T., etc. (Leeds, 1754-75, 6th ed. 3 vols. fol.). Dr. A. Clarke says of it that, "while it seems to be orthodox, it is written entirely on the Ariean hypothesis." Selten wrote a reply to it (London, 1765, 12mo.).—Darling, Cyclo. Bibliog. Soc., i, 609; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 821; Home, Bibliog. Appendix, v, 72.

Goar, Jacques, a French Dominican monk, was born at Paris in 1601. He entered into the order of Preaching Friars in 1619, and taught rhetoric in several houses of the Dominicans for some years. He was then sent on a mission into the Levant, and lived eight years at Chios, where he made the doctrine and ceremonies of the Greek Church the subjects of his investigation, and then came to Rome with many collections of MSS., etc. In 1647 he published at Paris, in Greek and Latin, his Eikologon, Eukologicon sive Ritualae Grecorum (Paris, 1647, folio; Venice, 1780). For the history of the liturgies, this is a very valuable and useful work. Goar died at Amiens in 1655. See Échar, Script. Ord. Pred. vol. ii; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xx, 860.

Goar, St., a French anchorite, was born in Aquitaine about the year 866. The legend says that, after being ordained priest, he devoted himself to the propagation of Christianity, and left his church to retire to the neighborhood of Oberwesel (Germany), where he erected a small chapel (at the place since called St. Goar), beside his cell, to receive pilgrims, and succeeded in converting a large number of heathens. Some of his enemies, having accused him as "an impostor and a man fond of good living" to Rusticus, bishop of Treves, he cleared himself by performing several miracles. Siegfelt 111 offered to appoint him bishop in the place of Rusticus, but Goar preferred remaining in his humble position. He died July 6, 869, and was buried in the small chapel he had erected at Spilin and Eusebush, two of Siegfelt's priests. The Church of St. Goar, on the Rhine, was dedicated to him in 1768. See Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xx, 895. (J. N. P.)

Goat, an animal of the genus Capra, found in every part of the world, and easily domesticated. There are various species or apppellations given to this in the original text of the Scriptures. See CATTLE.

1. Most frequently γάτα, generally said to denote the she-goat (as it is rendered in Gen. xxv, 9; xxx, 55; xxxii, 38; xxxii, 14; Num. xxv, 27), and in several passages undoubtedly so used (Gen. xxxii, 58; xxxii, 14; Num. xxv, 27; Prov. xxvii, 27); but it is equally certain that it is used also to denote the he-goat (Exod. i, 17; xxv, 9, 10. 14).

2. In Judges vi, 19; xiii, 15, 19; xv, 1; 1 Sam. xxxvi, 20 (1 Kings xxxii, 27; 2 Chron. xxvii, 2) it is used of a male and female goats, or rather a pair of either the male or the female animal (Gen. xxvii, 16; xxx, 55; xxxii, 38; xxxii, 51; Lev. i, 10; iii, 12; vii, 22; xxix, 19; 1 Sam. xxv, 2; 1 Kings xx, 27). It is used also to designate a kid (as rendered in Gen. xxxvii, 17, 20; Num. xi, 11; Judg. vi, 19; x, 23; xxvii, 39, 15; xxvi, 1; 1 Sam. xxxvi, 20 (1 Kings xxxii, 27); 2 Chron. xxvii, 2). From this we are led to conclude that properly it is the generic designation of the animal in its domestic state, a conclusion which seems to be fully established by such usages as ἱππος ἡ γάτα, a kid of the goats, ἱππός οἱ γάται, a flock of "goats," i. e. any of the goat species (Gen. xxvii, 6; Deut. xiv, 4). Bochart (Hieros. bii, c. 21) derives the word γάτα from γαί, os, strength; Gesenius and Fürst prefer tracing it up to ἱππος, an ox, to become strong; in either case the ground-idea is the super ior strength of the goat as compared with the sheep; Syr. ose; Arab. owsas (where the w represents the rejected r of ἱππος); Phoen. os, of which oza or ozas is the feminine form. Whether there is any affinity between this and the Sans. aga, fem. oṣ, Gr. αἴξ, αἷος, Goth. aλuun, and our goat, may be doubted. In the Sept. γάτα is usually represented by αἴξ, in a few instances by ἵππος; and when γάτως is used elliptically to denote goat's hair (as in Exod. xxxvi, 7, xxxvi, 16, 17; Num. xxv, 1; Deut. xxvii, 21; xxvi, 18; 1 Sam. xix, 13) it gives the strange rendering ἰππός ῥοιος αἴξων, reading ῥοίος for ῥοίος (comp. Joseph. Ant. vi, 11, 4). See BOSTER.

3. The next most frequent term is ἵππως, attad, which is used only in the plur. ἵπποι. In the A.V. it is translated sometimes "rams" (Gen. xxxi, 10, 12), often "he-goats" (Num. vii, 17-88; Ps. i, 9; Isa. i, 11; Jer. ii, 40; Ezek. xxxiv, 17), but usually simply "goats" (Deut. xxvii, 14; Ps. i, 13; Ixiv, 16; Prov. xxvii, 16; Isa. xxxiv, 8; Ezek. xxvi, 21; xxxiii, 18; Zech. x, 8). The singular occurs frequently in Arabic atted, and is defined in the Kemus la a young goat of a year old (Bochart, Hieros. bii, c. 58, p. 646, where other authorities are adduced). The name is derived from "τῃσ, attes, to set, place, prepare, and hence Bochart infer, describes the animal as fully grown, and fit for its functions and uses; for in its fourth month it is of full growth; but not four months old; while others think no more is implied by the name than that this animal was strong and vigorous. The attadim were used in sacrifices (Psal. lxvi, 15), and formed an article of commerce (Ezek. xxxiv, 26). In Jer. i, 8, the word is employed for the leaders of a flock ("chief ones"); and in Isa. ix, 9, and Zech. x, 3, it is used metaphorically for princes or chiefs. See θρατ. 8. ἵππως, gezi, is the young of the goat, a kid. The name is derived by Fürst from the obsolete verb ἱππάω, to crop, and so it is equivalent to the Latin inform; but was afterwards restricted to one kind, that of the goat. Gesenius traces it to θτς, ἱππάω, to crop, and supposes the name was given to it from its cropping the herbage. Both etymologies are purely conjectural. The phrase ἱππος οἱ γάται, kid of the goats, is frequently used. See above. The reason of this Kimmich finds in the generic sense of ἱππος, as applicable originally to the young either of the sheep or goat, so that it required the addition of ἱππος to specialize its meaning, until it came by usage to denote only the latter. Ibn-Zaar thinks the addition was made because the gezi, being yet tender, could not be separated from its mother. The flesh of the kid was esteemed a delicacy by the Hebrews (Gen. xxvii, 9, 14, 17; Judg. vi, 19; xiii, 15, etc.).—Kitto. See KID.
4. הָעַב, sàvî, signifies properly a he-goat, being derived from הָעַב, to stride, i.e. the shaggy ('he-goat'), only 2 Chron. xxix, 23; 'goat,' in Lev. iv, 24; ix, 15; x, 16; xvi, 7-27; Numb. xxviii, 22; xxix, 22-38; Ezek. xiii, 23; 'säyîr,' in Isa. xiii, 21; xxxiv, 14; 'devil,' in Lev. xvii, 7; elsewhere 'kid'). It occurs frequently in Leviticus and Numbers (הָעַב הָעַב), and is the goat of the sin-offering (Lev. ix, 8, 15; x, 16). The word is used as an adjective with הָעַב in Dan. viii, 21, "and the goat, the rough one, is the king of Javan," and also in Gen. xxvii, 11, 28, "a hairy man." See SATHIR. The fem. הָעַב הָעַב, seriûkh, a she-goat, likewise occurs ('kid,' Lev. iv, 28; v, 4). See SACRIFICE.

5. הָעַב, tešphir, occurs in 2 Chron. xxix, 21, and in Dan. viii, 8, 9; it is followed by הָעַב, and signifies a 'he-goat' of the goats. Gesenius derives it from הָעַב, tešphir, to leap, indicative of the sex. It is a word found only in the later books of the O. T. In Ezra vi, 17, we find the Chaldee form of the word, הָעַב, tešphir.

6. הָעַב, to'isîrâ, a buck, is from a rootשׁי ע, to strike. It is invariably rendered 'he-goat' (Gen. xxx, 83; xxi, 15; Prov. xxx, 31; 2 Chron. xvii, 11).

7. In the N. T. the words rendered goat in Matt. xxv, 32, 33, are ιπόβωλος and ιππόβωλος a young goat or kid; and in Heb. ix, 12, 13, 19, and x, 4, ραψως — a goat. Goat-skins, in Heb. xi, 37, are in the Greek αίγας δερματα; and in Judg. ii, 17, αίγας is rendered goats.

8. For the undomesticated species several Heb. terms are employed: (1) הָעַב, goâit, only in the plur. הָעַב, wild or mountain goats, rendered "wild goats" in the passages of Scripture in which the word occurs, viz. 1 Sam. xxiv, 2; Job xxxix, 1; and Isa. civ, 15. The word is from a rootשׁי ע, to ascend or climb, and is the Heb. name of the ibex, which abounds in the mountainous parts of the ancient territory of Moab. In Job xxxix, 1, the Sept. have γαλαζάφων νυμφήν. In Prov. v, 19, the fem. הָעַב, goâlah, 'tame' occurs. See ROZ. (2.) הָעַב, zekk, rendered wild goat in Deut. xiv, 5, and occurs only in this passage. It is a contracted form of הָעַב, according to Lee, who renders it pizzle, but it is probably larger, more nearly approaching the tetruglyphus or goat-deer (Shaw, Supplement, p. 76). See Wild Goat.

9. Other terms less directly significant of this animal are, (1) הָעַב, chazîph; a flock, i.e. little flock: "two little flocks of kids" (1 Kings xx, 27); and (2.) הָעַב, zekk, one of the flock of sheep and goats mixed (Lev. xxii, 28, and frequently 'goat' or 'kid' in the margin). See FLOCK.

10. For the הָעַב, AAZEEZ ('scape-goat,' Lev. xvi, 8, 10, 26), see AAZEEZ.

The races either known to or kept by the Hebrew people were probably, 1. The domestic Syrian long-eared breed, with horns rather small and variously bent; the ears longer than the head, and pendulous; hair long, often black. 2. The Angora, or rather Anadoli breed of Asia Minor, with long hair, more or less fine. 3. The Egyptian breed, with small spiral horns, long brown hair, very long ears. 4. A breed from Upper Egypt, without horns, having the nasal bones singularly developed; the nose contracted, with the lower jaw protruding the incisors, and the female with udder very low, and purse-shaped.

There appear to be two or three varieties of the common goat (Hircus agaprus) at present bred in Palestine and Syria, but whether they are identical with those which were reared by the ancient Hebrews it is not possible to say. The most marked varieties are the Syrian goat (Capra Mammallia, Linn.), with long, thick, pendant ears, which are often, says Russell (Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, ii, 150, 2d edit.), a foot long, and the Angora goat (Capra Angora, Linn.), with fine long hair. The Syrian goat is mentioned by Aristotle (Hist. An. ix, 27, § 3). There is also a variety that differs but little from British specimens. Goats have from the earliest ages been considered important animals in rural economy, both on account of the milk they afford and the excellency of the flesh of the young animals. The goat is figured on the Egyptian monuments (see Wilkinson's Ancient Egypt, i, 223). Col. Ham. Smith (Griffiths, An. King. iv, 308) describes three Egyptian breeds: one with long hair, depressed horns, ears small and pendent; another with horns very spiral, and ears longer than the head; and a third, which occurs in Upper Egypt, without horns. Besides the domestic goats, Western Asia is possessed of one or more wild species—all large and vigorous mountain animals, resembling the ibex or bouquetin of the Alps. Of these, Southern Syria, Arabia, Sindi, and the borders of the Red Sea contain at least one species, known to the Arabs by the name of Beden or Bedan, and Tastal—the Capra Jela of Ham. Smith, and Capra Sinaitica of Ehrenberg. We take this animal...
to be that noticed under the name of ḫaṭ, γαστ or γαλ (1 Sam. xxiv, 2; Job xxxix, 1; Ps. civ, 18; Prov. v, 19). The male is considerably taller and more robust than the larger he-goats, the horns forming regular, curved backwards, and with from 15 to 24 transverse elevated cross-ridges, being sometimes near three feet long, and exceedingly pious: there is a beard under the chin, and the fur is dark brown; but the limbs are white, with regular black marks down the front of the legs, with rings of the same color above the knees and on the pasterns. The females are smaller than the males, more slenderly made, brighter rufous, and with the white and black markings on the legs not so distinctly visible. This species lives in troops of 15 or 20, and plague these precincts with the same fearless impiety that distinguishes the ibex. Their horns are sold by the Arabs for knife handles, &c.; but the animals themselves are fast diminishing in number. See IBEX.

Wild Goat of Sinai.

In Deut. xiv, 5, ḫaṭ, ḫak is translated "wild goat." Schultens (Origenis Hebraicos) conjectures that the name arose from its shyness, and Dr. Harris points out what he takes to be a confirmation of this conjecture in Shaw's travels, who, from the translations of the Sept. and Vulgate, makes it a goat-deer or tragelaphus, under a mistaken view of the classification and habitat of that animal. ḫak, therefore, if it be not a second name of the zemer, which we refer to the kebeh, or wild sheep [see CAMEL], as the species must be sought among ruminants that were accessible for food to the Hebrews, we should be inclined to view as the name of one of the gazelles, probably the ahu (Aust. Subgutturosus), unless the Abyssinian ibex (Copa Walle) had formerly extended into Arabia, and it could be shown that it is a distinct species. See WILD GOAT.

From very remote antiquity goats have formed an important part of pastoral wealth in the East. They are not mentioned by name in the enumeration of Abram's possessions (Gen. xii, 16), nor in those of Job (Job i, 8; xliii, 12); but perhaps they are included under the generic term of "flocks," which Lot (Gen. xxxi, 5), and a fortiori, Abram possessed; and a she-goat formed part of the sacrifice offered by Abram on the occasion of the promise of Isaac (Gen. xv, 9). In the account of the miraculous liver of food (Exod. xxxvii, 27); their flesh was eaten (Deut. xiv, 4; Gen. xxviii, 9); their hair was used for the curtains of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvi, 7; xxxvi, 14) and for stuffing bolsters (1 Sam. xix, 18); their skins were sometimes used as clothing (Heb. xi, 37). Notwithstanding the offensively nauseousness which causes it to be significantly sep-
arated from sheep, the goat was employed by the people of Israel in many respects as their representative. It was a purificatory food sacrifice (Exod. ii, 22); a kid might be substituted as equivalent to a lamb: it formed a principal part of the Hebrew flocks, and both the milk and the young kids were daily articles of food. Among the poorer and more sober shepherd families, the slaughter of a kid was a token of hospitality to strangers, or of unusual festivity; and the prohibition, thrice repeated in the Mosaic law, "not to seethe a kid in its mother's milk" (Exod. xxiii, 18; xxxiv, 26; and Deut. xiv, 21), may have originated partly in a desire to recommend abstemiousness, which the legislators and moralists of the East have since invariably enforced with success, and partly with a view to discontinue a practice which was connected with idolatrous festivals, and the rites they involved. It is from goat-skins that the leatheren bottles to contain wine and other liquors are made in the Levant. For this purpose, after the head and feet are cut away, the case or hide is drawn off the carcass over the neck, without opening the belly; and the extremities being secured, it is dried with the hair in or outside, according to the use it is intended for. The old worn-out skins are liable to be treated with the old-fashioned preparation of drawing new wine into new bottles (Matt. ix, 17). Harmer (Obs. iv, 162) appears to have rightly referred the allusion in Amos iii, 12 to the long-eared race of goats: "As the shepherd taketh out of the mouth of the lion two legs or a piece of ear, so shall the children of Israel be as sheep in the fields."—Kitto. The passage in Cant. iv, 1, which comprise the hair of the beloved to "a flock of goats that eat of Mount Gilead," probably alludes to the fine hair of the Angora breed. In Prov. xxx, 31, a he-goat is mentioned as one of the "four things which are comely in going," in allusion, probably, to the stately march of the leader of the flock, which was always associated in the minds of the Hebrews with the notion of dignity. Hence the metaphor in Isa. xiv, 9, "all the chief ones (margin, "great goats") of the earth." So the Alexandrian version of the Sept. understands the allusion to τρίγυς τηφάναμος σώματων (comp. Theor. Id. viii, 49; Virgill, Eccl. vii, 7).—Smith. Goats, from their offensiveness, mischievous and libidinous disposition, etc., are symbols of the wicked, who are, at the day of judgment, to be finally separated from the good (Matt. xxv, 32). See SHEEP.

From Lev. xvii, 7, it appears that the rebellious Hebrews, while in the desert, fell into the idolatrous worship of the he-goat (rendered "deriv", comp. 2 Chron. xii, 15), after the example of the Egyptians, under whose influence their nation had grown up. Herodotus says (i, 46) that at Mendes, in Lower Egypt, both the male and female goat were worshipped; that the god Pan had the face and thighs of a goat; not that they believed him to be of this figure, but because it had been customary to represent him thus. They paid divine honors, also, to real goats which appeared in the table of Iis. The Stairim ("wild beasts") of Isa. xiii, 21 were, according to the popular notion, supposed to be wild men (see APE) in the form of he-goats, living in unrequited, solitary places, and represented as dancing and calling to each other.—Calmet. See SPECTRE.

A he-goat was the symbol of the Macedonian empire in the prophetic vision of Daniel (chap. viii, 5)—

Coin of Archelaus, king of Macedon.
Goath (Heb. id. Ṣib and Ṣib, a ψιθ, Sept. Γοαθ v. r. Ἡθ and Ψιθ, Vulg. Gob), the scene of two of David's encounters with the Philistines, in the former of which Sibbechah slew the giant Saph, and in the latter Elhanan slew the brother of Goliath (2 Sam. xxii, 18, 19). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. xx, 4) it is called by its more usual name Gath (2 Sam. xxii, 13; 1 Chron. xx, 6), and which, from the terms of the narrative, seems to have occurred at the same place as the others. The suggestion of Nob—which Davidson (Hebr. Text.) reports as in many MSS., and which is also found in the Compl. ed. of the Sept.—is not admissible, on account of the situation of that place. See David.

Goat. See Locust.

Gobel, Jean Baptiste Joseph, a Roman Catholic bishop of France, was born in 1727 at Thann, in Upper Alsace. He was educated in the College Germanicum in Rome, became canon at Poretnry, Switzerland, and in 1772 bishop in part of Ljubljana, and chancellor of the archbishop of Ljubljana. In 1789 he went as a delegate of the clergy to the Etats Généraux, allied himself with the Jacobins, became constitutional bishop of Paris, Upper Marne and Upper Rhine, voted on November 7, 1793, for the abolition of Christianity, and laid down his ecclesiastical dignities in the hands of the Convention. Having fallen into disfavour with Robespierre, he was executed April 13, 1794. (A. S. J.)

Goblet (грог, ogrom, prop. a trough for washing garments, hence a larger; Cant. vii, 2, where it is described as being round; elsewhere a sacrificial baín, Exod. xxiv, 6, or pénail drinking cup, Isa. xxiii, 24). In form and material these utensils were probably like those found in the Egyptian ruins, some being of gold or silver, others of bronze, porcelain, and even wood. See Bowl; Basin, etc.

Gobolitas. See Gerbal.

Goch, John of, more properly John Epaper, was born in the little city of Goch in the beginning of the 16th century. Dissatisfied with the Church of Rome, he, like some others at that time, wished for a reformation, and insisted on the free use of the Scriptures. There is no accurate history of his life; all that is known is that he established an order of canonesses at Meчин in 1451, attempted to introduce reform in the convents of that place, and for twenty-four years acted as father confessor of the deaconesses at Thabor. He died March 28, 1475. He was a man of great piety, and, though less vigorous than his friend Wessel, he was a better theologian than Thomas à Kempis. His principal works are, De Libertate Christiana, edited by Corn. Graepheus (Antw. 1521), and Dialoqà de quatuor erroribus circa legem evangelicam existit, in Walch's Monumenta mediæ ævi. The writings of Goch contain many reformatory ideas. He demanded that the Bi
GOD

bles should chiefly be explained by itself, and laid great stress on love, on living pietly, and especially on evangelical freedom. As an obstacle to the latter, he regarded the episcopal dignity, with its hierarchical elevation, above the priestly, which, in his opinion, was the highest in the Church. An excellent sketch of Goch, and of his relations to theology and Church reform, is given by Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 17-157; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* v, 220 sq.

GOD, from the same Saxon root as good, thus beautifully expressing the divine benignity as the leading attribute of the highest and most general term of divinity, and corresponding almost invariably to two Hebrew words, both from a common root (םְדִּי, צְדִי, to be strong). Hengstenberg, however, regards the simpler of these words (םְדִי, El) as a primitive (Auth. of Pent. i, 251), while some consider the extended form (םְדִּי, Eloah) as derived from a different root (the obsolete מְדִי, found in Arabic = to worship). The corresponding Semitic terms are: Arabic, Al or Allah (q. v.); Syriac, El or Eloah; Samar. El or Elah (= powerful); Castall, in Wyclif and the earliest English Bible, v. I, v. (v.); Phoenician El ( перед, or a), and in En-El (= El Hen, Gag-el (Galilus, הגאל), Eloah (Sanchoh). See also *Almighty*.

The only other Hebrew word generally employed in naming the Supreme Being is Jehovah, יהוה, which some (Hävernick, *Historische-Kritische Einleitung ins alte Testament*, Berlin, 1889) propose to point as **י-וה**. Jahweh, meaning "the Existing One," holding that Elohim is used merely to indicate the absolute and super-richeress contained in the Divine Being. With such, therefore, Jehovah is not of the same origin, or the same original as the heathen *Jove*, but of a strictly peculiar and Hebrew origin. Both names are used by Moses indiscriminately, in strict conformity with the theological idea he wished to express in the immediate context; and, pursuing the Pentateuch nearly line by line, it is astonishing to see that Moses never uses any of the names at mere random or arbitrarily, but is throughout consistent in the application of the respective terms. Elohim is the abstract expression for absolute Deity apart from the special notions of unity, holiness, subsistence, etc. It is more a philosophical than devotional term, and consequently occurs in the term *Deity*, in the same way as *state or government* is abstractly expressive of a king or monarch. Jehovah, however, seems to be the revealed Elohim, the Manifest, Only, Personal, and Holy Elohim: Elohim is the Creator, Jehovah the Redeemer, etc. See Jehovah.

The authors of the Eng. A. V. have invariably translated this last Hebrew word by "Lord," which is printed in those passages in small capitals in our common Bibles, but whenever the two words which they thus render occur together, Adoni-Jehovah, the latter is rendered "God," in order to prevent the repetition of "Lord." The Greek *Διόνυς* (either with or without the art.) Jerome and the Rabbins enumerate ten Heb. words as meaning God; but they relate rather to his attributes. See Lord.

I. Usage of the Hebrew terms properly rendered "God."

1. **El.** El. This term is used in the most general way as a designation of Deity, whether of the true God or of the false gods, even the idols, of the heathen. In the latter reference it occurs Is. xlv, 10, 15; xlv, 20; xlv, 6; and in the plur. בְּנֵי אֵל, *Eim*. Exod. xv, 11; Dan. xi, 56; though in both these last instances it may be questioned whether the word is not used in the sense of mighty ones. To render the application of the term in this reference more specific, such epithets as **יֵאמֹן, other, foreign (Exod. xxxiv, 14), "strange, hostile* (Psa. lxxx, 10), **גָּז, strange (Deut. xxxii, 12), are used. When used of the true God, El is usually preceded by the article (בְּנֵי, Gen. xxxi, 13; Deut. vii, 9), or followed by such distinctive epithets as בְּנֵי אֵל, Alimighty (Exod. vi, 8); בְּנֵי אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, eternal (Gen. xxxi, 33; Isa. xl, 28); יִשְׂרָאֵל, Supreme (Gen. xiv, 18); בְּנֵי אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, living (Josh. iii, 10); בְּנֵי אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, mighty (Isa. ix, 5); or such qualifying adjectives as בָּרָאֹת, of glory (Psa. xxxi, 5); בָּרָאֹת, of truth (Psa. xxxi, 6); בָּרָאֹת, of retributions (Jer. ii, 56); בָּרָאֹת, of Belial (Gen. xxxi, 18); בָּרָאֹת, of Israel (Gen. xxxii, 20); בָּרָאֹת (Deut. xxxii, 26). In poetry El sometimes occurs as a sign of the superlative; as בָּרָאֹת, hills of God, very high hills (Psa. xxxi, 7); בָּרָאֹת, cedars of God (lxxxi, 11). The phrase בָּרָאֹת occurs Psa. xxii, 1; lxxxi, 7; and is supposed by some to refer to angels; but others take בָּרָאֹת here for בָּרָאֹת, and translate Sons of the mighty (see Rosenmuller, ad loc.).

There is no instance of El in the singular being used in the sense of mighty one or hero; for even if we retain that reading in Ezek. xxxi, 11 (though thirty of Kennicott's codices have the reading בָּרָאֹת, and the probability is that in those which present בָּרָאֹת the "h" is implied), the rendering "God of the nations" may be accepted as conveying a strong but just description of the power of Nebuchadnezzar, and the submission rendered to him; compare 2 Cor. iv, 4. In proper names בָּרָאֹת is often found sometimes in the first member of the compound, e.g. גָּז, Eljah; בָּרָאֹת, Eldad, et., and sometimes as the last member, e.g. בָּרָאֹת, Samuel; בָּרָאֹת, Lemuel; בָּרָאֹת, Tabeel, etc. See El.

2. **Eloah, Elah, plur. בְּנֵי אֵל, Eloás, Elás.** The singular form occurs only in poetry, especially in Job, and in the later books, such as Daniel, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. It is used as well of idol deities as of the true God (Dan. xi, 37, 38; Habak. i, 11; Deut. xxxii, 15; Psa. i, 22; Habak. iii, 8, etc.); once in the former case with the addition of בָּרָאֹת (Dan. xi, 89), and in the latter with that of בָּרָאֹת (Psa. cxiv, 7). The more common usage is that of the plural. This pervades all the books of the Old Testament, from the earliest to the latest. Thus it is used principally of the true God, and in this case frequently with the article prefixed (Gen. xvi, 21; vi, 9, 11; xvii, 18), as well as with such adjectives as בָּרָאֹת, Neh. 4, 4, or with the addition of בָּרָאֹת (Gen. xxxiv, 3); בָּרָאֹת (Isa. lxv, 10; בָּרָאֹת (Psa. iv, 2); בָּרָאֹת (Amos iii, 18), etc. When the relation of Israel to God is to be indicated, the phrases God of Israel, Jacob,Abram are used (Ezek. v, 1; Psa. xx, 2; xlv, 10, etc.); and in this case, as the term Elohim is equivalent in effect to Jehovah, it is often used interchangeably with that term; thus Moses, who is designated בָּרָאֹת, Ebeel-Jehovah (Deut. xxxiv, 5), is called in the same sense בָּרָאֹת, Eedel-Elohim (Dan. ix, 11); and the same object is designated indifferently בָּרָאֹת, Eeueel-Jehovah, and בָּרָאֹת, Eeueel-Elohim (comp. Judg. iii, 10, and Exod. xxxii, 3, etc.). Not unfrequently the two terms are combined (Lam. xvii, 3, 4, etc.; xis, 2, etc., 2 Sam. v, 10; 1 Kings i, 56; 2 Kings v, 18; Psa. xxxii, 18). Most commonly, however, they are used distinctively, with respect, probably, to the difference between their primary meanings (see Hengstenberg, *Auth. d. Pent.* i, 181 sq.). In the Pentateuch this discriminative usage has given place for certain hypotheses as to the composition of that work. See *Pentateuch*. In the earlier historical books, Jehovah is more frequently used than Elohim; in Job, Jehovah is more frequently used in the poetical, Eloah or Elohim in the prosaic portions; in the Psalms, sometimes the one,
sometimes the other predominates, and this has been thought to afford some criterion by which to judge of the age of the psalm, the older psalms being those in which Elohim is used; in Proverbs we have chiefly Jehovah; in Ecclesiastes, Daniel, and Jonah, almost exclusively Elohim, and in the other prophets chiefly Jehovah. Elohim is also used of idol deities or false gods; and, as in the case of any other worshiped as gods, they were otherwise distinguished from God (Exod. xii, 20; xxii, 31; Josh. xxiv, 20; Jer. ii, 11; Jonah i, 5, etc.); and, like El, it is used as a superlative (Psa. cviii, 16; lx, 10, etc.). Kings and judges, as the vassergents of Deity, or as possessing a sort of representative majesty, are sometimes called Elohim (Exod. xvi, 13; 2 Kings xix, 6; Exod. xvi, 13, 8). Whether the term is used of angels may be made matter of question. This is the rendering given to נבון by the Sept., Vulg., Targ., S equivalent, etc., in Gen. iii, 5; Psa. viii, 6; lexii, 1, 6; cvii, 7; and cvxiii, 1; but in the majority of these instances there can be little doubt that the translators were swayed by more dogmatic considerations in adopting that rendering; they preferred it because they avoided thus the strongly anthropomorphic representation which a literal rendering would have preserved. In all these passages the proper signification of נבון may be retained, and in some of them, such as Gen. iii, 5; Psa. lexii, 1, 6; this seems imperatively required. In Psa. viii, 6 also the rendering "angels" seems approved by the consideration that the subject of the writer is the grace of God to man in giving him dominion over the works of his hands, in which respect there can be no comparison between man and the angels, of whom nothing of this sort is said elsewhere. In Psa. cvxvii, 7, the connection of the last clause with what precedes affords sufficient reason for our giving Elohim its proper rendering, as in the A.V. That the author of the epistle to the Hebrews should have adopted the Sept. rendering in citing these two passages (i, 7; i, 6), cannot be held as establishing that rendering, for, as his argument is not affected by it, he was under no call to depart from the rendering given in the version from which he quotes. But, though there be no clear evidence that Elohim is ever used in the sense of angels, it is sometimes used vaguely to describe unseen powers or superhuman beings that are not properly thought of as divine. Thus the witch of Endor said "Elohim ascended out of the earth" (1 Sam. xxviii, 13), meaning thereby some being of an unearthly, superhuman character. So also in Zech. xii, 8 it is said, "The house of David shall be Elohim and of the angel of the Lord," where, as the transition from Elohim to the angel of the Lord is a mino ad majus, we must regard the former as a vague designation of supernatural powers. Hengstenberg would explain Psa. viii, 6 in accordance with this; but the legitimacy of this may be doubted. See Elohim.

On the use or absence of the article with נבון, see Quarterly (Genesis, p. 370 sq.), who, after an elaborate examination of the subject, sums up the results as follows: "The dispensing of the supposition that any essential difference existed, at least in the earlier books, between Elohim with and without the article—any difference at all, but such as the exigencies of each occasion with respect to sense or grammar would have made in the case of any common appellative; the illustration of the use of the article with particulars and prepositions, elucidating many passages of Scripture, and explaining many seeming causes of particular characteristic difference as regards the usage in the case of Elohim with or without the article, between the earlier and later books of the sacred canon." See Article (in Grammar).

II. The predicates ascribed to God by Moses are systematically enumerated in Exod. xxiv, 6; 7, 7, though we find in isolated passages in the Pentateuch and elsewhere additional properties specified; which bear more directly upon the dogmas and principles of religion, such as, e.g. that he is not the author of sin (Gen. i, 31), although since the fall man is prone to sin (Gen. vi, 5; viii, 21, etc.). But, as it was the avowed design of Moses to teach the Jews the unity of God in opposition to the polytheism of the other nations with whom they were dwelt particularly and most prominently on that point, which he hardly ever omitted when he had an opportunity of bringing forward the attributes of God (Deut. vi, 4; x, 17; iv, 32; ix, 16, etc.; Num. xvi, 22; xxii, 3; xxiii, 4; etc.; Exod. xvi, 11; xxiv, 6; xxxi, 7, etc.). In the proverbs and the earlier writers of the Old Testament these attributes are still more fully developed and explained by the declarations that God is the first and the last (Isa. xliv, 6); that he changes not (Hab. iii, 6); that the earth and heaven shall perish, but he shall endure (Psa. ciii, 26)—a distinct allusion to the last doomsday—and that he is omnipresent (Prov. xv, 3; Job xxxiv, 22, etc.).

In the New Testament also we find the attributes of God systematically classified (Rev. v, 12, and vii, 12), while the peculiar tenets of Christianity embrace, if not a further, still a more developed idea, as presented by the proverbs and the primitive constitution of the Church (compare Semisch's Justin Martyr, ii, 151 sq., translated by J. E. Ryland, 1845). The expression "to see God" (Job xix, 26; xili, 5; Isa. xxxviii, 11) sometimes signifies merely to experience his help; but in the Old-Testament Scriptures it more usually denotes the approach of death (Gen. xxiii, 39; Judg. vi, 28; xili, 22; Isa. vi, 5). See Death.

The term נבון is, "son of God," applies to kings (Psa. ii, 7; lexii, 6, 27). The usual notion of the ancients that the royal dignity was derived from God may here be traced to its source: hence the Homeric ἐνίκις βασιλεύς. This notion, entertained by the Oriental nations with regard to kings, made the latter style themselves gods (Psa. lexii, 6), נבון נבון, "son of God," in the plural, implies inferior gods, angels (Gen. vi, 2; Job i, 6); as also faithful adepts, worshippers of God (Deut. xiv, 1; Psa. lxiii, 15; Prov. xxxiv, 26). נבון נבון, "man of God," is sometimes applied to an angel (Judg. xiii, 6, 8), as also to a prophet (1 Sam. ii, 27; ix, 6; 1 Kings xiii, 3). When, in the Middle Ages, scholastic theology began to appeal to the divine attributes as the basis of systematic and dogmatic Christianity, the Jews, it appears, did not wish to remain behind on that head, and, collecting a few passages from the Old Testament, and more especially from Isa. xi, 2, and 1 Chron. xxix, 11, where the divine attributes are more amply developed and enumerated, they strung them together in a sort of cabalistic tree, but in reality representing a human figure. See Cabala.

III. The Scriptures contain frequent notices of false gods as objects of idolatrous worship: 1. By the Hebrews. These were of two kinds: a. Adoration of other beings than Jehovah, held as divine (Ehren. De die et deo. Gentil. in S. S. memor. Argent. 1750; Leuen. De idolola V. T. in his Philog. Hebr. mixt. p. 291 sq.; Kalkar, Uedigt over den idolol. Cultus som omontales i bibelin, Odense, 1838 sq.). Such false deities (which are generally identified with their images, Deut. iv, 28 sq.; Psa. cvv, 4 sq.; cxxxi, 13 sq.; 2 Macc. ii, 2, 3; comp. also נבון, idols, in passages like 1 Sam. xxxi, 9; Hos. iv, 17) are called נבון נבון, nothings (perhaps a play upon נבון, in the Jewish Church phraseology (Lev. xiv, 4; xxvi, 1; comp. Hab. ii, 18), or נבון נבון, breaths, i.e. vanities (Jer. ii, 5; viii, 19; xiv, 22, נבון נבון, uter vanitiae (Jon. ii, 9; comp. rd thai, Acts xiv, 15), נבון נבון, abominations (1 Kings xi, 5;
2 Kings xili, 18; derivatively דִּבֶּשֶׁת, ðûôšeth, logy (Exek. vi, 4; xiv, 9); their sacred rites אֲרֹן, ʾārôn; (Sam. xv, 23; Isa. lix, 3), and their whole worship harlotry (Exek. xliii; compare פַּעַת, and derivatives, in Winer, Simonis Lex. p. 286 sq.), in contrast with which Jeho- vah is called the true God מְלֹא צִיוֹן, Jer. x, 10 sq.; Dan. vi, 20, 26 (compare יִתְנָא, Pes. cxvi, 26); Acha xiv, 15; 2 Cor. vi, 16), the God of Hosts (Judith v, 7; compare Jer. x, 11, etc.). Indeed idolatry was represented as a capital offence in the Mosaic law, under penalty of extirpation and destruction in the case of the whole people (Lev. xix, 4; Deut. vii, 15; viii, 19; xi, 16 sq.; xxix, 15 sq.; xx, 17 sq.; xxxi, 16 sq.; comp. Josh. viii, 16; 1 Kings ix, 6 sq., and standing for individuals (Exod. xx, 20; Deut. vii, 2 sq.; comp. vi, 14 sq.; vii, 16; viii, 19; xiii, 2 sq.; Exod. xx, 3, 23), and the Israelites were admonished in their campaigns utterly to demolish idolatrous images (Exod. xxiii, 24; xxxv, 13; Deut. vii, 5, 25; xii, 2 sq.; comp. 1 Chron. xiv, 12, 13, and not to tolerate any heathen whatever in their land (Exod. xxix, 8; Deut. xx, 17), and, furthermore, to shun all connection (even civil and political) with idolatrous nations (Exod. xxix, 8; xxxiv, 15 sq.; Deut. vii, 1 sq.). Even in- stigation to idolatry was liable to punishment by death (Deut. xxiv, 8 sq.). In spite, however, of these severe statutes, we find the Israelites, not only during the passage through the wilderness and the unsettled period of their polity (Numm. xx, 2; Deut. xii, 18; Josh. xix, 23; comp. Amos v, 22 sq.), but also under the conditions of the fully developed monarchy of Jehovah, and attaching themselves to the adoration of Phoenic-Philotie-Syrian and Arabico-Sabaean (in the time of the Maccabees also to Greco-Syrian) deities (see Gramberg, Religionisde, i, 436), such as Ba- al, Ashturath, Moloch, Chemosh, Thammuz, etc., and conversing in personal names of the gods and their attributes (Deut. xviii, 10 sq.; comp. Dalc, De la divination, idol. V. 5. in his work De origine et progr. idolol. p. 363 sq.). See each of these names in its place.

The service rendered to foreign deities was very muliform (Mishna, Shabbath, vii, 6), but consisted principally of vows (Hos. ix, 10, incd. 1 Kings xi, 8: 2 Kings xxii, 17; xxiii, 5; Jer. i, 16; vii, 9; xii, 12; xiii, 15; xxiii, 29), bloodless (Jer. vii, 18) and bloody offerings (2 Kings v, 17), including even human beings. See MOLoch. The incense and offerings were made on high places and in the temple (1 Sam. vii, 7; Jer. ii, 20; iii, 6; 20, 27; Hos. viii, 13; 1 Kings xi, 2; 2 Kings xxii, 5; xiv, 24, comp. Philostr. Apoll. iii, 4; Pan- schema, ad Callim. Del., 70; see HIGH PLACE, on roofs (Jer. xiii, 18; xxxii, 29; Isa. lxv, 3), under shady trees (1 Kings xiv, 23; 2 Kings vii, 4; xvii, 10; Hos. iv, 18; Isa. i, 29; Jer. ii, 20; iii, 13; xvii, 2; 2 Chron. xxiv, 8; Ezek. vi, 13; xx, 28; see Movers, Phon. p. 577 sq.), also in valleys (Jer. ii, 28; 2 Chron. xxvi, 9), and gardens (Isa. i, 29; lxv, 8). See GROVE. The votaries of many of these deities made an offering of their own chastity to them, and illicit concomming of the sexes was a chief element of such cultus. See BAAL; ASHTARTE. Sitting upon graves formed also a part of idolatry, either as a propitiation to the gods or in necromancy (Isa. lxv, 4). Lustration even was not wanting (Isa. lxvi, 17). The priestly castes of these idolatrous systems were numerous (1 Kings xiv, 22; 2 Kings, 21), and in good stations (Hos. x, 5).

One kind of them was called KEMARIM (ךְָיַמְרָא, Zeph. iv, 4; 2 Kings xxiii, 5; a Syriac word, Gessen. Thes. p. 936; Mishna, Megil. iv, 9). See IDOLATRY.

6. The worship of Jehovah, under the form of any image whatever, was strictly forbidden (Exod. xx, 4; Deut. xxxii, 16; v, 8; xxxii, 15; comp. Tacit. Hist. v, 5). Such symbols are not forbidden; the symbol is the image of the thing, and not the thing itself. In Egypt (Josh. xxiv, 14; Ezek. xxiv, 7 sq.). See Ewald, Jer. Gesch. ii, 109 sqq.; Gerritsen, Der Hebräe-
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The concept of God is central to many religions and philosophical traditions. The word "God" is used to describe a supreme being who is the creator of the universe and who is often worshipped in various forms. The nature of God is a topic of much debate and exploration across different cultures and time periods.

1. "God... as one of the names of Jehovah, who is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. See Trinity.

2. Connotation of the term God.—The word ἄρνης, God, taken to signify "an object of religious veneration," was formerly applied to the pretended deities of the heathen world; and these names were employed by the promulgators of the Gospel when calling on the heathen to transfer their worship from their idols to Jehovah. But the word "God" has come to signify in Christian use the Maker and Ruler of the world, and is absolutely and exclusively applied to him. There is "one God" in the Christian sense, and there can be but one. It is not meant merely that we believe this as a fact, but that it is moreover implied in the very meaning w: attach to the word. And this is a distinction which should always be carefully attended to. The word "Moamen" means nothing more or less than a believer in Mohammed, though the Christian regards Mohammed as having been in fact an impostor, and the Mohammedans regard him as a true prophet; but neither of these is implied (or connoted) by the word "Moamen" when used by a Christian. On the contrary, it is absolutely and exclusively applied to him. There is then no such being as a belief in the God and Maker of the world, would be considered by Christians not only as in error, but as an impostor. As holding that there is a God (while whoever should affirm the existence of more than one God would be held to be an idolater): and this not less than he should admit the existence of some being superior to man, such as the fairies, demons, nixes, etc., which are still feared by the vulgar in almost all parts of Chris tian Europe. Even the notion of the Godheads, and the gods and goddesses of the ancient heathens, which were all of this description. None of them was accounted the Creator, and the births of most of them are recorded in their mythology; and altogether the notions entertained of them seem to have been very nearly the same as the vulgar superstitions still prevailing in most parts of Europe relative to the fairies, etc., these being doubtless no other than the ancient heathen deities of those parts, the belief in their existence and dread of their power having survived the introduction of Christianity, though the title of 'gods' has been dropped, as well as the words 'sacrifice' and 'worship' in reference to the offerings, invocations, and other tokens of reverence with which they are still in several places honored. It appears, therefore, that as the ancient heathens denounced the early Christians as Atheists for contemning the heathen deities, so they may be considered as being, in the Christian sense of the word, themselves Atheists (as indeed they are called in Ephes. ii, 12), and that consequently the word 'God,' in the Christian sense and in the heathen, must be regarded as having two meanings. Wide, therefore, is the notion contained in Pope's 'Universal Prayer,' the Psalms, as it is called, of the ancient heathen philosophers and the Brahmins of the present day, who applied the word God to a supposed soul of the universe:

"Mens agitat mollem, et toto se corpore miscet,

a spirit pervading all things (but not an agent or a person), and of which the souls of man and brutes are portions. In the Book of Revelation, Jehovah, the self-existent and all-perfect Being, with the world which he creates, is described as "God" (Revelations). The word "Being" in this context meets our view. Though intimately present with all his works, he is yet entirely distinct from them. In him we live, and move, and have our being. He is infinitely nigh to us, and he is intimately present with us, while we remain infinitely distant from his all-perfect and incomunicable essence" (Eden).

3. Can God be known?—The Scriptures declare that God is invisible (Exod. xxxiii, 20; John i, 18; John iv, 12; 1 Thess. iv, 8, etc.). The knowledge of God is therefore the knowledge of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. See Trinity.
this teaching into a higher one, viz. that the longing of the soul for God, the search for God in Christ, is always real, so that there is a "parable in the spiritual eyes of faith." Luther's doctrine that God may be taught, named, and apprehended in Christ, and in Christ alone, is quite in harmony with the early theology of the Church (e.g. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, ii). Not that a mere intellectual faith in Christ, or a knowledge of God in Christ, is the conversion of the soul begins its new, spiritual capacity to receive and apprehend God; and as the soul is emptied of self and purged from sin by the Holy Spirit, it grows in knowledge of God, in light and love, until the "life of God" becomes the "life of the soul." Dr. Nitzsch (Die Leben des Kaisers, 1869) has observed that 'the conversion passage as to the specifically Christian conception of God: "There is a sense in which the absolute being of God, as related immediately and directly to our created being, must be considered the necessary ground of our knowing him and coming into union with him in the way of religion. The whole possibility of religion for us starts in the God-consciousness, or direct sense of Deity, which is as much a part of our original nature as the sense we have of the world around us or of our own existence. It is not put into us by any outward and external argument. It arises of itself and necessitates itself as a fundamental fact in our life; and in doing this it certifies, to the same extent, the truth of the object on which it is exercised. Or, rather, we must say, the truth of the object on which it is exercised, which is the Divine Being, or the existence of the Absolute, certifies itself, makes itself sure in and through the consciousness into which it enters. In this sense, the idea of God comes before Christianity, as it comes before religion in every other form. But who shall say that this general idea of God can be for us, therefore, the actual root of Christianity, so that any among us, starting with that alone, could ever by means of it come to a full construction of what God is for true Christian faith? It lies at the ground of pantheism, dualism, polytheism, deism, and all false religions, no less than at the ground of Christianity. For the distinctive knowledge of Christianity, then, we need some other specific principle or root, which, however it may be comprehended in the general principle of all religion, must be regarded at the same time nevertheless as the ground and beginning, exclusively and entirely, of religion under this highest and most complete form, namely, now, is that principle to be found? Where does the whole world of Christianity, the new creation of the Gospel (life, power, doctrine, and all), take its rise and start? Where do we come to the source of its perennial revelation, the ground of its infallibility, where, in the presence of the Word Incarnate, the glorious Person of him who is the Root and the Offspring of David, the bright and morning Star—the faithful and true Witness, the BEGINNING of the creation of God? But Religion has had her errors and excesses as well as Science. As the latter seeks in its pride, by purely intellectual effort, to apprehend the absolute, the former has at certain periods allowed mysticism to take the place of the simple revealed truth as to the life of God in the soul, and, in the spirit of the Oriental theosophy, has called the "redeemed soul but a drop in the ocean of God" (see MYSTICISM). The orthodox Christian doctrine keeps the golden mean between these extremes. It asserts, and has asserted from the beginning, that a real and objective knowledge of God comes only from the revelation of God in the person and work of Jesus Christ, the Logos, the Word, the Father's "little finger" (Arist. De Mund.), according to the best capacity of man. It teaches not only that God is "incomprehensible," but also that every step taken in the true knowledge of God by the soul makes his "incomprehensibility" more obvious. It does not pretend that the scriptural doctrine of one God in three persons is perfectly within the scope of the human intellect to comprehend as well as to apprehend; but all Church history shows that the genuine and even scientific knowledge of God has been preserved better maintained in the doctrine of the Trinity than without it. When the Arians attacked the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity on the ground that it transcended human reason, the orthodox replied that it was easier to know God by receiving it in the doctrine of the Trinity than to resist it. A monotheism, whether in Judaism, Islamism, or elsewhere, has always ended in bald pantheism (q.v.), while on the other hand the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, though stigmatized by infidel and rationalistic opponents as Tritheism, has, from the beginning, preserved by the Church the true spiritual, moral, religious, and personal Being, and has kept up, also, a pure and spiritual worship of the Great Supreme. See Ritter, Leben die Erkenntniss Gottes in der Welt, 1896; Nitzsch, Syst. d. Christlichen Lehre, § 7, 60–80; Nitzsch, in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. s. v. God.

V. Substantia and Mode of the Scriptural Teaching.—In the Scriptures no attempt is made to prove the existence of a God. The error of men consisted not in denying a God, but in admitting too many; and one great object of the Bible is to demonstrate that there is but one. No metaphysical arguments, however, are employed for this purpose. The evidence is drawn from facts recorded in the history of the Jews, from which it appears that they were always victorious and prosperous so long as they served the living and true God, Jehovah (the name by which the Almighty made himself known to the Hebrews), and uniformly unsuccessful when they revolted from him to serve other gods. What argument could be so effectual to convince them that there was no god in all the earth but the God of Israel? The sovereignty and universal providence of the Lord Jehovah are proved by predictions delivered by the prophets regarding the coming of the Messiah and of the nations and of empires, specifying distinctly their rise, the duration of their power, and the causes of their decline; thus demonstrating that one God ruled among the nations, and made them the unconscious instruments of promoting the purposes of his will. In the same manner, none of the attributes of God are demonstrated in Scripture by reasoning: they are simply affirmed and illustrated by facts; and instead of a regular deduction of doctrines and conclusions from a few admitted principles, we are left to gather them from the recorded works and declarations of persons whose hearts were influenced by the fear of God. These circumstances point out a marked singularity in the Scriptures, considered as a repository of religious doctrines. The writers, generally speaking, do not reason, but exhort and exhort; they do not attempt to fetter the judgment by the subtility of argument, but to rouse the feelings by an appeal to palpable facts. This is exactly what might have been expected from teachers acting under a divine commission, and armed with undeniable facts to enforce their admonitions. The sacred writers furnish us with information on the existence and the character of God (1) from the names by which he is designated; (2) from the actions ascribed to him; and (3) from the attributes with which he is invested.

1. The names of God as recorded in Scripture convey at once ideas of overwhelming greatness and glory, mingled with that wonderful mysteriousness with which, to all finite minds, and especially to the minds of children, the thought of the existence and mode of existence must ever be invested. Though One, he is τό ιδίον, EL-OHIM, GOD, person admirable. He is τὸ πάντα, JEHOVAH, self-existing; שֵׁלָל, El, the Mighty, Almighty; שָאֲדֵד, omnipotent, all-sufficient; חַי, ADONAI, Lord, Ruler, Judge. These are among the admirable appellatives of God which are scattered throughout the
revelation that he has been pleased to make of himself. But in one opinion he was pleased more particularly to declare his name, that is, such of the qualities and attributes of the divine nature as mortals are the most interested in knowing, and to unfold not only his natural, but also those of his moral attributes by which his conduct towards his creatures is regulated. And this gift of the God, the Lord God, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and that will by no means cleave the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation (Exod. xxxiv). This is the most ample and particular description of the character of God, as given by himself in the Old Testament" (Watson). The name "which is above every name" (Phil. ii, 9), is the name Jesus (Col. iii, 17). The name in Exod. iii, 14 is peculiar in denoting God as the "God who reveals himself." The declaration "I am that I am," or "I will be that I will be," does not so much include a predicate of God as a declaration of the eternal being of God, revealing himself at his own time and on his own terms. It involves not merely the sense of existence (to which it is limited by the Septuagint version Ο’ ἡμῶν), but also the idea of the continual self-revealing of God, and thus unifies, so to speak, all the successive steps and epochs of revelation. His "is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending," being all in all, and "which is to come—the Almighty" (Rev. i, 8). The name Jehovah was too holy to be uttered, and others were substituted for it by the Jews; the fearful penalty for blaspheming it was death (Lev. xxiv, 16; see Clarke's note ad loc.). In the names Father and Redeemer (Isa. lxxiii, 16), new elements of the character of the self-revealing Jehovah are set forth; he shows himself as the God of grace and love to his people who turn unto him.—Watson, Institutes, pt. ii, c. i; Nitzsch, in Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie s. v. Gott; Hengstenberg, Die Gotternamen des Pentateuch; Knapp, Theologie (Wood's ed. p. 84); Lange, On Genesis, Introd. § 7.

2. Actions.—The second means by which the Scriptures convey to us the knowledge of God is by the actions which they ascribe to him. They contain, indeed, the important record of his dealings with men in every age, who were commissioned with limited, strict, sacred history, and by prophetical declaration they also exhibit the principles on which he will govern the world to the end of time; so that the whole course of the divine administration may be considered as exhibiting a singularly illustrative comment upon those actions, and as prepared in the mind of the people before the events contained in such declarations as those which have been just quoted. (1.) The first act ascribed to God is that of creation. By this were manifested: his eternity and self-existence, as he who creates must be before all creatures, and he who gives being to others can derive itself from none; his almighty power, shown both in the act of creation and in the number and vastness of the objects so produced; his wisdom, in their arrangement and in their fitness to their respective ends; and his goodness, as the whole tended to the happiness of his amnest. The foundation of his natural and moral government are also made manifest by his creative acts. In what he made out of nothing he had an absolute right and prerogative; it awaited his ordering, and was completely at his disposal; so that he could destroy his own work, and to prescribe the laws by which the intelligent and rational part of his creatures should be governed, are rights which none can question. Thus, on the one hand, his character of Lord or Governor is established, and, on the other, our duty of lowly homage and absolute obedience. (2.) Providence.—The next and most strikingly shown to us since man was created he was placed under a rule of conduct. Obedience was to be followed with the continuance of the divine favor; transgression, with death. The event called forth new manifestations of the character of God. His tender mercy, in the compassion showed to the fallen pair; his justice, in forgiving them only in the view of a satisfaction to be hereafter offered to his justice by an innocent representative of the sinning race, in their stead, and by whose sacrifice he become this Redeemer, and in the fulness of time to die for the sins of the whole world; and his holiness, in connecting with this provision for the pardon of man the means of restoring him to a sinless state, and to the obliterated image of God in which he had been created. Exemplary instructions of the path traced from age to age in his establishing his own worship among men, and remitting the punishment of individual and national offences in answer to prayer offered from penitent hearts, and in dependence upon the typified or actually offered universal sacrifice; of his condescension, in stooping to the cases of individuals, in his dispensions both of pittance and grace, by showing respect to the poor and humble, and principally by the incarnation of God in the form of a servant, admitting men into familiar and friendly intercourse with him. And the time is coming when he will be their patron and advocate until they should be received into the same glory, 'and so to be forever with the Lord'; of his strictly righteous government, in the destruction of the old world, the cities of the plain, the nations of Canaan, and all ancient states, upon their misdeed filling up the measure of iniquity, under the plea that 'he will by no means clear the guilty,' in the numerous and severe punishments inflicted even upon the chosen seed of Abraham because of their transgressions; of his long-suffering, in frequent warnings, delays, and corrective judgments inflicted upon individuals and nations before the sentence of utter extermination and destruction; of faithfulness and truth, in the fulfillment of promises, often many ages after they were given, as in the promises to Abraham respecting the possession of the land of Canaan by his seed, and in all the promises made to the fathers respecting the advent, vicarious death, and illustrious offices of the 'Christ,' the Saviour of the world; of his immutability, in the constant and unchanging laws and principles of his government, which remain to this day precisely the same in every thing universal as when first promul- gated, and himself, and the refined chaff into heaven 10 places as well as through all time; of his preexistence of future events, manifested by the predictions of Scripture; and of the depth and stability of his counsel, as illustrated in that plan and purpose of bringing back a reviled world to obedience and felicity which we find in view in the ages of the world and the acts of God in former ages—which is still the end towards which all his dispensations tend, however wide and mysterious their sweep, and which they will finally accomplish, as we learn from the prophetick history of the future contained in the Old and New Testaments. Thus the course of divine operation in the world has from age to age been a manifestation of the divine character, continually receiving new and stronger illustrations until the completion of the Christian revelation by the ministry of Christ and his inspired followers. The foundation of his natural and moral government are also made manifest by his creative acts. In what he made out of nothing he had an absolute right and prerogative; it awaited his ordering, and was completely at his disposal; so that he could destroy his own work, and to prescribe the laws by which the intelligent and rational part of his creatures should be governed, are rights which none can question. Thus, on the one hand, his character of Lord or Governor is established, and, on the other, our duty of lowly homage and absolute obedience. (2.) Providence.—The next and most strikingly shown to us since man was created he was placed under a rule of conduct. Obedience was to be followed with the continuance of the
ble.' That, after all the manifestations he has made of himself, he is, from the infinite perfection and glory of his nature, incomprehensible: 'I know not how or in what way of his ways, and bow little a portion is heard of him.' 'Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out.' That he is unchangeable: 'The Father of Lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.' That he is the fountain of life, and the only independent, eternally true, universal, unvarying, and only hath the attribute of immortality. That every other being, however exalted, has its existence from him: 'For by him were all things created which are in heaven and in earth, whether they be visible or invisible.' That the existence of every thing is upheld by a creature being the unpromised and independent of his support: 'By him all things consist;' 'upholding all things by the word of his power.' That he is omniqritis: 'Do not I fill heaven and earth with my presence? saith the Lord.' That he is omnisciens: 'All things are naked and open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do.' That he is the absolute Lord and Owner of all things: 'The heavens, even the heaven of heavens, are thine, and all the parts of them; The earth is thine, and the fulness thereof, the world and them that dwell therein.' 'He doth according to his will in the sphere among the angels of the heaven, and in the circle of the sun.' That his providence extends to the minutest objects: 'The hairs of your head are all numbered;' 'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?' and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father.' That his knowledge is perfect: 'The eye of the Lord is upon the righteous, and his ear heareth their cry;' 'He that is perfect, he shall have perfect knowledge.' That his providence comprehends all things: 'Holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts!' 'A God of truth, and in whom there is no iniquity;' 'Of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.' That he is just in the administration of his government: 'Shall not the Judge of the whole earth do right?' 'Clouds and darkness are round about him;' 'judgment, and justice are the habitation of his throne.' That his wisdom is unsearchable: 'O the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!' And, finally, that he is good and merciful: 'Thou art good, and thy mercy endureth forever;' 'His tender mercy is over all his works;' 'God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ;' 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;' 'And hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.' See Attributes: also VI below.

"Under these deeply awful but consolatory views do the Scriptures present to us the supreme object of our worship and trust; and they dwell upon each of the attributes of God, in strict accordance with infinite beauty of language, and with an inexhaustible variety of illustration. Nor can we compare these views of the divine nature with the conceptions of the most enlightened of pagans without feeling how much reason we have for everlasting gratitude that a revelation so explicit and so comprehensive should have been made to us on a subject which only a revelation from God himself could have made known. It is thus that Christian philosophers, even when they do not use the language of the Scriptures, are able to speak on this great and mysterious doctrine in language so clear and with conceptions so noble; in a manner, too, so equable, so different from the sages of antiquity, who, if at any time they approach the truth when speaking of the divine nature, never fail to mingle with it some essentially erroneous or groveling conception. By the word God, it is shown, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the consummation of the world;' 'Theolphus, Præsidii, li, 811, ed. 1803; Watson, Inst. pt. ii, c. i.

VI. Dogmatical Treatment of the Doctrine of God.

The highest veneration and most profound submission and obedience are due' (Barrow, On the Creed). 'Our notion of Deity,' says Bishop Sherlock, 'both comprise, signify a Being or Nature of infinite perfection; and the infinite perfection of a being or nature consists in this, that it is absolutely and essentially necessary, an actual being of itself, and potential or causative of all beings beside itself; independent from any other which all things depend on, and by which all things else are governed' (Pearson, On the Creed).

'God is a Being,' says Lawson, 'and not any kind of being, but a substance which is the foundation of other beings; and not only a substance, but perfect. Yet many beings are perfect in their kind, yet limited and finite; but God is absolutely, fully, and infinitely perfect, and therefore above spirits, above angels, who are perfect comparatively. God's infinite perfection includes all the attributes, even the most excellent. It excludes all dependency, borrowed existence, composition, corruption, mortality, contingency, ignorance, unrighteousness, weakness, misery, and all imperfections whatever. It includes necessity of being, independency, perfect unity, simplicity, immensity, eternity, immortality; the most perfect life, knowledge, wisdom, integrity, power, glory, bliss, and all these are contained in God, who reaches up to the secrets of this eternal Being. Our reason comprehends but little of him, and when it can proceed no farther faith comes in, and we believe far more than we can understand; and this our belief is not contrary to reason, but is justly and necessarily united to us that we must believe far more of God than can form us of' (Lawson, Theo-Politico). To this we may add an admirable passage from Sir Isaac Newton: 'The word God frequently signifies Lord, but every lord is not God: it is the dominion of a spiritual Being or Lord that constitutes God; it is that which constitutes God, the supreme, the Supreme; feigned, the false god. From such true dominion it follows that the true God is living, intelligent, and powerful, and from his other perfections that he is supreme, or supremely perfect; he is eternal and infinite, omnipotent and omniscient; that is, he endures from eternity to eternity, and is perfect from infinity to infinity. He governs all things that exist, and knows all things that are to be known; he is not eternity or infinity, but eternal and infinite; he is not duration or space, but he endures and is present everywhere; he endures and is present everywhere; he is omnipresent, not only virtually, but also substantially; for power without substance cannot subsist. All things are contained and move in him, but without any mutual passion; he suffers nothing from the motions of bodies, nor do they undergo any resistance from his omnipresence; his eternity and his infinity are necessary, and by the same necessity he exists always and everywhere: hence also he must be perfectly similar, all eye, all ear, all arm, all the power of perceiving, understanding, and acting; but after a manner wholly to us unknown. He is destitute of all body and all bodily shape, and therefore cannot be seen, heard, or touched, nor ought he to be worshipped under the representation of any thing corporeal. We have ideas of the attributes of God, but do not know the substance of even any thing; we see only the figures and colors of bodies, hear only sounds, touch only the outward surfaces, smell only odors, and taste tastes, and do not, cannot, by any sense or reflex act, know their inward substances, and much less can we have any notion of the substance of God. We know him by his properties and attributes,' """"Theopol. Principi, ii, 811; Principal, Principi, ii, 811, ed. 1803; Watson, Insti. pt. ii, c. i.
according to their views of the relations of the subject to the other branches, but in general it constitutes the first topic treated, and is divided very much as follows:

2. Division.—I. The Nature of God: 1. As the original and unoriginated personal Being: (a) One; (b) self-existent; (c) infinite. 2. As the original Word and Will: (a) Creator; (b) preserver; (c) governor of the world, or the original Spirit; (d) Essential Spirit; (e) origin of all moral and spiritual laws and existences. And hence, II, the Trinity of three persons in the one Godhead: Father, Son, Holy Ghost. See Monothelism; Trinity. III. The Attributes of God: 1. Those intrinsic to the nature of God and essential to his existence; but conceptions of the Idea of God in his relations to the world and to human thought (Suaideissen, p. 150). Perfections Dei, qua essentiam divinam nostrum conspiciendi modo per se conosceamus et de Deo parumque prudenscuntur (Hollas, p. 254). So Aquinas: “The name of God does not express the divine essence as it is, as the name of man expresses in its signification the essence of man as it is; that is to say, by signifying the definition which declares the essence” (Summa, pt. I, q. xiii, art. I). The ground of this distinction was the conviction that finite things cannot be so perfectly and equally accurate, than God and his attributes are, since the limit of eternity is not otherwise than by imperfect analogies. “The attributes of God must be represented to our minds, so far as they can be represented at all, under the similitude of the corresponding attributes of man. Yet we cannot conceive of an essence, in God, in the same manner, as we exist as man. In man they are many, in God they must be one. In man they are related to and limit each other; in God there can be no relation and no limitation. In man they exist only as capacities at times carried into action; in God, who is purus actus, there can be no distinction between capacity and operation. Hence the divine attributes may properly be called mysterious; for, though we believe in their coexistence, we are unable to conceive the manner of their co-existence.” (Quarterly Review, July, 1864, art. iii). There have been many divisions of the attributes of God. The scholastic theology set forth the attributes in three ways: 1. by causality (via causaliatis), in which all the perfections we observe in creation, and especially in man, are necessarily to be attributed to their Creator; 2. by negation (via negationis), under which there can be created beings as kept out of the conception of God; 3. by analogy or eminence (via analogiae, via eminentiae), by which the highest degree of all known perfections is attributed to God. Accordingly, the attributes of God were classed as negative and positive, the negative being such as remove from the conception of a perfect being, such as infinity, immutability, immortality, etc.; while the positive assert some perfection in God which is in and of himself, and which in the creatures, in any measure, is from him. This distinction is now mostly disregarded. Among modern writers, Dr. Samuel Clarke sums up the attributes as ultimately referrible to three leading ones: omnipotence, omniscience, and perfect goodness. Others distinguish them into absolute and relative: absolute are such as belong to the essence of God, as Jehovah, Yah, etc.; relative ones are such as may be ascribed to him in time, with relation to his creatures, as creator, governor, preserver, redeemer, etc. Others, again, divide them into communicable and incommunicable attributes. The communicable are those which can be imparted to the creature, as goodness, holiness, wisdom, etc.; the incommunicable are such as cannot be so imparted, as independence, immutability, immortality, and eternity. Another division makes one class of natural attributes, e.g. eternity, immensity, etc., and another of moral, e.g. holiness, goodness, etc. The later German theologians adopt more scientific classifications; e.g. Böhme (Lehre v. d. Gött. Erscheinungen, 1821; last ed. Altenburg, 1842) distinguishes the attributes into those which refer to the world in general, and those which refer to the world in particular; and he makes two classes: (1.) attributes which refer to the universal sense of dependence on God, viz. omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence; (2.) attributes which refer to the Christian sense of redemption and of dependence on God, viz. holiness, justice, wisdom, love, etc. (Theol. Enzyklop. § 74) and classifies them as (1.) attributes of God as absolute cause (a) in himself—eternal, infinite, self-sufficient; (b) in relation to the world—omnipotent, omnipresent; (2.) attributes of God as the original and self-revealing soul—good, holy, just, benevolent, etc., which are not of the divine essence, but set forth by Babul in the Bulletin of the Revue Chrétienne (1866, No. 8, Juillet): I. Absolute or immanent Attributes: 1. self-sufficiency of God as a pure and absolute Being; 2. majesty; the divine will; 3. blessedness. II. Relative Attributes, implied in God’s relation to the universe; the love of God is the source of creation and being, while the essence of God is expressed in infinity, immensity, immutability. The personality of God is manifested to the world in goodness, wrath, grace; the intelligence of God in omniscience, holiness, truth. The self of God is manifested in omnipotence, immutability. The divine personality is manifested in the one attribute of omnipotence. See Bate, Harmony of the Divine Attributes. Charnock, Existence and Attributes of God (Lond. 1845, 8vo, last edit.); Elwet, in Tub. Zeitschrift, 1809; Blasche, Christus, dei et hominis redemptor, 7th ed. (Hamburg), 1852; Jantscher, in Annalen der Dirin., etc. (Lugdun. 1824); Bruch, Lehre v. d. göttl. Erscheinungen (Hamb. 1842); Moll, De justo attributorum Dei discrimine (Hal. 1855); Shed, History of Doctrine, i, 240; Hase, Evang. Dogmatik, § 102 sqq., and writers on systematic theology generally. See Creation; Time; Providence.

VII. History of the Doctrine of God.—The history of the argument for the being of God will be found under NATURAL THEOLOGY. We treat here briefly the history of the doctrine of the nature and attributes of God. The first office of Christianity was to vindicate the spirituality of God against the materialistic and anthropomorphic ideas of paganism, and even of corrupted Judaism. The proposition “God is a Spirit” was therefore a fundamental one; yet at an early period anthropomorphic ideas were developed in the Church. Melito, bishop of Sardis, in his treatise De oussais tou theou (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iv. 26), taught a corporeal representation of God. Tertullian (adv. Praxem., c. vii) declares Deum corpus esse, etn Spiritus esse; nihil enim incorporeale nisi quod non est; and thus plainly shows that he could not distinguish reality from form even in corporeal things, such as the pho- tophobes took the phrase “image of God” in a material sense, and taught that God is man per eminentiam, etc. (2.) The second error was Dualism (q. v.), brought in by the Gnostic distinction between the supreme God and the Demiurg. See Gnosticism. (3.) Opposed to both these was the philosophical mode of conceiving God, including the idea of immateriality, proved negatively, e.g. Minucius Felix: Ilic nec videt potest—invisus est; nec comprehendi potest—incognitus est; nec essentiam—insignis est: infinitus, immutabilis et omnium irlandiae opposits all crude anthropopathisms, but they were not-successful in correctly separating the real and the sensual view, and hence were led into a subtilizing of the divine attributes. Clement attributes all errors in the apprehension of the Old Testament to the sensual and liberal mode of understanding it, which led men to represent, after human fashion, the nature of God, who is exalted above all human passions. The prophets could represent God to us, not as he is, but only as we sensuals men can understand it (Ström. p. 392). Origen also sees in the Old Testament a condescension of God to the weakness of man.
In fact, there is no wrath in God, but he must appear as if wrathful to the lad, on account of the sufferings which their own evil conduct entailed upon them (Hom. 18, in Jerem.). The Alexandrians disputed the self-substinance of God's primitive justice, and merged it in the idea of a τεταγμένος σωτήρα, a disciplining reformatory love. Augustine spells out God's grace in terms of God as the immediately acting source, in the act of salvation, good and not evil, not of itself, notadium non mutatur, verum etiam mutari non potest, etc. But he declares that no complete definition of God can be given: Deus ineffabilis est: factus dicimus quod Deus non sit, quam quid sit (Comm. in Psal. lxxxxi). I mean that the same controversy and questions as to the nature of God were bound up with the discussion of the Trinity (q.v.); and in the period from Gregory I to the scholastic age (11th century), with that of the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and the Person of Christ. See CHRISTOLOGY. In the scholastic period Anselm supposed an analog (before by Augustine) between the divine mind and the human.

"We cannot know," he says, "the supreme Being in himself, but only after a certain analogy with created beings, therefore most of all with the rational spirit. The more this spirit enters into itself and observes itself, the more it can be trusted in reversion to the knowledge of the absolute Spirit. The human spirit is a mirror in which we may see the image of that which we do not directly behold. The supreme Spirit presupposes his own existence, knows himself; the human spirit supposes not only his own existence but also the human spirit.

Thus the supreme Being expressed himself. As everything which is produced by human art was before in the idea of the formative spirit, and as this idea remains even when the work perishes and is, in this respect, one with the art of the formative spirit itself, so it is in the case of the holy word, but the same word by which God knows himself and all creatures. In the divine Word creatures have a higher being than in themselves: the ideal being rests in the divine thoughts. The relation of the Son to the Father is something elevated above all language. The expression generation is best suited to represent the relation, but not the human.

Further, as God knows himself, he loves himself; his love supposes his being and knowing. This is also denoted by the procession of the Holy Spirit from both; all three pass completely into one another, and thus constitute the unity of the supreme Being" (Monologium, c. 64). The view of God taught by Scotus Eriugena—In de immutabili et essentiali sunt omnino—led, in the hands of David of Dinant and Amalric of Bena, to a pantheistical theory, which was opposed by Aquinas and the later scholastics. As to the attributes of God, the principal discussions of the scholastic period related to his omnipotence and omnipresence. The confessions of faith of the Reformation period generally agree as to the doctrine of the nature, attributes, and works of God; the discussions that have arisen in the bosom of Protestantism on this subject refer chiefly to the doctrines of the Trinity (q.v.) and predestination (q.v.). The later theories of the philosophical period, on the sceptical side, are those of Idealism, Materialism, and Pantheism (see the several heads). Some later Christian writers, in opposing the extremes of German Rationalism, have denied the possibility of any scientific knowledge of God. Mansell (Limits of Religious Thought, Bampton Lectures for 1859) maintains that only a regulative (as distinguished from a speculative) knowledge of God is possible. "A conception of the Deity as purely abstract, we must not conceive him as first cause, as absolute, and as infinite. But do not these three conceptions imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same being? A cause cannot, as such, be absolute; the absolute cannot, as such, be a cause. How can the infinite become that which it was not from the first?"

Mr. Mansell here pushes his opposition to the use of reason too far; and finding the words "absolute" and "infinite" used in transcendantal senses by the Germans, he adopts those senses, and reasons as if no other definitions were possible. For criticisms of his work, see London Review, July, 1860, p. 390 sq.; Young, The Province of Reason (London, 1859); Armstrong, The Method of the Divine Government (Edinb., 1859, 6th ed.).

The universal doctrine of God over against the modern speculative idea is well set forth in the following passage: "The problem in regard to God is simply this: The human mind is compelled to think a unity or synthesis of all things. But how is this unity to be conceived? Is it outside the human being, or outside and above it? Here it is that the Christian idea breaks off from the speculative. The Christian, realizing his own personality, feeling intensely that he himself in his inmost being is numerically different from and above nature, is compelled to think of the divine as in like manner supernatural. Having attained to this stage, the next question that arises is, How are we to image forth the divine Being? and the answer is, not surely by the lowest kind of natural existence, but by the highest. The human personality itself, not the immutabilities of the materialistic God, was the inner secret in revealing himself to be the image which shall shadow forth the divine Being. That which comprehends all things must, at least, equal in perfection the highest of these things. Thus the human personality becomes in the Christian system in a way analagous and like the eternal being of the transcendent.
Goddard, Josiah, a Baptist minister, missionary, a native of Scituate, Mass., was born at Wendell, Mass., in 1813; graduated at Brown University in 1838, and at Newton Theological Seminary in 1838. He was appointed a missionary to the Chinese in Siam. China being not yet open to the residence of foreigners. There he labored with success as a preacher, translator of the Bible, and created tracts. Mr. Godfrey, an Anglo-Chinese vocabulary. Being taken with bleeding from the lungs, he removed to Ningpo, one of the treaty ports then recently assigned for foreign trade and residence. Here he continued, with conscious and growing weakness, holding upon life by a peculiarly uncertain tenure, yet with courage and patience, to labor on for six years—preaching, journeying, preparing and circulating tracts, and carrying to completion his version of the New Testament. This is a valuable contribution to the difficult work of Biblical translation in Chinese language. He was an excellent scholar, and made high attainments in the study of that language. He proved himself a sensible and cautious, but brave and earnest worker. The disease against which he had borne up so long proved fatal in 1854. (L. E. S.)

Godken, Antoine, a Roman Catholic bishop, was born at Dreux in 1605. He was destined by his parents for public life, but, having been disappointed in love, entered the ministry. He was one of the ornaments of the Hotel Rambouillet at Paris, where his talent for verse gained him distinction. Richelieu made him bishop of Grasse in 1636. After his consecration he retired to his diocese, and devoted himself to its duties. He subsequently quit the see of Grasse for that of Venice, where he died April 21, 1672. He wrote Morale Charitienne (1605, 8 vols. 12mo): Paraphrases des Epitres de St. Paul et des Epitres Canoniques (1610, 1611, 4to): Pauvres de David, traduits en vers Français:—Nouveau Testament traduit et expliqué (1628, 2 vols. 8vo), besides other smaller ecclesiastical and chiefly biographical. The most important of his productions is l'Histoire de l'Eglise, from the commencement of the world to the end of the 9th century (Paris, 1635-1678, 5 vols. fol.). He left MSS. containing the work on grace in which he was engaged. He disputed the author of his history with his three and the threats of a powerful ecclesiastic induced him to write the rest of his work with less impartiality.—Dupin, Ecles. Writ. 17th cent.; Hook, Ecles. Biog. vol. v.; Niebr, Minnes. xvii-xx; Hoff, Novae. Biog. gen. xx, 885.

Godeschalkus. See Gottschalk.

Godfathers; Godmothers. See Sponsors.

Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lorraine, was born at Bézé, in Brabant, probably about A.D. 1060. He served with high distinction in the armies of the Emperor Henry IV. Near the end of the 11th century, the first crusade was set on foot, he entered into the movement, and was the first in rank among the Crusaders. "He not only signified himself by valor among the valorous, and by enthusiasm among the enthusiastic, but he showed also disinterestedness, probity, skill, and sagacity, which were of the first order. He maintained the most complete discipline among his division of the Christian army, which he brought safely to the appointed muster-place beneath the walls of Constantinople in the winter of 1096. By his sagacity and firmness he prevented hostilities breaking out between the Crusaders and the Greek emperor, Alexius Connenus, and in the spring of 1097 Godfrey led the Frankish nations into Asia Minor, to the siege of the capital of the Turkish sultan of Nice. This city was captured after a siege, in which the personal valor of Godfrey, as well as his generalship, was frequently displayed. He was tall, well-proportioned, and of such remarkable strength and dexterity in the use of his weapons that he is said, in more than one encounter, to have cloven his foe by a single sword-stroke from skull to skull. After Nice was captured, the Crusaders marched to Antioch, and defeated a Turkish army in the great battle of Dorylaeum. They reached Antioch, in Syria, late in the winter of 1097. The city was captured after an obstinate resistance, and the weakened army of the victors was in turn besieged in its walls by an innumerable host of the Mohammedans. After enduring the utmost suffering and loss, Godfrey led the Crusaders in a sudden sortie upon their enemies, which was completely victorious. The enthusiasm caused among the Christian army by the supposed discovery of the relic of the holy lance was one great cause of this success. It was not till 1099 that the Crusaders reached Jerusalem, and their numbers were then reduced by the sword and by disease to only 1500 horse and 20,000 foot fit for service. The Mohammedan garrison was far more numerous, and the city was fortifically strong. But the zeal of the Crusaders was invincible. The Crusaders had completed the conquest of Jerusalem, and the Syrian City was carried by storm July 15, 1099. Godfrey was proclaimed first Latin king of Jerusalem, but he rejected the title, and assumed the style of "Defender and Baron of the Holy Sepulchre." He defeated the sultan of Egypt at Ascalon, August 12, 1099. Godfrey compiled and promulgated a code named Les Asises de Jerusalem, which, as finally revised towards the close of the 14th century for the use of the Latin kingdom of Cyprus, is printed in old law French in Beaumanoir's Coutumes de Beaumanoir (Bourges and Paris, 1690). He died in 1100. See Creasy, in Rich's Cyclop. of Biography; English Cyclopedia; Michaud, Histoire des Croisades.

Godhead, the nature or essential being of God (Acts xvii, 29; Rom. i, 29; Col. ii, 9).

Godliness, strictly taken, is right worship or devotion, but in general it imports the whole of practical religion (1 Tim. iv, 8; 2 Pet. i, 6). It is difficult, as Saurin observes, to include an adequate idea of it in what is called piety, or what is commonly called devotion; a chiefly biographical. It import knowledge, veneration, affection, dependence, submission, gratitude, and obedience; or it may be reduced to these four ideas: knowledge in the mind, by which it is distinguished from the visions of the superstitious; rectitude in the conduct, that is,-poetry: sacrifice in the life, or renunciation of the world, by which it is distinguished from the unmeaning obedience of him who goes as a happy constitution
leads him; and, lastly, seal in the heart, which differs from the languishing emotions of the luke-warm. The advantages of the study are, peace, safety, usefulness, support in death, and prospect of glory; or, as the apostle sums up all in a few words, "it is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. iv. 8).

In 1796, he embarked upon the sublimate bound re-ligion as furnished in the various particulars enumerat-ed.

Barrow, Works, i, 9; Scott, Christ. Life; Scougal, Life of God in the Soul of Man; Saurin, Sermons, Eng. trans. v, serm. 3.

Godman, John D., an American naturalist and physician, was born at Annapolis, Maryland, in 1754, and at an early age left an orphan, was a pupil, and apprentice to a printer, and afterwards entered the navy as a sailor-boy. At nineteen he commenced the study of medicine, and on completing his studies he settled in Philadelphia as a physician and private teacher of an-thomy, and for some time was an assistant editor of the Medical Journal. In 1795 he was elected to the professorship of anatomy in Rutgers' Medical College, and removed to New York, where he soon acquired ex- ten-sive practice as a surgeon. Ill health, however, obliged him to relinquish his practice, and spend a winter in the West Indies. He died of consumption at Greenwich, Pa., April 17, 1830. He wrote a num-ber of medical works of value; but he is men- tioned here because of the fact that, having at one time adopted the infidelity and atheism of the French natu-ralists of the last century, the death of a friend in 1827 led him to reflection and to the reading of the Scrip-tures, and he became eminent for Christian piety. An account of him by Dr. T. Sewall is published by the American Tract Society.—Davenport, Biol. Dic- tionary; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 861.

Godman. See INCARNATION.

Godwin, Francis, an eminent English prelate and Church historian, was born at Hastingon, North-amptonshire, in 1561. In 1578 he entered the college of Christ Church, Oxford, of which his father, Thomas Godwin, was dean. Here he took successively the degrees of B.A. in 1580, M.A. in 1583, B.D. in 1598, and D.D. in 1595. He held divers ecclesiastical offices un-till his publication of the Catalogue of the Bishops of England (1621), in which he was appointed bishop of Lindauf. A Latin translation of this work, dedicated to James I, secured the support of the bishop of Hereford. He died April 10, 1633. His works are, A Catalogue of the Bis- hops of England since the first planting of Christianity in the island, with a history of memorable actions (1601, 4to; 2d ed., with additions, and Latin translation, 1615. This translation, with a continuation, was republished by Richardson, under the title De Praestibus Angliae Commentarius. Cambridge, 1748, folio);—Sermon Anglicorum Hereticorum VIII, Edwaedo VI, et Mariae regnantibus, 4 volume (1614, fol.; London, 1628, 4to; English, by his son Morgan, 1650, fol.);—Nuncius immensus in Utopia (1620, 8vo):—A Computation of the Value of the Roman Sextere and Attic Taelum (1630):—The Mm in the Moon, or a Discourse of a Voyage thither by Domingo Gonzalez (1638, 8vo); another edit. of 1665 (with a translation of the latter) (1666, 8vo). See Biographia Britannica; Chalmers, General Biog. Dictionary.

Godwin, Thomas, D.D., an English theologian, was born in Somersethire in 1587. He entered Mag-dalen Hall, Oxford, in 1602, became head master of the free school of Aldington in 1609, and afterwards rector of Burscot, in 1617. He was also dean of Chichester, and, finally, pastor of the Lutheran Church in Paris in 1649. There, together with Boisard, he opened the church called the Bib-lettes, took care of over 14,000 souls dispersed all over Paris, attended to the poor, the schools, and all the other details of his charge. He was one of the found-ers of the Missions Evangeliques, of the Societe Biblique.
the Société protestante de Proovance et de Secours mutuels, and the Société de la Morale Chrétienne. In 1815, at the time of the massacre of the Protestants at Nîmes, a London society had made proposals to the French Protestants to help them. Had the proposals been accepted, the position of Protestantism in France would have become even more worse than it had been. Goepp, while gratefully acknowledging the offer, declined, in the name of the French Protestants, accepting the protection of any foreign power. The French government acknowledged the services rendered by Goepp by creating him a member of the Legion of Honor. Goepp died at Paris June 21, 1856. Besides his immense pastoral work, Goepp did a great deal of literary labor. He wrote, besides numerous pamphlets and funeral discourses, Précis de l’histoire de la chrétienne exposée par le texte de l’Ecriture Sainte (in collaboration with Boisard, Paris, 1815, 8vo).—Prises à l’usage du culte domestique, suivies des exercices et préparation à la sainte Cène (same, Paris, 1821, 12mo).—Principes de la Religion chrétienne, à l’usage des écoles élémentaires (Paris, 1826, 12mo).—Discours sur le nom et le but de la Société de la Morale chrétienne (Paris, 1834, 8vo), etc. See Villenave, Notice sur J.-J. Goepp. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx, 949 sq.

Goeing, Jacob, a Lutheran minister, was born in York County, Pa., Jan. 17, 1775. His father was a farmer, and had designed his son for the same occupation, but, as the youth showed promising talents and holiness of character, his father consented to his becoming a minister of the Gospel. He studied theology with Dr. Helmuth, and in 1786 became pastor of the Lutheran Church at York, Pa. Here he continued to labor until his death in 1807. Mr. Goeing was regarded as an extraordinary man, a profound scholar, and an eloquent preacher. Nothing could check his ardor in the prosecution of his studies, or divert him from his purpose. In the pulpit he would often electrify his audience, and sway them at his will. It was his practice to present to his people systematic doctrinal instruction, always accompanied with a pointed application and an earnest appeal. On the afternoon of the Lord’s day, in connection with the catechetical exercise, he examined the whole congregation on the subject of the morning’s discourse. Although he wrote much, he published very little—only two small works on Rhetoric and on Method. His Méthode contained discussions of theological questions, inquiries into the Oriental languages, and translations from the Arabic poets, but these valuable papers, with all his letters, in compliance with his directions in his last illness, were committed to the flames. (M. L. B.)

Goerres (or Gößers), Johann Joseph von, an eminent German Roman Catholic writer, was born Jan. 25, 1776, at Coblenz, and educated at the gymnasium in that place. In early life he was involved in politics, and in 1798 he set up a Republican newspaper, the "Rothe Blätt." Being sent on a deputation to Paris in 1799, he saw French "freedom" under Bonaparte, and became disgusted with it. In that year he gave up his journal, and devoted himself to the study of law, and at intervals to philology and natural science. In 1802 he appeared his Aphorismen über Kunst (Aphorisms on Art); in 1805, Erzähler der Physiologie (Physiologist); and Glaube und Wissen (Faith and Knowledge). In 1808 he went to Heidelberg, and lectured on Physics there till 1808, when he left. From 1811 to 1810 he published Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt (Mythology of the Asiatic World, Heidelberg, 8vo). In 1814 he again entered the political field against the French as editor of the Rheinischer Merkur (The Rhine Mercury), an organ to express the whole public mind of Germany. It was prohibited by the Prussian government in 1816—a strange reward for the services it had rendered. In 1819 he had to take refuge in Strasburg, in consequence of publishing Deutschland und die Revolution, in which he pleaded for the liberal party of Germany. He afterwards published a number of political works of the same vein, and tinged with mysticism. In Strasburg he was surrounded by the Roman Catholic influence, and began to despair of reforming society by politics. In 1825 he accepted the professorship of history in the new University of Munich, and there he spent the remainder of his days. In 1838-42 appeared his Christliche Mystik (Christian Mysticism, Ratibon, 4 vols. 8vo). During the current conflict, he was considered a prominent adherent of the first philosophic system of Schelling, but he found in the abstruse speculations of German philosophy no elements adequate to content his restless spirit of investigation. He was then swept away by that current of conservative Roman Catholic restoration which in the early part of the present century, carried a number of German politicians, historians, and poets into the bosom of the Church of Rome. Like most of them, Goerres never regarded Romanism as it appears in the light of history, but invested it with all the brilliant features and colors of the ideal picture of a political society which had been previously conceived in his own mind. Still, under the influence of his former studies, he went down to the deep grounds of mysticism to discover there a light in the darkness, which he had found bestressing the sources of all sciences. He persuaded himself that he had there a great discovery in finding new and wonderful relations between the fables and myths of paganism as a shadow, and Roman-Catholic Christianity as the full truth; between the myriads of mysteries in all sciences, and the Roman-Catholic doctrine as a key to all. At the beginning and end of his science he posted a Roman Catholic dogma as a watchman; by it he measured all the manifold inventions of our age, boldly pretending that everything true in them came from and pointed to a "Catholic" truth; and then he called upon the youths of his Church to rewrite the history of the historical moment, also the political champion of the Roman Catholic interests, principally through the "Historische-politische Blätter" of Munich, a periodical edited, although not under his name, yet under his guidance and controlling superintendence. In one thing, however, Goerres was greatly disappointed. He found many readers, hearers, and admirers, but only a very few disciples. They could not master the sense of their teacher’s words; a bad omen, indeed, for his anticipated domination over the literature of the world. The first volume of his collected works (Geheimnisse der Wissenschaft, heraus, von Marie Goerres) appeared at Ratibon in 1854. See Meth. Quart. Rev. Jan. 1855, p. 146; Sepp, Joseph von Goerres, eine Skizze, etc. (Ratibon, 1848); Haneberg, Zur Erinnerung an J. J. Goerres (Munich, 1849); Heinrich, J. L. v., ein Lebensbild (Frankfort, 1867); Hist. Polit. Biblioth. (1956), ii. 149; Gieseler, Gesch. der Polit. Literatur Deutschlands (Leips, 1854); Hoefer, Nouve. Biog. Générale, xx, 957; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 224 sq.

Goertner, John Peter, a minister of the Lutheran Church, was born April 26, 1797, at Canajoharie, N. Y. He was graduated at Union College in 1822, the Reformers of that time being his chief study. For a time he prosecuted his studies at Hartwick Seminary under the direction of professor Hagelius, and then received private instruction from
Dr. Christian Schaeffer, of New York City, whom he aided in his pastoral work. He was licensed to preach by the New York Ministerium in 1824, and, after performing extensive missionary labor among the destitute Lutherans in the northern and western counties of the state and in Canada, he accepted a call to Johnstown, N.Y. He was loved and venerated not only by his flock, but by all who were the results of his earnest labors, and the salutary influence he exercised. His career was a brief one. He died when only thirty-two years of age from pulmonary disease. The impress of his life and efforts in the sanctified, refined, and loving spirit will descend to children and children's children. He left a valuable MS. Journal of six Months' Residence at Rome, and Visit to interesting Cities in Europe. (M. L. S.)

Goeschel (or Göschel), Karl Friedr., a German writer on philosophy, was born in 1784 at Langenzaalza. After studying law at Leipzig he became judge in Langenzaalza, and in 1816 published a history of that town. In 1844 he received an appointment in the ministry of justice as "Geheimer Oberregierungsrat," from 1845 to 1848 he was president of the consistory of Magdeburg. In 1848 he withdrew from the public service and lived in retirement at Naumburg, where he died, Sept. 22, 1892. He at first favored (Apologists über Nichstieren und absolut. Wissen, 1829) to show the agreement of the Hegelian philosophy with Christianity, also to refute Strauss from this standpoint (Beiträge zur specul. Philosophie, 1838); but gradually he joined the more liberal and the party of the Confessional Lutherans. He conducted the judicial proceedings against Williche, Uhlich, and the Friends of Light (q. v.), and in 1848 had to leave Magdeburg in consequence of the excitement of the people against him. He had previously tendered his resignation because the government had allowed the Protestant population of Magdeburg the use of one of the Protestant churches of the city. Goeschel wrote several works on Dante which are highly valued. — Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, xix, 567.

Goettingen (or Göttingen), a town of Prussia, with 12,974 inhabitants (1864). It is the seat of a celebrated German university (Georgia Augusta), which was founded in 1533 by king George II of England, and opened in 1737, and which numbered, in 1869, 106 teachers and 805 students. The library of the university contains over 800,000 volumes and 5000 MSS. Among the best known philosophers and theologians of the university belong Gieseler (q. v.), Luke (q. v.), and Ewald. See Liiter, Versuch einer akadem. Gelehrtenzusammenh. der Universität Göttingen (2 vols. Goett. 1755-88; continued by Sanfall, Hamb. 1820; and by Osterley, Goett. 1880). (A. J. S.)

Goethe (or Götzte), Georg Heinrich, a German writer, was born at Leipsig, Aug. 11, 1667. In 1687 he passed M.A. at the University of Leipzig, and in 1690 became Protestant pastor of Bury, in the duchy of Magdeburg. In 1702 he became superintendent of the churches of Lubeck, in which office he continued until his death, March 28, 1729 (according to others, April 29, 1729). He left over one hundred and fifty works, mostly on literary or historical questions. The most important are, De Virginis pacluhibus veterum christianorum (Lpz. 1687, 4to); —De Archichiconia veteris Ecclesiae (Leipsig, 1687, 4to); —De dubia Atheniari Scripta (Lpz. 1687, 4to); —De Sacrae Scripturae D. Bernardi (Drezd. 1673, 4to); in which he attempted to prove that St. Bernard preached the same doctrines as Luther.—Parallellellus Juda proctorii et Romanae Ecclesiae (Lubeck, 1706, 4to); —Elogia Germanorum quorumdam Theologorum (Lub. 1709, 4to), this work contains eighty-four biographical sketches.—Hofer, Neues, 62 sq.

Goethe (or Götzte), Johann Melchior, a German divine, was born in Halberstadt, Oct. 16, 1717, and studied at Jena and Halle. He was for nine years (1741-50) assistant preacher at Aschersleben, was then called to Magdeburg, and finally became pastor of St. Catharine, at Hamburg, in 1755. He was an orthodox Lutheran, and attacks especially the semi-infidel writings of such men as Lessing, Goethe, Semler, etc. He died May 19, 1786, leaving behind him more than sixty works, the chief among which are: Thesaurus doctrinarum et principia eticorum (2d edit. 1770), against the latent neologism of Schlosser and Alberti; —Exercitatio historico-theologica de patrum principium Ecclesie fructorum successu in propagando gen- tim componentium quadam amissae doctrina christiana (Halle, 1738, 4to); —Gedanken u. d. Betrachtung von der Bestimmung der Menschen (Halle, 1748, 8vo); —Ver- tiefung des richtigen Begriffs d. d. Aufsetzung der Todten, gegen Basidae (Hamburg, 1764, 4to, etc.). His autobiography was published in 1786 (3 vols.). See F. L. Hoffmann, Hamb. Stichr. iv; Serenium, 1855, No. 21 a, 22; Thies, Gelehr. Hamb. Deutsch. Biblioth. exuvi, xvii, 615-629; Lessing, Mendeisohn, Riebeck and Goetz (Offenburg, 1767, 8vo); Werksuche Nachr. d. d. Leben d. M. Götzte (Hamb. 1768, 8vo). —Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, 256; Hofer, Neues. Bij. Gén. xxi, 64 sq.

Goffine, Leonord, a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Bremen in 1648, and in 1674 entered the Convent of the Premonstratensians in the abbey of Steinfelde, loured many years as a priest at Oberstein and Coerfeld in Westphalia, and died August 11, 1719. He is the author of a devotional work (Christkathol. Unternehmungen und Erfahrungen) which has passed through a very large number of editions and is still in common use. There are new revised editions of the work by Steck (Tubingen, 9th ed. 1869), and by Diez (2 vols. Wurzburg, 1864). (A. J. S.)

Gog (Heb. id. 219; Sept. and N. T. Toph, but Tophy in 1 Chron. v. 4; Vulg. Gog), the name of two men, but whether they have any connection is doubtful. It also occurs in the Samaritan and Sept. for Agag, in Numb. xxiv. 7, apparently for the sake of euphony, tradition (Mishna, Shabb. 118) making the Messianic time to be distinguished by an antecedent struggle with Gog, as the Apocalypse does the millennium. See also Hanor-Dog.

As to the signification of Gog, it appears to mean mountain, i.e. Caucasus (Persic khor, Oesotick choy, i.e. mountain; and even the classical name 'Caucasus' originated in Kock-Kof), since Caucasus was the chief seat of the Scythian people. The hardening of the last sound in (khor) (gog) from (khor) seen in (la) seems to have taken place early, and when the name had already become that of a people, the other names, Magog, Agag (Samaritan Agag, gentile Aggah, Phoenic. Agag) also arose. Another explanation from the Phelvi koka, "moon" (see Gracchart of the Daries, p. 64), because they prayed to the moon, is improbable. A Chaldean etymology is also possible. From the reduplicated form Mh33 (from the root Mhi, whence נב, a roof), in the sense of "to be high or overtopping," איה might signify a mountain or summit (compare Arabic juyu, breast of a ship, i.e. something heightened). Figuratively, this stem would mean gigantic, great of stature, powerful, warlike (cognate withי -ש of Isa. xviii. 2, 3); comp. Sanskrit kai, to be, mighty (in the Vedas, Persic war), king, modern Persian kov, warlike or valorant; in which sense the Amalekite in Num. xiv. 20 is called the Gog, and the Heb. name Gog, and the Phen. Agag in the story of Ogyges, may be taken. In Gen. xiv. 1 Symmachus has taken מגא, Gog, i.e. heathen for גוג, Gog, and therefore translates it by "Seythians." —Fürst, Heb. Lex., n. v.

3. Son of Shemshak, and father of Shime, and one of the descendants (apparently great-great-grandson) of Reuben (1 Chron. v. 4). I.C. post 856. Most copies of the Sept., however, read, very different names here.
2. In Ezekiel Gog is (1.) the name of a mixed race dwelling in the extreme north, comprehended by the Greeks under the name of the Scythians; whence transferred (2.) to the centre and representative of their race, i.e. their king (chap. xxxviii. 89). Gog comes forth from the distant north (xxxviii. 15; xxxix. 2), the home of the Austria, of the Roman empire, and of the Tartar (ap kir also of Siras), with his army of cavalry (xxxviii. 15), marching against the people of Israel, where he is miraculously encountered (xxxviii. 17-23) and annihilated (xxxix. 1-8). In the later tradition which sprang from Ezekiel's description, Gog along with Magog represents the invasion of the north, the Scythians, Caucasians, etc. (3.) Gog is the name of the country of the people Gog, i.e. of the Scythians; but this only in the somewhat modified language of the Apocalyptic seer (Rev. xx. 8, 14, together with May a',) as it has become a geographical name in Arabia; and this corresponds with the assertions of other Oriental authors, in whose traditions this people occupy an important place, as the name of a country (see D'I Herbelot, Bibl. Or. p. 528).

Interpreters have given very different explanations of the name Magog and Gog, and the differences are generally understood as being symbolic expressions for the heathen nations of Asia, or more particularly for the Scythians, a vague knowledge of whom seems to have reached the Jews in Palestine about that period. Thus Josephus (Ant. i. 6, 3) has dropped the Hebrew word Magog, and replaced it by Xezdias and Magog does Jer: ome, while Suidas renders it by Paphos—a difference that matters but little in the main question, since E'ro:math in the ancient authors, is but a collective name for the northern but partially-known tribes (Cellarius, Notit. ii. 758 sqq.; and, indeed, as such a collective name, Magog seems to indicate in the Hebrew the tribes about the Caucasian mountains (comp. Jerome on Ezek. ibid.). Bothart (Phal. iii. 13) supports the opinion of Josephus, though by very precarious etymologies. According to Reinegeg (Descrip. of the Caucas, ii. 70), some of the Caucasian peoples call their mountains by Gog, and the highest northern points Magog. The Albanians are of opinion that the descendants of Gog and Magog inhabit the northern parts of Asia, beyond the Tatars and Sclavonians, and they put Pajaz and Magaj always in conjunction, thereby indicating the extreme points of north and north-east of Asia (Bayer, in Comment. Acad. Petrop. i). Nor are there wanting interpreters who understand by the Gog of Revelations the anti-Christ, and by the Gog of Ezekiel the Goths, who invaded the Roman empire in the 5th century of the Christian era. (See Dandorfer, Gog et Magog, Lam. 1863, Zc schen, in Zeit. f. Thal. 1862, p. 111.) In the Apocalypse these names appear to symbolize some future barbarian or infidel enemy that is to arise against Christianity (Stuart's Comment. ad loc.). See Magog.

Gogerly, Daniel John, a Wesleyan Methodist missionary and scholar, was born in London in August, 1792, and at fourteen united with the Wesleyan Methodist Society. He showed signs of remarkable talent, and at an early age became a local preacher. In 1818 he was sent to Ceylon to take charge of the Wesleyan mission at Colombo. In 1822 he entered the regular missionary service, and was one of the first missionaries to preach extempore in Cingalese. He devoted himself earnestly to the study of the languages of the country, especially the Pali, which is, to the Buddhist, what Sanscrit is to the Brahmin. He was the first European who could translate a Pali scripture, and had entered the study of this dialect. In 1834 he was stationed at Madura, where he had special opportunities to study Pali under learned native priests. He arranged about 15,000 words for a dictionary, and succeeded in having copied the whole of all the sacred books, with their glosses. This copy is now in the possession of the Wesleyan mission. In 1838 Mr. Gogerly became chairman of the mission, and afterwards general superintendent. The government appointed him one of the Central School Commission of Ceylon. In 1822 he became one of the translators for the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the Cingalese version is largely due to his labors. Every word of all the editions of the Bible published by that society has been read by his eye as editor and corrector. Among his most important literary labors were contributions to the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, and to other periodicals, in illustration of the Pali literature of Buddhism. He was vice-president of the Ceylon branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. At an early age he entered the Pali literature, and at a late age, having been ordained a Buddhist, he published Christiani Pragmata: the Evidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion: in Cingalese (Colombo, Wesleyan Mission Press, 1862). A native gentleman offered fifty dollars for a Buddhist exposition of this work, but it never has appeared. Mr. Gogerly died September 6, 1862. Born in England and France, he was recognised as the master of Pali literature. His writings on the subject are to be collected, it is said, and published in Paris.—London Quarterly Review, April, 1863, art. v.

Goguet, Antoine-Ven, a French jurist, was born April 18, 1716, and became counselor to the parliament of Paris. He applied himself closely to literature, and especially to historical studies. His name is chiefly preserved by his great work Origine des Lois, des Arts, et des Sciences, chez les Anciens Peuples (3 vols. 4to, Paris, 1758, in which he was assisted and introduced to the public by Pufteur). It shows the history of civilization among the Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Phoenicians, and the early Greeks, in vol. i.; and in vol. ii., the period from the death of Jacob to the establishment of monarchy among the Hebrews, with the usages, laws, and customs of the Lydians and Phrygians, with the states of Greece and the people of Crete. The third volume carries the subject down to the time of Cyrus, and upon the same plan as the other two. Goguet adds also dissertations on ancient coins; on the astronomical periods of the Chaldseans; on the antiquities of the Babylonians, Egyptians, and Chinese; on Sanchoniste; and on the authenticity and antiquity of the book of Job. Goguet died in 1758. His work has passed through several editions in France, of which the last is that of Paris, 1869, 3 vols. 8vo. There is an English translation, Origins of Laws, etc. (3 vols. 8vo, 1775, 18 vols. 8vo).—Beth Copeland, io; Hoeber, Nouv. Buvr. Général., xxii., 75.

Golm is thought to be the proper name of a people in northern Palestine ("Golm, Goyim, Josh. xii. 23; Sept. Tani, Vulg. gentes, A. V. 'nations'), whose king lived at Gilgal (q. v.). A similar designation is employed also in Gen. xiv, 1 respecting Tidal (q. v.), 'king of nations' (Sept. Tali, Vulg. gentes). It is, however, the universal term for Gentiles (q. v.).

Goring, Jonathan, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born at Reading, Vt., March 7, 1786, and graduated at Brown University in 1809. He was licensed to preach while a member of college, and pursued the study of theology under the direction of Dr. Messer, then president of the college. Dr. Messer's orthodoxy was not above suspicion, and Mr. Goring left the uninteresting views of that college for a time, but afterwards and finally became solidly grounded in 'the doctrines of the Reformation.' He was ordained in 1811, and settled at Cavendish, Vt. At this time, out of forty-five Baptist ministers in that state, he was the only one who had been educated at college, and had an extensive influence. He was called in 1815 to Worcester, Mass. Here his labors were the means of building up a large and efficient church. He took an active interest in public education, and aided in founding the Newton Theological Institution. A journey, in 1815, in which he was then "the West," awakened his interest in home missionary enterprises. The American Baptist Home
GOLAN (Heb. Golon), a place accorded to Gesen. but circle accorded to Furst; Sept. Gōlon; once Galon, גולון, "keri" at Jos. xxi, 27, Sept. Golen, a city of Bashan (Deut. iv. 24) allotted out of the half tribe of Manasseh east to the Gerazonite Levites (Jos. xxii, 27; 1 Chron. vi, 71), and one of the three cities of refuge east of Bashan (xx, 6). We find no further notice of it in Scripture; Josephus (Ant. xvi. 308, Jerome) and Josephus (Ant. xviii. 1) says it was still an important place in their time (Onomast. s. v. Γολον, Gaulon; Reland, Palest. p. 810), its very site is now unknown. The word is recognised in the present Judah, mentioned by Burch- harn (Syr. Jud. 296) as given to the district lying east of the lake of Tiberias, and composed of the ancient Gaulonitis, with part of Bashan and Argob (see also Robinson's Researches, iii. 308, 312; Appendix, p. 149, 162). It is indeed clear that the Gaulonitis of the later Jewish history must have included part of the modern Bashan, if Gaulonitis was the province, seeing that Gaulon was certainly in Bashan. The city itself may have been situated on tell el-Feras, which, although destitute of ruins, is the most prominent part of the Jabel Heilich that principally constitutes the modern district. Some have supposed that the village of Nqura, on the eastern border of Judah, round which are extensive ruins (see Porter, Handb. for Syr. and Palent)), is identical with the ancient Golon; but for this there is not a shadow of evidence; and Nawa, besides, is much too far to the eastward.

Some difficulty has been suggested as arising from the fact that the Judas whom Josephus (Ant. xvi. 308, 1) calls a Gaulonites is called by Luke (Acts v, 87) a Galilean. This is the more remarkable, as Josephus elsewhere (War, ii, 20, 4) carefully distinguishes Galilean and Gaulonitis. Yet he himself elsewhere calls this the name of the Judas whom Josephus (Ant. xviii. 1, 3; xx, 5; xx, 2, 17. 2; War, ii, 9, 1). It is, from this, probable that Judas had a double cognomen, perhaps because he had been born in Gaulonitis, but had been brought up or dwelt in Galilee; as Appollonius, although an Egyptian, yet was, from his place of residence, called Rhodes (see Kuy- nius in Jud., ii, 185, 27). See Jud., ii, 183.

The city of Golon is several times referred to by Josephus (Γαλονια, War, i, 4, 4, and 8); he, however, more frequently speaks of the province which took its name from it, Gaulonitis (Γαλονιατης). When the kingdom of Israel was overthrown by the Assyrians, and the dominion of the Jews in Bashan ceased, it appears that the aboriginal tribes, before kept in subjection, but now annihilated, rose again to some power, and rent the country into provinces. Two of these provinces at least were of ancient origin [see TRACHONIS AND ERAN]. and had been distinct principalities previous to the time when the Roman emperors united them under one sceptre. Before the Babylonish captivity Bashan appears in Jewish history as one kingdom; but subsequent to that period it is spoken of as divided into four provinces—Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Trachonitis, and Batanes (Jos. antiqu., iii. 5, 3, and 7, 4; i, 6, 4; xvi, 9, 1; War, i, 20, 4; iii. 8, 1; iv. 1, 1). It seems that when the city of Golon rose to power it became the head of a large province, the extent of which is pretty accurately given by Josephus, especially when his statements are compared with the beautiful description of Bashan, east of the confine of Galilee and north of Gadara (Gadara, Josephus, War, iii, 8, 1). Galama, an important town on the eastern bank of the Sea of Galilee, now called El-Hum, and the province attached to it, were included in Gaulonitis (War, iv, 1, 1). But the boundary of the provinces of Gadara and Galama must evidently have been the river Hioromax, which may therefore be regarded as the south border of Gaulonitis. The Jordan, from the south to the Sea of Galilee, is the boundary (Josephus, War, iii, 8, 5). It is important to observe that the boundaries of the modern province of Jerash (the Arabic form of the Hebrew גַּלְוָת, from which is derived the Greek Γαλα- νονίστη) correspond so far with those of Gaulonitis; we may therefore safely assume that their northern and eastern boundaries are identical. The western boundary is bounded on the north by Jodur (the ancient Iturae), and on the west by the Hauran [q. v.]. The principal cities of Gaulonitis were Golon, Hippotes, Galama, Ju- lias or Bethsaida (Mark viii, 22), Seleucia, and Sogane (Josephus, War, iii, 8, 1, and 5; iv, 1, 1).

The greater part of Gaulonitis was a flat and fertile table-land, well watered, and clothed with luxuriant grass. It is probably to this region the name Miskhor (מישكور) is given in 1 Kings xx, 23, 25—"the plain" in which the Syrians were overthrown by the Israelites, near Aphek, which perhaps stood upon the site of the modern Fik (Stanley, App. § 6; Porter, Handb. for Syr. and Pal. p. 495). The western border of Gaulonitis, along the sea of Galilee, is steep, rugged, and bare. It is upwards of 2000 feet in height, and when seen from the city of Tiberias resembles a mountain range, though in reality it is only the supporting wall of the plateau. It was this remarkable feature which led the ancient geographers to suppose that the mountain range of Gilead was joined to Lebanon (Reland, p. 342). Further north, along the bank of the Upper Jordan, the plateau breaks down in a series of terraces, which, though somewhat rocky, are covered with rich soil, and clothed in spring with the most luxuriant herbage, spangled with multitudes of bright and beautiful flowers. A range of low, round-topped, picturesque hills extends southward for nearly twenty miles from the base of Hermon along the western edge of the plateau. These are in places covered with noble forests of prickly oak and terebinth. Gaulonitis was once densely populated, but it is now almost completely deserted. Among the towns and villages which it once contained are still left the names of 127 places, all of which, with the exception of about eleven, are now uninhabited. Only a few patches of its soil are cultivated, and even the best of its pastures are but the tender grass of early spring. The flocks of the Turkmans and the Fudhili Arabs—the only tribes that remain permanently in this region—are not able to consume it; and the 'Anazeh, those "children of the East" who spread over the land like locusts, and whose camels are without number" (Judg. vii, 23), only arrive about the beginning of May. At that season the whole country is covered with them—their black tents pitched in circles near the fountains, their cattle thickly dotting the vast plain, and their fierce caravans roaming far and wide, "their hands against every man, and every man's hand against them."

For fuller accounts of the scenery, antiquities, and history of Gaulonitis, see Porter's Handbook for Syria and Pal. p. 295, 424, 461, 531; Five Years in Damascus, ii, 250; Journal of Soc. Lat. vi, 293; Burchard's Tan. iii, 397; Reland, Land in Asia, iii. 277; Wilkins, and Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 12 sq.; Schwarz, Palest. p. 220. See Bashan.

Gold (Gr. χρυσόν, χρύσον, the last being prob. a diminutive of the former and more general term, and therefore expressing gold in a small piece or quantity, especially as wrought, e.g. a golden ornament, 1 Pet. iii. 3; Rev. xvi. 11; xviii. 13; xx, 10; xx, 6; xx, 83; 1 Pet. i, 18; but also used of the metal generally, Heb. ix, 4; 1 Pet. i, 7; Rev. iii. 18; xxii.
GOLD

18, 21), the most valuable of metals, from its color, lustre, weight, ductility, and other useful properties (Pliny, *H. N.* xxxii, 10). As it is only procured in small quantities, its value is less liable to change than that of other metals, and this, with its other qualities, has in all ages rendered it peculiarly available for coin. There are six Hebrew words used to denote it, and four of them occur in Job xxviii, 15, 16, 17. These are:

1. בֶּן = sobah, the common name, connected with בֶּן = teashah (to be yellow), as Germ. *geld*, from *gold*, yellow. Various epithets are applied to it, as *fine* (2 Chron. iii, 5), *refined* (1 Chron. xxviii, 18), *pure* (Exod. xx. 3). Some of these, *beaten gold* (בָּשָׁל =) is probably melted gold; *Sept. λευκίας*; used of Solomon’s shields (1 Kings x, 16). In Job xxviii, 22 it is rendered in the A.V. “fair weather;” *Sept. מָשָׁלְת יָרָשָׁא (comp. Zech. iv, 12). The corresponding Chald. word is בִּנְנ = dehab (Dan. ii, 92; iii, 1, 5, 7).

2. נָשָׁפֶה (Job xxviii, 15), elsewhere as an epithet, נֶשָׁפֶה (Job xxviii, 15, 16) which is rendered, as also in Rev. xiv, 13, as a noun, *gold*.

The countries mentioned as producing gold are Arabia, Sheba, and Ophir (1 Kings iv, 28, 31; Job xxviii, 16; in Job xxviii, 24 the word *Ophir* is used for gold). Gold is not found in Arabia now (Nebihr’s *Travels*, p. 141), but it is used to be (Artemidor, ap. Strabo, xvi, 3, 18, where he speaks of an Arabian river *ψεύρος*; in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xii, 56), that it was found there native (*ψεύρος*) in good-sized nuggets (*βαλάφες*). Some suppose that Ophir was an Arabian port to which gold was brought (compare 2 Chron. ii, 7; ix, 10). Other gold-bearing countries were Uzaph (Jer. x, 9; Dan. x, 5), Parvaim (1 Chron. iii, 6), and (at least partially) Havilah (Gen. ii, 11). No traveller in Palestine makes any mention of gold except Dr. Edward D. Clarke. At the lake of Tiberias, he observes, “Native gold was found here formerly. We noticed an appearance of this kind, but, with the superficial nature, neglected not to give it more attention to it, notwithstanding the hints given by more than one writer upon the subject.” However, for every practical purpose, it may be said that Palestine has no gold. It is always spoken of by the Jewish writers as a foreign product. As gold was very common in Egypt, it is, in Egypt, at a very early date, much of that in the hands of the early Hebrews was probably obtained thence (Exod. xii, 28; xxxii, 2, 4; xxxviii, 24).

Metallurgical processes are mentioned in Ps. lxi, 10; Prov. xvii, 23; xxxvii, 21; and in Isa. lv, 6, the trade of goldsmiths (compare Judg. xvii, 4, 6). See Goldsmiths.

Gold, in the Scriptures, is the symbol of great value, duration, incorruptibility, and strength (Isa. xiii, 12; Lam. iv, 2; 2 Tim. ii, 20; Prov. xviii, 11; Job xxxvi, 19). In Dan. ii, 38, the Babylonian empire is a “head of gold,” so called on account of its great riches; and Babylon was called by Isaiah, as in our version, “the golden city” (xiv, 4), but more properly “the exactness of gold.” In Ecclus. xii, 6, some explain the expression “or the golden bowl be broken” of the human head or skull, which resembles a bowl in form. In Rev. iv, 4, “the elders,” and ix, 7, “the seven golden lampstands.” “The gold is not that thou mayest be rich”), though others interpret it of being rich in good works before God. In 1 Cor. iii, 12, it seems to denote sincere believers, built into the merely as a very precious article of commerce, and was weighed like other articles” (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 115; comp. 1 Chron. xxii, 25).

Gold was extremely abundant in ancient times (2 Chron. xxii, 14; Nah. ii, 9; Dan. iii, 1); but this did not depreciate its value, which was still the standard of values consumed by the wealthy in furniture, etc. (1 Kings vii, 22; x, passim; Cant. iii, 9, 10; Esth. 1, 6; Jer. x, 9; comp. Homer, *Od. xix*, 56; *Herod. ii*, 82). Probably, too, the art of gilding was known extensively, being applied even to the battlements of a city (Herod. i, 16) and other authorities quoted by Layard, ii, 264). Many tons of gold were spent in the building of the Temple alone, though the expression περίκας αστήν (2 Chron. i, 15) may be considered as hyperbolic. It is, however, confirmed by the history of the other Asiatic nations, and more especially of the Persians, that the period referred to really existed in gold, which was imported in vast masses from Africa and the Indies (Heeren, *Ideen*, i, 1, 37 sq.). The queen of Sheba brought with her (from Arabia Felix), among other presents, 120 talents of gold (2 Chron. ix, 22).

The gold of countries mentioned as producing gold are Arabia, Sheba, and Ophir (1 Kings iv, 28; x, 1; Job xxviii, 16; in Job xxviii, 24 the word *Ophir* is used for gold). Gold is not found in Arabia now (Nebihr’s *Travels*, p. 141), but it was used to be (Artemidor, ap. Strabo, xvi, 3, 18, where he speaks of an Arabian river *ψεύρος*; in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xii, 56), that it was found there native (*ψεύρος*) in good-sized nuggets (*βαλάφες*). Some suppose that Ophir was an Arabian port to which gold was brought (compare 2 Chron. ii, 7; ix, 10). Other gold-bearing countries were Uzaph (Jer. x, 9; Dan. x, 5), Parvaim (1 Chron. iii, 6), and (at least partially) Havilah (Gen. ii, 11). No traveller in Palestine makes any mention of gold except Dr. Edward D. Clarke. At the lake of Tiberias, he observes, “Native gold was found here formerly. We noticed an appearance of this kind, but, with the superficial nature, neglected not to give it more attention to it, notwithstanding the hints given by more than one writer upon the subject.” However, for every practical purpose, it may be said that Palestine has no gold. It is always spoken of by the Jewish writers as a foreign product. As gold was very common in Egypt, it is, in Egypt, at a very early date, much of that in the hands of the early Hebrews was probably obtained thence (Exod. xii, 28; xxxii, 2; 4; xxxviii, 24).

Metallurgical processes are mentioned in Ps. lxvi, 10; Prov. xvii, 3; xxxvii, 21; and in Isa. lv, 6, the trade of goldsmiths (compare Judg. xvii, 4, 6). See Goldsmiths.

Gold, in the Scriptures, is the symbol of great value, duration, incorruptibility, and strength (Isa. xiii, 12; Lam. iv, 2; 2 Tim. ii, 20; Prov. xviii, 11; Job xxxvi, 19). In Dan. ii, 38, the Babylonian empire is a “head of gold,” so called on account of its great riches; and Babylon was called by Isaiah, as in our version, “the golden city” (xiv, 4), but more properly “the exactness of gold.” In Ecclus. xii, 6, some explain the expression “or the golden bowl be broken” of the human head or skull, which resembles a bowl in form. In Rev. iv, 4, “the elders,” and ix, 7, “the seven golden lampstands.” “The gold is not that thou mayest be rich”), though others interpret it of being rich in good works before God. In 1 Cor. iii, 12, it seems to denote sincere believers, built into the
GOLDEN CAFE

GOLDEN CAFE (ןוֹנָה תַּבְשֵׁל, ה' גֶל מַבְשֵׁל), a store.

Image, Exod. xxxiii, 4, 8; Deut. ix, 16; Neh. ix, 19, lit. a 'gold store'; (v. which was not a mere wooden idol plated with gold); an idolatrous representation of a young buck, which the Israelites formed at Mount Sinai (Exod. xxxiii, 8 sq.); compare Pas. csi, 19: Acts vii, 29 sq., idolized by Jehovah (Hengstenberg, *Pemmat. i, 169*), and eventually, in the time of Jeroboam I of the kingdom of Israel, erected into a national object of worship (1 Kings xii, 28 sq.); 2 Kings x, 29; comp. xvii, 16; Hos. viii, 5 sq.; x, 6; Tobit I, 5) at Bethel and Dan (q. v.). See IMAGE. The symbol was undoubtedly borrowed from Egypt (s. p. 69). See Philo, ii, 169; Hengstenberg, *Pemmat. i, 156 sq.,* where living bucklots, *Apis (q. v.)*, as a living symbol of sins (Plutarch, *Isid. 33*) in Hierapolis (Herod. iii, 29; Dio. Sid. i, 21; Strabo, xvii, 805), and *Mnevis (q. v.)* as a representation of the sun-god [see EGYPT] at Heliopolis (Diod. i, 21; Strabo, xvii, 805), were objects of worship (see Jablonsky, *Pmyn. Egy. i, 122 sq.; 256 sq.; Creuzer, *Symbo. i, 480 sq.*). One of these two, possibly *Apis (Lactant. Inst. iv, 10; Jerome, in Hos. iv, 15; comp. Spencer, *Leg. Rom. Jud. Heb. b, i, i, i, 52 sq.; Slink, *Isis, Orig. i, 6 sq.*; Hermes, *Oedipus Argiv. i, 2 sq.); Ktesib. *Symbo. i, 480 sq.); more probably *Mnevis (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg. 26* ser. ii, 97), was the model of the golden calf which the Israelites in the desert, and perhaps Jeroboam afterwards, set up. On the contrary, Philo (Opp. i, 571), with whom Millar (Dissert. Sacr. p. 309 sq.) agrees, asserts that the Israel- itish calf was an imitation of the Egyptian Typhon, but this view was dictated rather by theological prejudices than historical considerations. Nevertheless, the bovine symbol is found in the ornamentation of the Temple (Ezek. i, 10; 1 Kings vii, 29), and is one of the main features in the similitude (Movers, *Phoen. p. 373 sq.*). See CHERUBIN.

How Moses was able to consume the golden calf with fire (יִנְסֹף), and reduce it to powder (יִפְרֵז, pulverize), as stated in Exod. xxxii, 20, is difficult to say, for although gold readily becomes weak and to some extent flammable under the action of fire, yet it is by no means sure that such a degree of heat is reducible to dust, and be susceptible of dissolution in drink. Most interpreters, e.g. Rosenmüller (Schol. ad loc.), think of some chemical process (which Moses may have learned in Egypt, see Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyp. abrigd.* ii, 186 sq.); by which gold may have been calcined, and so have been triturated with metallic salt. Others (e.g. Ludwig, *De modo quo comminutus est a Moses vitulus aureus, Aldtouf, 1746*) believe that Moses beat the fire-checked gold into leaves, and then ground these into fine particles in a mill, or filed the melted gold into dust (-sectora aurea; comp. Josephus, *Ant. xiii, 7, 3; 9*; see Bochart, *Isra. totius, 968*). The difficulty lies in the double procedure, and in the expression "burned with fire" (יִנְסֹף), which does not seem applicable to a chemical, but rather to a mechanical process.

See CAFE, GOLDEN.

GOLDEN CITY (ןוֹנָה תַּבְשֵׁל, madbokah; Sept. *iwvovonorich, Vulg. tributum,* a term applied as an epithet of Babylon (Isa. xiv, 4), and occurring nowhere else. Some derive it from the Aramaic עבודה, gold, as a verb-form (in the Hip. part. fem.)-gold-making, i.e. exacting gold of a not inapt emblem of the imperial mart (parallel hemistic *בּוֹם תַּבְשֵׁל, *grodning); or else - a heart of brass or golden of gold (pro prepos. of place). So Genenius prefers with hesitation (Theo. Heb. p. 322 b), after Kimchi, Aban-Ezra, etc. Others (so Furst, *Hbr. Lex. s. v.*), following the Targums, Sept., Aquila, Syriac, and Arabic of Sadas, prefer to read הַעֹלֶה, in the sense of oppression, from הָעֹלֶה, to score (compare Isa. iii, 5, where הָעֹלֶה occurs in parallelism with הָעֹלֶה), See BABYLON.

GOLDEN LEGEND (Lat. *Aurea Legenda,* a collection of the most charming and significant accounts of saints, long very popular, in almost all the European languages. It was compiled by a Dominican, James de Voragine, also written Vrangin and Vargine, about A.D. 1290. It has 377 sections, each giving an account of a particular saint or festival. It is of no historical value.

GOLDEN NUMBER, the number in the ecclesiastical calendar by which the age of the moon, and consequently the time of Easter, is determined. Easter-day being the first Sunday after the full moon, which happens upon or next after the 21st of March, to determine the time of Easter, it is only necessary to find out the precise time of the above full moon. As at the end of the year, or even at the beginning of the new year, the changes on the same days of the solar year and of the month on which they happened nineteen years before, it follows that by the use of a cycle consisting of nineteen numbers, the various changes of the moon for every year may be found out without the use of astronomical tables. The numbers of this cycle, from their great usefulness, were usually written in the calendar in letters of gold: hence the name, golden number.

Another account of the origin of the name is that the metonic cycle of nineteen years [see CASSOPOIOUS] was originally engraved in letters of gold on a marble column. The rule for finding the golden number for any particular year is: Add 1 to the number of years, and divide by 19; the quotient gives the number of cycles, and the remainder gives the golden number for that year; and if there be no remainder, then it is the golden number, and that year is the last of the cycle.

GOLDEN ROSE, a rose set in precious stones, consecrated by the pope, and sent to crowned heads and others whom the pope delights to honor. This rose was first sent in 1868 by Urban V to Joan, queen of Sicily. The end of nineteen years consecrates one every year on the 4th Sunday in Lent. The golden rose was sent to the queen of Spain just before her downfall in 1868.

GOLDEN WEDGE (ץֵן, kethem), Isa. xiii, 12; a poetical term, fine gold, as elsewhere rendered. See GOLD.

GOLDMITH (ץֵנְיָה, torepheh), Neh. iii, 8; Isa. xi, 19; xii, 7; xlv, 6; a founder or finer, as elsewhere rendered. See GOLD. See Mal. iii, 3). See GOLD. In Neh. iii, 31, the word so rendered (ץֵנְיָה) is rather a proper name, ZORPHI (q. v.). The use of gold for jewelry and various articles of luxury dates from the most remote ages. Pharaoh having arrayed Joseph 'in vestures of fine linen, put a gold chain about his neck;' and the jewels of silver and gold borrowed from the Egyptians by the Israelites at the time of their leaving Egypt (out of which the golden calf was afterwards made), suffice to prove the great quantity of precious metals wrought at that time into female ornaments. It is not from the Scriptures alone that the skill of the Egyptian goldsmiths may be inferred; the sculptures of Theses and Beni-Hassan afford their additional testimony, and the numerous gold and silver vases, inlaid work, and jewelry, represented in common use, show the great advancement they had made in this branch of art. At Beni-Hassan, the process of washing the ore, smelting or fusing the metal with the help of the blow-pipe, and fashioning it for ornamental purposes, weighing it, and taking an account of the quantity so made up, and other operations which the goldsmith, as such, might be supposed to undertake, were intended, to give a general indication of the goldsmith's trade, without attempting to
describe the means employed" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptian*, abridgment, ii, 188 sq.). See Metallurgy.

Ancient Egyptian Goldsmiths.

1, 2, and 3, are wringing out the water from the gold in a bag, d, d; a, c, frames supporting the bag while draining; f, c, are articles of jewelry on a frame, e; b, a box containing implements, i, and perhaps a crucible, k. The hieroglyphics consisting of the bush in which the metal was washed, the cloth through which it was strained, and the dripping of the water, united read "goldsmith" or "worker in gold."}
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GOLIATH

German traveller who visited Jerusalem in 1788. He was followed by Dr. Clarke (Travels), Schollar (Reise, and De Golgatha Sivm), Robinson, Tobler (Golgatha), and others. The identity of Golgotha has been maintained by Von Raumer (Palestina), Kraft (die Topographie Jerusalems), Tischendorf (Reise, ii, 17 sq.), Schulz (Jerusalem, ii, 96 sq.), and especially Williams in his Holy City. The tradition that fixes the site of Golgotha upon that of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre is not older than the 4th century, being first mentioned by Eusebius, and attributed to Quentius. The lunula discovered on the work of the fabri cross by the empress Helena. Yet, in the absence of any other tradition respecting a site which could not well have been forgotten, and in the difficulty of finding any other position answering to the requirements of the case, we may well coincide in the belief that it represents the true Pilate and the judgment hall stood at the north-west angle of the Haram area, where the house of the pasha still stands. There Jesus was condemned, scourged, and mocked. Thence the soldiers "led him out" (Mark xvi, 20) to crucify him. They met a man called Simon "coming out of the country," and offered him to bear the cross which they brought him unto Golgotha, and there they crucified him. The passers by reviled him. His mother and some others stood by the cross (John xix, 25). "All his acquaintance stood afar off beholding these things" (Luke xxiii, 49). The sensation of these evangelists shows that it lay just outside the walls of the city, opposite the tower of Antonia, and therefore probably at the north-west. See JERUSALEM. The traditional Golgotha is now a little chapel in the side of the Church of the Sepulchre, gorgeously decorated with marble, and gold, and silver. The monks profess to show the hole in which the cross was planted, and a rent in the rock made by the earthquake! (Porter, Handbook for Syr. and Pal., p. 166; Williams, Holy City, ii, 226 sq.) See Pleading, Ueb. Golgatha u. Christi Grab (Hal. 1768); Schollar, De Golgatha et J. C. seculur siti (Born, 1827); Schulze, De vera causa nominandi Golgathae (Nurnb. 1732); Themis, Golgatha et sanctum sepulchrum (in Ilgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol., 1842, iv, 8-84); Zorin, De Christi extra portam suppliance (in his Opusc. ii, 193-7); Finlay, Site of the Holy Sepulchre (London, 1846); Ben-Hur and Joseph, ii, Jerusalem u. das Heilige Grab, wider Robinson und neuer Zionspilger (Land, 1862); Tobler, Golgatha, seiner Kirchen u. Kriiter (Berl. 1850). See CALVARY.

Gol'fath (Heb. Golpeth, מְגַלְפָּת; Sept. Πολύφατος; Josephus Πολυφαντος), a famous giant of Gath, who "morning and evening for forty days" defied the armies of Israel; but was eventually slain by David, in the remarkable encounter, with a sling (1 Sam. xvii). B.C. 1063. Although repeatedly called a Philistine, he was possibly descended from the old Rehaim, of whom a scattered remnant took refuge with the Philistines after their dispersion by the Ammonites (Deut. ii, 20, 21; 2 Sam. xx, 22). Some trace of this condition may be preserved in his name. The tablet it is inscribed with the sign, an exite, as thought by Genesius (Theod. 989, p. 286). Simonis, however, derives it from an Arabic word meaning stout (Onom. s. v.); while Frütsch merely indicates it as of Philitian etymology (Heb. Lex. s. v.). Hitzig (Gr. u. Myth. der Philist. p. 76) regards it as merely =Γολιάας, i. e. strong. His height was "six cubits and a span," which, taking the cubit at 21 inches, would make him 10 feet high. But the Sept. (at 1 Sam. xvii, 4) and Josephus (Ant. 6, vi, 9, 1) read "four cubits and a span." This will make him about the same size as the royal champion slain by Antimenes, brother of Alcues (ἀλκούην ἀνδραῖον ποιήσας, ἀπὸ Σαμαρία, xiii, p. 617, with Muller's emendation). Even on this computation Golias would be, as Josephus calls him, ἀνίποις μαγευτιστος—a truly enormous man. (See Wichmannshausen, De armaturae Gor. Visb. 1711.) After the victory David cut off Goliath's head (1 Sam. xvii, 51; compare Herod. iv, 6; Xen. Anab. ii, 4, 17; Strabo, xvi, 15, 5). Josephus mentions a similar custom among the Arabs, Besch. p. 304), which he brought (ver. 54) to Jerusalem (probably after his accession to the throne, Ewald, Gesch. iii, 94), while he hung the armor in his tent. See FIGT. His sword was afterwards received by David, "of a great emergency from the hands of Ahimelech at Nob, where it had been preserved as a religious trophy (1 Sam. xxii, 9). See GIANT.

The scene of this famous combat (see Trendleburg, De pugna Dom. cum Golatha, Gaden. 1792) was the Valley of the Terebinth, between Shochoh and Azekah, proud on the western passes of Benjamin, although a confused modern tradition has given the name of Ain-Jahlad (spring of Goliath) to the spring of Harod, or "crumbling" (Stanley, Palest., p. 342; see Judg. vii, 1). See ELAH, VALLEY OF. This modern name, however, may rather be (= the spring of Gilead) a reminiscence of Gideon's exploit (Judg. vii, 8). See GILEAD. The circumstances of the combat (q. v.) are in all respects Homeric, free from any of the nuerile legends which Oriental imagination subsequently introduced into it; as, for instance, that the stones used by David called out to him from the brook, "By our means ye shall ask the plant." (etc. (Herod. i, 63). See Judg. vi, 15. Oriental. i, 8, p. 111 sq.) The fancies of the Rabbes are yet more extraordinary. By the Mohammedans Saul and Goliat are called Talut and Kalkut (Jalut in Koran, i, 151 sq.), perhaps for the sake of the homoeoteleuton, of which they are so fond (Hoskett, Hist. Orient. i, 8, p. 28). Abu'l-feidas mentions a Cannaite king of the name Jalut (Hist. Antiquit. p. 176); and, according to Ahmed al-Fassi, Gialout was a dynastic name of the old giant-chiefs of the Phalistanes (d'Herbelot, Bibl. Or. s. v. Gialout). In the title of the psalm added to the psalter in the Sept. we find the name γολοθανάς; and although the allusions are vague, it is thought by some that this psalm may have been written after the victory. This psalm is given at length under David, p. 687 (see Hilscher, Ps. centra. quaequaeque, prim absat, sec. vitam Golothi, Hauthen, 1746). It is believed that we find no more than allusions to this combat in Hebrew poetry; but it is the opinion of some that the song now attributed to Nathan (1 Sam. ii, 1-10) was originally written really in commemoration of David's triumph on this occasion (Theobald, Die Bücher Sam. p. 8; comp. Bethold, Einl. iii, 915; Ewald, Ps. Bücher des A. B. i, 111). See PSALMS.

In 2 Sam. xxi, 19, we find that another Goliat of Gath, of whom it is also said that "the staff of his
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spear was like a weaver's beam," was slain by Elhan-
nan, also a Bethlehemite. St. Jerome (Quius curtis, p. 12) cre-
ates the unlikely conjecture that Elhanan was
another name of David. The A.V. here interpolates the
words "the brother of," from 1 Chron. xx, 5, where this
is called "Lahmi." See Stiebritz, Die Da-
ridische Erlegung des Goliat's (Halle, 1743). See Elhan-
nan.

GOLIUS, Jacobus, was born at the Hague in 1596.
After finishing his studies at the University of Ley-
den, he was called to give instruction in the Greek
language at Rochelle. In 1624 he became professor of
the Arabic language, and in 1629 also of mathematics
at the University of Leyden. He died Sept. 28, 1667.
He brought out a defense of the literal translation of
the Old Testament in modern Greek. He also had the Confession of Faith of
the Reformed Church of Holland, the Heidelberg
Catechism, and the Liturgy translated into modern
Arabic by an Armenian for circulation in the Levant.
His principal work is his Lexicon Arab.-Latinum cum
ind. Lat. It was first published in London, and sub-
sequently at Leyden, 1603, in fol. See Glasius, Geod-
erler Nederland, i, 534; Bayle, Dict. hist. et crit. (J. P. W.)

GOLIUS, Petrus, brother of J. Golius, was brought
up by his maternal uncle, Jan Hemelsaer, canon at
Antwerp, in the Roman Catholic Church, in which he
remained all his life. He shared his brother's fond-
ness for Oriental studies. After spending several years
in Palestine, he was appointed professor of Oriental
languages at Rome. He translated Thomas à Kem-
pis's work, De Initiatione Christi, into Arabic, and lab-
ered on an edition of the Bible in the same language.
At the age of seventy-four he went to convert the
heathen on the coasts of Malabar. He died at Surat.
See Glasius, Geogelder Nederland, i, 586; Bayle, art.
Hemelsaer. (J. P. W.)

GOMAR, Francis, an eminent Calvinistic divine
and polemic, was born Jan. 30, 1563, at Bruges, and
educated at Strassburg under John Sturmius, and at
Neustadt, where the professors of Heidelberg found a
refuge when Louis, the elector palatine, had banished
them. In 1582 he came to England, and attended at
Oxford the divinity lectures of Dr. John Rainolds, and
at Cambridge those of Dr. William Whittaker, and at
this latter university he was admitted to the degree of
B.D. in 1584. The elector Louis dying in 1585, his
son Casimir, his brother, restored the professors of
Heidelberg, to which place Gomar returned from Cam-
bridge, and spent two years there. In 1587 he be-
came pastor of the Flemish church at Frankfort, and ex-
cercised that office until his death (1654). In 1648, in the
office of President of the Synod of Dort, he was
appointed professor of divinity at Leyden. Here he re-
mained teaching quietly until 1693, when he became
the zealous opponent of his new colleague
Arminius. Arminius, as is well known, opposed, and
Gomar defended, the peculiarities of Calvin, and in
this controversy Gomar was most violent, fervent,
ulcent, and intolerant spirit, and endeavored by various
publications to excite the indignation of the States of
Holland against his rival. The combatants disputed
before the States in 1608. See ARMINIUS. On one of
these occasions Barnevedt, in a short address to
them, declared that he thanked God that the controv-
sions did not affect the fundamental articles of the Christian
religion; Gomar replies that he "would not appear
before the throne of God with Arminius' errors." On
the death of Arminius, Gomar, 1609, retired to Middle-
sex, and in 1612 founded the theological college of
the Saurnur to be professor of divinity, and four years after he exchanged this office for the professorship of divinity
and Hebrew at Groningen. He attended the Syn-
od of Dort in 1618, where he took an active part in
the condemnation of the Arminians. See Dort.
He visited France in 1633 to revise the translation of
the Old Testament, and died at Groningen Jan. 16, 1641.

His works were published at Amsterdam in 1645 (fol.);
also in 1654, his omnia theologica (Amsterdam, fol.);
See Bayle; Hook, Eccles. Biog. v, 532; Moshein, Ch.
Générale, xxi, 146; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 231.

Gomè. See GOMER.

Go'mer (Heb.  [h], coming, or perhaps, seat, t.
e. passion; Sept.  [h] and [h] or [h]), the name of a man and of a race descended from him, also of a
woman.

1. The eldest son of Japheth (B.C. post 2041), son of Noah, and father of Ashkenaz, Riphat, and Togarma-

m (Gen. x, 2), whose descendants seem to have
formed a branch of the Hittites in the western
part of Europe (Gen. x, 8; compare 1 Chron. i, 6). In
the Scriptures, however, the people named Gomer (men-
tioned along with Togarmah in the armies of Magog,
Ezek. xxxviii, 6) imply rather an obscure and but vaguely-known nation of the barbarous north (Rosen-
müller, Alerter. i, 2, 255).

The name occurs in Assyrian and Persian texts.
renders Gen. x, 8 by [h] , Africans; [h], Turke.
Bochart (Phyleg, iii, 81) identifies the name, on
etymological grounds, with [h] (from , to
come, and [h] or [h], of the name, [h], to go, to roam). [h] being,
according to ancient testimony, a [h] (from [h],
where its origin, a branch of the Togarmian (Josephus,
Ant. i, 6, 1; Jerome, Quast. in Gen. x, 3), and
therefore cannot be regarded as the stem whence the Tog-
armians themselves sprang. The same objection ap-
plies to the suggestion that Gomer is the German race
(Talm. and Aram. 10 a); for this comes under a branch of Gomer. Wahl (Avise, i, 274) compare
Gimir, the ancient name for Cappadocia, and Kiallach
(Cym. in Gen.) seeks to identify it with the Chami-
uri, a nation in Bactria, noticed by Ptolemy (vi, 11, § 6).
Most of the interpreters take Gomer to be the ancestor
of the Celts, and more especially of the Cimmerian,
Kyrmur (Herodotus, i, 6, 15, 103), who were already
known in the time of Homer (Odys., xi, 14). To judge
from the ancient historians (Herodotus, Strabo, Plu-
terch, etc.), they had in early times settled to the north
of the Black Sea, and gave their name to the wealth
of the region (from the Abris, Tâyru, by transposition from the Heb.), the ancient Cimmerian (Herodotus, v, 48, 10); and in the modern name Cimmes. They forsook this
shores under the pressure of the Scythian tribes, and
during the early part of the 7th century B.C. they
poured over the western part of Asia Minor, commit-
ing immense devastation, and delaying for more
than half a century the power of the Lydian kings.
They were finally expelled by Alyattes, with the exception of
a few who settled at Sinope and Antandrus. It
was about the same period that Ezechiel noticed them
as acting in conjunction with Armenia (Togarmah)
and Magog (Scythia). The connection between Go-
mer and Armenia is supported by the tradition, pre-
served by Moses of Chorene (i, 11), that Gimir was
the ancestor of the Haichian kings of the latter
country. After the expulsion of the Cimmerians from
Asia Minor their name disappears in its original form;
but their real descendants, as the name and the people are to be recognised in the Cim-
бри of the north of Europe, described by the classical
writers sometimes as a German, sometimes as a Celtic
race. The preponderance of authority is in favor of
the latter (Sallust, Jug. 114; Florus, iii, 3; Appian,
De Ab. H. 1, 1, 3; Bel. Civil. 1, 39; of the 1st Diodorus, xiv,
114, 11; Plutarch, Cam. 15; Mor. 25, 27; Dion. Cass.
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The probability is that the Cimbrri were Celtic, and of the same tribe as the Cymry of Britain (Prichard, Eastern Origin of the Celic Nations, by Latham, p. 142; Latham, Germanics of Tuscus, Epilegmon, p. cix sq.). By the ancients the Cimmerii and the Cimbrri were held to be the same people (as they are still held by the Poles) as the city Paeon, which is fixed down the Roman empire in the north and west of Europe, particularly in the Cimbric Chersonese (Denmark), on the coast between the Elbe and Rhine, and in Belgium, whence they had crossed to Britain, and continued at one period all the way from the British isles, but were ultimately driven back to the western and northern districts, which their descendants still occupy in two great divisions, the Gael in Ireland and Scotland, the Cymry in Wales. The latter name preserves a greater similarity to the original Gomer than either of the Sodoms for being the same. The link to connect "Cymry" with "Cimbrri" is furnished by the forms Cambria and Cumberland. The whole Celtic race may therefore be regarded as descended from Gomer, and thus the opinion of Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 1), that the Galatians were sprung from the Cimmerians, is confirmed by the Ephod (Fulchius, Superint., p. 83 sq.). From the place Gomer occupies in the roll of nations in Genesis, it may be presumed that the people descended from him was one of the oldest, and this would fall in with the habit and character of the Cimmerian, as he appears in Homer. It is plain also from Ezek. xxxviii, 6 that the race of Gomer was regarded by the Hebrews as living to the far north of Palestine, and this accords exactly with the site assigned to the Cimmerii by Herodotus, who places them on the Caucasus, and represents them as skirtings the Euxine and coming down on Asia Minor by way of Colchis, and across the river Halys. If the Cimmerii and the Cimbrri are identified, and the latter be regarded as a Celtic-speaking people, the statement of Jerome that the Galatia spoke a language not greatly differing from that of the Treveri (Proleg. lib. i, ed. Ep. ad Gaiyan) may hang an important bearing on the subject of the migrations of the original Gomerian stock. See Ethnology.

2. The name of the daughter of Diblaim, a harlot who became the wife of concubine (according to some, in vision only of the prophet Hosea (Hos. i, 8). B.C. cir. 725.

Gomorrha (Heb. Amor'kh, ג'ומורה, prob. subnati- sion; Sept. δῦνα κρηθών, N. T. "Gomorrah"), one of the five cities near near to the Dead Sea (Gen. xix, 10, 13, 11) apparently overwhelmed by the destruction which caused the dead Sea (Gen. xix, 24, 28). B.C. 2064. See Sodom. Its king, Birsha, was one of those that joined battle with the forces of Cher-dorlaomer, and in the rout Lot's family became involved until rescued by Abraham (Gen. xiv, 2, 8-11). B.C. cir. 2080. The allusions in Scripture to the "cities of the plain" appear to indicate that they stood close together (Gen. xiii, 10; xiv, 8-11), and that they lay near the southern extremity of the present lake, for they are said to have gone to the mountain near Hebron, "loving toward Sodom and Gomorrha, and all the plain" (Gen. xix, 20), and this he could not have done had they been situated further north. The battle between the eastern kings and the people of the plain took place "in the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea" (Gen. xix, 3). The phrase, however, is not quite decisive as to the precise position; for, as Reland observes (Polemt, p. 254), it is not stated that the five cities stood in the vale of Siddim, although this perhaps may be inferred, and seems to be implied in the name of Gomorrha. This city appears to have been next in importance to Sodom, as it is always mentioned second, and often these two of the four cities alone are named, as types of impiety and wickedness (Gen. xviii, 20; Rom. ix, 29). That what atrocious cruelty was then gathered from Gen. xii, 4-6. Their miserable fate is held up as a warning to the children of Israel (Deut. xxviii, 23): as a precedent for the destruction of Babylon (Isa. xiii, 19, and Jer. i, 40), of Edom (Jer. xlix, 16), of Moab (Zeph. ii, 9), and even of Israel (Jer. vii, 22; xxii, 14). Jerusalem herself is there unequivocally called Sodom, and her people Gomorrha, for their enormities; just in the same way that the corruptions of the Church of Rome have caused her to be called Babylon. On the other hand, according to the N. T., there is a sin which exceeds in the Sodom for being the same. The link to connect "Cymry" with "Cimbrri" is furnished by the forms Cambria and Cumberland. The whole Celtic race may therefore be regarded as descended from Gomer, and thus the opinion of Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 1), that the Galatians were sprung from the Cimmerians, is confirmed by the Ephod (Fulchius, Superint., p. 83 sq.). From the place Gomer occupies in the roll of nations in Genesis, it may be presumed that the people descended from him was one of the oldest, and this would fall in with the habit and character of the Cimmerian, as he appears in Homer. It is plain also from Ezek. xxxviii, 6 that the race of Gomer was regarded by the Hebrews as living to the far north of Palestine, and this accords exactly with the site assigned to the Cimmerii by Herodotus, who places them on the Caucasus, and represents them as skirtings the Euxine and coming down on Asia Minor by way of Colchis, and across the river Halys. If the Cimmerii and the Cimbrri are identified, and the latter be regarded as a Celtic-speaking people, the statement of Jerome that the Galatia spoke a language not greatly differing from that of the Treveri (Proleg. lib. i, ed. Ep. ad Gaiyan) may hang an important bearing on the subject of the migrations of the original Gomerian stock. See Ethnology.

2. The name of the daughter of Diblaim, a harlot who became the wife of concubine (according to some, in vision only of the prophet Hosea (Hos. i, 8). B.C. cir. 725.

Gomorrha (Heb. Amor'kh, ג'ומורה, prob. subnati- sion; Sept. δῦνα κρηθών, N. T. "Gomorrah"), one of the five cities near near to the Dead Sea (Gen. xix, 10, 13), apparently overwhelmed by the destruction which caused the dead Sea (Gen. xix, 24, 28). B.C. 2064. See Sodom. Its king, Birsha, was one of those that joined battle with the forces of Cher-dorlaomer, and in the rout Lot's family became involved until rescued by Abraham (Gen. xiv, 2, 8-11). B.C. cir. 2080. The allusions in Scripture to the "cities of the plain" appear to indicate that they stood close together (Gen. xiii, 10; xiv, 8-11), and that they lay near the southern extremity of the present lake, for they are said to have gone to the mountain near Hebron, "loving toward Sodom and Gomorrha, and all the plain" (Gen. xix, 20), and this he could not have done had they been situated further north. The battle between the eastern kings and the people of the plain took place "in the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea" (Gen. xix, 3). The phrase, however, is not quite decisive as to the precise position; for, as Reland observes (Polemt, p. 254), it is not stated that the five cities stood in the vale of Siddim, although this perhaps may be inferred, and seems to be implied in the name of Gomorrha. This city appears to have been next in importance to Sodom, as it is always mentioned second, and often these two of the four cities alone are named, as types of impiety and wickedness (Gen. xviii, 20; Rom. ix, 29). That what atrocious cruelty was then gathered from Gen. xii, 4-6. Their miserable fate is held up as a warning to the children of Israel (Deut. xxviii, 23): as a precedent for the destruction of Babylon (Isa. xiii, 19, and Jer. i, 40), of Edom (Jer. xlix, 16), of Moab (Zeph. ii, 9), and even of Israel (Jer. vii, 22; xxii, 14). Jerusalem herself is there unequivocally called Sodom, and her people Gomorrha, for their enormities; just in the same way that the corruptions of the Church of Rome have caused her to be called Babylon. On the other hand, according to the N. T., there is a sin which exceeds in
far from the shore (see Maundrell, Early Travellers, p. 454).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. M. de Sauley is confident he has discovered the remains of Gomorrah in certain ruins which he reports in a valley by the name of Gummar, on the N. W. shore of the Dead Sea. Just north of this place, but Van de Velde makes light of this account (Narratio, ii, 115 sq.), which, indeed, lacks confirmation, especially as it is generally believed that the sites of these cities are all buried under the southern shallows of the lake. See Dead Sea.

Gomo’s brick, the manner in which the name GOMORRAH is written in the A. V. of the apocryphal books and the N. T., following the Greek form of the word Γομορρα (2 Esd. ii, 8; Matt. x. 15; Mark vii, 11; Rom. i. 29; Jude 7; 2 Pet. ii, 6).

Gondulf, or Gundulf, a Norman priest, was born in the neighborhood of Rouen in 1026. After entering the Church, he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in company with the archdeacon William, afterwards archbishop of Rouen. On his return, being in danger of shipwreck, he vowed to become a monk, and in 1059 he entered the convent of Bec, where he became intimate with Anselm. Lanfranc, prior of Bec, being in 1063 appointed abbot of Bec, chose Gondulf for his coadjutor, and still retained him when called in 1070 to the archbishopric of Canterbury. Through his influence Gondulf was created archbishop of Rochester March 19, 1077, and restored that see to its former importance. After the death of Lanfranc he administered the diocese for about 30 years. His name is found in the charters of that period, with which he was very much occupied. According to Gonus, it was only in the year after it was promulgated by Salomon that it was adopted by the Greek Church, and in 1098 by Vasquez. While admitting that the doctrine was held by the majority of the Greeks, he points out the archbishop of Seville, Apollo Custos, and Andrea Le Blanc (Candide Philoeteus), who had opposed it in their writings. Yet Gondulf did not consider it obligatory for all the members of his order to adopt his views: he permitted each one to follow his opinions and his interests. The work he wrote against it was not a very popular work, but it remained twenty-five years in MS. before being printed, and afterwards appears to have found but few partisans among the Jews. Father Oliva, director of the Index, greatly opposed the book, notwithstanding the approbation given to it by pope Innocent IX. The first edition bore the title Fundamentum Thelogiae moralis, ut est tractatus theologico de recto uso opinioi probabilitum (Dillingen, 1699; Naples, Rome, Lyons, Antwerp, 1694, 4to). The text of the latter editions has been altered in several passages, and the earlier ones have been destroyed. Gonus also wrote De Infalibilibus Romanis Pontificis in definitione, and De mortuorum controversia extra concilium generale (Rome, 1689, 4to; printed by order of Innocent IX, and suppressed by Alexander VIII).—Manuscript of conversionem Mechriomorum Dillingen (Dillingen, 1688, 4to);—Veritas Religionis catholicae demonstrata (Lille, 1626, 12mo). See Dupin, Bibli. des Autres ecclés. du 17e siècle (pt. iv); Jour. des Savants (1695, 1698); Richard et Giraud, Bibl. sacrée; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxii, 252.

Good (Lat. bonum) is variously defined by moralists, according to the nature of their ethical theories. The Stoic would define it to be that which is according to nature; the Epicurean, that which is most agreeable or diminishes pain; the Idealist, that which accords with the fitness of things; the Christian theologian, that which accords with the revealed will of God. So the philosophical schools give various and even contradictory definitions of the highest good (summum bonum). Thus Aristippus placed it in pleasure; Epicurus, in pleasure in repose; Zeno, in tranquility of mind; Kant, in well being conditioned on morality; the Materialists, in self-love.

Schleiermacher states his views of the subject as follows: In ethics there are three fundamental concepts—duty, good, and moral action; virtue is the moral power of the agent; the highest good is the objective aim of both. In the systems of Kant and Fichte, ethics is the doc-
of duty, and its development becomes simply a treatment of individual virtues. In opposing this view, Schleiermacher maintains that a system of moral precepts, or formulæ of duty, even though it might embrace the whole life of man, could only be applied in isolated cases and single acts, leaving the moral life as a whole still without a system. It is only in the very limited sphere that a moral agent acts alone, and without reference to other agents; and his virtue has relation to a general state of things, to produce which other agents co-operate. Schleiermacher charges the existing ethical systems with making an unnatural schism between the moral (duty) and the human (freedom). From this principle the whole sphere of ethics may be mapped, placing universal nature on the one hand, and the organizing reason (the universal reason of humanity) on the other. In this theory Schleiermacher expressly recognizes the authority of Plato, who, in his Phædo, speaks of the highest form of freedom, in whom the idea of virtue was the highest, places the highest good in ευτυχία, individual happiness—not, however, in the Epicurean sense, but in the sense of ζωῆς τὴν ἐν ἰεραίᾳ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀπεργίας τελεία, the working out or realization of a perfect life through perfect virtue.

In the further development of the history of ethics, so far as relates to the definition of the "highest good," we must particularly notice the distinction (1) between the individual and the general, indicated in Plato and Aristotle, and carried to the greatest extent by Epicurus and the Stoics; (2) the resulting distinction between the objective and subjective, according to which the "highest good" is, on the one hand, a condition of man (e.g. Epicurean enjoyment, Stoical endurance); or, on the other hand, a product of human activity; the end of virtue is a moral pleasure of virtue or of activity, according to the former of which the "highest good" lies in enjoyment, while according to the latter it lies in moral activity.

In the language of Christian theology, "the highest good" is called the direction of God, which is the highest good in itself and in itself alone. If one of the ethical elements, the individual and the general, activity and happiness, theory and practice, means and end. The means of securing the "highest good" is to promote the advancement of that kingdom; the end, the "highest good" itself, is the coming of that kingdom, to the individual, in his personal salvation; to the universal race, in the realization of the promise "God shall be all in all!" See Schleiermacher, Ethische Abhandlungen, in his Phäl. Nachtr. ii, 12, 18; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s. v. Ethik, Tugend.

Good Friday, the sixth day of the week before Easter, called Good Friday in acknowledgment of the benefit derived from the death of Christ. Among the Saxons it was denominated Long Friday, perhaps in allusion to the length of the fast. (1) In the Christian Church the day of our Lord's crucifixion was religiously observed, not independently, but as a part of the sacred season of Easter, which was celebrated by Christians instead of the Jewish passover, in commemoration at once of the sacrifice and death and resurrection of Christ. A bishop was accustomed to designate Good Friday and Easter-day, which had reference, in name at least, to the passover: πάσχα σαρκάων, and πάσχα οὐσιαστικόν, passover of the crucifixion, and passover of the resurrection. The day was observed as a strict fast. The usual acclamations and blessings were omitted, and nothing but the most plaintive strains of music, such as the Κηρίς δίκληνα, etc., were allowed to be sung. No bell was rung. None bowed the knee in prayer, because thus the Jews reviled Christ. The kiss of charity was omitted, for Judas betrayed his Master with a kiss. The Lord's supper was celebrated; but the element was not consecrated on this day, but on the day before. Communion-tables and reading-desks were stripped of ornaments; and the gospel of St. John was read, because he was a faithful and true witness of our Lord's passion. In reference to the Jewish ritual, the day was sometimes called ἀπεξαρτήσεως, ἀπεξαρτήσεως, but the element was not consecrated on this day. (2) In the Roman Church the day is celebrated with great care. "The Church in her whole office expresses the deepest mourning and compunction. The altars are naked, except at the priest's communion, when the chalice is in the form of a golden plate, and the host is covered with a black veil till the prostration, after which it is left uncovered." Instead of the ordinary mass, the "Mass
of the Presanctified" is said, without the consecration of the Host. The sacrament, reserved the day before, is received in one kind only by the priest, who recites the Lord's prayer and a small part of the prayers of the mass.

No others receive the holy communion except priests, alcoholics, and the sick in mortal danger of death, to whom it is administered by way of viaticum."

(3.) Among the Protestant churches Good Friday is observed as a fast, and by special services and prayers by the Church of England, the Lutherans, German Reformed, and many Methodists. —Covin, Abridged Christianity, p. 516; Wheatly, Common Prayer, ch. v, § 15; Butler, Feasts and Fasts, tr. vi, ch. v.

Good Tidings. See GOSPEL.

Good Works. See WORKS.

Goodall, WILLIAM, a clergyman of the Church of England, rector of Allhallows the Great and Less, London, and later dean of Ripon, died in 1868. He was a prominent and prolific writer of the Low-Church school. Among the best known of his works are: The Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit (London, 1834); — The Early Services of the Church (1834); — The Directory of Faith and Practice (1849); — The Divorce Act and the Church Rates (1849); — The Divorce Rule of Faith and Practice (1842, 2 vols.; 2d ed. 1855, 3 vols.), directed against the views of Dr. Pusey concerning the value of tradition as a rule of faith; — Tract XC Historically refuted (1844); — The Effects of Baptism in the Church of England, as to the Tests of Baptism in the case of Infants (1849); — Vindication of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders in the Scotch and Foreign Non-episcopal Churches (3 pamphlets, 3d ed. 1852).

Goodall, WILLIAM, D.D., a Congregational minister and eminent missionary, was born at Templeton, Mass., Feb. 14, 1792. In early youth he manifested great energy of character. At fifteen he went sixty miles on foot, carrying his trunk, to Phillips Academy, in Andover; and there, and afterwards in Dartmouth College, he overcame all difficulties until he graduated in 1817. He spent three years in Andover Theological Seminary, and in 1820 was accepted as a missionary of the American Board. He travelled for some time as agent for raising funds for the society from New England as far as Alabama, and also visited the Cherokee and Choctaw missions east of the Mississippi. In Dec. 1822, he sailed for India. After preaching in India and studying other languages during nine years, he left India for Britain, where he arrived Nov. 16, 1829. "By the presence of the stations. Goodall and Bird, Beirut became a regular station of the Board. After some attention to the Arabic, Mr. Goodall went in, June, 1824, to Sidon, to study the Arameo-Turkish language with an Armenian ex-bishop, Yakob Aga, where he became acquainted with another Armenian bishop, Dionysius Carabot, who, a year and a half later, was received into the mission church at Beirut. Thus singularly did the Mission to Syria and the Holy Land, at the very outset, take hold of a people who were not thought of in its establishment, and of whom but a few years before had been found by it as pilgrims to the sacred places. In March, 1826, after the repulse of the Greeks in an attack on Beirut, Mr. Goodall's house was plundered and his life endangered by Arab soldiers. In May, 1828, when the government between Turkey and England, the missionaries were obliged to flee to Malta. There Mr. Goodall labored in connection with the press until the summer of 1831, when he repaired to Constantinople, and commenced the mission to Turkey, with special reference to the Armenians, in which he had joined a few months later by the Rev. H. G. O. Dwight. From that time on his work lay especially among the Armenians. Mr. Goodall's early experience and natural temperament combined, with divine grace, to fit him eminently to meet them with a cheerful

1. GODMAN of patience. With a true Christian heroism, in which his wife had an equal share, he encountered such incidents of life as being obliged, by confessions, visitations of pestilence, convulsions and war, the exactions of landlords, hierarchical persecutions, interference of government, etc., to pack up and move his residence 'some thirty times in twenty-nine years,' and battled with the opposition and obstacles that were ever before him as a missionary. Indomitable in his purpose to do good, affable and courteous in manner, of ready tact, and abounding in restless pious activity, he gained access wherever he chose to go, and exercised a magnetic attraction that never left him without subjects on whom to pour, in some form, the light of truth. He commanded the respect of foreign ambassadors and travellers, of dignitaries of the Oriental churches, bankers, and the highest in society, with whom, at different periods, he had no little intercourse, as well as the common people; and even enemies to his work were constrained to honor him. Few possess in so high degree as he did the admirable faculty of doing good without offence, and of recommending personal religion to the world." One of his most important labors was the translation of the Bible into Armeno-Turkish, commenced in 1848, and finished (the last revision) in 1863. In 1856 he returned to America, worn out with labor, and died in Philadelphia Feb. 18, 1867. "In the future history of the kingdom of Christ in the lands where the first word of the Gospel was planted in Eden, and the scenes of events most sacred to Christian hearts, the name of William Goodall will be precious to successive generations of sanctified souls, even to the end of the world." —Missionary Herald, May, 1867.

Good Tree is the rendering of "Yv yv, etk kada", tree of splendor, the fruit ("yb, "boughs") of which (Sept. eptik dvyv kovv dvoe, Vulg. fructus arboris pulchri, et fructibus pulchris, i.e. carry about in festive procession) on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles, in memory of the inhawing dwell in booths in the wilderness (Lev. xxii, 40). The tree generally concealed to be meant is the citron (Citrus, Hierobot, l. 202), the fruit of which Josiphus states that was in the hands of the Jews on the day of the festival of the Sukkot, when they pelted king Jehu with it (Am. xiii, 13, 5). See Citron. Others regard the olive as meant, this being the tree mentioned in the parallel account of Neh. viii, 15. It would seem, however, that no specific tree is intended, but any one that would add beauty to the occasion (Ursini Arboribus, Bibl. p. 577). See TREE.

Goodman of the House, oikodemos, Matt. xxv, 11; xxiv, 43; Mark xiv, 14; Luke xxi, 11, master of the house, as usually elsewhere rendered (Matt. x, 20; Luke xii, 39; xiv, 21; "householder," Matt. xxv, 27, 28; xx, 1; xxv, 33). In Prov. vii, 15, "goodman" is the rendering of ZWN, id, zven, i.e. husband.

Goodman, Christopher, an English divine, was born at Chester in 1520. He studied at Brasenose College, Oxford, and graduated in the university during the reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI. When queen Mary ascended the throne he withdrew to Frankfort and thence to Geneva, where, with Knox, he became pastor of the English church. After Mary's death he went to Scotland, and became rector of Greenock in 1564. About 1570 he went to England, and accompanied Sir Henry Sidney in his expedition against Ireland. He was afterwards rector of Chester, and died there in 1602. He wrote, How far superior Powers are to be obeyed of their Subjects (Geneva, 1668, 16mo), against queen Mary;—A Commemoration of the Peace of Westminister (1555), an Prayer to Knox's The First Discourse against the Monstrous Regiment of Women. See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses (vol. i); Scott, Lives of the Scotch Reformers.
Mr. Goodrich was elected professor of rhetoric and oratory in the Boston Latin School, in 1839, to accept the chair of pastoral theology in the theological seminary, a position which he occupied until his death—a period of twenty years. In 1820 he was elected president of Williams College, but declined to accept that honor. In 1856 he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from Brown University.

"In 1814 he prepared a Greek grammar, which passed through several editions. In 1827 he superintended the abridgment of Webster's Quarto American Dictionary. In 1829 he established the Quarterly Christian Spectator, which he edited for nearly ten years. In 1846 and 1847 he prepared revised editions of Webster's Dictionary, and in 1856, the university edition of the same work. In 1852 he published his admirable work on British Eloquence, which has been extensively circulated, both in England and America. Besides performing the literary labors involved in preparing and editing these various works, Prof. Goodrich was prominently connected with many of the most important benevolent societies of the country. At the time of his death he was laboriously engaged, as one of the 'Committees on Versions' of the American Bible Society, in preparing the new edition of the Christian Standard Testament. As an instructor, Prof. Goodrich was enthusiastic, uniring, and effective, always impressing himself upon his pupils, inspiring them to the highest effort. He guided them to imitate models of clear and eloquent thinking, and taught them to express their own thoughts in a similar style. As a manly style, a manly character, and a successful writer of the college, he was singularly active and energetic, never shrinking from any duty or responsibility, and always making the interests of the institution the object of his own personal care and anxious solicitude."


Goodrich, Ellinor, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Wethersfield, Conn., Oct. 26, 1784. He graduated at Yale College in 1762. He was now studying theology, but was called to be tutor at Yale College in 1765. In 1766 he was invited to the Congregational church in Durham, Conn. In 1766, to aid in the support of his growing family, he began to prepare students for college. His thorough scholarship made him a highly successful teacher, and during the next twenty years more than three hundred young men passed under his instructions. He was repeatedly sent by the General Assembly of Connecticut, as a delegate to the convention held by that association, and the synods of New York and Philadelphia, from 1767 to 1776. He received the degree of doctor of divinity from Princeton College. In 1776 he was elected to the corporation of Yale College, and, as a member of the Prudential Committee, his labors in behalf of the college for twenty years were among the most useful of his life. He died of apoplexy at Norfolk, Conn., Nov. 22, 1797. He published a number of occasional discourses.—Sprague, Annals, i, 506.

Goodrich, Thomas, an eminent English divine, was born at East Kirby, Lincolnshire, about 1480. He studied at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, graduated at Jesus College in 1506, and became professor of the university in 1515. In 1529 he gained great favor with Henry VIII by pronouncing himself against the validity of that prince's marriage with Catharine. He was successively appointed rector of St. Peter's, London, canon of St. Paul's, Westminster, and chaplain of the king. In 1584 he was elected bishop of Ely, and showed himself a zealous supporter of the Reformation. He took an active part in the organization of the English Church, was one of the theologians commissioned to examine the translation of the N. T., to compile the Common Prayer—look of 1548, and the Institution of Christian Man, called also the Bishop's
Book, with the collaboration of Cranmer, Stokesley, Gardiner, Sampson, Latimer, etc. Goodrich was a member of the privy council under Henry VIII and Edward VI, who also employed him several times as ambassador. In 1531 he was appointed lord chancellor of England. This office he lost when Queen Mary ascended the throne, but he retained his bishopric, and died May 10, 1564.—Hoefer, *Novum Biogr. Generale*, xxii, 261; *Hook, Eccles. Biog. v*, 388; Burnet, *Hist. of Engl. Reformation*, ii, 214, 291, 427.

Goodwin, John, an eminent Armenian divine, was born in 1503, and was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, where he became fellow in 1517. In 1523 he became vicar of St. Stephen's church, Cambridge, London, of which he was ejected in 1645 for refusing to administer baptism and the Lord's supper promiscuously. He was a man of great courage, eloquence, and energy; and, though an Independent in Church government, he was a zealous Armenian in doctrine. At the Restoration he was exempted from pardon; but no measures were taken against him, and he died in 1655. He wrote *The Divine Authority of the Scriptures asserted* (London, 1614, 4to); *Redemption redeemed, wherein the most glorious Work of the Redemption of the World by Jesus Christ is vindicated against the Fabric of Certain Times of Post-Reformation, fol. new ed. 1840, 8vo); *Exposition of Romans ix* (new ed. by T. Jackson, London, 1835, 8vo); *Imputatio Fidei, a Treatise of Justification* (London, 1645, 4to). This last treatise was published in an abridged form (12mo) by Mr. Wesley, who held Goodwin's views of grace in high esteem. A summary of Christian Theology selected from Goodwin was published by S. Dunn (London, 1836, 12mo); and Goodwin's *Life* has also been written by Rev. T. Jackson (London, 1839, 8vo). John Goodwin was in advance of his age, not only in his theology, but in the broad views of the nature of the Church and of toleration. His writings contributed greatly to the diffusion of sound doctrines on religious liberty. "Had Redemption Redeemed been his only publication, it should have been enough of itself to perpetuate his fame. Its great learning, clear reasoning, sound judgment, and admirable spirit, render it worthy of the study of all lovers of this glorious doctrine, and the name of its author one which all Armenians should delight to honor. A volume so ably written, and going to the bottom of the controversy, could not, in that solemn age, fail of creating a profound impression. The pulpit rang with voices of hallelujah. The people were fired with sermons, pamphlets, and books. Some were bitterly scourious. Dr. Hill, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, charged him with falsifying his quotations, and with the errors of Pelagius. Rusby wrote very much in the spirit of Edwards. Robert Baillie seems to have taken Pryne for his model. Barlow, afterwards bishop of Lincoln, alone among the crowd addressed him in a style of manliness and Christian candor, speaking of his learning and talents with compliment and respect. George Kendall filled two folios, and actually removed to London that he might watch Goodwin and the better oppose him and his doctrine. He says of himself that though he sometimes sneers, he never snarls or bites. He doubtless tells the truth about the sneering and the biting. Toplady thought the 'Redemption Redeemed was effectually answered' by Kendall. 'If it was,' says Sellon, 'I wish that it, as tough a morsel as it is.' Dr. John Owen, then vice-chancellor at Oxford, and overaweled with labors, deemed it necessary to employ eight hundred and fifty octavo pages in a reply to the seven chapters on the *Penitence of the Saints* ('D. A. Whedon, in *Mediol. Quart. Rev.* July, 1863, p. 371; *Med. Q. Rev.* Oct. 1869, art. 1).—Hoefer, *Eccles. Biog. v*, 389; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 704; *Neal, Hist. of the Puritans*.

Goodwin, Thomas, D.D., a nonconformist Calvinistic divine of the 17th century, was born at Rollesby, Norfolk, Oct. 5, 1600. He was educated at Christ Church College and Catharine Hall, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became fellow. In 1628 he became lecturer of Trinity Church, Cambridge, and four years afterwards was present by the king to the vicarage. In 1635, on account of the uniformity, he relinquished his preferences, and in 1634 quitted the university. During the subsequent persecution of the Puritans he fled to Holland, where he became minister of a congregation at Arnhem. At the beginning of the Long Parliament he returned to London, and from the Assembly of the Realm he never afterwards withdrew, though he had not always been a member. He died Feb. 28, 1679. A portion of his works were published in five vols. folio (London, 1681); and besides those to be found there he wrote *Certain select Causes resolved, peculiar to the Comfort of Believers in Temptation* (London, 1647, 4to). The following have been recently reprinted, viz. *Child of Light* (London, 1840, 12mo); *Ephebias and Revelations* (London, 1842, 8vo); *Christ the Mediator* (London, 1846, 4vo); *Glories of Christ* (1847, 8vo); *Government of the Church* (1848, 8vo); *The Epistle of Fitch* (1849, 8vo); *Works*, compiled by J. Babb (London, 1847–49, 4 vols. 8vo). A new and complete edition of Goodwin's works has just been completed in Nicholla's *Series of standard Dienes*, making 12 vols. 8vo (Edinb. 1851–66), containing (vol. ii) a *Memoir of Goodwin*, by Robert Halley, D.D., Jones, *Christian Burial* (London, 1606), p. 185; *Darling, Cyclcop. Bibliograph. i*, i, 1295; *Calamy, Nonconformists' Memorials*; *Neal, Hist. of the Puritans*.

Gopatara. See JOTAPATA.

Goopher (Hebr. *גֹּפֹר*; see *Genesis* i. q. גַּפֵּר, pitch; acc. to Furst, connected with גַּפֶּר, *branston*, i. e. resin; Sept. *ερνύον*, Vulg. *leucipu- tuus*), a kind of tree, the wood of which is mentioned only once in Scripture, as the material of which Noah was directed to build the ark (Gen. vii. 14): "Make thee an ark of gopher wood; rooms shalt thou make in the ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch" (probably bitumen). In endeavoring to ascertain the particular kind of wood which was mentioned in the above passage, some have supposed the name to mean, the country where the wood was supposed to have been procured, or the traditional interpretations. The Sept. renders it "squared timbers," and the Vulgate *planed wood* (apparently understanding נָּבַע). Some have adopted the opinion that a kind of pine-tree is intended; and others that several species may be included, as they all yield resin, tar, and pitch. The Persian translator has also adopted the pine; but Celsius objects that this was never common in Assyria and Babylonia. The Chaldee version and others give the ceder, because it was always plentiful in Asia, and was distinguished by the incorruptible nature of its wood. But ceder is a very general term, and correctly applied only to different kinds of juniper. These, though yielding excellent wood, remarkable for its fragrance, never grow to a large size in any warm country. Eu. tychius, patriarch of Alexandria, relates in his *Annals* (p. 94, as quoted by Celsius [*Hierobi. i*, 381], that the ark (q. v.) was "made of a wood called eban, which is the teak, and not likely to have been the wood employed. The Chaldee Samaritan translator, for goopher, gives, as a synonym, *siym*, of which Celsius says (*Hierobi. i*, 382), "Vocem obscuram, sive referas ad *Eban* elsewhere, Malhia adferri sensuit Calyman* [*Perip. Mar. Erythr. p. 162, et Ebeno similis peribent alii* (Salmasius, in *Ordia. p. 727)]." The *siym* is probably the *simeon*, mentioned by Forskal as import-
ed in his time into Arabia, and is a highly-valued, dark-colored wood, of which one kind is called blackwood (Dalbergia latifolia). This greatest number of writers have been of opinion that by the gopher wood we are to understand the cypress; and this opinion is supported by such authorities as Fuller (Sacred Missals, iv, 209), Bocart (Gesch.), and others, as well as by Celsius (Historicon, 1, 229). It has been supposed that gopher is the Greek καυχυσωρός, with a mere addition to the root. It is argued, further, that the wood of the cypress, being almost incorruptible, was likely to be preferred; that it was frequently employed in later ages in the construction of temples, ships, and even ships; and that it was very abundant in the countries where, according to those authors, the ark is supposed to have been built, that is, in Assyria, where other woods are scarce. See also

Gophna (Γόφνα in Josephus; Γοφνα in Ptolemy; see Reland, Ptolem. p. 461), a town of Palestine, which gave its name to one of the ten toarchies, Gophanitis (qv Γοφνητις τοπογραφία, Josephus, War, iii, 3, 5; "to- parchia Gophnatis," Pliny, v, 14). Josephus recounts it second in importance to Jerusalem, and usually joins it with Archebala. It was one of the four cities taken by Cassius (War, i, 11, 2) and reduced to slavery (Ant. xiv, 11, 2), restored to freedom by a decree of Marcus Antonius after the battle of Philippi (8, 12, 2 and 8). It was taken by Vespasian in his last campaign in Pal- estine (War, iv, 9, 9), and, as Titus marched on Jeru- salem by way of Caesarea and Samaria, he passed through their Gophna (8, 12, 5, 5). It was to be the place that the latter allowed certain important Jewish refugees to retire temporarily during the siege of Jerusalem (v1, 2, 3). Eusebius probably gives the true origin of the name (from μαθητής, μαθητής, a vine, from the vineyards in the vicinity), although he errs (or is, rather, himself uncertain) in identifying it with the Eshkol of the spies (Numana, p. 157, ed. Clericus); and he states that they built the city (qv Ποππος) fifteen miles from Jerusalem towards Neapolis, in near agreement with the Peutinger Table, which makes it sixteen miles. It was identified by Dr. Robinson with Jufna, a small Christian village, rather more than one hour north-west of Bel- tina (Bethel), with many ruins of the Middle Ages, and situated in a very fertile valley (Sb. Bras. iii, 7-2). It is probably the Ophini (q.v.) of Benjamin (Josb. xviii, 24).

Gophrith. See BRIMSTONE.

Gor. See WHEEL.

Gologistus (q.v.), the name of three Roman emperors. Marcus Antonius Gordionus I, descended from a noble family, but distinguished, for his literary education, twice consul, under Caracalla and Severus. By the latter he was appointed proconsul of the province of Africa, in which position he gained the affection of the people of the province to so high a degree, that on the installation of the emperor Maximinus, he was, at the age of 80 years, restored to his residence in company with Plut- eny, by his son, who assumed the name of Marcus Anto- nius Gordionus II. The Roman Senate recognised them; but after a reign of only a few weeks Goria- nius II fell in a battle at Carchage against Capellianus, the governor of Mauritania, and Gordionus I, on learning the news, killed himself. At the demand of the Roman people, a minor grandson of Gordionus I was placed as Caesar by the side of Publius Maximinus and Balbinus, who had been elected emperors against Max- iminus; and when all these three emperors were killed by their own soldiers, he was still in the same year (289) proclaimed as Augustus by the Praetorians. He carried on a successful war against the Persians, and had an excellent advisor in his father-in-law Misitheus. He reigned until 244, when Philippus the Arabian, who for some time had been his colleague, caused him to be assassinated. The Christian Church during the reign of Gordionus was undisturbed. (A.J.S.)

Gordon, George N., a Presbyterian minister and missionary, was born in Prince Edward Island in 1821. He studied at the Free-Church College, Halli- fax, N.S., and was sent by the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia to the New Hebrides, and settled at Enomanga, in 1857, with his wife, whom he married in England. On the 30th of May, 1861, he and his wife were killed by the natives. —Wilson, Presb. Hist. Al- manac, 1862, p. 330.

Gordon, James Huntley, an eminent Scotch Jesuit, was born in 1843. He was educated at Rome, and entered the order of the Jesuits Sept. 20, 1863. For nearly fifty years he taught Hebrew and theology at Rome, and was his master. He travelled also, as missionary, through England and Scotland, where his zeal for making converts to the Roman Catholic Church caused him to be twice put in prison. He died at Par- is, April 16, 1820. Gordon was a learned and skilful man, and very zealous for his order. He wrote Con- troversiarum christianae fidei Epitome, 3 parts (1, Limos, 1612; ii, Paris; iii, reprinted with the two others, Cologne, 1629, 8vo). See Aegambre, Bibliotheca Scriptorium Societatis Jesu; Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Géné- rale, xxii, 230.

Gordon, James Lesmore, a Scotch Jesuit, was born at Aberdeen in 1845. He became a member of the Society of Jesus, and taught in various places in Scotland, and in the colleges of his order, at Toulouse and Bordeaux. Later in life he was appointed confessor to Louis XIII. He died at Paris, Nov. 17, 1641. We have from him D. du- tribua de catholica veritate (Bord. 1623, 12mo); Biblia Sacra, cum commentariis ad eaum litterar et explicationes locorum omnis in sacra litteris obscuritatebant (Paris, 1632, fol.) —Theologia moralia unive- rsa, cos libris comprehensa (Paris, 1634, fol.). Du- pin highly commends his commentary.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 280.

Gordon, Robert, D.D., a Scotch divine, was born in Dumfries. His first settlement in the min-

Gorgias (γοργίας, a frequent name among the Oriental Greeks), one of the generals of Antiochus Epiphanes, was chosen by Lysias, the general and min- 

Gorgias, the governor of the forces of Judaea, defeated them with great loss (1 Macc. v, 56 sq.; Joseph. Ant. xii, 7, 6).

The account of Gorgias in 2 Macc. is very confused. In one passage he is described simply as "a captain, who in matters of war had great experience," and therefore sent with Nicander, the son of Patroclos, one of the generals of the son of Antiochus Theos. The governor of Coele-Syria and Phœnicæ (comp. 1 Macc. iii, 38; Jo-
seph. Ant. xii, 7, 8), to root out the whole nation of the Jews (2 Mac. viii, 9). In another passage he is rep-
resented as 'governor of the holds' (στρατηγὸς τῶν τοίχων [Alex. MS. τοίχων], 2 Mac. x, 14), and ap-
parently of the holds of the Idumæans (?) (Acrabat-
tene[?]) comp. 1 Mac. v, 8; Joseph. Ant. xii, 6, 1; see Mac. xiv, 4, ed. 92, 815. He appears the same
according to the present text, described as 'governor of Idumæa' (2 Mac. xii, 82).
Grotius (see Wernsdorff, Der fidel. Libr. Mac. § 78) suggests that the reading 'governor of Idumæa' is an
error for 'governor of Jamnia' (as at 1 Mac. v, 58). Josephus itself does not contradict this construction (ος τοις Ιδομενεων
ζητηματικῶς, Ant. xii, 8, 6). From the epithet applied to Gorgias, he seems to have been held in the highest
destestation by the Jews (A. V. "that cursed man," τὸν καταρατὸν, 2 Mac. xii, 85). The description
of his flight to Marissa and his defeat by Dothnas, son
of Judas' general, is given at some length, though in an
obscure and confused manner (2 Mac. xii, 84-88; comp. Joseph. Ant. xii, 8, 6).

Gorham Case, a case in law involving the doc-
trine of the Church of England as to baptismal regen-
cration. In August, 1849, the Rev. Richard (lord Cottenham) Bloom encouraged to present Mr. Gorham to the
vicarage of Bramford-Speke. The bishop, on being re-
quested to countersign his testimonials, stated on the paper his doubts as to Mr. Gorham's views, both of
discipline and doctrine. The lord chancellor, howev-
er, concluded that he was a person to whom the appro-
val of the archbishop's nominees was due. The
bishop then intimated his intention of examining
Mr. Gorham before he instituted him. The examination
took place, and continued for several days. The
result was, that the bishop of Exeter declined to insti-
tute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Bramford-Speke.
"This," he alleged, was a refusal of the see which, he laid stress on, was one of the causes of the
injuried and formularies of the Church declare them to be.
The case was brought before the Arches Court of
Canterbury, which decided (1849) that baptismal regenera-
tion is the doctrine of the Church of England, and that
Mr. Gorham maintained doctrine on the point oppo-
sed to those of the Church, and that consequently
the bishop had shown sufficient cause for his refusal to
institute, and that the appeal must be dismissed with
costs. From this decision Mr. Gorham appealed to
the judicial committee of privy council. The com-
mittee upheld the bishop's view, and therefore the
injuried and entangling, and that the answers were not
given plainly and directly. Their decision was in sub-
stance as follows, and it must be noted what points
they undertook to decide, and what not. The court
declared that it had no jurisdiction to settle matters of
faith, or to determine what ought, in any particular
matter, to be the doctrine of the Church of England, its
duty being only to consider what is by law established
as the basis on which the legal construction of her
articles and formularies. It appeared that very dif-
ficult questions had been discussed by ministers of the
Church, held by the promoters of the Reformation; that differ-
ences of opinion on various points left open were al-
tways thought consistent with subscription to the arti-
cles; and also, that opinions in no important particu-
lar to be distinguished from Mr. Gorham's had been
maintained by ministers on the point. The court also
ruled that the judgment of the Arches Court should
be reversed. Mr. Gorham was accordingly in-
stituted to Bramford-Speke. During the two years
that the suit was pending, the theological question was
discussed with all degrees of ability and acrimony in
sermons and pamphlets."—History of Christian Church
(Encyc. Metrop., Glasgow, 1858, p. 887 sqq.); Chambers,
Encyclopedia, s. v.; Theological Critic, April, 1852, art.
iii; English Review, vols. xiii, xiv; Marand, Churches and
Sects, i, 42; Cunningham, Discussion of Church
Principles (Edinburgh, 1865), chap. vi.

Gorton (Goriton), son of Josephus (? Calaphus),
and one of those of eminent family who inclined the
Jewish populace to resist the anarchy of the Zealots
(Josephus, War iv, 3, 9), but was eventually slain by
them (ib. 6, 1).

Gorlin, surnamed Skantchel (the Admirable
One), an Armenian theologian, lived in the 5th century
of the Christian era. After studying philosophy, theo-
dology, and the Syriac and Greek languages under St.
Macrop (q. v.) and patriarch Isaac I, he was sent to
Constantinople to complete his studies. On returning
to his country, he engaged with Eneig (q. v.) and four
others in a translation of the Bible, and of several works
of the Greek fathers, into the Armenian. He subse-
quently became bishop of a see in the province of
Georgia. He is the author of a work on The Life
of Macrop, which is of importance for the early his-
tory of the Armenian Church, and was published by the
Mekhitarians in Venice in Opere di antichi Scrittori Armeni
del quinto secolo (Ven. 1883). See De Weerde, Goriani

Gorkum, the Martyrs of, the name given in
the Roman Catholic Church to two Armenian priests
of Dordrecht who had fled to Gorkum, were
captured at the conquest of that town by the Gueux
in 1572, and hung. On account of pretended miracles
 wrought by their relics, Pope Clement X, in 1674, al-
lowed them to be venerated in Holland. In 1867 they
were canonized by Pius IX. (A. J. S.)

Göte. See Gote.

Gorski, Theophylact, a Russian theologian,
died bishop of Kolomna in 1788. He wrote Orthodox
orientalis Ecclesiæ Dogmata (Lp. 1784), and a Compen-
dium of Christian Dogmas, in Latin and Russian, which
has since been translated into German and French (St.
Petersburg, 1792). These books, although in general
use in the Russian seminaries, openly advocate Pro-
testant views, and are opposed both to the Roman
Catholic and to the orthodox Greek dogmas. See Dict.
Hist. des Écrivains de l'Eglise grecque-russe; F. Pagarin,
De la Théologie dans l'Eglise russe (Paris, 1857); Hoe-

Gorton, Samuel, founder of a sect called Gorto-
monia, was born at Gorton, England, about 1600. He
says himself that he was one of the leaders in the
sects taught in the schools of human learning, and I bless God for
it." He was first in the employ of a linen- draper in London, but left that city in 1686 and went to Bus-
ton, U.S., in the hope of enjoying religious liberty;
but the Church there not being disposed to put up
with his extravagant ideas, he went to Plymouth, where he fared still worse, being fined, imprisoned, and
finally expelled in the midst of winter. In June, 1689,
he became an inhabitant of Aquidneck, or Rhode Is-
land, where fresh persecution befell him. Driven from
place to place, he finally sought some land at Pawtow-
exet, R.I., where he settled. Complained of by his
neighbors as encroaching on their property, he refused to ap-
pear before the court of Massachusetts, and in 1642
settled at Shawmut, where he had bought land of the
sacred Miantonomoh. His claims under this pur-
purchase were contested in court, where he was de-
criminated, convicted, and committed to prison, the cur-
sor, who appealed to the general court of Massa-
uchuets for assistance. Gorton and ten of his disci-
plaries were captured soon after and taken before the
court, where the land question soon gave place to
a trial for their lives as "damnable heretics," and that
the suit was pending, the theological question was
discussed with all degrees of ability and acrimony in
unlimited time. In 1644 the sentence was

changed into banishment. Gortyn then returned with his partisans to Rhodes Island, where he per-
sued the Indians to put themselves under the pro-
tection of England, and to abandon to that country a
part of their territory. He then returned to Eng-
lund where, in conclusion of this service, he re-
cived letters patent guaranteeing to him the peaceful
possession of his property at Shawmut. He called the
place Warwick, in remembrance of services rendered
him by the earl of Warwick. Gorton died about 1677.
His sect was in the end soon extinct. He wrote, "Secticopic
Defence against see-n-headed Policy" (1646, 4to):
- An incorruptible Key, composed of the 36 psalms, 
whereby you may open the rest of the holy Scriptures (1647, 4to):
- Salmancor, returned from the Dead (1655, 4to):
- An Antidote against the common Plague of the World: See
Mar's Life of Gorton in "The Sparks of Virtue, or
Divinity, Cyclop., American Literature, i. 178;
New American Cyclopaedia, viii, 384; Bartlett, Biblical,
Rhode Island, 134 sq.; Hutchinson, History of Mas-
achusetts, i. 117. (J. W. M.)
Gortyua (Gortynia; in classical writers, Gortyn,
or Gortyia; on a coin, Gortyia [pergortyia], a city
of Crete, mentioned in the Apocrypha in the list of
cities to which the Romans sent letters on behalf of
the Jews, when Simon the Macabees renewed the
treaty which his brothers Judas and Jonathan had
made with the Egyptians, xxviii, 23; Josephus, xxviii,
1 sq.; xlii, 1 sq.). There is no doubt that the Jews
were settled in great numbers in Crete (Josephus, Anti-
xvii, 12, 1; War, ii, 7; Philo, Leg. ad Caesam, sec. 86),
and Gortynia may have been their chief residence.
Tolemen Philometor, who treated the Jews kindly, and
who had received a numerous body in Egypt when
they were driven out of Judah by the opposite party
(Josephus, Anti. xiii, 8; War, i, 1, 1), rebuilt part of
Gortynia (Strabo, x, Didot. ed., p. 411). When Paul,
as a prisoner, was on his voyage from Caesarea to
Rome, the ship, on account of a storm, was obliged to
run under the lee of Crete, in the Bay of St. Paul,
Salmon, and soon after came to a place called Fair
Havens, which was near a city called Lassea (Acts
xxvii, 8). Lassea is probably the Lasia of the Peutin-
ergian Tables, and is there stated to be sixteen miles
east of Gortynia. It is very uncertain how long the
vessel was detained at Fair Havens, though "much
time had been spent" (Acts xxvii, 9), not since
they had sailed from Caesarea, but at the anchorage
(Alford, ad loc.). Doubtless the sailors, soldiers, and
prisoners had frequent intercourse with Lassea, and perhaps
Gortynia was a member of the League of the Great
Company at one or both of these places, but of this there is
not the slightest proof (comp. Coneybere and Howson, Life
Gortynia, according to Ptolemy (ili, 17, 10), was situ-
ated in 54° 15' and 84° 50'. Simon proposes a Sthoic-
omy for the name (Onom., p. 50; but see Sick-
ler, Handbuch, p. 470). Next to Cnosus, it was the most
important city in the island for power and mag-
nificence. At one time Gortynia and Cnosus in union
held the whole of Crete in their power except Lyttus
(Polyb., vi, 19), at other times they were in a con-
tinual state of warfare (Strabo, x, Didot. ed., p. 410).
Gortynia was founded by a colony from Gortys of Ar-
cadia (Plato, Leges, iv, Didot. ed., p. 320). It was
not of very considerable size, its walls being fifty stadia in
circuit, whilst those of its rival, Cnosus, were not more
than 100 stadia (Strabo, x, Didot. ed., p. 320). Its connec-
tion with Philopoemen in B.C. 201 is shown by the
Gortyaniacs having invited him to take the command
of their army (Plutarch, Philipp. 15). When the Acha-
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an League was in alliance with the Romans, B.C. 197,
against Philip V of Macedon, 500 Gortyaniacs joined
Quinclus Flaminiinus when on his march to Thessaly,
previous to the battle of Cynoscephalae (Livy, xxxiii,
9). It is only recently that a coin bearing the well-
known title of the late Col. Leake was found, struck at
Gortyna. The late Col. Leake has shown that the coin with the legend KOPTYNION AXAIION, which had previously been assigned to Gortyna in Arcadia by the late Mr. Burgon (Num. Chron. xix, 253-56), cer-
tainly belongs to the Cretan Gortyna (Supp. Num.

Coin of Gortyna.

Holl. p. 110), thus proving that cities beyond the con-
tinent were admitted into the League (R. S. Poola,
Num. Chron., new ser., i, 178). About the same period
there are evidences of an alliance, political or commer-
cial, between Athens and several of the Cretan towns.
Some of the coins of six of these—Cnosus, Cydonia,
Gortyna, Hierapytna, Phalasarna, Cyrenae, and Phasias,
are tetradrachmas, with exactly the types of those of
Athens of the same age, but distinguished by having
the distinctive badges of the Cretan towns. They
were probably struck by the Cretan cities of the great
alliance against Philip V of Macedon about B.C. 188
(Paris, 36, 5, 6; comp. Eckhel, iii, 186, 12, i;
Leake, Num. Hel. Insular Greece, p. 19; Poole,
L. C.). As Cnosus declined, Gortyna rose to eminence,
and became the metropolis of Crete. About A.D. 200 a
brother of Septimius Severus held at Gortyna the
office of proconsul and questor of the united provinces
of Crete and Cyrenaica (Bockh, No. 2321). In the ar-
rangement of the provinces by Constantine, Gortyna
was still the metropolis of Crete (Hier. Synecd.

The remains of Gortyna near Agibus Bheka (the
ten Saints), and the cavern in the mountain, have been
described by Tournefort (Relation d'un Voyage de La-
souss; and Pococke (Description of the East), and the
cavern, more recently, by Mr. Cockerell (Walpole, ii,
402). The modern Gortyaniacs hold this cavern to be
the Labyrinthe, thus claiming for themselves the hon-
ors of the discovery of the Minotaur. The Gortyna
coins do not appear from the Gortyna coins, which date from the
time of the Persian war to that of Hadrian (and there
are none later), that their ancestors ever entertained
such an idea (Leake, Num. Hel. Insular Greece, p. 18).

The famous Labyrinthe is represented on the coins of
Cnosus, and Col. Leake says that it is difficult to
reconcile this fact with the existence of the Labyrinthe
near Gortyna, for that the excavation near Agibus Bheka,
at the foot of Mount Ida, is the renowned Cretan
labyrinthe, cannot be doubted after the description of
p. 156). This opinion is given not on exceptional in the
assertion of Pausanias (i vii κωστών ἀντικεῖας, 
i, 27, 9). One of the coins of Cnosus bears, besides the
labyrinthe on its reverse, the Minotaur on the ob-
verse. It cannot be much later than the expedition
of Xerxes to Africa, when Homer was alive, though
the tradition of the Labyrinthe, if not of its real ex-
istence; whereas Héc (Kretas, i, 56 sq.), relying on
the silence of Hesiod and Herodotus, and the assumed
silence of Homer—though the Eii adds what looks
very like an allusion to the Cretan wonder (H. viii,
256 sq.)—has supposed it to have been an invention
of the later poets borrowed from Egypt (Poole, ut sup.
i, 171-72). A full account of the remains of the old site
and the modern place is given in the Museum of Crea-
sical Antiquities (ii, 277–286). Mr. Falkener here describes the cavern near Gortynia from Sieber, who spent three days in examining it, and says that certain sites of it are in a position which probably supplied the stone for building the city (Revue des Etudes Grecques, i, 511–520). Hock seems to hold similar views (Kretz, i, 447–454). See Cret.

Goshen (Heb. id. יגש, prob. of Egyptian origin, but unknown signif.). The name of at least two places.

1. (Sept. usually Πτερον or Πτεροτ). A province of Egypt, or of Thebes, in which Jacob and his family settled through the instrumentality of his son Joseph, and in which they and their descendants remained for a long period (Gen. xlv, 10; xlii, 28, 29, 34; xlviii, 1, 4, 6, 27; i, 6; Exod. viii, 22; ix, 26). (B.C. 1674–1558.) It is usually called the "land of Goshen" (גַּֽשְׁנָה נִבָּר, "country of Goshen," Gen. xlviii, 27), but also "Goshen" simply (Gen. xlv, 28, first clause, 29). It appears to have borne another name, "the land of Rameses" (רְמַה פָּרָה, Gen. xlviii, 11), unless this be the name of a district of Goshen. (See below.) That Goshen lay on the eastern side of the Nile may be justifiably inferred from the fact that Jacob is not reported to have crossed that river; nor does it appear that the Egyptians did not live in their territory of Egypt. The various opinions that have been held on the subject may be found classified and considered by Bellermon in his Handb. der Bibl. Lit. iv, 191–220. Lake-macher (Ox. Phil. vi, 291 sq.) locates Goshen in the vicinity of Bubastis, not far from Tanis; but this is too far from Palestine. Bryant (Ox. sum. des anc. Hist. of Egypt, p. 75 sq.) prefers the Saitic nome, which likewise is far west (comp. Eichhorn, Bibli, vi, 854 sq.). Jablonsky (De terra Gosh, Fruct. a. V. 1756; also in his Opusc. ii, 70) holds it to be the Heracleotic nome; but this has not been confirmed by the Greeks, nor by the Egyptians. The language of the land was not far removed from the Red Sea. It appears probable that we may fix the locality of Goshen in Lower Egypt, on the east side of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, in the district around Heropolis. The Sept. renders the words "land of Goshen" (Gen. xlviii, 28), כֹּֽהֵן הַנֵּבָּר בֶּלְבֶל, with the idea of the Hebrew "grass" (as in Ps. xlii, 6; Ps. cvii, 13). But Jacob and his family settled in the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, therefore, Rameses. This would make Goshen correspond with one of the divisions of what was anciently termed the Prefecture Arabica, Ti-Arabia, the eastern district, lying that is, on the eastern or Arabian side of the Nile. This is mentioned by Strabo (xv, 5, 1), and Ptolemy (iv, 6). C. C. Robinson, however, remarks that is, the southern branch of the Nile leaves the delta and continues, without a break, to the north of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile: this, Manetho tells us, was the custom of the first Shepherd king (Josephus, c. Ap. 1, 14). From the account of the arrival of Jacob (Gen. xlvii, 28, 29) it is evident that Goshen was between Joseph's residence at the time and the frontier of Palestine, and apparently the extreme province towards that frontier. The advice that Joseph gave his brethren as to their conduct to Pharaoh further characterizes the territory as a grazing one (Gen. xlvii, 33, 84). (It is remarkable that in Coptic writings signifies both a "shepherd" and "disgrace," and the like, Rosellini, Monumenti storici, i, 177.) This passage shows that Goshen was scarcely regarded as a part of Egypt Proper, and was not peopled by Egyptians—characteristics that would positively indicate a frontier province. But it is not to be inferred that Goshen had no Egyptizer in the earlier period; at the time of the ten plagues such are distinctly mentioned. That there was, moreover, a foreign population besides the Israelites seems evident from the account of the calamity of Ephraim's house (1 Chron. vii, 20–30) [see BERIAH], and the mention of the "mixed multitude" (תִּֽמְתָּל מֵתָּכָא), who went out at the Exodus (Exod. xii, 38), notices referring to the earlier and the later period of the sojourn. The name Goshen may possibly be Hebrew, or Semitic—although we do not venture with Jerome
to derive it from גֶּשֶן—for it also occurs as the name of a district and of a town in the south of Palestine (see below, No. 2), where we could scarcely expect an appellation of Egyptian origin unless given after the Exodus, which in this case does not seem likely. It is also noticeable that some of the names of places in Goshen or its neighborhood, as certainly Migdol and Bas-sephon (q. v.), are Semitic, the only positive exceptions being the cities Pithom and Ramses, built during the oppression. The next mention of Goshen confirms the previous inference that its position was between Canaan and the Delta (Gen. xlvii, 1). The nature of the country is indicated still more clearly than in the passage last quoted in the answer of Pharaoh to the request of Joseph's brethren, and in the account of their settling (Gen. xlvii, 5, 6, 11). Goshen was thus a pastoral country where some of Pharaoh's cattle were kept. The expression "in the best of the land" (יוְאֵשׁ גֶּשֶן) must, we think, be relative, the best of the land for a pastoral people (although we do not accept Michaelis's reading "pastures" by comparison with the Arabic, Suppl. p. 1072; see Gesen. Thes. s. v. גֶּשֶן), for in the matter of fertility the richest parts of Egypt are those nearest to the Nile, a position which, as has been seen, we cannot assign to Goshen. The sufficiency of this tract for the Israelites, their prosperity there, and their virtual separation, as is evident from the account of the plague, from the great body of the Egyptians, must also be borne in mind. The clearest indications of the exact position of Goshen are those afforded by the narrative of the Exodus. The Israelites set out from the town of Ramses, in the land of Goshen, made two days' journey to the "edge of the wilderness," and in one day more reached the Red Sea. At the starting-point two routes lay before them, "the way of the land of the Philistines . . . that [was] near," and "the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Exod. xliii, 17, 18). It is also represented, in conformity with this position, at the last great struggle, as comparatively near to Palestine, by the route that lay through the land of the Philistines (Exod. xliii, 17). Then, while the Israelites do not appear to have had any considerable settlements on the further side of the Nile, yet it is clear they were in a position that admitted of ready access to it: it was on the river (whether the main stream or one of the branches) that the infant Moses was exposed; in connection with it also that several of the miracles wrought by Moses were performed; and the fish of which they had been wont to partake, and the modes of irrigation with which they were familiar, bespoke a residence somewhere in its neighborhood (Exod. ii, 5; vii, 19; viii, 5; Numb.
vi, 5; Deut. xi, 10). Yet the locality occupied by the Israelites could not have been very near the Nile, since three days were sufficient for their going into the wilderness to keep a feast to the Lord (Exod. v, 5). From these indications we infer that the land of Goshen in part has been near the border of the ancient Delta, Rameses lying within the valley now called the wady et-Tumaylat, about thirty miles in a direct course from the ancient western shore of the Arabian Gulf. See Exodus. The superficial extent of the land, if we include the more fertile part of the natural valley, which may somewhat exceed that of the tract bearing this appellative, is probably under sixty square geographical miles. If we suppose the entire Israelitish population at the time of the Exodus to have been 1,600,000, and the whole population of Egypt, including Egyptians and fully as many other than the Israelites, about 2,000,000, this would give no less than between 30,000 and 40,000 inhabitants to the square mile, which would be half as dense as the ordinary population of an Eastern city. It must be remembered, however, that we need not suppose the Israelites to have been limited to the valley for pasture, but, like the Arabs, to have led their flocks into fertile tracts of the deserts around, and that we have taken for our estimate an extreme sum, that of the people at the Exodus. For the greater part of the sojourn there numbers must, however, have been, and before the Exodus they seem to have been partly spread over the territory of the oppressor, although collected at Rameses at the time of their departure. One very large place, like the Shepherd stronghold of Avaris, which Manetho relates to have had at the first a garrison of 240,000 men, would also greatly diminish the disproportion of population to superintendees. The very small superficial extent of Egypt in relation to the population necessary to the construction of the vast monuments, and the maintenance of the great armies of the Pharaohs, requires a different proportion to that of other countries, may, however, be in part explained by the extraordinary fertility of the soil. Even now, when the population is almost at the lowest point it has reached in history, when villages have replaced towns, and hamlets villages, it is still denser than that of many parts of England. It is not necessary, however, to suppose that during the whole period of the sojourn in Egypt the Israelites continued to dwell altogether within the same region: as they multiplied in number, and in process of time began to devote themselves to other occupations, they would naturally extend their territory. But these must be included in the number given, be they teachers or reapers, become more intermingled with the population of Egypt. It is quite possible that certain of their number crossed the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, and acquired dwellings or possessions in the tract lying between it and the Tanitine (Robinson, Researches, i. 76; Hengstenberg, Egypt and Books of Moses, p. 45). Particular families may have also shot out in other directions; and in this way would naturally arise that freer intercourse between them and the families of Egypt which appears to be implied in some of the later notices (Kings, ii. 29). Still, whatever area is indicated above as the land of Goshen, the district in which the original settlers from Canaan were assigned a home, continued to be the last the head-quarters of the covenant people (see Geiger, De regno Gionormum in Egipto, Marb. 1795). From the field of Zoan being mentioned in part has been near the eastern side of (Psa. lxxxvii, 12, 43), some have supposed that the town of that name, situated in the Tanitine nome, must have been the capital of Pharaoh at the time. Bocch and Hengstenberg, among others, have advocated this view; but not all that is positive is evident from it, but they have not been able to establish the point altogether satisfactorily; and it is quite probable that Zoan, in the passage referred to, is used in a general sense, as a kind of representative city in the land of Egypt for the land itself (see Kurtz, Hist. of Old Con., § 41; Naville, Goshen [4th Memoir of "Eg. Explor. Fund"], Lond. 1887, 4to). See Egypt.

2. (Sept. Gōsēn; Vulg. Gessen, Gosen), the "land" or the "country [both μητρόν] of Goshen," twice named as a district in southern Palestine, included in the conquests of Joshua (Josh. x, 41; xi, 16). From the first of these it would seem to have lain between Gaza and Gibeon, and therefore to be some part of the maritime plain of Judah; but in the latter passage that plain, the Shefelah, is expressly specified (here with the article) in addition to Gosen. In this place, too, the situation of Gosen—if the order of the statement be any indication—seems to be between the Beth-horon and the Shefelah (A. V. "valley"). If Goshen was any portion of this rich plain, is it not possible that its fertility may have suggested the name to the Israelites? On the other hand, the name may be far older, and may retain a trace of early intercourse between Egypt and the south of the promised land. For such intercourse comp. 1 Chron. vii, 21. The name may even have been extended from No. 8 below (see Keil, On Josh. p. 290).

3. (Sept. Gōsēn, Vulg. Gozem.) A town of the same name is once mentioned (between Anim and Holon) in company with Debir, Soco, and others, as in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 51), in the group on the south-western part of the hills (see Keil, Josh. p. 884). It is probably the origin of the application to an adjacent region (No. 2, above), for it is not likely that two entirely different places would be called by the same name, both in the southern quarter of Judah. From the mention of Gaza (Josh. x, 41) and the route of Joshua (ver. 10), the locality in question would seem to be situated in the gorges of Judah, running up between the territories of Benjamin and Dan, now occupied by the town of Malak, south of Kirjath Jearim (see Robinson's Researches, ii. 387). See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

Gospel. This word, "conformably to its etymological meaning of Good-tidings, is used to signify, (1.) The welcome intelligence of salvation to man, as preached by our Lord and his followers. (2.) It is after-wards transitively applied to each of the four histories of our Lord's life, published by those who are" therefore called "Evangelists," writers of the history of the Gospel (ιεραγλιον). (3.) "The term is often used to express collectively the Gospel-doctrines; and 'preaching the Gospel' is accordingly often used to express the practice of conveying to others the good tidings, but the 'teaching men how to ament themselves of the offer of salvation,' the declaring of all the truths, precepts, promises, and threatenings of Christianity. It is termed "the Gospel of the grace of God," because it flows from God's free love and goodness (Acts xx, 24); and, when truly and faithfully preached, is accompanied with the influences of the divine Spirit. It is called "the Gospel of the kingdom," because it treats of the kingdom of grace, and shows the way to the kingdom of glory. It is styled "the Gospel of the Christ" because he is the great subject of it (Rom. i, 16); and "the Gospel of peace and salvation," because it publishes peace with God to the pientiful and believing, gives to such, peace of conscience and tranquillity of mind, and in the means of their salvation, present and eternal. As it displays the glory of God and the means of his salvation in the means of eternal glory, it is entitled "the glorious Gospel" and "the everlasting Gospel," because it commenced from the fall of man, is permanent throughout all time, and produces effects which are everlasting. This use of the word Gospel has been so extensive as to the Gospel-truth is to be found exclusively or chiefly in the "Gospels," to the neglect of the other sacred writings; and others, to conclude that the discourses of our Lord and the apostolic epistles must exactly com-
cide, and that in case of any apparent difference, the former must be the standard, and the latter must be taken to bear no other sense than what is implied by the other. Whereas, it is very conceivable, that though both might be, in a certain sense, "good tidings," yet one may contain a much more full development of the Christian doctrine, and the one be the correct form of the day. It has been disputed whether the Gospel consists merely of promises, or whether it can in any sense be called a law. The answer plainly depends upon adjusting the meaning of the words gospel and law. If the gospel be taken for the declaration God has made to men by Christ, concerning the manner in which He will treat them, and the conduct He expects from them, it is plain that this includes commands, and even threatenings, as well as promises; but to define the Gospel so as only to express the favorable part of that declaration, is indeed taking the Gospel for granted, and confining the word to a sense much less extensive than it often has in Scripture (comp. Rom. ii, 16; 2 Thess. i, 8; 1 Tim. i, 9-11); and it is certain that, if the Gospel be put for all the parts of the dispensation taken in connection one with another, it may well be called, on the Gospel message. In like manner, the question, whether the Gospel be a law or not, is to be determined by the definition of the law and of the Gospel, as above. If law signifies, as it generally does, the discovery of the will of a superior, teaching what he requires and warning of the consequences of his intention of dispensing rewards and punishments, as this rule of their conduct is observed or neglected; in this latitude of expression it is plain, from the proposition, that the Gospel, taken for the declaration made to men by Christ, is a law, as in Scripture it is sometimes called (James i, 25; Rom. iv, 15; viii, 2). But if law be taken, in the greatest rigor of the expression, for such a discovery of the will of God and our duty, as to contain in it no intention of our obtaining the divine favor otherwise than by a perfect and universal conformity to it, in that sense the Gospel is not a law. See Win- ton, The Cos- mants, vol. iii, ch. i; Doddridge, Lectures, lect. cixii; Watts, Orthodoxy and Charity, Essay ii.

GOSSPEL SIDE OF THE ALTAR, the right side of the altar or communion-table, looking from it, at which, in the English Church service, the Gospel appointed for the day is read. It is of higher distinction than the opposite side of the Chantry, and is occupied by the Archdeacon of the highest ecclesiastical rank who happens to be present. In some cathedrals, one of the clergy has this special duty to perform, and is designated the Gospeller.

Gospeller. (1.) A term of reproach, though really an honorable epithet, applied by the Romanists to those who advocate the circulation of the Scriptures. It was first given in England to the followers of Wickliffe, when that eminent reformer translated the New Testament (Eden). (2.) A term applied in the Reformation period to certain Antinomians. "I do not find anything objected to them as to their belief, save only that the doctrine of predestination has been generally taught by the reformers, many of this sect began to make strange inferences from it, reckoning that since everything is decreed, and the decrees of God could not be frustrated, therefore men were to leave themselves to be carried by these decrees. This drew some into great impety of life, and others into desperation. The Germans soon saw the ill effects of this doctrine, Luther changed his mind about it, and Melancthon openly writ against it; and since that time the whole stream of the Lutheran churches has run the other way. But both Calvin and Bucer were still for maintaining the doctrine of these decrees; only they warned the people not to think much of them, since the Scripture speaks of these things which men may not penetrate into; but they did not so clearly show how these consequences did not flow from such opinions. Hooper, and many other good writers, did often dehort people from entering into these curiosities; and a caveat to that same purpose was put afterwards into the article of the Church about predestination" (Burnet, History of Reformation, pt. ii, bk. i, p. 180). (3.) It is customary in the Church of England for the ministers to read the gospel at the opening of the service before the communion table. He who reads the gospel, standing at the north side of the altar, was formerly called the Gospeller; and he who reads the epistle at the opposite side, was called the Epistoler. In the canons of Queen Elizabeth, we find that a special reader, entitled an Epistoler, to read the epistle in collegiate churches, vested in a cope.

Gospel, a term evidently of Anglo-Saxon origin (according to some, i. q. God's Spell, i.e. Word of God; but according to most and better authorities, i. q. good spell, i.e. glad news) is the rendering of eowga- gyl(i)on, lit. good message (originally spoken of a record for good news, Homer, Odyssey, xiv, 152, 166; Plutarch, Ages. 38; then of glad tidings itself, and so Sept. for γεγογησα, 2 Sam. xviii, 20, 22), constantly used in the N. T. (but not in Luke nor by John, and only twice in Acts, once in Peter, and once in Rev.) to denote, 1. The announcement of the kingdom of the Messiah, as ushered in by the coming and life of Christ; 2. The Gospel as an act or plan of salvation thus inaugurated, especially in its proclamation in the world; and, 3. The characters of the persons or histories which constitute the original documents of this system of faith and practice. Justin Martyr em- ployed for the last the less appropriate term ενσώπου- μαρα, memoirs; and other ancient writers occasionally style them, evangelia, i.e.; but they were not so much de- signed as biographical sketches, whether complete or otherwise, but rather as outlines of the divine econo- my introduced in the New Dispensation. The central point of Christian preaching was the joyful intelli- gence that the Saviour had come into the world (Matt. iv, 23; Rom. x, 15); and the first Christian preachers, who characterized their account of the person and mission of Christ by the term εὐαγγελίου, were themselves called εὐαγγελισται (Ephes. iv, 11; Acts xxii, 8). The former name was also prefixed to the written accounts of Christ; and this intelligence was ascribed by various writers in various forms, the particle κατα, "according to," (e.g. εὐαγγελίου κατὰ Ματθαίου) was inserted. We possess four such accounts; the first by Matthew, announcing the Redeemer as the promised King of the kingdom of God; the second by Mark, de- claring him the prophet mighty in deed and word (Luke xxiii, 19); the third by Luke, of whom it might be said that he represented Christ in the special char- acter of the Saviour of sinners (Luke vii, 86 sq.; xv, 18-9 sq.); the fourth by John, who represents Christ as the Son of God, in whom deity and humanity be- came one. The ancient Church gave to Matthew the symbol of the ox, to Mark that of the lion, to Luke that of the man, and to John that of the eagle; these were the four faces of the cherubim. The cloud in which the Lord revealed himself was borne by the cherubim, and the Evangelist who were also the symbols of the glory of God which appeared in the form of man.

I. Relative Position.—Concerning the order which they occupy in the Scriptures, the oldest Latin and Gothic versions, as also the Codex Cantabrigiensis, place Matthew and John first, and after them Mark and Luke, while the other MSS. and old versions fol- low the order given to them in our Bible. As di- istmatic reasons render a different order more natural, there is much in favor of the opinion that their usual position arose from regard to the chronological dates of the respective composition of the four gospels (see Seiler, De ordine codicum quos de Evangel. priores scriptorum, Erlang., 1805). This is: the Gospel of Origen, Irenæus, and Eusebius. All ancient testimo- nies agree that Matthew was the earliest and John the
latest evangelist.—Kitto, s. v. For the dates, see each gospel. See also Tischendorf's tract, *Worte waren unsere Evangelien verfasst* (3d ed. Lpz. 1865).

11. Authenticity. — It may fairly be said that the genuineness of these four narratives rests upon better evidence than that of other ancient writings. They were all composed during the latter half of the 1st century. Before the end of the 2nd century there is abundant evidence that the four gospels, as one collection, were generally used and accepted. Irenæus, who suffered martyrdom about A.D. 185, in the discreditation of Polycarp and Papias, who, from having been in Asia, in Gaul, and in Rome, had ample means of knowing the beliefs of various churches, says that the authority of the four gospels was so confirmed that even the heretics of his time could not reject them, but were obliged to attempt (Apent. ad Apolin. i. p. 141) *an abridgment* or *another exposition of them* (Contra. Hær. iii, 11, § 7). Tertullian, in a work written about A.D. 205, mentions the four gospels, two of them as the work of apostles, and two as that of the disciples of apostles (apostolici); and sets their authority on their apostolic origin (Adv. Marcion. iv, ch. ii). Origen, who was born about A.D. 185, and died A.D. 255, describes the gospels in a characteristic strain of metaphor as "the four elements of the Church's faith, of which the whole world, reconciled to God in Christ, is composed" (In Joh., v. Elsewhere, in commenting on the opening of the gospel of John, he draws a line between the inspired gospels and such productions as "the gospel according to the Egyptians," "the gospel of the Twelve," and the like (Hom. in Luc. iii, p. 582 sq.). Although Theophylact, who became sixth (seventh?) bishop of Athens about A.D. 106, speaks only of "the gospels," without adding, at least in that connection, the names of the authors (Ad Autol. iii, p. 124, 125), we might fairly conclude with Gieseler that he refers to the collection of four, already known in his time. But from Jerome we know that Theophylact arranged the records of the four evangelistic gospels only one week of "the gospels," without adding, at least in connection with the names of the authors (Ad Autol. iv, p. 127). Tertullian, who died about A.D. 225 (?), compiled a Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels. The Muratorian fragment (Muratori, Antiq. ii. iii. 584; Routh, Relig. S. vol. iv, which, even if it be not by Caesius and of the 2nd century, is at least a very old monument of the Roman Church, describes the gospels of Luke and John; but time and carelessness seem to have destroyed the sentences relating to Matthew and Mark. Another source of evidence is open to us in the citations from the gospels found in the earliest writers. Barnabas, Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, and possibly Papias, bear witness to the genuine quotations from them, but not with verbal exactness. The testimony of Justin Martyr (born about A.D. 99, martyred A.D. 165) is much fuller; many of his quotations are substantially found in the gospels of Matthew, Luke, probably of John, and possibly of Mark also, whose words it is more difficult to separate. The quotations from Matthew are the most numerous. In historical references, the mode of quotation is more free, and the narrative occasionally unites those of Matthew and Luke: in a very few cases he alludes to matters not mentioned in the parallel gospel, as, for instance, Apoc. Dkokowigik. j. M. Justin. Hamil. 1846). Beside these, Matthew appears to be quoted by the author of the epistle to Diognetus, by Hegesippus, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus. Eusebius records that Pantaenus found in India (the south of Asia?) Christ "in a clearer light than any other ancient writer." All this shows that long before the end of the 2nd century the gospel of Matthew was in general use. From the fact that Mark's gospel has few places peculiar to it, it is more difficult to identify citations not expressly quoted to him; and Athenagoras and Theophilus appear to quote his gospel, and Irenæus does so by name. Luke is quoted by Justin, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus; and John by all of these, with the addition of Ignatius, the epistle to Diognetus, and Polycrates. From these we may conclude that before the end of the 2nd century the Gospel collection was well known and in general use. There is yet another line of evidence. The heretical sects, as well as the fathers of the Church, knew the gospels; and as there was no greatest hostility between them, if the gospels had become known in the Church after the discussion arose, the heretics would never have accepted them as genuine from such a quarter. Both the Gnostic and Marcionites arose long before the 3rd century; therefore it is probable that the gospels were then accepted, and thus they are traced back almost to the times of the apostles (Ols-hausen). Upon a review of all the witnesses, from the apostolic fathers down to the Canon of the Laodi-cean Council in 364, and that of the third Council of Carthage in 397, it is clear that the four gospels are numbered in the Canon of Scripture, there can hardly be room for any candid person to doubt that from the first the four gospels were recognised as genuine and as inspired; that a sharp line of distinction was drawn between them and the so-called apocryphal gospels, of which the number was very great; that, from the citations of passages, the gospels bearing these four names were the same as those which we possess in our Bibles under the same names; that unbelievers, like Celsus, did not deny the genuineness of the gospels, even when they were implying their infidelity; that heretics thought it necessary to plead some kind of sanction out of the gospels for their doctrines: nor could they venture on the easier path of an entire rejection, because the gospels were everywhere known to be genuine. As a matter of literary history, nothing can be better established than the genuineness of the gospels; and if in these latest times they have been assailed, it is plain that theological doubts have been concerned in the attack. The authority of the books has been denied from a wish to set aside their contents. Out of a mass of authorities the following may be selected: *Norton, Genuineness of the Gospels* (Lond. 1846–8, 8 vols.); Kirchhoffer, *Quellenansammlung zur Geschichte des N. T. Canons* (Zurich, 1844); De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung,* etc. (8th ed., Berlin, 1860; tr. Botst. 1858); Hug's Einleitung (tr. with notes, Andover, 1836); Olshausen, *A Sketch of Christian Hermeneutics*; and W. Lougher, *A Sketch of the Ecclesiastical Authority of the N. T. Canons.* (Königsb. 1823); Jones, *Method of settling the canonical Authority of the N. T.* (Oxf. 1758, 2 vols.); Baur, *Krit. Untersuchungen über die Canon. Evangelien* (Tüb. 1847); Reuss, *Grund. des N. T.* (4th ed., Brunswhick, 1844); *Greek Text of the N. T.* (2d ed., Lond. 1851; 3d ed. Lond. 1866); Gieseler, *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Einleitung,* etc., der schriftlichen Evangelien (Leipzig, 1818).

II. Mutual Relation and Origin.—"Many portions of the history of Jesus" (remarks Mr. Norton, who has minutely investigated the subject) "are found in common in the first three gospels, others are common to two of their number, but not found in the third. In the passages referred to, there is generally a similarity of wording, sometimes in the greatest degree, in particular circumstances, in the aspect under which the event is viewed, and the style in which it is related. Sometimes the language found in different gospels, though not identical, is equivalent or nearly equivalent; and not infrequently, the same series of words, and the same order, are the characteristic marks of the whole or a great part of a sentence, and even in larger portions." (Genuineness of the Gospels, i, 240). Mr. Westcott exhibits the proportion of correspondences and peculiarities in several numerical tables: if the asserted coincidences are represented by 100, their proportionate distribution will be, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 58; Matthew and Luke, 21; Matthew and Mark, 20; Mark and Luke, 8, 6, etc. Looking only at the general result, it may be said that of the
contents made to it at different periods. Various copies of this original gospel, with these additions, being ex-
tant in the time of the evangelists, each of the evan-
gelists is supposed to have used a different copy as the
basis of his gospel. In the hands of bishop Marsh,
who adopted and modified the hypothesis of Eichhorn,
this original gospel becomes a very complex thing.
He supposed that there was a complete, literal text of
the Aramaean original gospel, and various transcripts
with alterations and additions. But when it is considered
that all these suppositions are entirely gratuitous,
that they are made only to meet the emergencies of
the case as it has come to be refuted, it is evident
that the whole theory of hypothesis is carried beyond
just bound.
The grand objection to this original gospel is the
element of historical evidence for its existence. If
such an original gospel ever had existed, it must have
been of the very highest authority, and, instead of being
tampered with, would have been carefully preserved
in its original form, or at least in its Greek translation.
The alterations and additions supposed to have been
made in it are not only inconsistent with its sacred
and authoritative character as the original gospel, but
also with the habits of the Jews. Even if this hypothesis
were true, it is clear that the writer of the first
three gospels, it is far too artificially contrived
to be true; but it fails of its aim. The original work,
supposed to consist of the sections common to the three
gospels, cannot be made out; and the individuality
of character, that is so much the mark of the evangelists,
cannot be reconcilable with the supposition that several
different writers contributed materials. Notwithstanding
the identity of subject among the three gospels, each writer
is distinguished by his own characteristic style. It
is remarkable that Dr. Weiss, of Königsberg, has quite
recently (Stud. u. Kritik, 1821, i. 4) propounded a the-
ory of explanation very much akin to that of Marsh.
He supposes that the first evangelist, the writer of
Matthew's Gospel, as well as Luke, used a copy of
Mark's Gospel, and, along with this, a second more
ancient, perhaps immediately apostolic written source,
which Marius also made use of in the composi-
tion of his gospel. In this way he thinks all the
phenomena are simply and easily explained. He
endeavors to establish his view by a detailed examina-
tion and comparison of the three synoptic gospels,
and he holds that the whole argument against the hypo-
thesis of Griesbach thought that Mark copied from
Matthew and Luke, and this opinion is still held by some;
but an opinion in favor of the originality of Mark has
of late been gaining ground (Thilenius, Meyer, Weiss).
It must, we think, be held that the gospels are
more consistent with the hypothesis that Matthew
wrote his gospel in Hebrew, while there is no trace of the Hebrew
gospel itself. The conclusion is that the Hebrew gospel
of Matthew must have been displaced at an early period
by another containing its essential contents, but richer
and more complete in accordance with the ancient
tradition that Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew.
Hence the later Greek gospel was held to be the work
of Matthew the apostle, the more ancient Hebrew one
having been really the apostle's work. This revival
in the present day of what is substantially the hypoth-
esis of Eichhorn and Marsh is significant of the still
unsolved state of the question.

3. That our present gospels are to be traced mainly
to the oral teaching of the apostles as their source, was
the opinion of Herder and Giseler, and more recently
of De Wette, Guericke, Norton, Westcott, and others.
They are 'oral traditions' (says De Wette) 'the spirit of Christian antiquity who regard the oral
tradition of the gospel (the oral original gospel) as the
basis and source of all the Christian gospels, and who
endeavor to apprehend the history of the origin of the
latter in a definite relation to the former' (Introd. to
N. T., sec. 87). The above account was published orally
before it was committed to writing, and the preaching
of the apostles must, from the nature of the case, have
consisted chiefly of a narration of the facts recorded
in our present gospels. It is naturally supposed that
the same source which now constitutes the narrative
would be the result, and that we have a transcript,
as it were, of this type or form of narrative in the first
three gospels. The verbal coincidences in the gospels are found especially in those cases in which it might have been expected that the first preachers of the gospel would be exact, namely, the recital of the words of Christ and quotations from the O.T. This account of the probable origin of the gospels is not only in accordance with the testimony of the apostles or of the period, but is an instance of the oral tradition rather than of writing, but is also substantially the same as that which Luke gives in the preface to his gospel (Luke i, 1-4). While Luke refers to written accounts of the ministry of Christ in the preparation of some Christians at that time, he mentions that these accounts of Christ were founded directly or indirectly upon the oral accounts of the apostles (ελθει απαντήσων ἤν τοις ἀρχαῖς ἀπάντησι καὶ ὑποτείναι γενέμαν τοῦ λόγου). The statement of Papias respecting the origin of Mark's Gospel is, that it was derived from the preaching of Peter, and we have already quoted the important testimony of Irenæus to the same effect. To prevent misapprehension, however, it ought to be observed that our written gospels date from the latter half of the first century, and that, "so long as the first witnesses survived, so long the tradition was current and the traditions of their masters; whereas they passed away it was already fixed in writing" (Westcott, p. 192). The theory of the oral origin of the gospels, while it has much evidence in its favor, cannot be accepted as a complete solution of the problem. It has been the object of some instances of verbal coincidence in the narrative common to the three synoptics, or to two of them; nor the instances in which either two or all the three evangelists agree with each other in their quotations from the Sept., and at the same time differ from the Sept. itself (Matt. iii, 8; Mark i, 8; Luke iii, 4; compared with Isa. xi, 8, Sept., and Matt. iv, 10; Luke iv, 6, compared with Deut. vii, 15, Sept.). De Wette would combine "the two hypotheses of a common oral source, and of the influence through writing of one evangelist on another." There is a striking difference between the fourth gospel and the synoptic gospels in respect both to contents and form; but, with all this difference, there is a general and essential agreement. John relates in part the same things as the synoptists, and in a similar manner, but not with the verbal agreement. The following are parallel: The purification of the Temple, i, 12-22 = Matt. xxi, 11 sq.; the feeding of the multitude, vi, 1-15 = Matt. xiv, 18-21; the walking upon the sea, vi, 16-21 = Matt. xiv, 22-36; the anointing, xii, 1-8 = Matt. xxii, 16-18; the entrance into Jerusalem, xii, 9-19 = Matt. xx, 1-16; the prediction of Peter, xiiii, 36-38 = Matt. xxvi, 33-35. In some of these instances the expressions are verbally parallel; also in the following: xii, 25 = Matt. x, 19; xiii, 20 = Matt. x, 40; xiv, 31 = Matt. xxvi, 46. There is a similarity between i, 24, and Luke vi, 40 (De Wette, Evang. Handb. zum N. Test.). On the other hand, however, much important matter has been omitted and much added by John, while his manner of narration also differs from that of the synoptists. In the first three gospels, the course of our Lord's ministry is chiefly laid in Galilee, but in the fourth gospel it is more largely in Judaea and Jerusalem. This may partly account for the different style of our Lord's discourses in the synoptic gospels, as compared with the Gospel of John (Hug, p. 435). In the former, Christ often makes use of parables, parables of the fish; in the latter, John records long and mystical discourses. Yet we find proverbial maxims and parables also in John xii, 24-26; xiii, 16, 20; x, 1 sq.; xv, 1 sq. Many points of difference between the fourth gospel and the others may be satisfactorily reconciled for from the fragmentary character of the narratives. None of the four gospels are to be considered a complete biography, and, therefore, one may omit what others omit. Besides, the fourth gospel was composed after the others, and designed to be in some respects supplemental. This was the opinion of Eusebius, and of the still more ancient writers whose testimony he cites, Clement of Alexandria and Origen; and the opinion appears to be well founded. Whether John was acquainted with the works of his predecessors or not is uncertain, but there is no doubt acquainted with the evangelical tradition out of which they originated. We have, then, in this circumstance, a very natural explanation of the omission of many important facts, such as the institution of the supper, the baptism of Jesus by John, his life as a Nazorean, the temptation, the temptation, and the internal conflict at Getsemane. These his narrative assumes as already known. In several passages he presupposes in his readers an acquaintance with the evangelical tradition (i, 39, 45; ii, 1, iii, 24; xi, 2). It is not easy to say precisely, we and the synoptists with reference to the day on which Christ observed the last passover with his disciples. Lücke decides in favor of John, but thereby admits the discrepancy to be real. Again, in the synoptic gospels, the duration of our Lord's ministry appears to be one year; whereas John mentions three passovers which our Saviour attended; but neither the synoptists nor John determine the duration of the Saviour's ministry, and, therefore, there is no contradiction between them on this point. It has been alleged that there is an irreconcilable difference between the synoptic and the Johannine view of the resurrection of Christ, in considering the historical reality of the former, the latter must be regarded as ideal and subjective; particularly, that the long discourses attributed to Christ in the fourth gospel could hardly have been retained in John's remembrance, and that the denial of the resurrection of Christ in the other gospels, and so like John's own style in his epistles, that they appear to have been composed by John himself. If the allegation could be made good that the Christ of John is essentially different from the Christ of the synoptists, the objection would be theoretical. On the contrary, however, we are persuaded that, on this all-important point, there is an essential agreement among all the evangelists. We must remember that the full and many-sided character of Christ himself might be represented under aspects which, although different, were not inconsistent with each other, but by no means so diverse. The fourth gospel represents Christ as God, while the others describe him as a mere man. Yet we may find in the fact of his wondrous person as the God-man an explanation of the apparent difference in their respective views of him. The denial of the resurrection essentially from John in their view of Christ is shown by Dorner in an admirable comparison (Dorner, Entwicklungsge schichte, i, 81 sq.; E. tr. i, 50 sq.). Lücke and Frommann, as well as De Wette, greatly incline to the view that John has mingled his own subjectivity with the discourses of Christ, which he professes to relate. That the evangelist does not transfer his own subjective views to Christ appears from the fact that while he speaks of Christ as the Logos, he never represents Christ as applying this term to himself. We may also refer to those passages in which, after quoting obscure sayings of Christ, the Evangelist appears in different occurrences, he either adds an explanation or openly confesses his ignorance of their meaning at the time (ii, 19-22; vi, 70; vii, 37-39; xi, 11; xii, 16, 22; xiii, 27; xx, 9). The susceptible disposition of John himself, and the intimate relation in which he stood to Christ, make the supposition reasonable that he drank so deeply into the spirit of his master, and retained so vivid a recollection of his very words, as to reproduce them with accuracy. Instead of transferring his own thoughts and experiences to Christ, he appears to have reproduced those of Christ himself. In this way the similarity between John's language and that of Christ is
accounted for. It is acknowledged, even by Strauss and De Wette, that the most characteristic expressions in John were really used by Christ himself. When it is objected that John could not retain in remembrance, or hand down with accuracy, such long discourses of Christ as he records in his gospel, far too little regard is paid to the influence of the historical background upon the memory. The literary form of the Discourse is to be expected especially in such a case as this, according to the Saviour's promise. "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John xiv, 20).

See Bp. Marsh's "Translation of Michaelis's Introduct. to N. Tii. III. 2 (1803) for an account of Eichhorn's earlier theory and of his own. Veyssie's "Examination of Mr. Marsh's Hypothesis (1808) has suggested many of the objections. In Bp. Thirlwall's "Translation of Schleiermacher's "St. Luke (1856, Introduction) it is an account of the whole question. Other principal works are, an essay of Eichhorn, in the 5th vol. Allgemeine Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur (1794); the Essay of Bp. Marsh, just quoted; Eichhorn, "Einleitung in das N. T. (1874); Gratz, "Neuer Versuch die Entdeckung der wahre Beschreibung der Geschichte der Erlösung von Christi Leid und Sterben in die Einleitung der Bibel. Historische kritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanon. and apok. Schriften des A. und N. T. (1812-1815); and the work of Gieseler quoted above. See also De Wette, Lehrbuch, and Westcott, "Introduct., already quoted; also Welse, "Evangelienfuge (Lpz. 1856); Schleitholf, "Verkündigung und Erlösung des Menschen (Lpz. 1850); Willke, "Erzähler (Gottingen 1853); Wilken, "Der Ueberzeugelit (Dresden and Leipzig 1888); Lücke, "Kommentar zu Ec. Joh.: Frommann, "Der Johanneische Lehrgriff; Schwatt, "Untersuchungen über d. sympl. Evangelien (Tub. 1884); Anon. "Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, Verfasser und Verhältniss zu einander (Leips. 1848); Ritsch in the "Theol. Jahrb. 1851; Ritsch, "Das UrspRUNg und Kompos. d. sympl. Evangelien (Stuttg. 1858); Smith (of Jordanhill), "Origin and Connection of the Gospels (Edinb. 1853). For the mythical theory of the origin of the gospels, as developed by Strauss and others, see "RATIONALISM, and the art. JESUS. For discussion on the gospels, see "HARMONIES OF THE GOSPELS.

IV. Commentaries, expressly on the whole of the four gospels alone, have been numerous; the most important are here designated by an asterisk (*); prefixed: Theologen-Evangelien kommentir (1812); Bartholomae, Scripturae colegium, ii, 229 sq.; Athanasius, "Quaestiones (in Opp. [Syrac.], ii, 153 sq.; Jerome, "Expositio (in Opp. [Syr]., xi, 738 sq.; Augustin, "Quaestiones lib. ii (in Opp. iv, 511 sq.; Juvenal, "Carmina (in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii iv); Sedulius, "Expositions (in Matt., Mark, and Luke, 9 vols.; Kuchenreuter, "Der Adamitc, (in "Annalen der akadem. Vereinigung (in Bibl. Max. Patr. viii); Theophylact, "Commentarius (in Opp. i); Anselm, "Explanations (in Opp. ed. Picard); Rupert, "Exeget. lib. i (in Opp. i, 55 sq.; Eu­thymius, "Commentarius (Gr. and Lat., Lips. 1792, 3 vols. in 4, 8vo); Aquinas, "Aurea Catena (Paris 1687, fol.; also in "Opp. iv, 8; in Bibl. Patr. Gall. xiv, 297, et al.; Catena aus der Vaters, by Pusey, etc., Ox. 1841-5, 4 vols. in 8, 8vo); Gorman, "Commentarius (Colonia. 1472, 1587, Hag, 1592, Awtv. 1617, Lugd. 1693, fol.); Zuinglic, "Commentaries (ed. Leo Judae, St. Omer iv); Faber, "Commentarius (Molv. 1599, Basill. 1593, Col. 1541, fol.); Bucer, "Exe­narrations (Argent. 1527, 1598, 2 vols. 8vo; Basil. 1587, Geneva, 1558, fol.); Arboeus, "Commentarius (Paris 1829, 1551, fol.); Cajetan, "Commentarius (Venice. 1820, Paris 1828, 1556, 1546, 4 fol.; ib. 1542, Lugd. 1558, 1574, 8vo); Samoy, "Exegetica (Oviedo, 1612, fol.); Masa vurtuosa (Mal. 1593, Basel. 1583-50, 4 vols. 8vo); Broeckweg, "Exe­narrations (Par. 1548, 8vo; Ven. 1648, 4to); Herborn, "Ex­narrations (Col. 1546, 4to); Brunsfeld, "Adnotationes (in­cluding Acta (Argent. 1583, fol.); Delcroix, "Commentaries (Htispe, 1556, fol.); Lossel "Adnotationes (Franc­fort. 1552, 2 fol.; also in "Reiner, "Commentarius (in suc­cessive gospels; together, Tigrini, 1561, fol.); Arzutus, III. 30—*
The Gospels, especially the Nostorians and Monophysites. It was found to have been universally read by the Syrians of St. Thomas, in Travancore, and was condensed by the Synod of Dionysius. It was publicized by Macenas, who describes it as "the book of the Infancy, almost condemned by the ancients for its many blasphemous heresies and fabulous histories." Wherever the name Jesus occurs in this gospel he is universally entitled c-rb, while in the New Testament he is Christ. This Gospel was introduced by the Nostorians. The blessed Virgin is also entitled the Lady Mary. The Persians and Copts also received this gospel (De la Brosse's Lexic. Pos. s. v. Tinctoria Ars). The original language was probably Syriac. It is sometimes called the Gospel of Peter of Antioch.

2. The Gospel of Thomas the Israelite (Gr.), a work which has flowed from the same source with the former, was first published by Cotelerius (Notes on the Constitutions of the Apostles, i. vi. c. xvii, tom. i. p. 846), from an imperfect MS. of the 15th century, it was republished and divided into chapters by Fabricius. The most perfect edition was that of Magarelli, in the Nuova Raccolta d'Opereologica e Filosofiche (Venet. 1764), from a Bologna MS. of the 15th century. Magarelli (who believed it to have been a forgery of the 3d century) preserved his text, but the translation. Thilo has given a complete edition from a collation of Magarelli's work with two MSS., preserved at Bonn and Dresden. This gospel relates the fable of Christ's learning the Greek alphabet, in which it agrees with the account in Irenæus. In other Gospels of the Infancy (as in that published by Siborne) he is represented as learning the Hebrew letters. It has been questioned whether this is the same work which is called the Gospel of Thomas, by Origen, Ambrose, and others. This gospel probably had its origin among the Gnostics, and found its way into the Church through the Gnostics, and was translated into several languages. It is seldom copied by the monks, which accounts for the paucity of MSS. Nicephorus says that the Gospel of Thomas contained 1600 oryxos. This pseudepigraphal work is probably the foundation of all the histories of Christ's infancy, but it is supposed to have been recast and interpolated.

8. The Protevangelion of James has descended to us in the original Greek, and was first published by Bibilander at Basel in 1554, in a Latin version by William of Glanum, and afterward translated into English, and the Greek churches, and maintained that it was a genuine work of the apostle James, and intended to be placed at the head of St. Mark's Gospel. These recommendations provoked the wrath of the learned Henry Stephens, who insinuated that it was fabricated by Pottell himself, whom he calls a detestable monster (Introduction au Treilit de la Conformité des Métravli Anciennes avec les Modernes, 1565). It was reprinted in the Orthographica, and in the Orthographica, vol. i. of 1629, of Jacob Grynew, who entertained a very favorable opinion of it. Subsequent discoveries have proved that, notwithstanding the absurdity of Pottell's high pretensions in favor of the authenticity of this gospel, Stephens's accusations against him were all ill founded. There had, even at the time when Stephens wrote, been another apocryphal work, which had been published by Neander, of which Stephens was not aware; it appeared among the Apocrypha annexed by Opip to his edition of Luther's Catechism (Basel, 1654). It was republished by Fabricius (who divided it into chapters), and subsequently translated by Hase, and was collated for his edition six Paris MSS., the oldest of which is of the 10th century. From the circumstance of these MSS. containing a Greek calendar or martyrology, and from other internal evidence, there seems little doubt that this gospel was formerly read in the Eastern Christians, especially the Nostorians and Monophysites. It was found to have been universally read by the Syrians of St. Thomas, in Travancore, and was condensed by the Synod of Dionysius. It was publicized by Macenas, who describes it as "the book of the Infancy, almost condemned by the ancients for its many blasphemous heresies and fabulous histories." Wherever the name Jesus occurs in this gospel he is universally entitled c-rb, while in the New Testament he is Christ. This Gospel was introduced by the Nostorians. The blessed Virgin is also entitled the Lady Mary. The Persians and Copts also received this gospel (De la Brosse's Lexic. Pos. s. v. Tinctoria Ars). The original language was probably Syriac. It is sometimes called the Gospel of Peter of Antioch.
GOSPELS

Greek Church (Montfaucon, Palæogr. Græc. p. 304). There are also extant versions of the Gospel of the Infancy in the Arabic and other languages of the Eastern churches, among which they appear to have possessed a high degree of authority.

Although this work is styled by Postell the Protevangelium, there is no MS. authority for this title, nor for the fact of its being ascribed to James the apostle. It appears to have been written by a man who was a Gnostic, and whose and the narratives of this gospel were known to Tertullian (A. decret. Gnost. c. viii.), Origen (Com. in Matt. p. 223), Gregory Nyssen (Orat. in diem Nat. Christ. Op. iii. 340), Epiphanius (Hær. 79. § 5), the author of the Imperfecta version on Matthew, Chrysostom (Ev. op. vii.), and many others among the ancients, (Socock, De ory. et ind. Prot. Jacobi, Bresl. 1830.)

4. THE GOSPEL OF THE NATIVITY OF MARY (Latin). Although the Latins never evinced the same degree of credulity which was shown by the Greeks and Orta for the gospel in such fabulous productions, and although they were generally rejected by the fathers, they were again revived about the 6th century. Notwithstanding their contemptuous rejection by Augustine and Jerome, and their condemnation by popes Innocent and Gelasius, they still found readers in some itinerant religious mendicants, and are in the book concerning the Nativity of St. Mary and the Midwife.

The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, which most probably, in its present form, dates its origin from the 6th century, has even been recommended by the pretended authority of St. Jerome. There is a letter extant which is written by him in the name of Damascus and Heliodorus to Jerome, requesting him to translate out of Hebrew into Latin the history of the Birth of Mary, and of the Birth and Infancy of Christ, in order to oppose the fabulous and heretical accounts of the same contained in the apocryphal books. To this Jerome accedes, observing, at the same time, that the real author of the book was not, as they supposed, the evangelist Matthew, but Seleneus the Manichees. Jerome observes that there is some truth in the accounts, of which he furnishes a translation from the original Hebrew.

It is from these Gospels of the Infancy that we have learned the names of the parents of the blessed Virgin, Joachim (although Bede reads Eli) and Anna. The narratives contained in these gospels were incorporated in the Golden Legend, a work of the 13th century, which was utilized into all the languages of Europe, and frequently printed. There are extant some metrical accounts of the same in German, which were popular in the era of romance. These legends were, however, severely censured by some eminent divines of the Latin Church, of whom it will be sufficient to name Aegidius, in his Hesychia, in the 9th, and Fulbert and Petrus Damianus (bishop of Ostia) in the 11th century. "Some," says the latter, "beating its wise than they should be, with superfluous curiosity, they inquire into the names of the parents of the blessed Virgin, for the evangelist would surely not have failed to have named them if it were possible to mankind." (Germom on the Nativity). Eadmer, the monk, in his book on the Excellence of the Virgin, writes in a similar strain (cap. ii. Anselm. Opp. p. 485, Paris, 1721). Luther also inveighs against the reader's concern about questions of this kind (W. theol. tom. xi. and Tab. Localis, ch. vii. tom. xxii. p. 896).

There were several editions of Jerome's pretended translation published in the fifteenth century, one of them by Caxton. It is printed by Thilo from a Paris MS. of the 14th century, and divided by him into twenty-four chapters, after a MS. of the 15th century in the same library. One of the chief objects of the writer of these gospels seems to be to assert the Davidic origin of the Virgin, in opposition to the Nestorians, or some later Christians in India. Lardner (Credulity, vol. viii.) so far differs from Mr. Jones as to believe the author not to have been a Jew. That these legendary accounts have not altogether lost their authority appears from the Life of St. Joseph, in the Catholic Augsburg for December, 1782. In the Catholic Augsburg for December, 1819.

The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary was received by many of the ancient heretics, and is mentioned by Epiphanius, St. Augustine, and Gelasius. The Gnostics and Manichees endeavored to found on its authority some of their peculiar opinions (such as that Christ was not the Son of God before his baptism, and that he was not the tribe of Judah, but of that of Levi); as did also the Collyridians, who maintained that too much honor could not be paid to the blessed Virgin, and that she was herself born of a virgin, and ought to be worshipped with grace and reverence. See the book concerning the Nativity of St. Mary and the Midwife.

5. Although the GOSPEL OF MARCHON, or rather that of Luke, as corrupted by that heretic in the 12th century, is no longer extant, professor Hahn has endeavored to restore it from the extracts found in ancient writers, especially Tertullian and Epiphanius. See MARCION. This work has been published by Thilo.

6. Thilo has also published a collation of a corrupted Greek Gospel of St. John, found in the archives of the Knights Templars in Paris. This work was first noticed (in 1791) by the Abbe Marchon, as well as by abbé Grégoire, ex-bishop of Blois. It is a vellum manuscript in large 4 to, said by persons skilled in paleography to have been executed in the 13th or 14th century, and to have been copied from a Mount Athos MS. of the 18th. The writing is in gold letters. It is divided into twenty sections, each containing a gospel, and is on this account supposed to have been designed for liturgical use. These sections, corresponding in most instances with our chapters (of which, however, the twentieth and twenty-first are omitted), are subdivided into verses, the same as those now in use, and said to have been invented by Robert Stephens. See VERSUS. The omissions and interpolations (which latter are in barbarous Greek) represent the heresies and mysteries of the Knights Templars. Notwithstanding all this, Thilo considers it to be modern, translated into verse, and fabricated since the commencement of the 18th century.

7. One of the most curious of the apocryphal gospels is the GOSPEL OF NICODERUS, or ACTS OF PILATE. It is a kind of theological romance, partly founded on the canonical gospels. The first part, to the end of ch. xxvii, it little more than a paraphrastic account of the trial and death of Christ, embellished with fabulous additions. From that to the end (ch. xxviii) is a detailed account of Christ's descent into hell to liberate the spirits in prison, the history of which is said to have been obtained from Lanthius and Charinus, sons of Simon, who were two of those "saints who slept," but were raised from the dead, and came into the holy city after the resurrection. This part of the history is so far valuable, that it throws some light upon the ancient ideas current among Christians on this subject. It is therefore not a forgery (it is therefore not a forgery (Birch, p. vi) to be as valuable in this respect as the writings of the fathers.

The subscription to this book states that it was found by the emperor Theodosius among the public records in Jerusalem, in the hall of Pontius Pilate (A.D. 388). We read in ch. xxvii that Pilate himself wrote all the
transactions from the relation of Nicodemus, who had taken them down in Hebrew; and we are informed by Epiphanius that the Quartodecimans appealed to the Acts of Pilate in favor of their opinions as to the proper time of keeping Easter. It was written in these Acts that our Saviour suffered on the eighth Kal. of April, a circling of the Jews; all sects of Christians are stated in the ancient Papias, 2 Euseb. vii. 21, or English translation, by Chevalier, 1838. From this circumstance it has generally been held that such documents must have existed, although this fact has been called in question by Tanaquil Faber and Le Clerc (Jonge, On the Fabricator of Gospels, Lucius Charisius, who flourished, however, in all probability first furnished the ideas of the present pious fraud. Mr. Jones supposes that this may have been done in order to silence those pagans who denied the existence of such Acts. The citations of those fathers are all found in the present work. (See Hengel, Papii Pilati actus in causa J. C. ad Tiberii, 1784.)

We have already seen that a book entitled the Acts of Pilate existed among the Quartodecimans, a sect which originated at the close of the third century. We are informed by Eusebius that the heathens forged certain copies of their Acts, lords of which they again present to Christ, which they procured (A.D. 808) to be dispersed through the empire; and that it was enjoined on schoolmasters to put them into the hands of children, who were to learn them by heart instead of their lessons. But the character of the Gospel of Nicodemus, which contains no blasphemy of the kind, forbids us to identify it with these Acts. This gospel probably had its origin in a later age. From the circumstance of its containing the names of Lenthis and Charinus, Mr. Jones conceives it to have been the work of the celebrated Fabricator of Gospels, Lucius Charisius, who flourished in the beginning of the 4th century. It is certainly not later than the 5th or 6th. "During the persecution under Maximin," says Gieseler (Eccles. Hist. vol. i. § 24, note), "the heathens first brought forward certain calumnious Acts of Pilate (Euseb. ix. 5), to which the name of the Greek Church (Ephrain, Hist. 24, § 10), which were afterwards in various ways amended. One of these improved versions was afterwards called the Gospel of Nicodemus." See Acts of Pilate.

Beaumarchais supposed that the latter part of the book (the descent into hell) was taken from the Gospel of Pilate. Fabricius (Eccles. Hist. 24, § 10), and the character of the so-called "Codex Apocryphon" (see Bezae) thinks that it is the work of a Jewish Christian, but it is uncertain whether it was originally written in Hebrew, Greek, or Latin. The only Greek writer who cites it is the author of the Synagoge, and the first of the Latins who uses it is the celebrated Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. i. 20, 23).

The Gospel of Nicodemus (in Latin) was one of the earliest books printed, and there are subsequent editions in 1490, 1516, 1522, and 1588, and in 1658 in the Orthodoxorographia of Grynaeus. It was afterwards published by Fabricius (Eccles. Hist. 24, § 10), and divided it into chapters. Fabricius gives us no information respecting the age or character of his MS., which is extremely defective and inaccurate. Mr. Jones republished this, with an English version.

The Greek Gospel of Nicodemus was first published from an incorrect Paris MS. by Birch (Auctorarium), and subsequently from a collection of several valuable manuscripts, the most ancient of which are of the 12th century, by Thilo, with the Latin text of the very ancient MS. at Einsiedel, described by Gerbert in his Iter Alemannicum, for conversion (1821). The text of this Greek work, uncorrected, comprises an important portion of the composition of the canonical Gospel of Matthew. Baronius, Grotius, father Simon, and Du Pin lock upon the 6th century, and consequently that this gospel is extremely useful in a critical point of view.

The esteem in which this work was held in the Middle Ages may be seen from the number of early versions which were in popular use, of which innumerable MSS. have descended to our times. The earliest of these is the Latin version, known as the "Sermones in Egitto," in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, in 1698, from a Cambridge MS. (Talbot's Hepaticus). This is a translation from the Latin, as none of the Greek MSS. contain Pilate's letter to Claudius. There are also MSS. of the same in the Bodleian and Canterbury libraries. That in the Bodleian is divided into five books, that in the Canterbury MSS. of the English version in the Bodleian, one in Sion College, and one in English verse in Pepys's collection. It was also translated by Wicliffe; and there were versions printed in London, in 1507 and 1509, by Julianus and Wypshyn of Werke, which ran through several editions (Pantaleon's Annals). The latest published before Mr. Jones's work was by Joseph Wilson in 1797. He says nothing of the age of his MS., but the following specimen from the prologue may not prove uninteresting: "It beft in the 18th year of the reign of the emperor Trajan, the grandson of the emperor Titus, and the son of Hadrian, who was king of Galilee, the 8th kalend. of April, which is the 25th day of March, the fourth year of the son of Vellum, who was counselor of Rome, and Olympias had been afore two hundred years and two; at this time Joseph and Annaes were in Egypt. The emperor Trajan, according to the command of the emperor Nigidemus, who was a worthy prince, did write this blessed history in Hebrew, and Theodosius the emperor did translate it out of Hebrew into Latin, and bishop Turpin did translate it out of Latin into French, and hereafter did ensue the blessed history called the Gospel of Nicodemus." The regard, indeed, in which this book was held in England will be understood from the fact that, in 1524, Erasmus acquaints us that he saw the Gospel of Nicodemus affixed to one of the columns of the cathedral of Canterbury.

Translations were also common in French, Italian, German, and Swedish. In the French MSS., and editions, it is united with the old romance of Perseforest, King of Great Britain. There was also a Welsh translation (Lloyd's Archaeologia, p. 256), and the work was known to the Eastern Christians, and has been even supposed to have been cited in the New Testament, but this has been shown by Ludolf to be a mistake, as the lesson is from the history of Nicodemus, in John iii (see Brunn, De indol. et atae et univ. Evang. Nexc. Brdl. 1794; Tischendorf, Pilati circa Chr. judicid quod in us afferetur ex Acta Pilati, Lips. 1865). See Nicodemus.
it as the Gospel of Matthew—interpolated, however, by the Nazarenes. Baroinus and Grégoire think that it was cited by Ignatius, or the author of the epistles ascribed to him. Others look upon it as a translation altered from the Greek of Matthew. Mr. Jones thinks that this gospel was referred to by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians. It is referred to by Hegesippus (Consecratio Eclesiae, Hist. iv, 22), Clement (Strom. ii, p. 280), Origen, Comm. on John; Hom. viii in Malabath, and Eusebius (Hist. Ecles. iii, 25, 27, 89). Epiphanius (Hær. § 29, 30) informs us that it was held in great repute by the ancient Judaizing Christians, and Eusebius states that it came to be used by the days of Herod, king of Judaea, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan,” etc. It consequently wanted the genealogy and the first two chapters.

2. The Gospel of the Egyptians is cited by Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. iii, p. 445, 452, 453, 465), Origen (Hom. in Luc. p. 1), Ambrose, Jerome (Pref. to his Comm. on Matt.), and Epiphanius (Hær. Ixxii, § 2). Grabe, Mill, Du Pin, and father Simon, who thought highly of this gospel, looked upon it as one of the works referred to by Luke in the commencement of his gospel. Mill ascribes it to the Essenes, and supposes this and the former gospel to have been composed in or a little before A.D. 58. It is cited by the Pseudo-Clement (Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Chevalier’s translation, 1883), who is generally supposed to have written before the 3d century.

III. Literature.—See Car. Chr. Schmidt’s Corpus omnium vet. Apocr. extra Biblia; Kleuker, De Apocryph. N. Test. (Hamburg, 1798); Birch’s Acta Aegyptiorum, fasc. 1 (Haen. 1804); Cave, Hist. Lit.; Oudin, Script. Ecle.; Ant. v. Dale, De orig. idolol. p. 252 sqq.; Vitringa, Intro. in N. Test. p. 6, 58; Mosheim, Dissert, ad Hist. Ecle. spect. i, 217; Nitzsch, De apocryph. Evang. (Viteb. 1806); Tischendorf, De Ecle. apocr. origine et usu (Hag. 1831); Reuss, Gesch. der H. S. neuen Test. § 258 sqq.; Hofmann, Das Leben Jesu nach den Apocryphen (Lips. 1851). A list of most of these apocryphal addenda to the N. Test. may be seen in Toland’s Aemontor (1699); and a fuller list in Toland’s reply to Dr. Blackhall’s (bishop of Exeter) attack on the Aemontor, found in De Maizena’s edition of Toland’s Miscellaneous (posthumous. Lps. 1843), London, 1803, 3 vols. 4to. Most of these apocryphal fragments were collected and published by Fabricius in his Codex Apocryphi Novi Testamenti (8 vols. 8vo, Hamb. 1719-48). This work, with additions by other authors, was republished by Dr. Giles (London, 1852). English translations of some of these apocrypha are now hardly forgone sights in the works of Jones, Lardner, Whiston, Cotton, and Laurence. Hone’s Apocryphal N. T. (London, 1820) contains a translation of many of them. Other collections (in the original languages), more or less complete, have been made by Græbe (Sched. Patrum et Heret. sec. i-iii, Oxon. 1689), Schmid (Corpus Apocryphi extra Biblia, Had. 1804), and especially Thilo (Cod. Apoc. N. Test. coll. et illustr. Lps. 1832, vol. i). Still later, Tischendorf has edited (in some cases for the first time published) the following apocryphal gospels (Evangelica Apocryphala. Lps. 1848, 2 vols. 8vo) (Pseudo-Matthaei’s Gospel (Gr.)), “Pseudo-Matthew’s Gospel” (Lat.); “Gospel of the Mativity of Mary” (Lat.); “History of Joseph the Carpenter” (Latin, from the Arabic); “Gospel of Thomas” (Greek A.); “Gospel of Thomas” (Greek B.); “Gospel of Thomas” (Lat.); “Gospel of the Infancy of Christ” (Lat.); “Gospel of Pilate” (Greek); “Gospel of Pilate” (Greek A.); “Deeds of Pilate” (Gr. B.); “Descent of Christ into hell” (Latin A.); “First Epistle of Pilate” (Gr. A.); “Second Epistle of Pilate” (Gr. B.); “Ananphora of Pilate” (Gr. C.); “Paradoxa of Pilate” (Gr. D.); “Death of Pilate” (Gr. E.); “Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea” (Gr. F.); “Defence of the Saviour” (Lat.). See also H. Cowper, The Apocryphal Gospels, etc., translated, with notes, etc. (Lips. 1867, 8vo); A. Hilgenfeld, Nos. Testam. extra canones, embracing the apocryphal gospels, epistles, etc., with notes, etc. (Lips. 1866 sqq.). See APOCRYPHA.

Göschele. See GÖRSEL.

Gospel (from “God” and “sak,” a Saxon word signifying “kindred”), a name given in England to sponsors as bearing a spiritual relationship to the children for whom they stand. —Procter, On Common Prayer, p. 361.

Goßner, Johannes Evangelista, a prominent divine of the Evangelical Church of Germany, was born in 1773, of Roman Catholic parents, at Hausen, near Augsburg. He studied at Dillingen under Salier (q. v.) and Zimmer, entered in 1798 the College of Innsbruck, and was appointed chaplain. The profoundly evangelical convictions which he had already had for several years were strengthened by personal intercourse and correspondence with Martin Boos (q. v.), and they were certainly not weakened by persecutions from ultramontane zealots. He was appointed parish priest at Dirlewang, which position he resigned in 1811 in order to accept a small benefice at Munich, which allowed him greater liberty in his evangelical and literary labors. Having been deposed in 1817 on account of his evangelical views, he was in 1819 appointed professor at the gymnasium of Düsseldorf. From 1820 to 1824 he was pastor of a German congregation in St. Petersburg; in 1826 he openly joined the Evangelical Church; in 1827 he became pastor of the Bethlehem church at Berlin. He died March 29, 1858. He wrote a great deal to the last. At seventy he learned English, and translated some of Ryle’s tracts when he was upwards of eighty. His writings, numbering (exclusive of many posthumous works) forty-six, occupy the press of a separate book and tract society. They enjoy unusual popularity, some having run through annual and semi-annual editions for many years. Among the best known of his works are the Schutzhützen (1824) and Goldkörner (1859). Up to the spring of 1858 he corrected proofs and continued his correspondence. The summer previous he was still able to train his vines. He established a missionary society, which during his lifetime sent out more than 140 missionaries. His life was, like the life of Abraham, one of wonderful faith. From humble little Hausen and the unnoticed struggles of a country priest, he rose to be the Father Goßner of a reverent, religious Germany. The story is well told in a little work which was published by the Carters, of New York.—Bismarck-Hollweg, J. Goßner, (Berlin, 1858); see also Prochnow, J. Goßner, Biographie aus Togbächern u. Briefen (Berlin 1868-9, 2 vols.); Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, xix, 572. (A. J. S.)

Gotama, a Hindu philosopher, the exact time of whose life is not known. The Indians consider him as the author of the philosophical system which, under the name of Nyaya (logic), is still in use among them. All we know of him is derived from the mythical tradition contained in the Ramayana and the Puranas. According to this legend, Gotama was born in Mount Himalaya, and for a long time lived as a hermit in the woods; he then married Ahalya, one of the daughters of Brahma, but subsequently divorced her for having been led astray by Indra. He spent the remainder of his life in prayer and ascetic practices, and when he died his body was cremated and all that had commented on, and which together form the Nyaya. The work in which his system is expounded has been published, for the use of the Indian schools, under the title Nyaya extra vritti (The logical Apokryphs of Go- tama), with a Commentary by Vijnanavachas or Phalancha or Go- tama, published under the authority of the Committee of Public Instruction, Calcutta, 1828, 8vo. The book is
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divided into five parts: the first and most important contains the dogmatic exposition of the doctrine of the Nyaya. The author proceeds by axioms, of which there are sixty in his first part. He distinguishes sixteen points in the art of reasoning, the first nine teaching to discern truths, and the last seven to detect and against objections. He begins by pointing out the general sources of certainty, of which he recognizes four: perception, induction, comparison, and divine or human testimony. He next inquires into the objects of certainty, i.e., the objects presented to human knowledge and recognized as such. Each of these objects can be considered in different ways, and they can all be brought down to one—the knowledge of man and of his destiny. After having thus established his general dialectic principles, Gotama proceeds to their application. His third point is doubt: when anything has been presented to our knowledge by one of the above-named sources of certainty, we must first doubt it, and only affirm its truth after thorough investigation. Affirmation is the fourth point. After a thing is affirmed it has yet to be proved, and first of all the axioms form the foundation of this framework. When once the illustrative example is found, the object of the demonstration has to be stated: this is the sixth point. The seventh is the enumeration of the five members of the demonstration. Colebrooke gives the following illustration of this process of argumentation, in an attempt to think in the manner of the Nyaya system's syllogism: 1. proposition, This mountain is burning; 2. reason, for it smokes; 3. explanation, whatever smoke is burning, as, for instance, a kitchen fire; 4. application, and the mountain smokes; 5. conclusion, hence it is burning. The eighth point, which is called reductio ad absurdum by Colebrooke, and raisonement supposé by Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, is a sort of confirmation of the argument. Finally, the ninth point is the definitive conclusion, the absolute affirmation which closes the argument. The last seven points treat of all the objections which can be opposed to a demonstrated fact. These objections are sophisms, and be who uses them will necessarily be overthrown by his opponent if the latter follows strictly the rules laid down in the Nyaya. As for the defender of truth, Gotama promises him not only the pleasure of defeating his adversary, but also everlasting happiness. This line of thought of the first part of the Nyaya will suffice to show how inadequate the system of the Indian philosopher is as an analysis of the operations of the human mind. Still there is much to be admired in the doctrine of the Nyaya. The method was an immense progress for India, and as such deserves a high place in the history of philosophy. It would deserve a still higher one if it had, as was advanced by Sir William Jones, served as a model for the Organon, and if the fifth point of Gotama had been the origin of Aristotle's syllogism. Jones maintained, on the strength of a more than doubtful tradition, that Callisthenes gathered during Alexander's expedition a number of details on Indian doctrines, and afterwards transmitted them to Aristotle. According to him the logic of the latter would be but a development of Gotama's system. This strange assertion is completely disproved by Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, who has shown that there is no relation between the Nyaya and the Organon, and that those who spoke of their resemblance must have been acquainted with each. His conclusion is that the Greek system owes nothing to the Indian. But might not the question be reversed so as to inquire whether the Indian system may not to some extent be derived from the Greek? Greek civilization hovered over centuries near the Indus and Himalaya. The Greek kingdoms of Bactria appear to have exerted great influence over the poetry of India; may they not also have had some influence over its philosophical systems? And may not the Nyaya in particular, which differs so much in its analytical process from the other Indian systems, owe its peculiarities to the influence of Greece? These are questions which it has so far been impossible to solve, since none has yet been able to find out the dates of the various Indian systems. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire believes the Nyaya older than the Organon, but admits that it is only authentically named in works posterior to the Christian era. See Sir William Jones, Arist., Research.; Ward, View of the History, Literature, and Mythology of the Hindoos; Colebrooke, in the Transact. of the As. Soc. of Gt. Britain and Ireland, 1823, i. 76, and Misc. Essays, vol. i.; Windischmann, Die Philosophie, bei den Aryanern, et. al., 1. p. 1204; Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, in the Mém. de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques, iii., 184; Journ. des Savants, April and June, 1855; Dict. des Sciences philos. art. Gotama, Nyaya, Philosophie indienne; Ritter, Gesck. der Philosophie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gén. xxxr, 258; Bi- gandet (Rom. Cath. bishop), The Life or Legend of Gom- dama (Kangoon, 1866, 8vo).

Gothic Architecture, the style of architecture that prevailed in central and western Europe from the middle of the 12th till the 16th century, being preceded by the Romanesque (q. v.), and followed by the Renaissance style (q. v.). Under the influence of the revival of taste for classic art, the Renaissance architects applied the name Gothic, meaning thereby barbaric, to the styles of architecture that were developed north of the Alps during the Middle Ages. The name Gothic is now limited by critics of all nations to the architecture of the period above indicated.

In the extraordinary activity that pervaded every department of social, industrial, intellectual, and religious life during the 12th century, many churches were founded upon a scale of grandeur and magnificence which, with the exception of a few isolated cases (as the Santa Sophia, q. v.), was entirely unprecedented in the history of Christianity. These churches embodies, in the style and spirit of their architecture, and the grand scale upon which they were projected, more of the sublime aspiration of the Christian faith, of confidence in its endurance, and love and sacrifice in its behalf, than do the churches of any other period. Many elements of the Gothic architecture had been developed during the classic, Byzantine, and Romanesque periods; others were taken from the Saracen architecture; and others still were developed within the Gothic itself. The typical features of the Gothic architecture are: the universal use of the pointed arch (Fig. 1); a general tendency to vertical lines;
are sustained against lateral thrust by prominent buttresses and by flying-buttresses (Fig. 5); the ornamentation is conventionalized from various forms of foliage, and is distributed freely over all prominent parts of the building, being thrown in great profusion over the façades, and especially around the main entrances; the towers are square at the base, octagonal above, and terminate in lofty spires, which are richly decorated with ornament; the plan is cruciform, the apsis being replaced by a choir, which is surrounded by a row of chapels (Fig. 6).

While these are the typical features of the Gothic architecture, great variety prevailed in their adaptation in the different periods of the style, and in the various lands where it was employed.

Gothic architecture owes its character mainly to the adoption of the pointed arch. There is no longer a
discussion as to the origin or the invention of the pointed arch, as it is to be found occasionally in all the most ancient styles of architecture, as the Egyptian, the early Greek, the Etruscan, and the Roman. It is found in the court of a monastery in Sicily, which was built in the 6th century after Christ. It was adopted in Saracenic edifices in Cairo as early as the 9th century. Probably a knowledge of its effects in architecture was brought to Europe from the Orient by the Crusaders, though the production of the pointed arch by the crossing of round arches in the external ornamentation of Romanesque churches could not have escaped the notice of architects. The contest for supremacy of the pointed over the round arch lasted a long time, the two being often employed in different parts of the same edifice. The earliest church in which the pointed arch only was adopted is the cathedral of St. Denis, founded 1144. The Gothic style, being thus fully developed, spread rapidly over the Ile de France, Normandy, England, Spain, and the countries bordering on the Rhine. A large number of the most magnificent churches in the world were founded between 1150 and 1250, and thus the new style had immediate opportunity for full development. (Fig. 7.)

Three chief periods are usually marked in the history of Gothic architecture. During the first (1144–1280), called by English writers the "early English" period, the general effect of the style was very grand, though rather severe. The ornamentation was rather meagre, and sculpture was used rather sparingly on exteriors. During the second period (1280–1380), termed by many writers the "decorated" or "complete Gothic" period, greater freedom and lightness were introduced into all the ornamentation, without diminishing the boldness of the general effect. The windows were enlarged and filled with rich flowing tracery. The third, usually termed the "perpendicular" period (1380–1550), and extending till the revival of classic architecture, was marked by a general decadence of style, and finally by a loss of all true Gothic spirit. The arches were depressed; beauty of outline disappeared from the mouldings; a minuteness, and finally a triviality, was introduced into all the ornamentation. The rapid decadence of the style was contemporaneous with the revival of taste for ancient classic art. In less than a century it was banished from all the countries where it had held sole dominion for nearly four centuries.

The Gothic churches in France are distinguished for the magnificence of their façades and the grandeur of their interiors. As the true object of a church is to have a good interior, the French Gothic churches are to be esteemed superior to those of any other land. The cathedral at Rheims (Fig. 8) is esteemed the finest Gothic church in existence. The other most important churches are the cathedrals of Paris, Amiens, Rouen, Dijon, Chartres, Beauvais, etc. In the cathedral at Paris (Notre Dame), and in some other French Gothic churches, there is a greater tendency to horizontalism in the lines of the exterior than is found in the English or German Gothic.
The English Gothic cathedrals surpass those of all other lands in the varied combinations of striking effects in the exteriors. The windows often overpower the doors and other features of the façade, and the nave is usually too long and narrow for fine effect. The plan is frequently rectangular, and is sometimes crossed by two transepts. The finest examples of English Gothic are the cathedrals of York (Fig. 9), Salisbury, Canterbury, Lincoln, Peterborough, and the Westminster Abbey. The richest interior in English churches is that of Henry’s chapel in the Westminster Abbey. The grandeur of the effect of this interior is diminished, however, by the minuteness of the ornamentation.

In the German Gothic churches the spires are more beautifully wrought, and are more harmoniously joined to the towers than in the churches of any other country. The spires of the cathedrals of Freiburg and of Vienna are considered the finest in the world. The round choir, with a row of chapels, that prevails in the plans of most French Gothic churches, is generally adopted. The cathedral of Cologne (founded 1248) is the largest Gothic church ever erected. Its towers are now (1869) being finished. When they are completed, this edifice will be the most glorious work of ecclesiastical architecture ever erected. The style is somewhat affected by the too great minuteness of the detail. The harmonious perpendicular tendency of the lines is unexampled in any other edifice (Fig. 10). The other chief Gothic churches of Germany are the cathedrals of Strasburg, Freiburg, Ulm, Vienna, Magdeburg, Meissen.

The Spanish surpassed the French, English, or German Gothic in the varied richness of outline; but there were frequently too many horizontal lines in the interior as well as the exterior, and the ornament was often overlaid. The cathedral of Burgos (Fig. 11), begun in 1224 and finished in 1567, is marked by a
prodigality of external ornamentation. But, with all this richness, there is a lack of repose and of lightness in the general effect. Other important Gothic churches in Spain are the cathedrals of Oviedo, Toledo, Barcelona, Oviedo, Leon, and Valencia. The influence of the Moorish architecture is visible in many of the Gothic churches in Spain. There are several excellent examples of the Gothic architecture in Portugal, as the cloister church in Batalha and the church in Belem. The entrance to the mausoleum of Manoel, in the church of Batalha, is one of the most gorgeous specimens of Moor-Gothic architecture.

In Scotland, Belgium, and Holland, Gothic architecture took the general characteristics of this style in the adjacent countries of England, France, and Germany. The cathedral of Antwerp is remarkable for the beauty of some of the details of the interior. On the other hand, the violations of constructive and aesthetic laws, both in the interior and in the exterior, are striking proofs of the decadence of artistic feeling during the latter part of the history of Gothic architecture. In Scandinavia, also, Gothic architecture is marked by the development of few, if any, native elements. The cathedral of Upsala is essentially a French, and that of Drontheim an English edifice. The interior of the latter is marked by a number of exceedingly picturesque effects.

Gothic architecture was never fully naturalized in Italy. The traditions of classical and basilican architecture in favor of round arches and horizontal lines overpowered the Gothic tendency to perpendicular lines. The predilection for paintings on walls prevented the adoption of glass-painting in the windows. Towers surmounted by spires were replaced by campaniles adjacent to the church. Marble of two colors is usually employed in the exteriors, and mosaic paintings frequently replace sculpture in the facades. The fronts, though very impressive in themselves, are
often false, not representing the true size of the church. The finest examples are the cathedrals of Sienna (Fig. 12), Orvieto, Florence, Perugia, and Milan. The cathedral at Milan has a magnificent interior, and its roof is covered by a forest of statuary and turrets. The tower of the cathedral of Florence, designed by Giotto, is the most beautiful ever erected. Its cost was over $5,000,000.

It is a mistake to consider Gothic architecture to be adapted only to ecclesiastical edifices. During the Middle Ages this style was applied with marked effect to edifices of all kinds—to castles and fortified gates of cities, as well as to city halls, courts of justice, and palatial residences.

As to the material employed in the erection of Gothic edifices, stone was generally used. In Italy especially, the finest marbles were often employed. With marble of two colors very pleasant variations of surface effects were produced, many of which were inconsistent with the extensive use of buttresses and flying buttresses that were so generally introduced in the Gothic edifices north of the Alps. Brick was also employed with excellent success in the erection of Gothic edifices, both ecclesiastical, civil, and domestic; this was especially the case in North Germany. Fine contrasts of surface color also were produced in North Italy by the alternation of brick and colored marble.

But few Gothic churches have been completed, and in fewer yet has the original design been carried out. At least one, and sometimes both spires are generally lacking. This incompleteness or defect in design is often copied in modern Gothic churches, frequently producing very absurd effects.

With all its beauty and even grandeur, Gothic architecture has some features that make its adoption in modern, and especially in Protestant church edifices, a most dangerous experiment. The pillars are apt to obstruct the view and sound. The clerestory is so high that it often detracts from the harmony of the interior, while its ornamentation is also lost to the view; high pointed ceiling is apt to produce an echo; and the churches are very difficult to heat. But the great error in modern Gothic edifices is the indiscriminate copying of unfinished churches, built in the age of decadence of Gothic architecture. See Kugler, Geschichteder Baukunst; Lübke, Geschichte der Baukunst; Ferguson, Styles of Architecture; Hugues, Course and Current of Architecture; Pugin, Gothic Ornaments; Viollet-le-Duc, Dictionnaire de l'Architecture Française; Street, Gothic Architecture in Spain. (G. F. C.)

Gothic Version of the Bible. The Mosso-Goths were a German tribe which settled on the borders of the Greek empire, and their language is essentially a German dialect. Their version of the Bible was made by Ulphius, in the fourth century, after Greek MSS. in the N. T., and after the Septuagint in the Old. The author is generally regarded as an Ariian; but his peculiar doctrinal sentiments do not seem to have influenced his translation. Of the O.-T. portion, nothing but a fragment of Nehemiah has been printed, although parts of other books have been discovered. A great part of the New has been published at different times in fragments. The four gospels ex-
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In the very celebrated MS. called the Codex Argenteus, now preserved in the library of the university at Upsal, Sweden, are contained by Dr. E. D. Clarke and Zahn. See Argent. Codex. This MS., however, has considerable chasms. The gospels have been several times printed from it, but not very correctly. The ed. of Uppström is the most exact and beautiful (1854). Bosworth has lately published, in the Berol. saxon gospels together (Lond. 1866). Knittel described fragments of Paul's Epistle to the Romans in a codex rescriptus belonging to the Wolfenbüttel library, which he published in 1762, 4to, and which were re-published by Zahn in the complete edition of the Gospels issued in 1817. The Gospels of the Codex'described important parts of the Greek version among five codices rescripti in the Ambrosian library at Milan. They contain, for the most part, the Pauline Epistles, with the exception of that to the Hebrews and two fragments of Matthew. Various portions were printed by Mai, in conjunction with Castellionus, in 1819. In 1829 the latter published the fragments of Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians. In 1834 fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, the First to the Corinthians, and that to the Ephesians; and in 1855, the fragments of the First to the Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and the First to the Thessalonians. In 1839 the same scholar published the fragments of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. These were all combined in the edition by Gobellants and Loebi 2 vols. 1836, 1847. See also the works of Neander, Plummer, and Deissmann.

Gotho(n)ion (Γόθονιος), father of Jostis, who latter was one of the "sons of Elam" who returned from Babylon with Ezra (1 Esd. viii, 33); the same as Athalith (q. v.), of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 7).

Gothoni(é)l (Γοθονίλε), father of Chabris, who was one of the governors (ἀρχοντας) of the city of Bethulia (Judith vii, 15).

Goths, the, appeared in the countries of the Lower Danube, the former seat of the Gete, in the 3d century A.D. Yet from this we are not to infer that the former drove away and replaced the latter, but, on the contrary, they are to be considered as one and the same people, as has been shown by J. Grimm (Gracc. d. deutsch. Sprache, 2 vols. ed. Leipz. 1838). This consideration sheds an important light on a period in the history of the Goths, whose migrations have been involved in deep obscurity, and gives us an insight into their deeply-rooted predisposition to embrace Christianity. The mighty confederacy of the Gete, founded by Berebites, was dissolved even before the end of the 3d century; and before the end of that year there were two distinct nations, the one called the Nicene party; the latter also prevented the assembling of another council promised to the former for 388. Religious divisions among the Goths afterwards permitted Chrysostom to attempt uniting the sectarians on the Nicene basis; but he was thwarted by the influence of the dispersed tribes of the Roman empire in the provinces of the Lower Danube about the first century A.D. and from them sprung a new nation, composed of these different tribes again united, which, under the name of Goths, appeared during the reign of Caracalla, in the beginning of the 3d century A.D. Their unity emboldened them to attack the Roman empire; and in the reign of Alex. Severus we already find them receiving tribute to preserve the peace, and the issue of the struggle with Decius led to new invasions. Commodian, the Christian apostle of the triumphant faith, in his letter to the emperor, attributed the justice and advantages of Christianity to the Goths. The Visigoths, under Alaric, invaded the countries south of the Danube to the Peloponnesus, destroying the temples and altars of the heathen gods; the sacking of Eresus put an end to the famed mysteries of the Pythian games; and after the death of Alaric, 406, the last of the Visigoths fell before the host of Attila. The Gothic nation was thus extirpated.
the city, with the exception of the Christian churches, sparing only such of the inhabitants as had taken refuge in them. After Alaric's death, his brother-in-law Athaulf succeeded him; and, having married Gallia Placidia, daughter of Theodosius the Great (in which marriage some saw a fulfillment of Dan. ii. 92), he attempted to return to Ravenna, desiring to recover the Gothic help. Finally, the Visigoths were rewarded for conquering Spain to Rome by permanent possessions in Gaul, where they founded an independent empire. See VISIGOTHS. The Ostrogoths settled for a while in Spain, where they found a hospitable people and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).

—HERDOT, Resid-Encyclopedia, v. 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, Leauy mein young men occupied their time in study and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).

—HERDOT, Resid-Encyclopedia, v. 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, Leauy mein young men occupied their time in study and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).

—HERDOT, Resid-Encyclopedia, v. 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, Leauy mein young men occupied their time in study and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).

—HERDOT, Resid-Encyclopedia, v. 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, Leauy mein young men occupied their time in study and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).

—HERDOT, Resid-Encyclopedia, v. 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, Leauy mein young men occupied their time in study and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).

—HERDOT, Resid-Encyclopedia, v. 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, Leauy mein young men occupied their time in study and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).

—HERDOT, Resid-Encyclopedia, v. 251 sq.; Dr. J. Aschbach, Leauy mein young men occupied their time in study and the Visigoths in Gaul, while the greater part followed Theodosius into the Eastern empire. The emperor Zenra finally induced them to retreat, to Italy, where Theodoric, in 498, founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see that art.).
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in attending to all the duties of his pastoral charge, and, by the smallest abilities and accomplishments that distinguished and adorned his character, he possessed great and extensive influence among his clerical brethren, as well as in general society. "The virtue, however, which above all others shone brightest in him," says archbishop Tillotson, "and was his reigning attribute, was that of meekness, with the plain, silent, and unobtrusive zeal in acts of pious charity. In this he left behind him all that ever I knew, and had a singular sagacity and prudence in devising the most effectual ways of doing good. For the last nine or ten years of his life, he did almost wholly apply his charity to Wales, because there he judged there was most occasion for it; he did not only lay out whatever he could spare out of his own estate, but employed his whole time and pains to excite and engage the charity of others for assisting him in it. By the large and bountiful contributions thus obtained, to which, among his writings, are, his own income (amounting to £200 a year), there were every year 800, and sometimes 1000 poor children educated by his means; and by this example several of the most considerable towns in Wales were excited to bring up, at their own charge, the like number of poor children. To this care, in 1688, was added the care and instruction. But which was the greatest work of all, and amounted indeed to a mighty charge, he procured a new and very fair impression of the Bible, and the liturgy of the Church of England, in the Welsh tongue, to the number of 9000; the former impression being the holy scripture of the Church of England, he had in all London. This was a work of such a charge that it was not likely to have been done in any other way. And always, but usually twice a year, he travelled over a great part of Wales, none of the easiest countries to travel in; but for the love of God and man he cheerfully endured all privations, so that, all things considered, there have not, since the primitive times of Christianity, been any among the sons of men to whom that glorious character of the Son of God might be better applied, that he 'went about doing good.'" He died October 29, 1681. Among his writings are the Principles of Religion (1679); Young Man's Guide to Heaven (1681), and other practical treatises. His Works are collected in one vol. 8vo, with a sketch of his life and Tillotson's funeral sermon at his burial (Lond. 1706). His sermon on The Surest and Swiftest Way of Throwing with a Stone (1685) is a sketch of the life of this great man. Sir R. Blinney (Lond. 12mo.—Jamieson. Cyclop. of Biography. p. 2:0; Tillotson, Works, i, 265 sq.; Neal, History of the Puritans, ii, 233; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 710.

Gouge, William, D.D., an eminent Puritan divine, was born in Bow in 1675, and educated at Eton and Cambridge. He entered the ministry at the age of thirty-one, and was minister of St. Ann's, Blackfriars, London, for forty-five years. He was esteemed as the father of the London ministers, and the spiritual oracle of his time. In 1648 he was called to be a member of the Assembly of Divines, and was in such reputation that in the moderator's absence he frequently filled the chair. He was appointed one of the annotators on the Scriptures, and performed, as his part, from the beginning of 1 Kings to the book of Job, in a manner that gained high approbation. He also published several works, the principal of which are: Domestical Duties, and The Whole Armor of God; The Lord's Prayer Explained; and all to be found in his Works, revised and enlarged (Lond. 1696, fol.).—a learned and very useful Commentary on the Hebræus (Lond. 1656, 2 vols. fol.), containing a thousand of his Wednesday lectures. He died December 12, 1658.—Neal, History of the Puritans, ii, 611; Darlington, Cyclop. Bibl. a. r.; Middleton, Essays of Mr. Darlington, 267; Life by his Son, prefixed to his Works (1665).

Goulart, Simon, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Sens, October 20, 1540. He embraced the Reformation in 1545, went to study theology at Geneva in 1566, and was consecrated pastor on the 90th of October of the same year. He obtained at once charge of a rural congregation, and in 1571 became a pastor of the parish of St. Jérome, Geneva. Here his plain speaking brought him repeatedly into troubles with the civil authorities, yet he remained at Geneva notwithstanding numerous calls from other places. After the death of Beza (January 2, 1607), the pastors chose him for their president, but he resigned that office December 18, 1612. He died at Geneva, February 8, 1626. Goulart was a very prolific writer, both of original and translated works. Among his scores of publications we name: Imitations chrétienennes, etc. (1574, 8vo);—Expositio verisimilis et succincta de rebus super nobis gestis inter Allodiorum regulam et Helvetiae regis Gulharum carissimis copiae (1589, 4to);—Vingti Dixme canoniques touchant l'estat du monde et de l'Eglise de Dieu (1591, 16mo);—Apophthegmatum sacrorum. Loci communes, ex sacris, ecclesiasticis et secularibus libris collecta (Geneva, 1592, 8vo);—French transl. Gen. 1604, 12mo);—Vræ Discours de la miraculeuse délitérature enlevée de Dieu à la ville de Genève, au manoir, etc. (Paris, 1604, 4to);—Recueil de la vie de Paul l'Ecreviseur de l'Eglise (Lyon, 1659, 12mo; English, London, 1621, 4to);—Quarantäux Tableaux de la mort repréentées (last ed. Lyon, 1606, 12mo; German, Cassel, 1606);—Considérations de la Conscience humaine (Gen. 1607, 8vo);—Considérations sur divers articles de la doctrine chrétienne (Gen. 1610, 4to);—Considération de la doclrine de l'Incarnation (Gen. 1621, 8vo);—Consideration de la doctrine de Dieu, etc. (Gen. 1623, 8vo);—Recueil des choses mémorables advenues sous la Ligue, etc. (Gen. 1637-80, 3 vols. 8vo);—last ed. by abbé Goujet, under the title Mémoires de la Ligue sous Henri III et IV, etc. (Amst. 1734, 4 vols. 4to). He also edited a number of authors, ancient and modern, with annotations, and translated numerous works on history and theology. Some of his letters were published in the Épistres francois des personnages illustres et doctes à J. J. de la Salle, mène en lumière par Jacques de Rioux (Paris, 1627, 8vo).—S. Goulart's Syllabex, in Ecclesia Generum pastoris, etc. (Gen. 1628, 4to);—Bayle, Dict. Hist.; Nicéon, Mémoires, xxix, 863-874; Senebier, Hist. litt. de Genève; Haag, La France Protestant; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 1830, 246.

Goulart, Simon, a Swiss Protestant theologian (son of the preceding), was born at Geneva about 1576. He was at first pastor of the French Protestant church at Wesel, and in 1601 was called to Amsterdam to take charge of the Wallon church. Being a zealous Arminian, he engaged in a controversy with his colleagues, and was accused of heresy, and in 1618 the Remonstrants chose him as one of their defenders at the Synod of Dort. He was, however, forbidden to appear, as being under interdiction. When the Arminian ministers were banished in 1619, he followed Episcopius to Antwerp. When hostilities were renewed between Holland and Spain he went to Calais. In 1628 he was accused of conspiring against the prince of Orange, but was proved innocent and the next year removed to Friedrichstadt, where a large number of Remonstrants had sought refuge. He died there March 19, 1628. He wrote, Brief Traité de la grâce de Dieu envers les hommes et de l'éternelle élection des fidèles et réputation des indifférents (Amst. 1616, 8vo);—Érasmien des opinions de M. François Rosescourt, comme dans un livre de disputé intitulé L'élection éternelle et ses dé-
It has also been called Pentadactyles and Palma Christi, from the palmate division of its leaves. It was known at much earlier times, as Hippocrates employed it in medicine; and Herodotus mentions it by the name of alκαντος (II. 91) when speaking of Egypt: "The inhabitants of the marshy grounds make use of an oil which they term κίκι, expressed from the Silli-
cyprian plant." That it has been known there from the earliest times is evident from Caillaud having found castor-oil seeds in some very ancient sarcophagi. That the Arabs considered their kherw to be the same plant is evident from Avicenna on this article, or kηλραβ of the translation of Plinius (p. 801); so Serapion (iii. c. 79). But most decisive of all seems the derivation of the Hebrew word from the Egyptian κικί (Herodot. ii, 94; comp. Bähr, ad loc.; and Jablon-
sky, Opusc. p. 1, p. 110), established by Celsius, with whose arguments Michaelis declares himself entirely satisfied (J. D. Mich. Suppelm.). and confirmed by the Talmudical פֶּתַדַּכְּל (Peta
dacle), prepared from the seeds of the ricinus (Buxtorf, Lex. Chalda. Talmud. col. 2029), and Dioscorides, iv, 164, where αρχαν (Palma Christi) is described under the name of αρχαν, and the oil made from its seeds is called αρχανίας (Rosenmuller, p. 127). Lady Calcott states that the mod-
ern Jews of London use this oil, by the name of oil of κικί, for their Sabbath lamps, it being one of the five kinds of oil which their traditions allow them to em-
ploy. The castor-oil plant attains a considerable size in one season; and though in Europe it is only known as an herb, in India it frequently may be seen, especially at the margins of fields, of the size of a tree. So at Bursa, Niebuhr saw an eλκρως which had the form and appearance of a tree. From the erect habit, and the breadth of its foliage, this plant throws an ample shade, especially when dry. From the softness and little substance of its stem, it may easily be destroyed by insects, which Rumphius describes as sometimes being the case. It would then necessarily dry up rap-
idly. As it is well suited to the country, and to the purpose indicated in the text, and as its name kherw is so similar to kikyos, it is generally thought by inter-
preters to be the plant which the sacred penman had in view.

This opinion, however, that the first-named plant
above is the true representative of Jonah's gourd, is reviewed by the Rev. H. Loebel, M.D., missionary in Aserpa, in a letter published in the Bibliotheca Sacra, April 6, 1855, p. 85 sq., who says, "The Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews all agree in referring the plant to the kera, a kind of pumpkin peculiar to the East. The leaves are large, and the rapidity of growth astonishing, but the fruit is for the most part eaten in a fresh state, and is somewhat like the squash. It has not more of a generic resemblance to the gourd of the United States, though I suppose that both are species of the cucurbita. It is grown in great abundance on the alluvial banks of the Tigris, and on the plain between the river and the ruins of Nineveh, which is about a mile wide. . . . The castor-oil plant is cultivated, indeed, to some extent here, but is never trained, like the kera, to run over structures of mud and brush to form boodas in which the gardeners may protect themselves from the terrible heats of the Asiatic sun. I have seen at a single glance dozens of these boodas—these lodges in the fields of melons and cucumbers around the old walls of Nineveh (Isa. i. 8)—covered with the vines of the kera, of which there are numerous species, the fruit of which weighs from one to fifty pounds. One species, growing in Kurdistan, a few days' distance from Mosul, is a genuine gourd; but there is no probability that it ever flourished on the hot plains of Mosul." The same view is taken by Thomson (Land and Book, i, 96 sq.), who says that "Orientals never dream of training a castor-oil plant over a booth, or planting it for shade; and they would have but small respect for any one who did. It is in no way adapted for that purpose, while thousands of arbors are covered with various creepers of the gourd family. . . . The gourd grows with extraordinary rapidity. In a few days after it has begun to run the whole arbor is covered. It forms a shade absolutely impenetrable to the sun's rays even at noonday. It flourishes best in the very hottest part of summer. Lastly, when injured or cut, it withers away with equal rapidity." See JONAH.

Oriental Arbor covered with a Gourd-vine.

2. WILD GOURDS (עֵבָד, pâkâthôth; Sept. râlômân, Vulg. colocythis). It is related in 2 Kings iv. 38-40 that Elisha, having come again to Gilead, when there was a famine in the land, and many sons of the prophets were assembled there, he ordered his servant to prepare for them a dish of vegetables: "One went out into the field to gather kera (orach), and found a wild vine (legation, field colocythis), and gathered thereof wild goards (עֵבָד, pâkâthôth), his lap-full, and came and shrewd them into the pot of pottage, for they were eating the potage. . . . They poured out for the man to eat; but as they were eating of the potage, they cried out, O thou man of God, there is death in the pot; and they could not eat thereof." Though a few other plants have been indicated, the pâkâthôth has almost universally been supposed to be one of the family of gourds or cucumbers, several of which are conspicuous for their bitterness, and a few poisonous, while others, it is well-known, are edible. The reasons are given in detail by Celsius (Hieron. 1, 505). (1.) The name is supposed to be derived from פַּת, pâth, "to spout," or "to burst," from the exploding of the fruit, and scattering the seeds on being touched; and this is the characteristic of the species called the wild cucumber by the ancients. (2.) The form of the fruit appears to have been ovoid, as the name is essentially the same with that of the "knops," or פַּתָּה, pâthâ, of 1 Kings vi. 18, vii. 24, rendered "eggs" in the Chaldaic version of Jonathan, to whom the form of the fruit could not have been unknown. (3.) The seeds of the pâkâthôth, moreover, yielded oil, as appears from the words מֵאָמָה, "the meal," (ii, § 2). The seeds of the different gourd and cucumber-like plants are well known to yield oil, which was employed by the ancients, and still is in the East, both as medicine and in the arts. (4.) The bitterness which was probably perceived on eating of the pottage, and which disappeared on the addition of meal, is found in many of the cucumber tribe, and conspicuously in the species which have usually been selected as the pâkâthôth, that is, the Cocoythus (Cucumis Cocoythus), the Squirming Cucumber (Momordica alatrum), and Cucumis prophetarum; all of which are found in Syria, as related by various writers, from the first, or Colocythis, essentially a desert plant. Kitto says: "In the desert parts of Syria, Egypt, and Arabia, on the banks of the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, its tendrils run over vast tracts of ground, offering a prodigious number of gourds, which are crushed under foot by camels, horses, and men. In winter we have seen the extent of many miles covered with the connecting tendrils and dry gourds of the preceding season, the latter exhibiting precisely the same appearance as in our shops, and when crushed, with a cracking noise, beneath the heel. Re-charging, in the form of a light powder, the valuable drug which it contains" (Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). In the Arabic version, hinnazal (which is the Cocoythus) is used as the synonyme for pâkâthôth in 2 Kings iv. 38. The third, or Globe Cucumber, "derives its specific name (Cucumis prophetarum) from the notion that it afforded the sons of the prophets' shroud by mistake into their potage, and which it shrouding, in the form of a light powder, the valuable drug which it contains" (Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). But this plant, the fruit not being bigger than a cherry, does not appear likely to have been that which was shrouded into the pot. Celsius, however, is of opinion that the second of the above-named species, the Cucumis aegyptiaca of the ancients, and which was found by Bezae descending from Mount Sinai, was the plant, being the Cucumis asinus of the druggists. This plant is a well-known drastic purgative, violent enough in its action to be considered even a poison. Its fruit is ovate, oblong, and scabrous, and likely to be mistaken for orach; and might certainly be mistaken for young gherkins. The wild cucumber bursts at the touch of the finger, and scatters its seeds, which the cocoythus does not (Rosenmüller, Alterthumk. iv, pt. i, etc.). The etymology of the word פַּת means to have been thought to favor the identification of the
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di rations théologiques et critiques sur le projet d'une nouvelle version française de la Bible, publié l'an 1696, sous le nom de M. Ch. Lecène, etc. (Amst. 1698, 12mo), a violent Calvinistic attack, accusing Lecène's translation of favoring Arminianism at the expense of correctness: — 

"De l'occupation des États de Bourgogne et d'Écosse et de l'Église protestante dans l'Europe, etc. (Amst. 1702, fol.; Lpz. 1743, 4to). — Les joies de la mort et des martres d'un évêque français de l'Église protestante (Amst. 1696, 8vo). —


Gouttes, Jean Louis, a French Roman Catholic priest and political economist, was born at Tulle in 1740. He first entered the army, and soon after the Church. He was for some time curate of a parish near Bordeaux, then of Arguillers (Languedoc), where he remained until the beginning of the French Revolution. He had acquired great influence over the clergy of the diocese of Béziers, and was in 1789 sent as their representative to the States General. Here, on Oct. 5, 1789, he was appointed by the National Assembly to the office of Chaplain in the navy. He also succeeded the motion of Talleyrand-Périgord, bishop of Autun, proposing the sale of the property of the clergy. In February, 1791, he succeeded Talleyrand as bishop of Autun. But afterwards, opposing the excesses of the Republican party, he was accused of re-

lectionary sympathy, arrested, judged, condemned, and executed, all in one day, March 26, 1794. He wrote Théorie de l'intérêt de l'argent, etc. (Paris, 1780, 12mo; 2ed edit., with a Defense, etc., 1785; —

"Droit de Règne, ou réflexions sur l'Assemblée nationale (1790, 8vo). —

"La scène nationale du Clergé (April 12, 1790, 8vo). —

"Exposé des Principes de la Constitution civile du Clergé, par les écrivains des Assemblées nationales (1790, 8vo); this latter work is under a collective name, but Gouttes was its principal author. See Moniteur universel (1789, 1790); Quartard, La France protestante; Hoetzer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxi. 470. (J. N. P.)

Government of God. See Theocracy.

Government of the Hebrews. This we shall here treat in its secular or political relations, so far as these can be severed from the divine ordinances which underlie them all. See Monarchy.

1. Constitutional Form. — This varied materially in different ages. With the Israelites, as with all other nations, unquestionably the earliest form of government was the patriarchal, and it subsisted among them long after many of the neighboring countries had exchanged it for the rule of kings. The patriarchs, that is, the heads or founders of families, exercised the chief power and command over their families, children, and domestics, without being responsible to any superior authority. Such was the government of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. So long as they resided in the land of Ca-


The Hebrews having greatly increased in numbers in Egypt, it appeared very evident that they could not live among nations given to idolatry without running
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the hazard of becoming infected with the same evil. They were, therefore, in the providence of God, assigned to a peculiar existence as the extent of which was so small, that they were obliged, if they would live independently of other nations, to give up, in a great measure, the life of shepherds, and devote themselves to agriculture. Besides, very many of the Hebrews, during their sojourn in Egypt, had formed doubtful habits. These were to be brought back again to the knowledge of the true God, and all were to be excited to engage in those undertakings which should be found necessary for the support of the true religion. All the Mosaic institutions aim at the accomplishment of these objects. At a time when they had passed to the desert—then the true God, the creator and governor of the universe, and none other, ought to be worshipped. To secure this end the more certainly, God became king to the Hebrews. Accordingly, the land of Canaan, which was destined to be occupied by them, was declared to be the land of Jehovah, of which he was to be the king, and the Hebrews merely the hereditary occupants. God promulgated, from the summit of Mount Sinai, the prominent laws for the government of his people, considered as a religious community (Exod. xx.); and the organization of the civil and military government, most completely and effectively developed by Moses. The rewards which should accompany the obedient, and the penalties which should be the lot of the transgressor, were at the same time announced, and the Hebrews promised by a solemn oath to obey (Exod. xx.xiv.; Deut. xxvii.-xxx.); see Law.

In order to preserve the true religion, God governed the whole people by a striking and peculiar providence, which has rightly been termed a theocracy. But, although the government of the Jews was a theocracy, it was not destitute of the usual forms which exist in civil governments among men. God, it is true, was the king, and the high-priest, if we may be allowed so to speak, was his minister of state; but still the political affairs were, in a great measure, under the disposal of the elders, princes, etc. It was to them that Moses gave the divine commands; he determined their powers, and submitted their requests to the divine decision (Numb. xiv. 5; xvi. 4; xxvii. 5). Josephus pronounced the government to be aristocratical, but Lowman and Michaelis are in favor of considering it a democracy, and in support of their opinion such passages as the following: Exod. xxiv. 3-8; Deut. xxix. 9-14. The Hebrew government, however, putting aside its theocratical feature, was of a mixed form, in some respects approaching to a democracy, in others assuming more of an aristocratical character. In the time of Samuel, the government, in point of form, was changed into a monarchy. The election of a king, however, was committed to God, who chose one by lot; so that God was still the ruler, and the king the vicegerent. The terms of the government, as respected God, were the same as before, and the same duties and principles were inculcated on the Israelites as had been originally (1 Sam. viii. 7; x. 17-25). In consequence of the fact that Saul did not choose at all times to obey the commands of God, the kingdom was taken from him and given to another (1 Sam. xii. 5-14; iv. 1-31). David, through Samuel, was selected by Jehovah for king, who thus gave a proof that he still retained, and was disposed to exercise, the right of appointing the ruler under him (1 Sam. xvi. 1-8). David was first made king over Judah, and before he received his appointment from God, and acted under his authority, the elders of the tribes submitted to him (2 Sam. v. 1-8). The paramount authority of God as the king of the nation, and his right to appoint one who should act in the capacity of his vicegerent, are expressly recognised in the books of Kings and Chronicles. See King.

The rebuilding of Jerusalem was accomplished, and the reformation of their ecclesiastical and civil polity was effected, by the two divinely-inspired and pious governors, Ezra and Nehemiah; but the theocratic government does not appear to have been restored. The new temple was not, as formerly, God's palace; and the cloud of his presence did not take possession of it. After the death of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews were governed by their high-priests, but theocratic function, however, to the Persian kings to whom they paid tribute (Ezra iv. 18), but were ruled by their own magistrates, and were in the full enjoyment of their liberties, civil and religious. Nearly three centuries of uninterrupted prosperity ensued, although during that time they had passed to the Gentiles, and in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, when they were most cruelly oppressed, and compelled to take up arms in their own defence. Under the able conduct of Judas, surnamed Maccabaeus, and his valiant brothers, the Jews maintained a religious war for twenty-six years with five successive kings of Syria; and after destroying upwards of two hundred thousand of their best troops, the Maccabees finally established the independence of their country, and the royal station of their own family. This illustrious house, whose princes were distinguished for their sagacity and excellence, under the guidance of their own persons, administered the affairs of the Jews during a period of one hundred and twenty-six years; until disputes arising between Hyrcanus II and his brother Aristobulus, the latter was defeated by the Romans under Pompey, who captured Jerusalem, and reduced Judas to the rank of a dependent kingdom, B.C. 50. See Jews.

2. Executive Department. The organs through which these various forms of administration were exhibited always partook of that absolute and arbitrary character, both in their appointment and their exercise, which was common among Eastern nations. The government of the Israelites, however, under the monarchy, was, as far as we can understand its political organization, very simple, and in its principal features analogous to modern Oriental forms (see Paulsen, Die Regierung Mosas- länders, Altona, 1750, vol. i.). The king, not simply the central figure, but more properly the representative of civil power, had around him as advisers and supreme executors of his commands several "councillors," or נבכ保護 (2 Sam. xv. 12; 1 Chron. xxvii. 82; 1 Kings xii. 2), at whose head stands almost always the chancellor, ריבש, "recorder," whose chief duty, however, was that of heralds and heralds (comp. 2 Kings xix. 18, 87), and who is immediately recognised as the prime minister, such as is to this day the organ of the royal command in Persia (see Elstten, "Persische Landeskunde," 1876, p. 258). Co-ordinate with him probably stood the "scribe," ידנ, or state (cabinet) secretary (2 Sam. viii. 17, xx. 25; 2 Kings xvii. 18, xix. 2; xxii. 8, 10 sq.; Jer. xxxvi. 10). Sometimes we find several of these officers mentioned as existing at the same time (1 Kings iv. 8); their bureau is called the "scribe's chamber," ידנ חנ_cb (Jer. xxviii. 12). By the side of the king was also the prefect of the royal palace, ידנ יכ, whose functions, however, were not entirely confined to the royal household (such as commissions and messages, 2 Kings xviii. 19 sq.; xix. 4, 6; Neh. i. 11), but who was also employed on state business (1 Kings xviii. 8; 2 Kings xvii. 18; Jer. xxxvi. 8), and often assumed a high degree of importance (Isa. xlix. 13 sq.), as he then became an officer of the royal household (Isa. xxxv. 1). Sometimes a prophet enjoyed the confidence of the king as extraordinary civil counsellor, and grew influential as "the king's friend," ידנ יכ (a title of most trusted minister or prime vizier in the modern East; see Gesenius, Comment. on Isa. xxix. 15; Paulsen, Register, p. 990), such as Nathan under David and Solomon, and Isaiah under Hezekiah. The superior
functionaries appear under the kings to have conducted the civil administration. It was the duty of the priests and Levities to care for the maintenance of justice (Deut. xv, 16). The king himself rendered decisions in the highest cases, not seldom in less weighty causes, or even altogether. See TRIAL. As officers of the exchequer, at least so far as to provide for the wants of the royal kitchen, under Solomon, twelve commissioners were appointed (1 Kings iv, 7 sq.), one at the head of each household or establishment, the domains and manors, had their particular superintendent. See PURVEYOR. All these constitute together, as we may say, the regal board or court. On the other hand, under the 550 officials of Solomon alluded to in 1 Kings ii, 39 must be reckoned under-officers, of whose department or service we know nothing further. Among these intermediate jurisdictions are, at all events, included the lieutenants of provinces, פְּרוֹצֵי הָעָרִים ("princes of the provinces," 1 Kings xx, 14 sq.), a district-superintendents, who are first mentioned under Abiah of Israel. In conjunction with them may be classified the municipal officers, the elders and magistrates of cities, to whom were addressed and who executed the royal behests (1 Kings xxi, 8; 2 Kings x, 1). See OLD MEN. The oldest and leading men of the tribes (q. v.) also formed a kind of national representatives. The scribes (q. v.) functioned in a certain official position. Under the Chaldean rule, Gedaliah (q. v.) appears as governor פָּדָיו (of desolated and depopulated Judæa (2 Kings xxv, 22), which after this time became, in connection with Egypt, Cælo-Syria, and Phoenicia, a mere satrapy of the Babylonian empire (Berosus, in Josephus, Ant. x, 11, 1). The Persian court commanded all the provinces lying west of the Euphrates to satrape, הָאָדָם (Ezra viii, 26; Neh. ii, 9), associated with which while civil administration was a governmental one, was another functionary, secretary and assessor (Ezra iv, 8, 9). Yet the same title, הָאָדָם (l. q. pozao), was also borne by the (Jewish) prefects of the new Israelitish colony (Ezra vi, 7; Neh. vii, 14, 18; comp. Hag. i, 14; ii, 2), which it had over its own people, exclusive of the circuit or ministerial officers (Neh. iii, 9, 14, 15, etc.), municipal officials, or פְּרוֹצֵי הָעָרִים (Neh. ii, 16; iv, 19; v, 7, etc.), and judges (Ezra viii, 23). See CROSSHATCH. Besides the Persian civil functionaries, there were likewise in the subject territories tax-commissioners or treasurer-officers appointed לְעַנְדּוּת (Ezra vii, 21), and under them a general forest-keeper (Neh. ii, 8). During the Seleucid-Syrian rule Judæa belonged, while their relations were peaceful, to the precinct of a general or παρασφυγὸς of Phoenicia and Cælo-Syria (2 Macc. iii, 5; iv, 4; viii, 9), who was a provincial officer endowed with civil and military jurisdiction. The administration of the revenue was intrusted to special functionaries (2 Macc. iii, 8; 1 Macc. x, 41; xiii, 37). The chief management of the finances, however, was in the hands of the royal chamberlain (2 Macc. iii, 7 sq.). During the government of Antiochus Epiphanes we find military appointees (1 Macc. vii, 8) and extraordinary commissioners (1 Macc. i, 53; ii, 15; 2 Macc. v, 29) in Judæa. During the contests for the throne between Demetrius Soter and Alexander, the Jewish high-priests still retained the dignity of vassal-chiefs over Judæa (1 Macc. x), and Jews were intrusted with executive authority, even beyond the limits of that territory (1 Macc. xi, 59). Simon was absolute hereditary prince over Judæa, and held also the right of coinage (1 Macc. xv). In the last period of the kingdom, as well as the Egyptian dominion, the impost duties were not infrequently farmed out to the high-priests, or to wealthy Jews (1 Macc. xi, 28; xiii, 15; Josephus, Ant. xiii, 4, 4 sq., 16), which brought them into close connection with the royal functionaries, and even conferred upon them a certain executive authority in civil matters. See AS- SESSMENT.

For the government of Judæa under the Romans, see ROMAN EMPIRE.

The supreme political body of the Hebrew nation, duly met in congress, is designated in the original by two words of nearly equal frequency in the sacred writings, יְהַ֣בָּסָה, râykh, from יְבָ֣שָׁנ, to appoint, also to bring together; and יְבָ֣שָׁנ, kābal, from יְבָ֣שָׁנ, i. q. kāvalī, to come over (Sept. ἐκκοιλεῖται, ἐκκοιλεῖται; Vulgate, Congregatio, Cœtus, Ecclesia). The phrase "tabernacle of the Congregation," however, which so frequently occurs as indicating the place of meeting, is described by neither of these words, but by בִּתְרוֹת (the versions consistently mark the difference also, the Sept. invariably translates it by הַשְּׁכוֹת, Μυστήριον, and the Vulg. by tabernaculum mysteriorum; comp. also Num. x, 33, where the word בִּתְרוֹת occurs without the בִתְרוֹת (as in Num. xvi, 2), it has somewhat of the ambiguity of the Latin Curia, which equally well signifies the Senate and the Senate-house. In this passage בִּתְרוֹת is translated by בִּתְרוֹת and Tempus Concilia; in many other passages the word is variously rendered, but generally bears reference to a set time or place, e. g. in Lam. i, 15, A.V. renders it assembly; but in ii, 6, place of assembly and solemn feast; the Sept. and Vulgate are equally capricious—κατάκοπος and tempus standing in Lam. i, 15, and topiō, tabernaculum and festivitas in ii, 6. This word בִּתְרוֹת is the most frequent original equivalent of our noun "congregation." Apart from בִּתְרוֹת (tabernacle), it has a highly generic sense, including all the holy assemblies of the Jews.

There is good reason to believe that, not unlike the Servian constitution of the Roman people (Arnold's History of Rome, i, 70), the Hebrew nation from the first received a twofold organization, military as well as political (comp. Exod. xii, 51; Num. i, 8, and throughout; Num. xxxvii, 5; and 1 Chron. vii, 4 and 40. See also Josephus, Ant. i, 10, 6). The civil government (the Civil Government on the Hebrews, p. 159, 168, etc.). The classification of the people is very clearly indicated in Jos. vii, 14-18. (1) The Tribe פִּי הָרְגָּז or פִּי הָרְגָּז was divided into clans, genea., A. V. "families," פִּי הָרְגָּז. (2) Each Mishpachah comprised a number of families, A. V. "houses," פִּי הָרְגָּז. (8) Each Tribe or "house" was made up of qualified men, fit for military as well as political service, being twenty years old and upward (Num. i, 8). The word which describes the individual member of the body politic, פִּי הָרְגָּז (pl. פִּי הָרְגָּז), is very significant; for it means vir a robor devote (Gesenius, Thes. i, 267), "a man of valor," from פִּי הָרְגָּז, to be strong (Furst, Heb. Wörterbuch, p. 220; Meller, Heb. Wörterbuch, VI. B. p. 202). Now it was the organic unit of the tribes which constituted the highest and trunest sense of the פִּי הָרְגָּז, or פִּי הָרְגָּז, i. e. "Congregation," convened duly for a competent purpose (Kurtz, Hist. Old Cost. ii, 163). As with the Greeks there was an arvóura, and with the Latins a Duminatio Capiro, so there were sundry factions which deprived a home-born Israelite (=set. פִּי הָרְגָּז, Sept. πολιτεία, Vulg. indigenea; or פִּי הָרְגָּז, civis, in Deut. i, 16) of his privilege as a member of the national assembly (see Deut. xxiii, 1-8 [comp. with Neh. xiii, 1-
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3] also Exod. xii, 17, 19; xxx, 38, 88; xxxvi, 14; Lev. xvii, 20, 21, 25, 27; xviii, 4, 9, 10, 14; xviii, 29; xix, 8; xxi, 17, 19; xx, 17, 18, 20, 21. On the other hand, the franchise or civitas was conferred (with certain exceptions, such as are mentioned in Deut. xxiii, 3) on foreigners, i.e. "strangers;" Sept. προφόλοκοι; Vulg. pergraii), after they had qualified themselves by circumcision (Exod. xii, 19; Lev. xvi, 94; Deut. x, 19; Jos. xiii, 9). On this subject, comp. with Isaiah 56, 3.

The above words, expressive of the national congregation, sometimes imply 1 (a) a meeting of the whole mass of the people; sometimes 2 (a) a congregation of deputies (Jahn's Hebrew Republic, p. 348). 1. At first, when the nation dwelt in tents, in their migration from Egypt to Canaan under their divine command of the great legislator, the congregation seems to have comprised every qualified Israelite who had the right of a personal presence and vote in the congress. In Exod. xxxvi, 1, this ample assembly is designated בְּכֵלָ֣ה־כֹּל, the entire congregation of the Sons of Israel (קְרַע תַּנְיָת יִשְׂרָאֵל, omnis tota Israel). Similarly in Num. xxvii, 19, the phrase is בְּכֵלָ֣ה—קֶּרֶם, in all the land of Canaan (קְרַע תַּנְיָת יִשְׂרָאֵל, omnis multitudine), while in Lev. xvi, 17 we have בְּכֵלָה־יִשְׂרָאֵל, the entire assembly of Israel (קְרַע תַּנְיָת יִשְׂרָאֵל, universus cocus Israel).

We would have no difficulty in supposing that every member of the Edok was present at such meetings as these, in the lifetime of Moses and before the nation was dispersed throughout its settlements in Canaan, were it not that we occasionally find, in later times, an equal or ample designation used, when it is impossible to believe that the nation could have assembled at one place of meeting; e.g. in Josh. xxii, 12, where "the whole congregation of the children of Israel" is mentioned; and again still later, as at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (1 Kings v, 1; 2 Chronicles iii, 14; Jer. xxxvii, 18, etc.). From this impossibility of personal attendance in the national congregation, we should expect to find a representation constitution provided. Accordingly, in Num. i, 16, we read of persons called יְהַנְּמִיָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, not, as in the A.V., "renowned of the Congregation," but went to be called to the Congregation (Michaelis, Laws of Moses, i, 290). In xvi, 2, they are still more explicitly styled יְהַנְּמִיָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, i.e. chiefs of the Congregation who are called to the Convocation (נְעַבְּרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, qui tempore consili vocabantur). While in Exod. xxviii, 25 occurs the phrase יְהַנְּמִיָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, those deputed to the assembly, which exactly describes delegated persons. From Josh. xxii, 2, and xxiv, 1, it would appear that these deputies were—(1) "The elders" (called יָדְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, elders of the Congregation," in Lev. iv, 15), as if deputed thereto; and "elders of Israel," or "of the people," as if representing them and nominated by them (Deut. i, 15). (2) "The heads," יְהַנְּמִיָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, i.e. the princes of the tribes (Num. i, 4, 16), and the chiefs of the Mishpochoth, or "families" (Michaelis, Laws of Moses, i, 280). (3) "The judges;" not, of course, the extraordinary rulers, beginning with Othniel, but the דָּשָּׁנִי, referred as in Deut. xvi, 18, stationed in every great city, and summoned probably as ex officiö members to the congregation. (4) "The officers" יָדְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, יָדְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, יָדְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, יָדְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, whom Jahn calls genealogists, and Gesenius magistrati), whether central, as in Num. xi, 16, or provincial (Deut. xiii, 18). These four classes of men, in addition to official duties, were also attached to their offices the prerogative of representing their countrymen at the national congregation or Edok. We have not classed among these delegates either the "Judithonian prefects" (Exod. xviii, 15; Deut. iii, 13-15) (Neh. 11, 15), for they were undoubtedly included already in one or either of the normal classes (comp. Numb. xi, 16, and Deut. i, 15). The members of the Congregation were convened by the ruler, or judge, or king, for the time being; e.g. by Moses, pæsthum; by Joshua (xxiii, 1, 2); probably by the high-priest (Judges xx, 27, 28); frequently by the kings—by David (1 Chron. xiii, 2), by Solomon (1 Kings vi, 5, etc.), by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx, 3, 4), by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx, 2), probably by the Tirhakah after the Exile (see Ezra x, 9, 12), and by Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. iii, 42-46). The place of meeting was at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation; sometimes, however, some other place of celebrity was selected, as Shechem by Joshua (xxiv, 1, 2); Mizpah by Sam. i, 7, 8); Hezekiah by Saul; and Ggila by Samuel (1 Sam. xi, 7, 8).

As long as the Israelites were encamped in the wilderness, the Edok were convened by the sound of the silver trumpets. From Numb. x, 2-4, it appears that the blowing of one trumpet only was the signal for a more select conversation, composed only of the priests, the Ἐκπακεῖτοι, and the princes of the tribes; whereas when both trumpets sounded the larger congregations met. But after the occupation of Canaan, when this mode of summons would be clearly ineffectual, the congregations seem to have been convened by messengers (Judg. x, 5; 1 Sam. xi, 7, 8). As to the powers and authority of the congregation—it was not a legislative body (Conringius, De Rep. Hebr. sec. 10, p. 246). The divine law of Moses had already foreclosed all legislation, properly so-called; there was only room for by-laws (Sherlock, Disert. iii, 217). Now was exercising power within the country of the Israelites Edok: "the national revenues of the state were so settled in the tithes and other offerings, and there being no subleay in pay, all holding their estates by military service, there was no room for new or occasional taxes; so that the Hebrew parliament could have no business either to make new laws or to raise money" (Lowman, Disert. p. 135). But there was, for all that, a large reserve of authority, which sufficiently guaranteed the national autonomy. (1) The divine law itself was deliberately submitted to the Edok for acceptance or rejection (Exod. xix, 3, 8, and xxiv, 8). (2) Their public or private chris were submitted to this body on appointment for its approval; e.g. Joshua (Num. xxvii, 19); Saul (1 Sam. x, 24); Saul again, on the renewal of the kingdom (1 Sam. xxi, 15); David (2 Sam. v, 1-8); Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 22); so the latter kings—indeed, as an instance Josiah (2 Chron. xxxvi, 8). (3) The Edok seems to have had a sort of staving the execution of a king's sentence (as in Jonathan's case, where "the rescue" was not by force or violence, but by constitutional power (יָדְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל carries with it the idea of authority). 1 Sam. xiv, 44, 45). (4) In parliament, if it had not actually the prerogative of making peace and war, it possessed the power of checking, by disapprobation, the executive authority (see Josh. ix, 15; comp. with ver. 18). In later times, indeed, the prince seems to have laid questions of foreign alliance, etc., before the congregation, either for deliberation or approbation, or both (see the case of Simon Maccabæus in 1 Macc. xiv, 18-20). (5) But in the absence of a ruler, the Edok itself apparently decided on war or peace (Judg. xx, 1, 11-14; also xiii, 12-20). (6) The congregation was a high court of appeal in cases of death and life (Num. xxxv, 12, 24, 25). (7) Capital punishment was not inflicted without the cognizance of the Edok, and the execution of the sentence was on the one hand (Exon. xxiv, 10-14; Numb. xiv, 28-36). Lastly, the congregation was consulted by Hezekiah and Josiah in their pious endeavors to restore religion (2 Chron. xxx, 2-4; xxxiv, 29). When David mentions his "praises in the great congregation" (בְּכֵלָ֣ה יִשְׂרָאֵל, Ps. xxvii, 29), this is probably in reference to his composition of Psalms for the use of the Israelitish Church, and the establishment
in its full splendor of the choral Levitical service" (Thrupp, Psal. i, 111), in all which he would require and obtain the co-operation and sanction of the Edah. After the rejection of the theocratic constitution by Jeroboam, the congregation sometimes receives a more limited designation, a. the *congregation of Judah*, all the congregation of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxx, 2), and *the congregation of Judah*, all the congregation of the whole land (ver. 25). The phrase "congregation of Israel" is used, indeed, twice in this later period (see 2 Chron. xxiv, 6, and xxx, 25); but in the former passage the expression directly refers to the original institution of Moses, and in the latter to the large number of people, among whom Hezekiah selected or received the neighboring kingdom to attend his passover. See Congregation.

4. Literature.—See the Critical Bibliography, vol. i: Courting, De politica Heraeorum (Helmstäd, 1668); Cuneus, De republica Heraeorum (Leyden, 1617; Cur 1666; with notes by Nicolai, Leyd, 1765); Dietrich, De jure et status Judaeorum (Marburg, 1695); Hoëllum, Staatsverfassung der Israeliten (Lpz. 1824); Leidheck, Antiquitates Judaeorum (Amst. 1794); id. De vara republica Heraeorum (Ib. 1710); Lowman, Civil Government of the Hebrews (Lond. 1740, with an appendix, 1741); Mendelssohn, Vollendung der Staatsrechtslehre (Hamburg, 1744); Paalson, De civitate Judaeorum (Berlin, 1805); Reimer, De republica Heraeorum (Hav. 1857); Relke, Theocratis (Jena, 1763); Sigonius, De republica Heraeorum (F. a. M. 1858; also in his Annotat. et Antiq. Leyden, 1701); Walch, Monarchiae Hebræarum (from the Spanish of Vinyé for N. Philip, 1718; vol. i); and Wehner, De republica Heraeorum (Vilhelm. 1657).

Governor, a term used by the A.V. to denote various degrees of authority and power: absolute and limited, acquired by birth or by election, military and civil. The numerous and mostly vague original terms are found in other passages translated by "ruler," "chief," "prince," "captain," etc.

1. "Ruler" (Phon. 32b, 33b: Ar. majdul; Syr. mgdla; from "mgha," a verb only used in Hiph. and Hoph. in the signification of to tell). The original meaning of the root megil, to be visible, to be in front (comp. "mgha," preterot, roterot, to lead, to be first (compare Gsm. Firdh = prince). The word mgd, therefore, denotes a prominent personage, whatever his capacity, and is used of a chief or precept, "governor" of the royal palace, Aziram (2 Chron. xxviii, 7; compare 1 Kings iv, 6; Isa. xxii, 15; oiskosmos, chamberlain, secretary of state), whose power (from mgd) seems to have been very considerable (compare Isa. xxii, 21 sq. "Shebanah . . . a nait to the throne"; and, who, it would appear, was distinguished from the other court officers by a particularly brilliant uniform (girdle and robe), and to whose insignia belonged a key worn over the shoulder. In a wider sense the word is applied to the chief of the Temple: Azariah, the high-priest, "ruler of the house of God" (1 Chron. ix, 13; compare 2 Chron. xxvii, 18); Paschur, "chief governor of the house of God" (Jer. xx, 1); further, to the "leader of the Aaronites," Jehoiada (1 Chron. xii, 27). Again, it is used of the keeper of the sacred treasury, "Shebuel, ruler of the treasures" (1 Chron. xxi, 24); of the chiefstalls of a tribe, "Zebadiah, the ruler of the tribe of Simeon" (1 Chron. ii, 22; 2 Chron. xxx, 18); of the "captains" of the army (1 Chron. xiii, 1; 2 Chron. xxxii, 21); of the eldest son of the king, the heir-apparent, "Abijah, the son of Maachah [the chief], to be ruler among his brethren" (2 Chron. xxiii, 25). It is found also in connection with the kingdom of Manasses, "Amen to him to be captain," 1 Sam. ix, 16 (etc.), to "Messian [the Anointed], the Prince" (Dan. ix, 25, etc.). In the plural the word occurs in the more general sense of aristocracy, "Nobles" (Prov. viii, 16).

The Targum renders דבשכש, "their judges," by דבשכש, and in the Talmud רכמ is used paradoxically for "leader of a flock." "When the shepherd is angry with his flock he gives it a blind leader" (Baba K. 92)—a corrupt generation to which God appoints a bad king. How far the talmudic use of רכמ, in the sense of "flagellate" (Pesi. 92) and of "extend" (Baba Met. 74), may be connected with the notion of supremacy, reign, we cannot decide here.

2. נָשָׁא, nasi' (from נָשָׁא, to carry, lift up; lit. raised, exalted, set aside, Sept. syvhoyn, 'agaparon'), a word applied to the chiefs of the families of which a tribe was composed (Num. iii, 24, 28, 30, 32, xvi, 2; as many as 290 on one occasion, Num. xvi, 2); and who, as deputies (commoners) at the National Assembly, are also called נויס of the congregation, or Nasi of the tribe (frequently called the hanoshim, under whom it was also used of the twelve supreme chiefs of the tribes themselves (Num. ii, 8 sq; vii, 2 sq; iii, 32, etc.). Both these dignities, the chieftdom of a family as well as that of a tribe, would appear to have been elective—corresponding to the word נָשָׁא—not hereditary, as Michaelis and Winer hold. The Nasi of Judah, e.g., was called benaminahad, the eldest son from the first line of the tribe (Num. ii; compare 1 Chron. ii, 10, 10). The Nasi of Issachar, again, is called נויס Nathaniel ben-shuar, a name not found among the eldest sons of this tribe (1 Chron. vii, 1-3). Finally, in the table of the Nasi—no doubt the chief of the tribes—"the head of the tribe" is mentioned, and the tribal land was insturcted by Moses at his death, no son of the Nasi of the desert occurs (Maim. Pielast. p. 194).

נָשָׁא is further employed for generals, under a head (נָשָׁא), 1 Chron. vii, 40; of Abraham, a Nasi of God, a mighty sheik; for non-Israelite "princes:" of the Midianites (Josh. xiii, 21), and of the Hivites (Shechem) (Gen. xxiv, 2). On the Maccabean coins Simeon is called נויס of Israel. Nasi was also the official name of the president of the Sanhedrin (under whom stood the "father of the tribunal, or vice-president"), whose seat was in the middle of the seventy-one members (Maim. Todach. xiv, Sima. i).}

3. פְּקָד, p'kad' (from פּקָד, to appoint), an officer, official, magistrate, applied to the ecclesiastical delegate of the high-priest, who, together with the king's scribe, bore the chest containing the books to the Temple (2 Chron. xxiv, 11); to the Levites (Neh. xi, 22); to the "chief" of the Temple (Jer. xx, 1, 9); to "officers in the house of the Lord" (Jer. xxiv, 20); to a military commander (2 Kings xxxix, 19; Jer. lii, 20); and to his adjutant or principal manager (Judg. ix, 28). Further, to the officers whom Joseph suggested that Pharaoh should put over Egypt during the years of the famine (Gen. xli, 34); to those who were to gather all the vegetables unto Shushan for Ahasuerus (Ezra ii, 8); to prefects; "overseers," etc. (Neh. vi, 9; xii, 42); and, finally, to the nobles or "princes" of the king (Jer. xx, 1; 2 Chron. xxxv, 8).

4. שָׁלֵל, Shalh', Heb. and Aram. (from שלל, to rule, have power, Arab. id. comp. Sultán); "one who hath power" (Eccles. viii, 8); "Arioch the king's captain" (Dan. ii, 15); "Joseph, the governor over the land" (Gen. xiii, 6); a "mighty man" or hero (Eccles. viii, 19); a "king" or satrap (Ezra iv, 20); Daniel, the third "ruler" (Daniel ix, 1); etc. The verb שלל, שלל is also used in later Hebrew in the sense "to have power," of evil hours, evil spirits, etc.

5. פִּקְדָה, P'k'dah' (from פיַד, Arab. id. to join, etc.), originally, one who is put over a "thousand," or פִּקְדָת, פִּקְדָה, the round number of families which constitute a clan or subdivision of a tribe (comp. saxon Hundred). It is first used of the chiefs, "dukes," of Edom (Gen. xxxvi, 1 Chron. i, 51); we find it at a
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counsellor" (Exra viii, 25), to "king" (Hos. iv, 3). The merchants of Tyre are called ד"ענש, merchant-princes (Isa. xxix, 9); the same term is applied to noblemen and courtiers, "the princes of Pharaoh" (Gen. xii, 15); "princes of Zaan" (Isa. xix, 11, 13).

The priests are called chiefs or princes of the sanctuary (Isa. xiii, 28; 1 Chron. xxv, 5), and the chief priests again are called princes of the priests. Gradually the word came to be used of angels, as patrons and representatives of special nations (guardian angels): of Persia (Dan. x, 13, 20); of Greece (Dan. x, 20); of Israel (x, 21); Michael, "the great prince" (xii, 1); the chief princes (x, 13); "the eyes of princes"—God (vii, 25; comp. Sept. in Deut. xxxii, 8). The use of מ"ג as guardian angel is retained in the Midrash, but the word is also applied in the Talmud to "a hero at the table, a mighty drinker" (Nidd. 16, etc.). See CAPTAIN.

Of foreign origin is, מ"ע, Peqah', מ"ע, יִּעָר, יִּעָר; Josephus, Ἰραχος, of Tattal (Ant. xi, 4, 4). This word has been variously derived from the Persian for "magistrate" (Bodel); Persic "to cook" (Ewald); Persic for "Satelles," "Pedisoeus" (Gesenius); from the Turkish for "general" (Fränz); from the Assyrian פֹּֽקָה (Pakka); whence paška—friend (of the king), adjutant, governor of a province (Bene, Stera); from the Arabic فل ("the lower," and גלא, "royal officer" (=Fegah, sub-kings (Fatra); from the Arabic verb מ"כ, walled (John); and, finally, from the Hebrew מ"כ, yarih. It is applied to a sub-province of a province, who is subject to the authority of the prefect or real governor, in contradistinction from the מ"כ, a satrap (Esth. viii, 9); from מ"כ (ib.); from מ"כ, "sagan," municipal officer (Jer. ii, 28); and from מ"כ, "king" or sub-king (2 Chron. ix, 14). It is used of the chiefs of provinces in the Assyrian (2 Kings xxv, 24; Isa. xxxvi, 8). Babylonian Chaldean (Jer. ii, 57; Ezek. xxiii, 6, 28; Dan. iii, 2); Median, and Persian empires (Jer. ii, 28; Esth. iii, 12; viii, 9). Palestine stood, while under Persian domination, under such officers, called "prefects over the rivers" (Esdras), whose official residence (וכֵֽשְׁבָּה) was in Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 7; Ezra v, 5; vi, 6; Neh. ii, 8). They are also referred to (Cant. iii, 1); e.g., Zeoribabel (Ezra ii, 63; Hagg. ii, 21, etc.). Nehemiah, who succeeded Sheshazar (Neh. v, 5, 14; xvii, 12). The word seems to have been adopted into the Hebrew idiom at an early period, since we find it used in 1 Kings x, 15 (2 Chron. ix, 14) of the tributary chieftains "of the country," together with the "kings of Arabia." Further, of Syrian chieftains to be put in the room of the (vice-)kings at the time of Ben-hadad (1 Kings xx, 24); and, finally, it passed current for any person in high authority who was to be propitiated by gifts (Mal. i, 8). With respect to the ב of Ḫa-da, introduced by Persian rule, it would appear that their remuneration ("bread of the governor") Ezra iv, 14) was on the part, partly in money ("bread, wine, and forty shekels of silver," Neh. v, 15), chargeable upon the people (Neh. v, 18): "One ox and six choice sheep, also fowl, and once in ten days store of all sorts of wine." Their office seems to have consisted in collecting the taxes of the province (Ezra vi, 8); an office at a later period in the hands of the high-priest, and still later let out on lease. See PAHATH-MOAB.

10. The Chaldean term מ"כ, Sogas (in the pln. מ"כ), is applied (Dan. iii, 2, 27; vi, 8) to the governors of the Babylonian satrapies, in a general way, in connection with other official terms, from which it is not clearly distinguishable, except that to designate the provincial prefects or viceroys; and elsewhere (Dan. ii, 48) it is applied to the prefects
over the Magi, of whom one is especially entitled as chief or supreme (καγ) over his colleagues. The corresponding Heb. term "צגד, zagad", is spoken of the provincial rulers under the Chaldee supremacy (Jer. ii, 23, 28, 57, where it distinguished from פירס, above; Ezek. xxii, 6, 12, 23; comp. Isa. xii, 25); also to the chiefs and rulers of the people of Jerusalem under the Persian supremacy (Ezra ix, 2; Neh. ii, 16; iv, 8, 18; v, 7, 17; vii, 5; xii, 40; xiii, 11; in many of which passages it is associated with other titles (of office or honor); and in the Targums it is used of the eir of the high-priest, or the presiding officer of the Temple. Corresponding to this term are the modern Persian, Arabic, and Syriac words for satrap. It is apparently of Mesopotamian origin.

The Greek terms rendered in the N. T. "governor" are the following, of which the first two relate to public or military officers, and the last two to domestic usages:

11. Εθνάρχης, Ethnarch (2 Cor. xi, 82), an officer of rank under Aretas, the Arabian king of Damascus. It is not easy to determine the capacity in which he acted. The term is applied in 1 Macc. xiv, 47; xv, 1, to Simon the high-priest, who was made general and eirarch of the Jews as a vassal of Demetrius. From this the office would appear to be distinct from a military term. The jurisdiction of Aretas, called by Josephus (War, ii, 6, 3) an ethnarchy, extended over Idumaea and all Judaea, the half of his father's kingdom, which he held as the emperor's vassal. But, on the other hand, Strabo (xvii, 13), in enumerating the officers who formed part of the machinery of the Roman government in Egypt, mentions ethnarchas apparently as inferior both to the military commanders, and to the monarchs, or governors of districts. Again, the prefect of the colony of Jews in Alexandria (called by Philo γενώρχης, ib. in Flaccus, § 10) is designated by this title in the edict of Claudius given by Josephus (Ant. xix, 5, 2). According to Strabo (Joseph. Anti. xiv, 7, 2), he exercised the prerogatives of an ordinary independent ruler. It has therefore been conjectured that the ethnarch of Damascus was merely the governor of the resident Jews, and this conjecture receives some support from the parallel narrative in Acts ix, 24, where the Jews alone are said to have taken part in the conspiracy against the apostle. But it does not seem probable that an officer of such limited jurisdiction would be styled "the ethnarch of Aretas the king; and as the term is clearly capable of a wide range of meaning, it was most likely intended to denote one who held the city and district of Damascus as the king's vassal or representative. See ETHNARCH.

12. Ἰμηράρχος, the Procurator of Judaea under the Romans (Matt. xxvii, 2, etc.). The verb is employed (Luke ii, 2, etc.) to denote the nature of the jurisdiction of Quirinius over the imperial province of Syria (see Gerlach, Die römischen Stellhalter in Syrien und Judäa, Berlin, 1865). See PROCURATOR.

13. Οἰκονόμος (Gal. iv, 2), a steward, apparently instructed with the management of a minor's property. See STEWARD.

14. Κανελειώς (John ii, 9), "the governor of the feast." It has been conjectured, but without much show of probability, that this officer corresponded to the συμμετοχιος of the Greeks, whose duties are described by Plutarch (Sympos. Quest. 4), and to the arbiter biiwai of the Romans. Lighfoot supposes him to have been a judge who pronounced on the persons offering the sacrifice, upon the wine that was drunk during the seven days of the marriage feast. Again, some have taken him to be equivalent to the τρισκελεως, who is defined by Pollux (Onom. vi, 1) as one who had the charge of all the servants at a feast, the carvers, cup-bearers, cooks, etc. But there is nothing in the narrative of the marriage feast at Cana which would lead to the supposition that the κανελειως held the rank of a servant. He appears rather to have been on intimate terms with the bridegroom, and to have presided at the banquet in his stead. The duties of the master of a feast are given at full length in Ecclus. xxv (xxvii). See ARCHITECTS.

In the apocryphal books, in addition to the common words ἁγγαρευς, ἐνόπτωτος, στραταγες, which are rendered "governor," we find εὐστάτος (1 Esdr. i, 8; Judith ii, 14), which closely corresponds to τρισκελεως; ἐφόρος used of Zenobius and Tatnai (1 Esdr. vi, 3; 8, 29; vii, 1), and στραταρχης, applied to Sheshbazzar (1 Esdr. ii, 12), both of which represent φυλαττων (1 Esdr. vii, 2) and φυλαττων του ενωου (2 Macc. iii, 4), "the governor of the temple"; τρισκελεως (comp. 2 Chron. xxvii, 9); and στραταρχης (1 Esdr. iii, 2, 21), "a satrap," not always used in its strict sense, but as the equivalent of στραταρχης (Judith vi, 2; vii, 8).—Smith, a. v. See PRINCE.

15. In James iii, 4, the Greek term rendered "governor" is κυριωτα, a guide or director, i.e. helmsman (prop. κυριοτητας, whence Lat. gubernator, Eng. governor, the last in a different sense). See STEER.

The following list (modified from the Biblical Reropository, 1832, p. 581, 582) of the presiding officers of Judaea (q. v.) will be found useful in comparing the history of those times. See each name in its place. For those of Syria, see SYRIA.

PROCURATORS OF JUDEA

1. (1) Κομποσθες 9-12
2. (2) Μαρκος Αμβυθιου 9-12
3. (3) Αμμιλας Ριφιου, These three were appointed by Augustus; the two following by Tiberius 15-15
4. (4) Βλετος Αροιου 15-10
5. (5) Πολιτος Ριφιου 16-35
6. (6) Μαριλος, sent by Vitellius, the governor of Syria, 37-40
7. (7) Πουλιπιος Πετρονιους, who was at the same time governor of Syria, 37-40

8. (8) Πενελειος Φλωρος, the last procurator of Judea 40-48
9. (9) Ενερεχ Ζελιους, sent by Caligula 43-48
10. (10) Τιβεριους Αλεξανδρου 44-44
11. (11) Βασίλειου Καμαντας 45-14
12. (12) Α. Καλοσθεις 49-21
13. (13) Πολτος Φειτους, under Nero 55-50
14. (14) Απλιους 60-69
15. (15) Γεσεις Φλωρος, the last procurator of Judaea 70-70

16. (16) Ζησοθεις, however, speaks (War, vi, 4) of a Marcus Antonius as the being (or having been procurator (διαργος) of Judaea in the last struggle with the Romans, A.D. 70.

Govinda, SINGH, the tenth and last guru (teacher) of the Sikhs, was born at Patna, in Behar, in 1631. He was a son of Tegh Bahadur, the ninth guru. He was educated at Madra Des, in the Punjab, where the Sikhs have always been very numerous. His father, whose power was offensive to the Great Mogul Aurungzebe, was put to death by order of the latter in 1675. Govinda himself had to retire to the mountains surrounding Djemnah, where he passed twenty-five years, devoting his time to religious meditation, to the study of the Koran, of the religious books of the Hindus, and the Persian language. He then undertook a religious reformation of the Sikhs (q. v.). It was his object to be a special friend of the Lord, though he at the same time always declared that he was only a mortal man. He sanctioned the abolition of caste; all the Sikhs are to be equal. They must only adore the one God. The worship of saints and of images of the Deity are regarded as acts of superstition. He considered the Evam and the Puranas cannot procure salvation. The faithful, on the contrary, must totally separate from the Musulmans and the Hindus. They are permitted to kill animals and to use their flesh. Govinda declared all the infamors who were not to the Mongols was, on the other hand, declared to be a meritorious act. War was to be the occupation of all his followers, to every one of whom
he gave the title singh (lion or soldier), and threat- ened with excommunication and everlasting damnation all who would abandon the chief in a battle at the moment of danger. For admission into the sect a kind a baptism was prescribed, and it was declared to be a mortifying act to bathe from time to time in the lake or river sacred to the sect. Had he adhered to this, he would have been absolved every where where five of his disciples would be assembled; and he introduced a kind of council, at which the prominent chiefs met to discuss public affairs. Govinda gained many converts for the sect of the Sikhs. His relative, Ram Rae, who disputed with him the title guru, was put to death. He was one of the leaders in the revolt against the Mongols, and in the battle of Panipat, when the Sikh forces were defeated; but finally, as all his allies abandoned him, he had to withdraw into the interior of his states. While he endeavored to defend his strongholds, all his children perished. When the last stronghold, Tschambor, fell, he made good his escape in the disguise of a dervish, and safely reached the desert of Bhitnata. Having been joined by many of his adherents, he was able to repulse his enemies. Finally, he accepted an invitation to the court of the Great Mogul Aurangzebe; but, before he reached the seat of power in Delhi, Aurangzebe was assassinated, and the successor of the latter, Bahadur Shah, received him with marked honor, and is said to have made him governor of a province in the valley of the Godavery. There he died soon after. The Sikhs regard Govinda as superior to the preceding gurus, and none of his successors has been worthy to bear the title. Govinda is the author of a part of the Dastam Padshah ka Graft (Book of the Tenth King), one of the sacred books of the Sikhs, which is written in Hindoo verses, with a conclusion in the Persian language. Of the sixteen parts of this work, the five first and a portion of the sixth are from Govinda. He also made additions to the other sacred book of the Sikhs, the Graft (Book), a collection of sentences of several gurus. Besides these works, he wrote Roti namak (Book of Rules) and Ten- kau namak (Book of Restrictions).—Hoefler, Novum. Biog. Generale, xii. 503; Magie, History of the Sikhs, vol. i. (A. J. S.)

GOZAL. See FLEETING.

GOZAN (Heb. Gozam), 1 Macc. 11:4, according to Genenius, quarry; according to Furst, ford; Sept. Tawaw; r. towzap and xowzep, the tract to which the Israelites were carried away captive by Pup, Tiglath-Pileser, and Salmanasser, or possibly Sargon (2 Kings xvi, 6; 1 Chron. v, 26). It is also mentioned as a region of Assyria, with Asarainen, the Asyrians (2 Kings xii, 12; Isa. xxiii, 12), and again (2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 11). Ptolomy, in his description of Media, mentions a town called Gauzania (Geogr. vi. 2, 10), situated between the Zagros mountains and the Caspian Sea. Bochart (Opp. i. 194) and others (so Rosenmüller, Sbm. Geogr. i. i, 109) have attempted to identify this town with Gozan. Rennell further states that the river Gozan (1 Chron. v, 26) is the modern Kishon, which rises near Sinna, in the eastern part of the Zagros chain, and, after a winding course, joins the Senid-rud, which flows into the Caspian (Geography of Herodotus, i. 521, 2d ed.; see also Eltzer, Erdkunde, viii. 16; Ker Porter, Travels, i. 267; Kinnier, Memos on the Persian Empire, p. 121; Morier's Second Journey, i. 267). This theory, however, places Gozan too far east for the requirements of the Scripture narrative. Dr. Grott suggests that the word Gozan signifies "pasture," and that is the same as the modern Goz, but is given by the Nestorians to all the highlands of Assyria which afford pasture to their flocks. He thinks that the ancient province of Gozan embraced the mountainous region east of the Tigris, through which the Kha- bidzir runs (Dr. Grott's Memoirs, in the Geographical Journal, p. 125 sq.). A close examination of the notices in Scripture and other materials in comparison with the Geography of Ptolomy and modern researches, enable us to fix, with a high degree of probability, the true position of Gozan. It appears from 2 Kings xvii, 6 (also xviii, 11), that Go- zan was in Assyria, which is there distinguished from Media; and that Habor was "a river of Gozan." There can be little doubt that the Habor is identical with the Khabidzir of Mesopotamia. See HABOR. Gozan must, therefore, have lain in Mesopotamia, or at least, in the eastern part of it. The text of 2 Kings xix, 12, in 1 Chron. v, 26, Gozan, is, by an erroneous transposition of the last word, called a river, and is distinguished from Habor. The true explanation seems to be, that in this passage Habor is the name of a district, probably that watered by the lower Kha- bidzir; while the upper part of the same river, flowing through the province of Gozan, is called 1 Macc. 11:4, the river of Gozan. Gozan seems to be mentioned on the cuneiform tablets (Lagash, q. v.). Ptolomy states that Gauzania (Tawaw) was one of the provinces of the Mesopotamia adjoining Chalidzita (Geogr. xvi, 18, 4), which may probably be, as suggested by Rawlinson, another form of the same name (Ancient Monarchies, i. 266), being prefixed and rendered into δ. As we find Halah, Habor, and Haran grouped together in Mesopotamia; as we find beside them a province called Gauzania; and as in Scripture Gozan is always mentioned in connection with the above places, we may safely conclude that Gozan and Gauzania are identical. Gauzania lay along the southern declivities of the Moons Massus, and extended over the region watered by the upper Khabidzir and Jerrul rivers to the ranges of Sinjar and Hamma. The greater part of it is an undulating plain, having a poor soil and scanty vegetation (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 275). On the other hand, Mr. Layard describes the tract immediately along the Khabidzir as one of remarkable fertility (ib. p. 227). See CAPTIVITY.

GRAAL (Grail, from the old French, but originally Celtic word Griel, Provençal grazel, and in medieval Latin gradaet) signified originally a "bowl-shaped vessel." The poetry of the Middle Ages makes numerous mention of the Saint Graal (in old French San Graal, in old Provençal San Graal), a vessel which lay on the altar where the body of Jesus was placed on the cross, and which contained the last supper and in which Joseph of Arimathaea caught the blood that fell from the side of Christ (hence the erroneous meaning attached to the word, as sang real, i.e. royal blood, blood of the Lord). The legend was made the subject of a poem in old French by Guilet de Provins, which has been lost. This tale furnished Wolfram with material for the famous Parzival and Titurel, but he gave the subject a deeply allegorical meaning of his own. The subject was more
GRABA

thoroughly treated by the author of the second Túrcoł in 1720; yet he connects it with the legends of Lohengrin and of Prestor John.

The legend of the Saint Gran is of some importance in the history of the Church. Attempts have been made to derive the story of the word itself, gran, from the Latin granum, or grain, a comparison to the blood shed in crucifixion as the type of the blood of Christ. But it appears certain that it means a vessel, cup, or shell. A costly cup was really found by the first crusaders at Cæsarea. It was allotted to the Geneuese, who brought it to Genoa, where it remained for several centuries in the chapel of John the Baptist in the Porta San Giorgio. From Genoa it was transported to Paris. There appears to be some connection between the legend of Prestor John, as joined with the Ban Gran, and the still existing remains of the Gnostic sect known by the appellation of Disciples of John (Sábians, Zabana, Nazareans, Mardeans, Bajistas). Not only the name John, but the locality also, is evidently used in the legend (viz. the interior of Asia, on the southern frontier of the Turkish empire), as well as the fact that in this Gnostic sect the king is at the same time high-priest, seems to favor the idea of a connection. The use of the name John, according to the tradition, is as follows: It is claimed on every Good Friday there comes into it, from heaven, a holy wafer, which is intended as the food for many; thus the Gran is a sort of continuation of the miracle of feeding the multitude (Matt. xv, 53). It provides food and drink in abundance for the assembled multitude to the tune of hundreds of thousands, which cannot be obtained by violence, but is to be received by faith. At the bottom of the legend we find the doctrine of the real presence in the Lord’s Supper. The wondrousings of the Saint Gran, which came from the East to the West, afterwards to return again to the East, points the Church to the duty of not lessening the Church of the平淡, etc. In all these poetical legends one point is especially deserving of notice: it is the evidence they afford of the tendencies of the Christian mind in all ages to fathom the unfathomable, and to cling to the memory of past events, and to reproduce them. But for this very reason it becomes more necessary for us to distinguish between the original and the image, between the real facts and the errors which have grown up around them. By a just criticism, the poetry of the Middle Ages, which in latter times has been much studied, can be made very instructive on the history of the Church of the平淡, etc.

Der heil. Gran u. seine Hülle (Altorlogia des Museum, Berlin 1809, vol. 1, p. 1); Boisnerer, Über d. Beschreibung d. heil. Gran’s (Mun. 1884); C. Lachmann, Wolff von Eckenbach (Berlin 1833, 2 ed 1854); San Marte (Schultzs), Die Siege v. heil. Gran (Leben v. Dichtern W. v. Eckenbach, 1841, vol. II); K. Simrock, Parzicul u. Tüen (Stuttg. and Tubing, 1842); C. G. Fischel, Die Siege v. Parzicul u. v. Gran, etc. (Berlin, 1855); Harzog, Real-Encyklop. v. 814; Dunlop, History of Fiction, p. 78 sq. (London, 1845, 1 vol 8vo); Bullfinch, Age of Chivalry, p. 189-226 (Boston, 1868, 8vo).

GRACE (Gr. géra, Gr. χάρις, Heb. חָּרָה and יָרָה, a word of various import in Scripture and in theology.

I. Scriptural Uses.—(1.) Physical beauty (grace of form and person) (Prov. i. 9; ii. 22; xxxii. 80; Ps. xiv, 2, etc.). (2.) Favor, kindness, goodness, leniency, friendship of God towards men, or of men towards one another (Gen. vi. 8; xviii. 8; xix. 19; 2 Sam. x. 2; 2 Tim. i. 9). (3.) God’s forgiving mercy, as granted in apocalyptic language to the Hebrews (Is. v. 3; II. xii. 5; Coles. i. 6, etc.). (4.) The Gospel generally, as contradistinguished from the law (John i. 17; Rom. vi. 14; 1 Pet. v. 12, etc.). (5.) Certain gifts of God, freely bestowed; e. g. miracles, prophecy, tongues, etc. (Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. x. 13, Eph. iii. 8, etc.). (6.) Christian virtues, e. g. charity, humility, meekness, etc. (2 Cor. vii. 7; 2 Pet. iii. 8). (7.) The glory to be revealed, or eternal life (1 Pet. i. 8). Wilson (Sermon Lecture on the Communion of Saints, Oxford, 1861, 8vo) remarks as follows on the scriptural use of the word: "Grace occurs in the Septuagint at only five times, of which number it stands sixty-one times for ἡγαγὴ, and its signification in the New Test. cannot be fairly estimated without reference to the ideas expressed by that Hebrew word. This is drawn alto-
GRACE, MEANS OF. See MEANS OF GRACE; SACRAMENTS.

GRACE AT MEALS, a short prayer at table, implying the direction, expressing and approving thanks to God for the food he has provided. The form of such an act is evident both from the scriptural injunction (1 Cor. xiii, 31) and from the example of our Lord (Mark viii, 6, 7).

GRADUAMONTS. See GRANDMAINTANS.

GRADUAL, an anthem, psalm, or part of a psalm chanted in the mass between the epistle and the gospel. So called because the chantor stood on the pulpit steps. The name is also given to the book containing the psalms chanted at mass, which was called graduale, or graduae.—Palmer, Orig. Liturg. ii, 46; Procter, On Common Prayer, p. 8, 317.

GRADUATE, one who has obtained a degree in a university: the name is usually given to those who have obtained merely the lowest degree, that of A.B. See DEGREES.

GRECIA. See GREECE.

GRIEFE, JOHANN FRIEDRICH CHRISTOPH, a German philosophical and theological writer, was born at Göttinngen Feb. 15, 1754. He studied in the university of that city, became pastor of Oberreisa in 1784, and in 1792 became pastor of a parish and professor of catechetics at the college of St. Gotthard, which he left in 1816. He wrote several works on philosophy and theology, all more or less on the system of Kant. Among them are: Vollständige Lehrbuch d. allgemeinen Katechekis nach Kantischen Grundsätzen (Göttingen, 1795-95, 2 vols.; 8vo).—Grundzüge d. allgemein. Katechek, nach Kantischen Grundsätzen (Göttingen, 1799).—De Miraculaurum Natuna, philosophia principii non contraefficient (Helmstadt, 1797).—Commentar über eine der schwersten Stellen in Kant's metaphysischen Anfangsgründen d. Naturwissenschaft (Celle, 1798).—Die Piaritischeologie nach ihrem gräz. Umfange (Celle, 1803, 2 vols.).—See Beyer, Allg. Mag. für Predig., vol. xii; Doering, Ges. Theol., i, 525; Hoerner, Nowa. Bibl. Geneal., xxx, 584.

GRAFT (ιγκουρινια), to prick in or spur on, Wisd. xvi, 11; hence to insert by an incision, Rom. xiii, 23, A.V. "graft in", the process of inculcating fruit-trees, often resorted to in order to preserve the quality of the fruit; by budding shoots or buds from approved trees and inserting them on others, where, with proper precautions, they continue to grow (Rom. xvi, 17-24). By this process particular sorts of fruit may be kept from degenerating, which are very apt to do when raised from the seed; for the graft, though they receive their nourishment from the stocks, always produce fruit of the same sort as the tree from which they were taken. This process is peculiarly appropriate to the olive-tree (Stuart, Comment. ad loc.). An insect of the gnat species is said to breed in the male fig-tree, and, being covered with pollen, pollinizes the male flowers, impregnates with it the stigma of the female tree. The flowers of the palm-tree yield fruit only on the female tree, when its stigmata have been fecundated by pollen from the male; and as it is precarious to leave this process to be effected by insects or the wind, it is commonly done by manual labor. See Fig. The Hebrews appear to have pinched off the blossoms of the fruit-trees during the three first years of their growth, in order to improve their fruitfulness (Numb. xxvii, 12, 18). See TREM.

GRAFTON, JOSEPH, a highly respected and useful Baptist minister, was born at Newport, R. I., in 1757. His father, a sea captain, had established and set up the business of sail-making in Providence. Joseph, at the age of fourteen, began working at his father's trade. He was hopelessly converted in 1776, and joined the Congregational Church, which included Baptists dissatisfied with strict communion. He began
GRAHAM

peaching in 1776. While preaching to a congregation of "Separates" in Plainfield, Conn., he reconsidered his views on communion, and joined in 1781 the Baptist Church. He was ordained a pastor of the First Baptist Church in Newton, Mass., in 1786, where for nearly fifty years he continued his studies and labors in the cause and in behalf of missionary and benevolent undertakings. He was actively engaged in founding the theological seminary at Newton, and was for many years one of its trustees. He died in 1836. He published four sermons and some occasional addresses. (L. E. S.)

Grain, a woman noted for her piety and intelligence, one of the "saints" of modern times. She was born in Lanarkshire, Scotland, and was piously educated by her parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Marshall. At seventeen she was admitted by Dr. Witherspoon (afterwards president of Princeton College) to Lord's Supper. In 1765 she was married to Dr. Graham, and accompanied him to Canada, where his regiment was stationed. Her husband died at Antigua in 1774. She returned to Scotland, and supported her father and her four children by opening a school for young ladies. In 1789 she returned to New York, and opened a seminary. In 1799 a society was instituted at New York for the relief of poor widows with small children. The original plan of the society was formed at the house of Mrs. Graham, and a school for the instruction of orphans was opened, and taught by Mrs. Graham's former pupils. Besides establishing this school, Mrs. Graham selected some of the widows best qualified for the task, and engaged them for a small compensation to open day schools for the instruction of the children in distant parts of the city. She also established two Sunday-schools. In 1806 a society of ladies was organized to procure or build an asylum for orphan children. Mrs. Graham remained in the office of directress of the Widows' Society, but felt also much interest in the success of the Orphan Asylum Society, and herself, or one of her family, taught the orphans daily until the friends of the institution were sufficient to provide a teacher and superintendent. In 1811 some gentlemen of New York established a Magdalen Society, and Mrs. Graham became its president until her death. In 1814 she united with some ladies in forming a society for the promotion of industry among the poor. For some weeks (previous to her last illness she was favored with unusual health, and much enjoyment of religion. She died on the 24th of July, 1814. Few books have been more widely circulated than her Life and Letters (5 vols. ed. London, 1839, 8vo). In America, Dr. Mason's sketch of her has been widely scattered by the Tract Society. See Mason, Life of Isabella Graham (N. York, 12mo); Bethune (Mrs.), Letters and Correspondence of Mrs. Graham (1888, 8vo); Jones, Christian Biography, p. 189.

Graham, Mary Jane, was born in London in 1803, and was so carefully educated, and so industrious in study, that she acquired a knowledge of nearly all the modern languages, as also of Latin, Greek, and mathematics. In her eighteenth year she fell into infidel doubts, but soon emerged from them into Christian light and hope. To save others from a like experience, she wrote the Test of Truth (London, 12mo, 7th ed. 1859), giving an account of her mental exercises, her infidelity, and her conversion. She also wrote a treatise on The Freedom and Sovereignty of God's Grace, published after her death (12mo). Her last years were full of suffering, but she died in great peace and joy at Stoke Fleming, Devonshire, Dec. 1st, 1836. See Bridges, Life of Mary Jane Graham (London, 1889, 12mo 1835, 1840, and 1858, 12mo).

Grain (occurs only as a rendering of γυμνός, trocer, a small stone or kernel, Amos ix, 2; ἀκορός, a berry or individual seed, e. g. of mustard, Matt. xiii, 31, etc.; or wheast, John xii, 24; 1 Cor. xv, 57) is not used in the A. V. in our American collective sense of corn (q. v.) in general, which is the designation of οἰκήμα, ἀγρός, or αὐτός. The Hebrews planted only wheats, barley, and spelt (comp. Isa. xxviii, 25; Ezek. iv, 9); rye and oats are not mentioned in the Bible (in the Talmud five species of grain are named, Mishna, Neduut, vii, 2; and some find even rye and oats in the הַכַּבֵּד בֵּית הַמִּשְׁכָּב). On the other hand, some (e. g. Michaelis) think that rice is referred to by רֵחֶן (Isa. xxi, 19), in opposition to Rosenmüller and Ge- senius. As diseases of seed-grain, γυμνός, paleness ("mildew"), and γύμνωμος, night ("blasting"), are mentioned. See Cereals.

Grail or Grail. See Graal.

Gramma, Graphē (γραμμα, γραφή), terms ordinarily used in the ancient Church to signify the Holy Scriptures. They were also occasionally employed as names of the Apostles' Creed, perhaps because it was gathered entirely from Scripture; or else because it was used in reference to the learning of the Creed by the catechumens. As the word "graphē" was the word used to designate the Creed, because the catechumens were bound to commit it to memory.—Valerius, Not. in Socrat. i, 8; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. x, ch. iii, § 4.

Granary. Originally corn was kept in subterranean storehouses, and even in caves; but in progress of time granaries were erected, both in Egypt and Persia. In the former country granaries were often of an extensive character. They were laid out in a very regular manner, and varied of course in plan as much as the houses, to which there is every reason to believe they were frequently attached, even in the towns; and they were sometimes only separated from the house by an avenue of trees (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. abridgment, i, 13). They had vaulted roofs, and complete arrangements for depositing and removing the grain. Dr. Robinson, when visiting Huj, a village not far from Gaza, says, "Here were several subterranean magazines for grain, like cisterns, with a month like a well, such as we have seen in several villages" (Jub. Res. ii, 885). The peasantry in the East generally prefer these subterranean storehouses, not so much for the preservation of the corn as for the greater security against the incursions of marauding parties, while erected barns are generally confined to more populous districts (Deut. xxvi, 8; Prov. iii, 10; Gen. xli, 55; Exod. i, 11; 1 Chron. xxvii, 25; Luke xii, 18). See Garrek.
Grundler, Urbain, a French priest of the 17th century of unhappy memory. He was educated among the Jesuits, became a Jesuit, and later attached himself to St. Peter's, archbishop of Bordeaux. His preaching became very popular, and not the less so because of his attacks upon the vices of the clergy. Bitter enmities were excited, and he was charged with favoring the French revolutionists, and generally against the celibacy of the clergy was found among his papers. He was condemned by the bishop of Piotiers in 1850 to do penance, and interdicted from service as a priest for five years. From this penalty he was freed, on appeal, by the archbishop of Bordeaux. This triumph increased, and he returned. He died in 1854, and soon got into new trouble. In 1863 the nuns of the Ursuline convent of Loudun became, as they said, possessed with devils: hysterical convulsions and all sorts of extravagances abounded among them. Grundler was charged with "bewitching" them, and sending "legions of devils into their bodies." A libel on cardinal Richelieu, published in 1632, was charged upon Grundler, with no ground whatever. He was arrested and conducted to Angers Dec. 7, 1633. The charges against him were sacrilege, adultery with the wife of his dean, and witchcraft, and he was put into the Ursuline nuns. The records of the trial are very curious. One of the necessary signs of "possession," according to the Romish law, is the knowledge of languages not acquired in the ordinary way. The exorcist who was appointed to test the nuns asked one of the nuns for "haberdashery." She was found, with convulsive contortions, "Jesus Christmas." One of the judges could not help remarking, "This devil, at least, does not know syntax." The trial lasted a long time, and ended in the condemnation of Grundler, who was burnt alive Aug. 18, 1634. But the devils still kept possession of the nun; it was not till November 5, 1635, that "Leviathan" was dislodged from the head of the superior of the convent; and "Bebomoth," the strongest of all the demons, stubbornly kept his place till August 15, 1637. The affair, of course, caused immense scandal, and a small library of pamphlets and books was written upon the subject. Alfred de Vigny recounts the story of Grundler at length in his Cinq-Mars. A similar trial took place in 1647 with regard to certain cases of possession (or of crime) in the convent of Louviers. See Mierlet, Louise Quareron, p. 935. Grundler, Malakoff, Maitre Malakoff, des Diables de Louvain (Amst. 1668, 12mo); Bayle, Dictionnaire; Hoevel, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxi, 644 sq.

Grandmont or Grammont, Order of. This religious order was founded by Stephen of Thiers, who in 1076 withdrew to the mountains of Muret, near Toulouse, France, to lead an ascetic life. He wore a pensive's shirt made of meshes of steel, and slept in a bed made of boards in the shape of a coffin. His extravagant asceticism found many imitators, who joined him in his retreat. Unwilling to take the title of prior or abbot, he called himself their corrector. To avert the evils which had ruined so many other monastic orders, he required his followers to make vows of poverty as well as of obedience and humility; and would not even permit them to possess a church or a piece of land. Gregory VII's reformers were in favor of this order, and he expressed condition of its submitting to the rule of Benedict. It is evident, however, that the founder had more in view than a mere return to the original strictness of the rules. St. Stephen said to his disciples, "You are to ask for what order you belong, among these Cenobiasts, and the Tertiaries," which is the model of all the other orders." Two cardinals who were going to France as nuncios went to visit Stephen in his retreat, and while there happened to ask him whether he considered himself a canon, a monk, or a hermit. "I am none of these," answered Stephen. Being pressed to define more clearly his position and that of his followers, he said, "We are poor sinners whom God has mercifully called to the wilderness to live upon the charity of the people. I, therefore, request, he has himself appointed the duties we fulfill here. We are too imperfect and too weak to emulate the example of the saint benedicts who were so absorbed in their divine contemplations as to make them forget the existence of the natural part of their duties; besides, that we do not wear the habit either of canons or of monks; and we do not desire to be called either, as we are far from having the merits of the one or the sanctity of the other." After the death of their founder (1124) the order withdrew to the wilderness of Grandmont, near Murret, where they dwelt in caves. But they had given them no written code of rules; they were transmitted verbally from one to another, until Stephen of Lissac, fourth prior of Grandmont, caused to be collected and written all that could be ascertained of the words and acts of their founder. He even represents himself in several instances as the author of the rules. The order of the Grandmonts spread only in France. In 1170 there were sixty convents following their rule, and so great was the respect they had gained that they were generally known under the name of "Rule of St. Stephen." Rules which were subsequently introduced in the observance of their rules are to be attributed to the popes. The later history of the order is chiefly a record of quarrels and contentions. It was extinguished in the time of the French Revolution. —Joseph Fehr, Allgemeine Ge- schichte der Kirche, vol. iv, p. 215, etc. Butler, Lives of the Saints, Feb. 8. (A. J. S.)

Grange, a farming establishment, especially such as belonged to ancient monasteries. Most monasteries had farm-houses on their estates, to which were attached chapels, as well as barns and other offices. Many of these buildings, as well as the chapels, were built in fine architectural taste.

Grant, Asaiah, M.D., an American missionary, was born in Marshall, N. Y., August 17, 1807. He early commenced the study of medicine, and at the age of twenty he married and settled in Braintrim, on the Susquehanna; but, losing his wife four years after, he removed to Utica, where he acquired a large and lucrative practice as a physician. The meeting of the American board at this place in 1846 wrought an entire change in his destiny; he was directed to foreign missions, and, after carefully considering the subject, he made an offer of his services to Dr. Anderson. Having expressed a preference for the mission contemplated among the Nestorians, he was directed to join Dr. Perkins, who was already on his way to Persia. Abandoned in his second voyage, he sailed from Boston May 11, 1855, and on the 27th of October they arrived at Oromiah, their future home. "The district of Oromiah is in the western part of Azerbijan, the ancient Atropatane, and forms the frontier line of Persia in the direction of the Turkish empire. The scenery is unfitted even beneath a Persian sky." To the missionary the scene was endeared by the most sacred associations. "In the city of Orom-iah, and amid the three hundred villages of the plain, there still lingered the scattered remnant of a once illustrious and luminous people, a people whose history is bound up with the history of Rome herself the spiritual dominion of half the world." See NESTORIANS. When they were first visited by American missionaries, the vast jurisdiction which had once comprehended twenty-five metropolitan provinces had shrunk to a petty sect, hardly able to maintain itself against the Moslems, which is the history of the model of all the other orders." Two cardinals who were going to France as nuncios went to visit Stephen in his retreat, and while there happened to ask him whether he considered himself a canon, a monk, or a hermit. "I am none of these," answered Stephen. Being pressed to define more clearly his position and
Mr. Merrick had joined him at Constantinople. Together they commenced the work of establishing the mission. Dr. Grant’s character as a physician secured the confidence of the Government, and the Nestorian bishops and priests gave him a hearty welcome. A school was at once commenced, and the work soon extended in every direction. (For details, see Nestorianism.) In 1859 Dr. Grant visited the almost inaccessible region in which the Nestorian patriarch, Mar Shimion, resided. On the sides of the rugged hills of Kordostan, and within their deep ravines, dwelt the “Wildness of the East—the Protectors of Asia.” Among those hills were thousands who had preserved, with few corruptions, an apostolic faith. The difficulties in the way of the missionary labors with them were numerous and formidable; but Mr. Grant was not to be deterred, and finally received an invitation from the patriarch, with the promise of a guard through the Koord villages. His fame as a physician had been carried to the mountain districts, and, indeed, his professional character not only gave him many opportunities of doing good, but often saved his life. Dr. Grant remained among them five weeks, gaining all the information he could, and, soon after, his wife’s death and the failure of his own health compelled his return to the States. In consequence, the board decided at once to establish a mission among the mountains. Being appointed to that work, he returned to his labors in April, 1841. In company with the patriarch, Mar Shimion, he now made an extensive tour through the different villages and districts (1842). A school was opened at Askitas in April, 1843, and Mr. and Mrs. Laurie took charge of the station. Soon after, Dr. Grant ascertained that the barbarous Mohammed, pacha of Mosul, was forming an alliance with the Koords against the Nestorians, who had always before made peace and submission. Dr. Grant was convinced that this independence was gone at an end, and tried to persuade them to make terms with the Turks. This the infatuated Nestorians refused to do; but Dr. Grant did not relinquish his hopes of sustaining the mission; and, though abandoned by all his native assistants, when hostilities commenced he hastened with Mr. Stocking to the Persian emir, and gained the promise of his protection. They then proceeded to the patriarch, but all their efforts were unavailing to induce him to unite with the Persians against the Turks and Koords. The infatuated patriarch had entered into correspondence with the Persian governor, and the Nestorian Armenian, Media, and Moscopatia (London, 1841; Bost. 1843, 2d ed.).—See Lotthorp, Memoir of Aba Chel Grant, M.D. (N.Y. 1847, 18mo); Laurie and Grant the Mountain Nestorians (Bost., 1858; 3d ed. 1856, 12mo); D’Iriens, Rev. Engledore, August, 1858, art. vii; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, p. 561 sq.

Grant, Johnson, an English divine, and an author of some merit, was born in Edinburgh in 1778, and was educated at St. John’s College, Oxford, where he passed A.M. in 1806. He became rector of Binbrok in 1818; minister of Kentish Town Chapel in 1822; and died in 1845. He was a faithful and, at the same time, a popular preacher. Among his writings are a History of the Church of England, and of the Sects which have departed from it (London, 5th ed., 1824; 2 vols.); Lectures and Sermons in six vols. (London, 1821–45); Sketches in Divinity (London, 1840, 8vo).—Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. Bibliographica, i, 1802.

Grantham, Thomas, an English Baptist minister of distinction, was born in 1838. He was selected to deliver to Charles II the confession of faith drawn up by the General Assembly of the English church, in a later period of life to present a remonstrance against persecution, both of which were kindly received by the king, and redress of grievances promised. He was often engaged in public disputations, in which he displayed great logical skill. He also had a long controversy with the Rev. John Concourt, vicar of Norwich, who yet remained his friend through life. Among his writings is Christianus Primitivus, or the Christian Religion in its nature, certainty, excellency, etc., vindicated (London, 1678, fol.).—Benedict, History of the Baptists, vol. i; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, i, 1806.

Granville, Antoine Perrenot, cardinal, one of the most eminent politicians and diplomatists of the 15th century, was born in 1413, died on 29th May, 1517. He studied law at Padua, and afterwards theology at Louvain. He became canon of Liege, then bishop of Arras, and was often employed by the emperor Charles V in diplomatic missions. He went with his master to the diets of Worms and Augsburg, and was at the latter in the capacity of ambassador. He defended the rights of the emperor, and vainly endeavored to array the Council against France. After the battle of Mühlberg he managed the capitalization of the electors John Frederick of Saxony and Philip of Hesse, and was at the peace of Passau in 1552, and in 1558 negotiated underhand for the marriage of queen Mary of England and Philip II of Spain. When Charles V resigned the crown, Granville entered the service of his son, Philip II; in 1559 he signed the treaty of Château-Cambresis with France, and afterwards remained in the Netherlands which he protected from M. prefects. The young Turk deceived him with promises, and the unsuspecting Nestorians allowed the enemy to close against them without resistance. At last the storm burst, and there ensued such a massacre as has few parallels in history. Faint attempts were made to fill the void thus created, and choked the mountain streams. All the efforts of Dr. Grant to avert the catastrophe were useless, though for some time the protection of the emir was observed, and the missionary buildings were left undisturbed. Soon, however, they too were destroyed, and the missionaries fled for their lives. After Dr. Grant reached Mosul, “all his energies were devoted to the work of relieving the wretched fugitives who crowded the city.” In the spring he looked forward to a return home, but early in April his health began to fail, and on the 28th he died at Mosul. Dr. Grant published The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, with Sketches of France in 1855, 8vo. Fenton’s Service he was created archbishop of Mechelin by the king, and cardinal by the pope. Being succeeded almost by his enemies of too great leniency towards the Protestants, he left the Netherlands in 1564. He was finally appointed archbishop of Besançon in 1564, and died at Madrid Sept. 21, 1566. His letters and memoirs were collected by abbot Boisot; they form 80 vols. under the title of Trésor de Granvelle, in the Archives of Besançon. The most interesting of these are published in the Documents inédits pour l’histoire de la France. See Gerlach, Philip I1 d’Granvelle (Brussels, 1842); Mollet, History of the Dutch Republic; and Fenton, Rev. Dr. (Bibl. Bibliographica).—D’Iriens, Rev. Engledore, August, 1858, art. vii; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, p. 561 sq.

Grape is the representative in the A. V. of the following Heb. and Greek words: properly 2357, ephos, grapes in the berry (Gen. xii. 10, 11; xli. 11; Lev. xxv, 5; Num. vi, 8; xili, 29, 38; Deut. xxiii. 24; xxxii, 14, 32; Neh. xii, 15; Isa. v, 2, 4; Jer. viii. 13; Hos. ix. 10; Amos ix. 13; “wine,” Hos. iii. 1); not in the bunch, στόμιλος(”grapes,” Matt. vii, 16; Luke vi. 44; Rev. xiv. 10); improperly for 2357, pe'evi (lit. scattering), grapes that drop off spontaneously (Lev. xii. 10);
GRASS

GRASS is the somewhat indistinct rendering in the English Versions of several Heb. terms:

1. It is the ordinary rendering of the Hebrew word בָּרִיאָה, chaitar, which signifies properly an inclosed spot, from the root בָּרִיא, to incline; but this root also has the second meaning to flourish, and hence the noun frequently signifies "fodder," "food of cattle." It designates ripe grass fit for mowing and for feed, and in this sense it occurs in 1 Kings xvii. 5; Job xx. 5; Ps. civ. 14; Isa. xxv. 6, etc. As the herbage rapidly fades under the parching heat of the sun of Palestine, it has afforded to the sacred writers an image of the fleeting nature of human fortunes (Job vii. 12; Isa. xxvii. 2), and also of the brevity of human life (Isa. ix. 5; Ps. xxv. 5). The Sept. renders it by בָּרִיאָה and נוֹם, but most frequently by יִכְוף, a word which in Greek has passed through the very same modifications of meaning as its Hebrew representative: יִכְוף = γραμμή, "fodder," is properly a court or inclosed space for cattle to feed in (Homer, II. xi. 774), and then any feeding-place, whether inclosed or not (Job xxv. 6; Ps. lxxiv. 134). Gesenius questions whether מַעְלָה, יִכְוף, and the Sansc. kaśūra = green, may not be traceable to the same root. See LEXX.

In the N. T., wherever the word grass occurs, it is the representative of the Greek ἑγερτής. The dry stalks of grass, etc. were often used as fuel for the oven (Matt. vi. 30; xiii. 30; Luke xiv. 30). See FRIER,

2. The next most usual, and, indeed, more appropriate word, is מַעְלָה, de'ak, green grass, from the root מָעֶל, to germinate. This is the word rendered grass in Gen. i. 11, 12, where it is distinguished from שָׁכַה, e'eb, the latter signifying the herb suitable for fowl and cattle. Gesenius says it is used chiefly concerning grass, which has no seed (at least not to general observation). The sickly and few-leaved weeds which spring up spontaneously from the soil. It properly signifies the first shoots from the earth, tender grass, young herbage, as clothing the meadows, and as affording the choice food of beasts (Gen. i. 11 Isa. lxvi. 14; Deut. xxxii. 2; 2 Sam. xxiii. 4; Job vi. 5; Ps. lxix. 19; Prov. xl. 13). The sickly and few-leaved weeds which spring up on the flat plastered roofs of houses in the East are used as an emblem of speedy destruction, because they are small and weak, and, being in an elevated part, with little earth, exposed to the scorching rays of the sun, they soon wither away (2 Kings xix. 28; Ps. cxxxix. 6; Isa. xxxvii. 27). (See Hackett's Illustra, of Scrip. p. 125.) The Sept. renders it by γάλακτος, as well as by יִכְוף, בָּרִיא, and מַעְלָה. In Dan. iv. 15, 16, the corresponding Chaldee מַעָלָה, de'ak, is used. See HEBR.

In Jer. i. 11, the A. V. renders מַעְלָה קְדִישָה as the heifer at grass, and the Sept. ἀγέλθισα καὶ φέραινα. It should be "the heifer treading out corn," (comp. Hose. x. 11). מַעְלָה, דֹּאָה, the word here employed, comes from מַעְלָה, to trample out, and has been confounded with the preceding term. See FODOR.

3. שָׁכַה, e'eb, is used in Deut., in the Psalms, and in the Prophets, and as distinguished from the foregoing מַעְלָה, signifies ἀγρός for human food (Gen. i. 30; Ps. civ. 14), but also fodder for cattle (Deut. xi. 15; Jer. xiv. 6). It is the grass of the field (Gen. ii. 5; Exod. x. 29) and of the mountain (Isa. xlii. 15; Prov. xxviii. 25). See HAY.

He was consequently arrested (1521), imprisoned at Brussels, compelled to recant, and deposed from his office. The later years of his life he spent in literary retirement at Antwerp, sympathizing with reformation movements, without, however, daring to be their avowed leader. He died at Antwerp Dec. 15, 1558. Herzog, Real-Encycl. xiii. 577.

Grass is the somewhat indistinct rendering in the English Versions of several Hebrew terms:

1. It is the ordinary rendering of the Hebrew word הבַּרִיאָה, chaitar, which signifies properly an inclosed spot, from the root הבָּרִיא, to incline; but this root also has the second meaning to flourish, and hence the noun frequently signifies "fodder," "food of cattle." It designates ripe grass fit for mowing and for feed, and in this sense it occurs in 1 Kings xvii. 5; Job xx. 5; Ps. civ. 14; Isa. xxv. 6, etc. As the herbage rapidly fades under the parching heat of the sun of Palestine, it has afforded to the sacred writers an image of the fleeting nature of human fortunes (Job vii. 12; Isa. xxvii. 2), and also of the brevity of human life (Isa. ix. 5; Ps. xxv. 5). The Sept. renders it by בָּרִיא and נוֹם, but most frequently by יִכְוף, a word which in Greek has passed through the very same modifications of meaning as its Hebrew representative: יִכְוף = γραμμή, "fodder," is properly a court or inclosed space for cattle to feed in (Homer, II. xi. 774), and then any feeding-place, whether inclosed or not (Job xxv. 6; Ps. lxxiv. 134). Gesenius questions whether מַעְלָה, יִכְוף, and the Sansc. kaśūra = green, may not be traceable to the same root. See LEXX.

In the N. T., wherever the word grass occurs, it is the representative of the Greek ἑγερτής. The dry stalks of grass, etc. were often used as fuel for the oven (Matt. vi. 30; xiii. 30; Luke xiv. 30). See FRIER,

2. The next most usual, and, indeed, more appropriate word, is מַעְלָה, de'ak, green grass, from the root מָעֶל, to germinate. This is the word rendered grass in Gen. i. 11, 12, where it is distinguished from שָׁכַה, e'eb, the latter signifying the herb suitable for fowl and cattle. Gesenius says it is used chiefly concerning grass, which has no seed (at least not to general observation). The sickly and few-leaved weeds which spring up spontaneously from the soil. It properly signifies the first shoots from the earth, tender grass, young herbage, as clothing the meadows, and as affording the choice food of beasts (Gen. i. 11 Isa. lxvi. 14; Deut. xxxii. 2; 2 Sam. xxiii. 4; Job vi. 5; Ps. lxix. 19; Prov. xl. 13). The sickly and few-leaved weeds which spring up on the flat plastered roofs of houses in the East are used as an emblem of speedy destruction, because they are small and weak, and, being in an elevated part, with little earth, exposed to the scorching rays of the sun, they soon wither away (2 Kings xix. 28; Ps. cxxxix. 6; Isa. xxxvii. 27). (See Hackett's Illustra, of Scrip. p. 125.) The Sept. renders it by γάλακτος, as well as by יִכְוף, בָּרִיא, and מַעְלָה. In Dan. iv. 15, 16, the corresponding Chaldee מַעָלָה, de'ak, is used. See HEBR.

In Jer. i. 11, the A. V. renders מַעְלָה קְדִישָה as the heifer at grass, and the Sept. ἀγέλθισα καὶ φέραινα. It should be "the heifer treading out corn," (comp. Hose. x. 11). מַעְלָה, דֹּאָה, the word here employed, comes from מַעְלָה, to trample out, and has been confounded with the preceding term. See FODOR.

3. שָׁכַה, e'eb, is used in Deut., in the Psalms, and in the Prophets, and as distinguished from the foregoing מַעְלָה, signifies ἀγρός for human food (Gen. i. 30; Ps. civ. 14), but also fodder for cattle (Deut. xi. 15; Jer. xiv. 6). It is the grass of the field (Gen. ii. 5; Exod. x. 29) and of the mountain (Isa. xlii. 15; Prov. xxviii. 25). See HAY.
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4. In Numb. xxii, 4, where mention is made of the ox licking up the grass of the field, the Heb. word is פָּרָת, פָּרָת, which elsewhere is rendered green when followed by נְצָר or נְצָר, as in Gen. i, 30, and Psa. xxxvii, 2. It answers to the German das Grünne, and comes from the root פָּרָת, פָּרָת, of a flower like grass.—Smith, v. 1. See Grass.

אר (from חָזָק, to be late ripe, in the "after-math" or "rowen" that springs up on meadows after being once mown ("latter growth", Amos vii, 1). See MEADOW.

"Mown grass" is יָאָש, a mowing or mown meadow (Psa. lxxxi, 6; Amos vii, 1). See MOWER.

Dry grass or self-made hay is called עַזְרָשׁ, עַזְרָשׁ, "staff" (Isa. v, 24; xxxvii, 11). See STUBBLE.

As in Matt. vi, 30, where a lily is called "the grass of the field," it is evident that, like the Latin graminem and the English "grass," the Hebrew equivalent had a very extensive range, and was not restricted to the "grassess" (Gramineae) of the botanist. These are themselves a very ample order, ranging from diminutive plants like our own mouse-ear barley to the bamboo which seems to rise to a height of fifty or sixty feet in an Indian jungle, and including productions as various as the Aamuda domae of Southern Europe, which furnishes the fisherman with his rod and the weaver with his "reed," the cereals which supply to all mankind the staff of life, and the sugar-cane which, on the table of the humblest artisan in Europe or America, places luxuries unknown to a Roman emperor. See REED.

But when we speak of grass we are usually thinking of the narrow blades, so thickset and tender, which form the sward on a meadow, or the matchless turf on an English lawn. Or, if we are thinking of a separate plant, it is a hollow glossy stem rising up from the midst of these spiral blades, and throwing out similar leaves from its joints, till it ends in blossoming spikelets, loose or more compact, which, when the flowering time is over, show the taper corn-like seeds inclosed in the chaffy glum "as food for the cattle, even as we reserve the fruit of the cereal grasses as food for ourselves. The fescues, darnels, and poa, which clothe the meadows and build up the hay-ricks at home, are pignums, however, when compared with the grass which grows for the cattle" (other blades with the "tussac" for domestic use, whose enormous tufts form an inextricable supply to the herds both amphibious and terrestrial of the Falkland Isles, and the beautiful pampas-grass, under which the huntsman can ride and see high overhead its "plumes of long sylphic feathers."

The imperfect enumeration which we possess of grasses native to Palestine is of less importance, as the scriptural allusions may very well be understood without being able to identify the species. The psalmist wishes (Psa. cxviii, 6) that the haters of Zion may be "as the grass upon the house-tops, which withereth afore it groweth up," or, as it should be rendered, "before it is plucked up" (see Hengstenberg, Walford, etc.); and Isaiah (xxxvii, 27) speaks of vanished populations "as the grass of the field, as the grass on the house-tops, blasted before it be grown up." On the flat roofs at the present day any one may see grass which has sprung up in the rainy season, withered away by the first weeks of sunshine. "When I first came to reside in Jerusalem," says Dr. Thomson, "my house was connected with an ancient church, the roof of which was covered with a thick coat of grass. This being an awkward way of a man employed to repair my house, he actually set fire to it and burned it off; I have seen others do the same thing without the slightest hesitation. Nor is there any danger; for it would require a large expense for fuel sufficient to burn the present city of Jerusalem" (Land and Book, ii, 574). Indeed nearer home we may often see grass and even oats springing up on the roof of a thatched cottage, and a goat peregrinating nibbling the herbage before it is withered. The dew "distilling" on the grasses in the morning descending on the mown grass, or rather on the grass which has been close-browsed by the cattle, furnishes the sacred poetry with a frequent and exquisite image (Deut. xxxiii, 2; Psa. lxxvi, 6; Prov. xix, 12; Micah v, 7); and still more frequently does that emblem occur in which our fleeting generations are compared to the grass "which in the morning growth up and which in the evening cut down and withereth" (Psa. xc, 6; xxxvii, 2; xcii, 7; cii, 11; ciii, 15; Isa. xi, 6; James i, 10; 1 Pet. i, 24).

Grasshopper is the rendering in certain passages of the Auth. Vers. of three Heb. words: פָּרָת, פָּרָת, "arkh" (Judg. vi, 5; vii, 12; Job xxxix, 20; Jer. xvi, 26), a locust (as elsewhere rendered), sometimes a particular species, the migratory kind (Lev. xi, 22; Joel i, 4); בַּלְגֹּל, balgal (Lev. xi, 22; Num. xxx, 88; Eccles. xi, 5; Isa. xi, 22), a locust (2 Chron. vii, 19), winged and edible (Lev. xi, 22), and therefore evidently not a proper grasshopper. See Locust. In Numb. xxiii, 38; Isa. xi, 22, this insect is used to express comparative insignificance. In Exe. xi, 5 reference is probably made to that degree of weakness and infirmity in old age which makes the weight, or even the chirping of this insect, to be burdensome. For the curious illustration of this passage from the fable of Tithonius, see Kittle's Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc. See OLD AGE.

The true grasshopper (Gryllus grassus) belongs to a tribe of neopterous insects styled Gryllides, and it appears from modern travellers that it is not unknown in Palestine. Its habits greatly resemble those of its congener, the Oriental locust; it has mandibles or jaws peculiarly fitted for devouring green vegetables, and in many parts even of America its ravages often become quite formidable. See INSECT.

Grate (גָּרֶט, tibrith, something twined, from גָּרָה, to braid; Sept. lekinia), a network of brass for the bottom of the great altar of sacrifice (Exod. xxvii, 4; xxxv, 10; xxxix, 4, 5, 50; xxxix, 38), placed horizontally in the fire-bed so as to allow the cinders, ashes, etc. to pass through, and a draught of air to supply the fire upon it. See ALTAR.

Gratian. See GRACE.

Gratian or Gratianus, an Italian Benedictine and distinguished canonist, was born toward the end of the 11th century. He appears to have first entered the convent of Classe, near Ravenna, from whence he removed to that of St. Felix de Bologna, where he wrote his Decretum. According to his contemporaries, he was a nephew of Mont St. Michel. He became subsequently bishop of Avignon, which fact is also asserted by an Italian biographer in the 14th century. The latter adds that Gratian, having sent his Decretum to the pope by a priest, the latter claimed to be the author of it, but the fraud having been detected, the pope indemnified

Gratianus, emperor of Rome, son of Valentinian I, was born in 329, and on the death of his father, A.D. 375, succeeded to a share of the Western Empire. On the death of his uncle Valens, A.D. 378, he obtained control of the whole empire; but he appointed Theodosius his colleague, giving him the Eastern provinces. He was killed A.D. 398, in a revolt in Gaul. Gratian was tolerant towards the various sects which divided Christianity, but he displayed a stern determination against the remains of the heathen wor- ship. At Rome he oversaw the altar of Victory, which continued to exist; he confiscated the property attached to it, as well as the property belonging to the other priests and the Vestals. He also refused to as- sume the title and the insignia of Pontifex Maximus, and on his death the dignity was transferred as an appendage of the emperor. These measures gave a final blow to the old worship of the empire; and although the senators, who for the most part were still attached to it, sent him a deputation, at the head of which was Symmachus, they could not obtain any mitigation of his decrees.—Engl. Cyclopaedia; Moseheim, Church Hist. cent. iv, pt. ii, ch. v, § 15.

Gratus (pleasing, Gracezied Fyrgo), Valerius, procurator of Judaea from A.D. 15 to 26, being the first appointed by Tiberius, and the immediate predecessor of Pilate (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 6, 5). The government of Gratius is chiefly remarkable for the frequent changes which he made in the Jewish highpriests, the deposition of Ananias and the substitution in his room of a man named Fabi; next Eleazar, son of Ananias; then Simon, son of Ca- mitius; and lastly Joseph Caiaphas, son-in-law of Ananias (ib. 2, 3). He put down two formidable bands of robbers that infested Judaea during his procuratorship, and killed with his own hand the captain of one of them, Simon, formerly a slave of Herod the Great (ib. xvii, 10, 6, 7; War, ii, 4, 2, 5). Gratius assisted the procurator Quintius Varus in quelling an insur- rection of the Jews (War, ii, 5, 2).—Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s. v. See Judas.

Gratul, Karl D.D., a German theologian, was born in Feb. 6, 1801, at Dusseldorf. After studying theology at Leipzig, he was for a time tutor in an Eng- lish family residing in Italy. On his return he was appointed teacher in a school at Dusseldorf, and in 1844 director of the missionary society of Dresden. During his management, which lasted from 1839 to 1847, the society had an almost tenfold increase of its annual reve- nue, and from being a society merely of the little king- dom of Saxony, became a general Lutheran missionary society of Continental Europe. In order to give to the pupils of the missionary seminary an opportunity to at- tend the lectures of a university, Gratul caused, in 1834, its transfer from Dresden to Leipzig. He concentrated

...
GRAVE

all the efforts of the Church upon the missionary work among the Tamula in South India, and from 1849 to 1858 made himself a journey through Palestine and Egypt to India, to examine the condition and the prospects of the mission. While in India he devoted a special attention to the study of the language and literature of the Tamula, as the result of which he published the "Lithoea Tazulica" (Leips. 1854-56, 6 vols.). He also published an account of his journey in 5 vols. (Reise nach Odintzeln, Leips. 1854-56). In the question of caste, Graul was opposed to the practice of all the English and American missionary societies, and in favor of tolerating the differences of caste among the Christian converts. He published, in defense of his views, in 1852, a pamphlet in the English language at Madras, and in 1861 another in the German language at Leipsic ("Die Stellung der evangel.-luther. Mission in Leipsig zur onlind. Kautenfrage, 1861"). He resigned his place as director of the missionary seminary at Leipsic, and in 1862 went to Erlangen with a view of connecting himself with the university, but a serious sickness prevented him from carrying out this design. He died Nov. 10, 1864. Of the numerous works of Graul, that with which he was most familiar was his "Biблиocl. Беblenstahne, Lpz. 1846; revised by Harnack, 1867), in which he shows an extreme unfailness in his remarks. His "Reise nach Odintzeln" is the most noted work among his other works is one on Ireneus ("Die christ. Kirche an der Schwelle des 7ten. Zeitalters, Lpz. 1860.").—Herzog, Real-Encykl. xix, 578.

GRAVE (properly "grab la, kerber, a sepulchre; Greek μνημεῖον or μνημονίου, a tomb, as a monument [see Buri-
al]) is also in some passages of the common vers. the rendering of ἱερᾶς, "shrine," ἱερός, "sacred" [see SHEEL; HADDAS]; once of μνημονεύω, "shun the (Job xxxii, 29), the pit or open sepulchre, as elsewhere rendered; and once erroneously of "grā, "prefer" (Job xxx, 24). See TOMB.

Sepulchres among the ancient Hebrews were, as still among all Orientals (Schweigger, Reisen, p. 199; Shaw, Travels, p. 192; Hasselquist, p. 56 sq.), outside of cities (see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 167; according to the Talmud, Babs. Batr. ii, 9, at least fifty yards distant from the city walls), in the open field (Luke v, 12; John xi, 39; compare Cicero, Leg. ii, 23; & ad famili. iv, 12, 9; Plutarch, Afr. 58; Theocrit. vii, 10; Homer, Il, viii, 435 sq.; Michaelis, Mos. Recht. ii, 807). Only kings and great nobles (Job xvi, 6, 29; 2 Chron. xxv, 33, 35; xvii, 9; 2 Chron. xvi, 14; xxvii, 37) and prophets (1 Sam. xxv, xvi; xxvii, 8) were allowed to be buried within cities (Harn. Obs. ii, 129 sq.; compare Thucyd. v, 11; Potier, Gr. Ant., ii, 427 sq.; when it is said that any one was interred in his house (1 Kings ii, 54; 2 Chron. xxviii, 20), we must understand the grounds or environs of the house to be meant, i. e. the garden (comp. Numb. xix, 18); it was otherwise among the ancient Romans, Isidore, Orig. x, 2). Generally the graves were pits or graves (Gen. xxvii, 17; xxxvii, 8; 1 Sam. xiv, 18; 2 Kings xxii, 18, 26; John iii, 41; comp. Strabo, iv, 636; Virgil, Ec. vi, 851), shady spots under trees or in gardens being preferred (Eck, De sepulcris in hortis, Meling. 1738 sq.; Walch, Observ. in Matt. xx inscript. p. 89); and those excavations were either natural, with which Palestine abounds [see C. T. Leslie, "Israel," chap. vii], or the result of which he published the subject and walked up; see Knobel, Jena. p. 99, or hewn in rocks (Isa. xxii, 16; 2 Chron. xvii, 14; Matt. xxvii, 60; John xii, 38; Luke xxiii, 53), sometimes very spacious and with numerous side-passages and chambers (Baboo Bucholz, "Israel," 9); they are also described as graves sunk perpendicular as in the ground (Luke xi, 20); and were occasionally situated on hills (2 Kings xxiii, 16; comp. Isidore, Orig. x, 11). Not only in the case of kings and nobles (2 Kings ix, 28; 2 Chron. xxxii, 32; xxxv, 24; 1 Macc. ii, 70; ix, 19; xiii, 25, etc.), but in every good family (Gen. xlviii, 20; Judg. viii, 32; 2 Sam. ii, 32; 1 Kings xii, 22; Tobit xiv, 12; 1 Macc. ii, 70), were there hereditary vaults (it was a deep disgrace to the remains of persons of distinction to be buried among those of the poor). See Jer. xxvi, 23; and it appears the very natural desire of those dying abroad to repose in such family cemeteries (Gen. xlviii, 29; i, 5; 2 Sam. xix, 37; 1 Kings xii, 32, 31; Neh. ii, 8; comp. Sophocles, Elektra, 1181 sq.; Aeschyl. Gr. ii, 169; 2 Sam. iv, 15; 2 Kings xxiv, 6; De terra sancta a Jacobo et Josepto expatrat. Viteb. 1742; Semler, De patriarcharum ut in Palest. sepulturatur decedere, Hale, 1756; Carpaov, in Ugolini Theaur. xxxiii). But whoever had not such a hereditary sepulchre wished none the less to rest in the land of his fathers, but went to the fields (see Prov. xi, 10, in the margin). (Ex. xxv, 4, 5). For the poor were (later) public buri-
al-places assigned (Jer. xxvi, 23; 2 Kings xxii, 6; comp. Matt. xxvii, 7). As a protection chiefly against the carnivorous jackals (Plini., v, 44), the graves were closed with doors or large stones (Matt. xxvii, 57, 109; Luke xxiii, 53; Acts iv, 30). (March), after the rainy reason (Shekel, i, 1), they were (in the post-elemental period) whitewashed afresh (Massee Smén, v, 1), in order to warn the great multitudes of strangers visiting the Passover against contact (Matt. xxvii, 37; see Lightfoot and Schöttgen, ad loc. Prochorus, ad loc. Oecumenes, ad loc. and Reustach, Die sepulcrum calce notaarvz, in Ugolini Theaur. xxxiii), which caused pollution (Numb. xix, 16; comp. Josephus, Ant. xvii, 2, 5). There are still many such sepulchral grooves in Palestine, Syria, and Idumae generally (see Pococke, East, ii, 70, 100, etc., Burchhardt, i, 229 sq.; Robinson, i, 78 sq.; ii, 175 sq.; 668; iii, 817, 692). They descend sometimes vertically, sometimes horizontally in the earth, the former by steps. Within are usually found several chambers or apartments, of which one sometimes lies deeper than another. Most of them have on the side of the cells, six to seven feet long, in which the bodies are deposited. Among those found at Jerusalem, for which tradition assigns special names and origin, are the Sepulcrum of the Kings (perhaps derived from 2 Chron. xxvi, 20; xxvii, 37; compare Neh. iii, 16; Acts ii, 29; see Ne-

buhler, p. 63; Rosenmuller, Alt. ii, 269 sq.; Robinson, i, 386 sq.; ii, 183; compare Hottinger, Cippili Hebraici, Heidelberg, 1850 [also in Ugolini Theaur. xxxiii]). They consist of an anteroom and between chambers, lying on the north of the city, east of the temple (Malch. i, 3; misc. of the nobility, and not merely, if at all, to the ancient Jewish kings. See Jerusalem. Far more imposing are the sepulchres of Egypt, and especially celebrated by the ancients is the tomb of king Osyamandias (Diod. Sic. i, 47 sq.), of which the ruins are still extant (Pococke, i, 159). Above the tombs were from the earli-
est times erected monuments (Gen. xxxv, 20; 2 Esd. xxxv, 20, as often on the Phoenician grave-stones, originally of very rude work (Stich. auf der Erde, 22; John xxii, 22; 1 Macc. xxv, 255 sq.; Virgil, Ec. vi, 851), later in the form of splendid mausolea (1 Macc. xxvii, 27 sq.; Josephus, Ant. vii, 10, 3; xx, 4, 8; comp. Pausanias, viii, 16, 3; see Salmianus, ad Solin. p. 851; Zorn, in the Nov. Miscell. Jp. v, 218 sq.) with various devices (2 Sam. xviii, 16). To open a grave forcibly in order to ab-

struce a stone or earth (Joseph. Ant. vii. 10; 2 Sam. iv, 4); weapons (Ezek. xxxii, 27; 1 Macc. xxii, 29; Curtius, v, 18), or other articles deposited with the body (comp. Sept. Vet. at Josh. xiv, 30; Jerome, ad Jer. vii; Rosenmuller, Morgend. iii, 10), or even the bones of the deceased (John, 20, 24; comp. Dind. Sic. xiii, 86; xiv, 63; see Wächter, Uber Ezechiesid bei d. Röm. p. 209 sq.; Abegg, Straf-
The reliefs of the dead were thus pillaged for magical purposes (Apul. Metam. ii, p. 38, Bp.; Heron, Epod. xiv, 8 sq.; Lucan, vi, 538; and Cebes and Thule, 2). The marble does not appear very clearly from Isa. lxv, 4. There are scriptural traces of the popular idea that graves were the residence of demons (comp. Matt. viii, 28), who were perhaps connected with soothsaying (Acts xvi, 16); other, more subtle allusions to the superstitious notions respecting offering to the manes of the departed (inferior, fructuations; compare Athen. iii, 98; Macrobr. Sat. i, 13, p. 263, Bp.; Barhebr. Chron. p. 256); or a species of necromancy practised in such spots (see Gregor. Nazianz. Or. in Psal. p. 91; Otho. Lex. Rhyd. p. 171). The graves of the prophets and holy persons were in post-exilian times sedulously repaired and adorned (Matt. xxiii, 29; see Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. i, 205; Eckhard, De adhibitiose et exorcismate sepulcorum, Jena, 1746), a tribute of reverence (and eventually of grateful veneration, Matt. xxiii, 80 sq.), which was not unknown likewise in Greek antiquity (Kilian, Var. Hist. ii, 7; Diod. Siculus, xi, 58; Athen. xii, 583; Suetonius, Octav. xviii; the Greeks even appointed the tombs of honored men, Plutarch, Alex. c. 15), and still general in the East (Kämpfer, Asia, iii, 171, as works of art and of general utility). See generally Nicolaï, De sepulcris Hebr. (1. B. 1706; also in Ugo-, lino, xxxiii); Fuhrmann, Hist. Unterricht über die Bergräberplätze der Alten (Halle, 1800). See SEPUL- 

CHRE.

Gravel (גֶּלע, chesta'ts), something broken or small: gravel-stone, Prov. xx, 17; Lam. iii, 16. In Psa. lixvii, 7, נֹּֽבַה, "thine arrows," is regarded by First as a redundant formative from נֹּֽבַה; in Isa. xxviii, 19, נֹּֽבַה, erroneously "the gravel thereof," is undoubtedly the same as in נֹּֽבַה preceding, and stands elliptically for "[the issue of its bowels," sc. the sea's, i. e. the fish that spawn so numerous], com- minuted rock, coarser than sand, but smaller than stones, forming a large part of what is known geolog- 

ically as "drift" or diluvium over the surface of the earth. See LAND.

Graven Image (גֶּלע, pe'el, plur. נֹּֽבַה, a carving). From the passage in Deut. xxvii, 15, "Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place, and all the people shall go out, and say unto him, Amen," we may fairly infer with Michaelis, in his Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, that there was a marked distinction between idols and images, or rather between idolatry and image-worship, which appears to have prevailed from the earliest times. See IDOL, pe'el, or graven image, seems to refer to the household gods; an idol is termed נֹּֽבַה, eli', and in some places נֹּֽבַה, he'bel, both words having a similar signification, that of "valn, void, void." The distinction is particularly marked in Psa. xc, 7: "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols." John says (Archeol. § 400), "Every nation and city had its own gods, which at first had acquired some celebrity by the worship of some particular family merely, but were at length worshipped by the other families of that town or nation, yet every family had its separate household or tutelary god. No one felt himself bound to worship every god, but paid his honors, as he chose, to those he deemed the most propit- ious or most powerful. But still he did all he could to think it advisable wholly to neglect other gods, lest perchance, thinking themselves consoled by such neglect, they should revenge themselves by sending some evil retribution." (See Reineccius, De non faciendo sculptulis, Wurmeia, 1724.) See TERAPEUT.

There has been a good deal of discussion as to the extent of the prohibition contained in the second com- mandment; some (including early Jewish commentators) have thought that the prohibited articles were "con- dened against this extreme view Michaelis protests (Laws of Moses, art. 250), on the reasonable ground that certain figures were in fact made by God's own command. Both in the Tabernacle and the Temple many objects were provided which would put under contribution the above-mentioned "sacrificial" laws. In the Temple, for example, the gilded candlestick (xxxv, 34); the various embroidered hangings of the sanctuary (ch. xxvi); and the brazen serpent (Num. xxi, 5, 9). So again in the Temple, besides the cherubim, were the dragon, the figures of all kinds, as well as the brazen sea, as it was called, which rested on twelve brazen oxen. Ezekiel's temple, in like manner, has cherubim with the heads of men and lions. Even after the return from Babylon, when men severely interpreted the prohibition of the commandment, there were figures of animals on the golden candlestick (Beland, De Spolios Temp. Hier. in Arcs Selmos), and vines with pendent clusters on the roof of the second Temple, and the golden symbolic vine over the large gate. Not the making of images itself, but all attempts to represent the very God, or even their saints (Kitto, Pictorial Bible, Deut. v, 8, 9). There were, however, from whatever cause, limitations in fact, which the artisans who ornamented the Tabernacle and the Temple observed. In the for- mer, nothing is mentioned as fabricated of φιλος; nor is skill in metalworking His metal included among the qualifications of the artificer Bezaleel; while i in the Temple there is no mention made of sculptured stones in any part of the building. All the decorations were either carved in wood and then overlaid with metal, or wholly cast in metal. Even the famous portal of Jachin and Boaz were entirely of brass (Kitto on 2 Chron. iii, 6). The qualifications of the accomplished men who built the Tabernacle (Bezaleel and Abiob) and the Temple (Hiram) are carefully indicated; to the former, especially Bezaleel, is attributed skill in 'carving (Exod. xxxii, 4); to the latter, "the candlestick and the table after the work of the sea, and all manner of workmanship that thou shalt do." (See GREGORY.)

Graving Work. A French Protestant theologian, was born at Nismes, July 28, 1647 (Sept. 11, 1656, ac- cording to Gravorol de Floghrevrair). After studying theology at Geneva, he was appointed minister of Tra- del (Vivarais) in 1671. In 1672 he removed to Lyons. After the revocation of the edict of Nantes he went to Holland, remained a while in Amsterdam, and finally went to take charge of a French congregation in Lon- don. He died there in 1780, according to Menard; in 1778, according to Watt. He wrote De Religiones Con- ciliatoribus (Lausanne, 1674, 12mo, under the pseudo- nym of "theologian"); L'Eglise protestante est sû- re par l'Eglise romaine sur quelques points de contro- verse (Geneva, 1682, 12mo, Anon.):—Projet de réunion entre les protestants de la Grande-Bretagne (Lond., 1689, 8vo):—Moes viaductus ad Th. Burnettii archeologias philosophicas (Amst. 1684, 8vo):—Projet de réunion entre les protestants de la République helvetique (Amst., 1697, 8vo). See Moréri, Dict. Hist.; Bayle, Œuvres diverses, iv, 605 and 610; Michel Nicholas, Hist. litt. de Nimes, vol. ii: Haug, Les Francs Protestants; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxi, 746.

Graves, Hiram Atwill, a Baptist pastor and
writer, was born at Wendell, Mass., in 1818. In boyhood he was a precocious student. He graduated at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1834. On account of impaired health he did not pursue a regular course of study for the ministry, but was ordained in 1837 at Springfield, Mass. He became pastor of a church in Lynn, and in 1842 editor of the Christian Reflector, a paper which has since, in conjunction with another, become a journal of extensive influence. Infirm health sent him to Cuba in 1845, and to reside in Jamaica in 1849. He returned without essential benefit, and died in 1856.

Graves, Richard, D.D., a learned Irish divine, was born at Kilfinnan, Linnecar, Oct. 1, 1768, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, of which he became fellow in 1786. In 1813 he became dean of Ardfag, and regius professor of divinity. He died Mar. 29, 1829. Horne pronounces his Lectures on the Pentateuch (1807, 2 vols. 8vo) "indispensably necessary to the Biblical student." Besides that learned work, which passed through several editions, he wrote The Apostles and Evangelists not Enthusiasts (1798):—Scriptural Proofs of the Trinity (four discourses):—Absolute Prostration compared with the Scripture statement of the Fatherhood of God:—Prostration repugnant to the general tenor of Scripture (London, 1829). These, with a number of Sermons, are given in his Whole Works now first collected (London, 1840, 4 vols. 8vo), of which vol. 1 contains a memoir of his life and writings by his son, R. H. Graves, D.D.

Graving. There is much indiscernibility in the terms of this ancient art of the Jews, arising from the fact that one and the same artisan combined, in skill and name, in so many branches, which the modern principle of "division of labor" has not yet applied to different pursuits. Thus Aholiah was not only "an engraver," but also "a cunning workman in general art," and an embroiherer in blue, and in purple, and in scarlet and fine linen (Exod. xxxviii, 23). In like manner Benazeel is described as accomplished "in all manner of workmanship; and to devise curious works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones to set them, and in carving of wood, to make any manner of cunning work" (Exod. xxxv, 35—38). These numerous gifts they both possessed and employed themselves and others; indeed, that they formed an early school of art to supply the demand created by the institution of the Mosaic ritual, the members of which school were as comprehensive in their attainments as their great teachers (Exod. xxxv, 34, xxxvi, 1). The same combination of arts seems to have characterized the later school, which was formed under the auspices of David, when preparing for the erection of the Temple (1 Chron. xxii, 15; xxvii, 21). Many of these artificers were Phenicians, whom the king had invited to his new capital. II (Sam. v, 11; 1 Chron. xiv, 1). In the next reign, Hiram, to whose genius the Temple, which Solomon owed much of the beauty of its architectural details, as well as its sacred vessels (1 Kings vii, 15—45), was a native of Tyre, the son of a Tyrian artificer by an Israelitish mother. This man's skill was again as comprehensive as that of his great predecessors (v, 16).

3. צֶ֣כֶת, chakak, describes a branch of art which more literally coincides with our idea of engraving. In Ezek. iv, 1 the word is used of engraving a πέτρα on a πέτρας or on a στήλη (Job xxxii, 25); in Job xxxii, 25, of inscribing upon tablets of stone or metal, a very early instance of the art; similarly in Isa. xxx, 8; while in Ezek. xxii, 14 (_particle?) the word seems to indicate painting, portraying in colors ( Particle) : and the addition of Particle upon the wall, raises the suspicion that fresco art, which was known to very ancient nations, including the Egyptians, was practiced by the Babylonians, and admired, if not imitated by the Jews; compare comp. Soc. iv, 8 (Painting is known to the Assyrians, Egyptians, Greeks, etc., see Sir G. Wilkinson, On Color and Taste, p. 153.). The Sept. renders the remarkable phrase before us, Particle, with specifying color; but Symmachus, the Vulgate, the Peshito, and the Chaldee paraphrases all include in their version the press idea of color. The idea of careful and accurate art which is implied in the term under consideration implies
much beauty to the passage in Isa. xi, 16, "Behold, I have grafted thee upon the palms of my hands," where the same word is used. (There is here an allusion to the Eastern custom of tracing out on the hands the sketches of eminent cities or places, and then rubbing them with the powder of the henna or cypress, and so making the figures perpetually visible.) Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 100 [London, 1830] describes the process of "pillgrims having their arms and hands marked with the usual ensignia of Jerusalem." See also Rosenmüller, ad loc., and J. D. Michaelis, Note in Locutio Prophet. [Oxford, 1827], p. 601, 605, and Barthelemy, oriental Costume and Costume, p. 149 [London, 1810].

The second clause of this passage, "Thy walls are continually before me," may be compared with Isa. xxii, 16, where our verb פֶּן is also employed to describe the engraved plan or sketch of a house for architectural purposes. Among other applications of the art indicated by this word may be mentioned monolithic monuments, such as the אֶּרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל of Sam. vii, 12, with suitable inscriptions; see especially Deut. xxxii, 4-8.

4. In יָרָשׁ, paexel, and its noun יָרָשָׁה, pe sel (always rendered in A. V. "graven image"), we have the operation rather of the sculptor's or the carver's art than the engraver's. In several passages of Isaiah (xxx. 27; xxi. 19; xii. 7; xlix. 12-15) curious details are given of the fabrication of idols, which afforded a facile employment of the various artist's engiemed in the complicated labor of image-manufacture (see also Jer. x. 8-9, from which it would seem that the wrought and prepared metal for covering the idol was imported, and put on by Jewish artisans). Working in ivory was common to the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson's Anc. Egyptians, iii, 169), the Assyrians (Layard's Ninevites, ii, 420), the ancient Greeks (Grube's Grecia, vi, 30-32), and the artificers of Jerusalem (Solomon's ivory throne, 1 Kings x, 18; ivory palaces, Psa. xiv, 8; ivory beds, Amos vi, 4) and of Samaria (Ahab's ivory house, 1 Kings xii, 32; which was not an uncommon luxury, Amos iii, 15). No doubt the alliance of the royal houses of Israel and (indirectly) of Judah with the Phoenician monarch (1 Kings xvi, 31) was the means of attracting many of the artificers of Tyre, and Sidon, and Gebal to the metropolis of each of the Jewish kingdoms; both in Solomon's time and in Ahab's, ivory-sculpture was probably a Phoenician art. The neighboring idolators, whose example was so disastrous to Israel, were skilled in image-manufacture. From Deut. vii, 25 it appears that the body of the idol was of sculpture, and the head overlaid with one or more precious metals. The passage, 1 Sam. vi, 2-12, seems to prove that the Philistines had artificers in the precious metals capable of forming the figures of small animals; and their idols that were taken from the spoils of the great battle of Baal-perazim were probably graven of wood (1 Chron. xiv, 12).

5. מָשָׁל, pathock (in Fiel and Pual), is perhaps distinguished from the term we have just considered (מְשָׁל) by being used to describe figures in relief rather than statues, such as the cherubic figures on the walls of the Temple (see 1 Chron. iii, 7). Compare the cognate noun מִשָּׁל, puliuach, engraved figure, in 1 Kings vi, 29, which passage informs us that the Temple walls were lavishly adorned with these figures, standing out probably in various degrees of relief (see also other such work, described by this word, 1 Kings viii, 26). The chief application, however, of the word is to the cutting and engraving of precious stones and metals (issantio work, as distinguished from the raised work of cameo, etc.), such as the breastplate of the high priest, the altar, the door and the plate of his mitre (ver. 36, 37). The mystic engraving of Zech. iii, 9 is likewise described in the same terms. The splendid jewelry of Solomon's time, as referred to in the Canticles, i, 10, 11, is best classed under the art indicated by מְשָׁל and its derivatives. From Isa. iii, 18, 24, it appears that this art of the goldsmith continued rife in later reigns, and was not unknown even after the captivity (see Zech. vi, 11). The neighboring nations were no less skilled in this branch of art; for instance, the Egyptians, Exod. xxi, 35, compared with xxxii, 3-5; the Chaldeans, Josh. vi, 19; the Medes, Ezech. xlix, 51, and (afterwards) Judg. viii, 24-26; the Ammonites, I Chron. xxx, 2; the Syrians of Zoba- hab and Hamath, 2 Sam. vii, 7-11.

6. מְשָׁל, mik'ath, like our last term of art, describes sculpture in relief (Pirrt, Hebr. Worterb. i, 780); it occurs 1 Kings vi, 18, 29 ("carved figures" of cherubims), vii, 2; viii, 31 ("graving").

7. מָשָׁל, m'sel, occurs only in Exod. xxxii, 4 (A. V. "giving food") and in Isa. viii, 1 (A. V. "a pen"). This was rather the sculptorum fabrile of the Romans (Livy xxiv, 49) than the stylus (see Smith's Dict. of G. and R. Antiq. s.v. Sculptura). For other two opinions as to the meaning of מְשָׁל in Exod. xxxii, 4, see Gesenius, Thee, p. 530.

8. מָשָׁל, m'sel, (which in Psa. xiv, 2 and Jer. viii, 8, means a writer's style or reed), has the same meaning as the previous word in the other places of its occurrence (Job xii, 10; Prov. xvii, 11; Dan. iv, 18). Yet he has given it the use of מָשָׁל, i.e. "pen of iron." The occurrence of מָשָׁל in Job xii, 10, points to the קֶּרֶב the idea of a finer art than is usually expressed by that verb (see De Saulcy's Hist. de l'art Judaïque, Paris, 1856).

See CARVE.

Gray (some form of the root מָשָׁל, m'sel), applied to the hair as an indication of old age (q. v.), which in the East is universally respected (Prov. xx, 29). See HAIR.

GrayFriars. One of the mendicant orders, otherwise called Franciscans, Minorites, etc. The name is derived from the dress which they wore. See FRANCISCANS.

Gray, James, D.D., a minister of the Associated Reformed Church, was born at Corvoam, Ireland, Dec. 25, 1770. He entered the college of Glasgow in 1790; graduated in 1798; afterward studied theology under the Rev. John Rogers, and was licensed by the Presbytery of Monaghan. In 1797 he sailed for America. After laboring with great acceptance at Washington, N. Y., until 1808, he accepted a unanimous call to the Spruce-street Church, in connection with the Associate Reformed Synod, Philadelphia. In 1808 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Pennsylvania. He was one of the most important agents in establishing the theological seminary of the Associated Reformed Church in the city of New York. In 1808 he took an active part in the organization of the Philadelphian Bible Society, and was for a long time its corresponding secretary. At this time, in connection with Dr. S. B. Wylie, he opened a classical academy, which soon obtained great repute. After several years of this labor he resigned the school, and also his pastoral charge, and removed to Baltimore, where he devoted himself especially to the study of certain points in theology until his death, which occurred at Gettysburg, Pa., Sept. 20, 1824. His literary reputation rests chiefly on his Mediatorial Reign of the Son of God. He also edited for one year a Theological Review, and published several Occasional Sermons.—Sprague, Annals (Associate Ref.), i, 94.

Gray, Robert, D.D., bishop of Bristol, was born at London in 1763. He studied at Eton and Oxford, took his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1791, and became successively vicar of Holy Trinity (Berkshire), rector of Cralk (Yorkshire) in 1802, and canon of Durham in 1804. His benevolence, and the talents evinced in his works, caused him to be appoint-
ed by Lord Liverpool's cabinet to the bishopric of Bristol in 1827. He was very popular in this position, and the duke of Wellington offered him the see of Bangor. He declined, and died soon after at Rodney House, Sept. 28, 1834. He wrote: *Key to the O. T. and Apocrypha*, or an account of their several books, their contents, and authors, and of the times in which they were respectively written (Lond. 1790, 8vo; 9th ed. 1829, 8vo):—*Discourses Illustrative of the Evidence, Influence, and Doctrines of Christianity* (Lond. 1789, 8vo):—*Sermons on the Principles of the Reformation of the Church of England* (Bampton Lecture, 1798, 8vo):—*The Theory of Dreams* (Lond. 1806, 8vo):—*The Connection between the Sacred Writings and the Literature of Jewish and heathen Nations* (Lond. 1812, 8vo); *A View to Establish Evidence in Confirmation of the Truth and Revealed Religion* (Lond. 1819, 2d ed. 2 vols. 8vo).—Rose, *New General Biographer*, Dict.; Hosier, *New Biog. Générale*, xxi, 766; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographiae, 1, 1890.

Grease (γρατζ), *ca’ leb*, Psal. cxix, 70, *fist* [q. v.], as elsewhere rendered.

Great Britain and Ireland, the United King- dom of, is, since the union of Ireland, the full official designation of the country more generally known as Great Britain, that is, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. It includes the two large islands of Great Britain (England and Scotland) and Ireland, and the adjacent smaller islands, together with the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. The island of Great Britain—so called to distinguish it from Britannia Minor, or Little Britain (see Ireland) —lies between Lat. 49° 57' 50" and 58° 40' 24" N., and between long. 1° 46' E. and 6° 18' W., and is the largest island in Europe. It is bordered on the N. by the Atlantic, on the E. by the North Sea, on the S. by the English Channel, and on the W. by the Atlantic, the Irish Sea, and St. George's Channel. The most northerly point is Dunnottet Head, in Caithness; the most southerly, Lizard Point, in Cornwall; the most easterly, Lowestoft Ness, in Norfolk; and the most westerly, Ardnamurchan Point, in Argyllshire. Its greatest length is about 800 miles, and its greatest breadth (from Land's End to the east coast of Kent) about 320 miles, while its surface contains about 89,600 square miles. In addition to the home territories comprising the kingdom, Great Britain possesses a multitude of dependencies, some of them of vast extent, scattered over every part of the globe, and which are also styled "empire", or "an empire over the sun never sets." According to the official census held in 1861 in the United Kingdom, and nearly all the colonies except British India, the extent and population of all the British dominions were in that year as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Area (sq. miles)</th>
<th>Population (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (including soldiers and sailors)</td>
<td>131,115</td>
<td>89,821,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonies and possessions (exclusive of soldiers, 45,814 men)</td>
<td>3,964,792</td>
<td>9,864,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British India (exclusive of British army, 42,002 men)</td>
<td>953,729</td>
<td>120,571,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Possessions</td>
<td>129,312</td>
<td>8,388,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Colonies</td>
<td>519,193</td>
<td>8,938,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian Possessions</td>
<td>128,288</td>
<td>1,114,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyssinia</td>
<td>1,004,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessions in the South Atlantic Ocean</td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>7,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessions in the Indian Ocean</td>
<td>2,463,766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>2,558,976</td>
<td>1,392,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,419,390</td>
<td>114,156,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not included in this enumeration is the vast territory in North America which heretofore belonged to the Hudson's Bay Company, which in 1869 ceded its right of sovereignty. Added to the above total of square miles, this territory would increase the total extent of the British dominions to about seven millions of square miles, and make it, in point of extent, the first empire of the world. The total population was estimated in 1860 at 200,000,000; and in this respect the British empire was the second of the world, being exceeded only by the Chinese empire.

In England and Wales the Anglican Church is recognised as the state Church [see England, Church of], and the sovereign must belong to it. In Ireland the Anglican Church was also the established Church until 1869, when, after a long and violent struggle between the Conservative and Liberal parties, it was disestablished. See Ireland. In Scotland the established Church is Presbyterian. See Scotland. According to the census returns of 1861 (in the census returns of 1861 religions statistics were not included), the number of places of worship, together with the sittings provided in England and Wales, and the estimated number of attendants on a particular day, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England and Wales</th>
<th>Places of Worship</th>
<th>Sittings Provided</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Attendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established Church</td>
<td>14,077</td>
<td>5,317,910</td>
<td>7,173,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Methodist (comprising sects)</td>
<td>11,207</td>
<td>9,194,296</td>
<td>8,680,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents or Congregationalists</td>
<td>5,844</td>
<td>1,067,100</td>
<td>798,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist (see sects)</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>718,513</td>
<td>507,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvinistic Methodists</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>180,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish and Irish Presbyterians</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>668,012</td>
<td>81,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Congregations</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>104,651</td>
<td>61,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>136,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Friends</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>909,584</td>
<td>81,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarians</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>65,654</td>
<td>73,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter-Day Saints (see sects)</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>115,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandemanians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethren</td>
<td>18,620</td>
<td>110,850</td>
<td>104,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravians</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>7,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarianist Free Church</td>
<td>10,836</td>
<td>25,305</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostolic Church</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7,427</td>
<td>4,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Protestant, Catholic, and Greek Churches</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,457</td>
<td>2,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Denominations:
- 30,990 | 4,097,720 | 3,477,468

Total: 54,827 | 7,139,635 | 7,651,087

| Scotland |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Established Church | 1,642 | 2,187,750 | 1,775,400 |
| Free Church | 809 | 450,935 | 343,058 |
| United Presbyterians | 465 | 298,160 | 275,864 |
| Reformed Presbyterians | 197 | 16,169 | 15,065 |
| Original Seceders | 36 | 10,424 | 9,781 |
| Scotch Episcopalian | 404 | 3,022 | 1,967 |
| Independent or Congregationalists | 192 | 73,342 | 70,831 |
| Evangelical Union | 36 | 10,519 | 10,750 |
| Wesleyan Methodists | 29 | 5,241 | 5,185 |
| Glazebrook and Sandemanians | 6 | 1,060 | 990 |
| New Church | 97 | 7,191 | 6,900 |
| Society of Friends | 7 | 9,109 | 9,103 |
| Roman Catholics | 114 | 68,788 | 40,711 |
| United, Moravians, &c. | 100 | 7,050 | 5,468 |
| Isolated Congregations | 61 | 11,409 | 9,401 |
| Jews | 1 | 1 | |
| Mormons | 149 | 3,159 | 3,177 |
| Apostolic Church | 67 | 67 | 67 |

Other Denominations:
- 2917 | 1,459,600 | 1,069,409

Total: 3805 | 1,884,065 | 1,089,049

* In England the chief institutions for education are the ancient national universities of Oxford and Cambridge; the more recent institutions of London, Durham, and Lampeter in Wales; the classical schools of Eton, Westminster, Winchester, Harrow, Rugby, and Eton College; the schools of the dissenting denominations; the middle-class schools, either started by individual teachers, and hence called 'adventure' schools, or by associated bodies; the new academies as directors, to which the parishes are responsible; the schools of design, and the various elementary schools and training-colleges in connection with the different religious denominations. The number of day-schools in England and Wales in 1861 was 46,042, of which 15,518 were public.—i. e. schools deriving a portion of their incomes from some sources besides
the scholars—and 38,524 private—i.e. sustained entirely by the payments of scholars. The total number of scholars was 2,144,578, of whom 1,422,982 attended the public, and 721,596 the private schools. As the population then amounted to 17,927,608, this gives a proportion of one scholar to every 8% of the inhabitants.

Scotland possesses four universities for the higher branches of education, viz. those of Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrew's, and Aberdeen, besides a variety of minor colleges connected with the Episcopalian, Free Church, and other non-established churches; a complete system of parish schools, grammar-schools, or academies in the chief towns, which serve as preparatory gymnasium for the universities, and a large number of denominational schools." In 1861 the number of 'day-schools' was 294, of which 3849 were public, and 1853 private. The number of scholars was 366,317, of whom 290,945 belonged to the public, and 88,472 to the private schools. Out of a population of 2,888,742, this gives a percentage of 12.78, or 1 scholar to every 7½ of the inhabitants. According to the education statistics of 1866, the number of children from 5 to 15 years of age attending school in Scotland was 441,166, which, out of a population of 3,061,291, gives 1 scholar to every 6½ of the inhabitants.

For the Church History of Great Britain, see England, Church of; Scotland, Church of; Ireland, and the articles on the several dissenting denominations. The most important works on the Church History of Great Britain have been referred to in the art. on England, Church of; besides them must be mentioned Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters (Lond. 1808–14, 4 vols.); J. Bennett, History of Dissent during the last thirty years (Lond. 1849). (A. J. S.)

Greathead. See Grosseteste.

Great Owl. See Owl.

Great Sea. See Sea.

Great Shears. See Shears.

Great Shears (מְאֹל, bı̂ lōkāš, lit. a cutting; Sept. κυστίς, Vulg. orcas) occurs in the A. V. only in 1 Sam. xviii, 6, in the description of the equipment of Goliath—"He had great oars of brass (מְאֹלָה, copper) upon his legs" (םֵעָלָה בְּפֹט, lit. on his foot, whence some have supposed only a kind of boot to be meant). Its ordinary meaning is a piece of defensive armor reaching from the foot to the knee, and thus protecting the shin of the wearer. This was the case with the isthμις of the Greeks, which derived its name from its covering the isthμή, i.e. the lower part of the leg, and was a highly esteemed piece of defensive armor (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s. v. Orcas). The Heb. term is derived from מְאֹל, the fore part of anything. Hence all the ancient versions and Josephus (Ant. vi, 3, 1) agree in regarding it as designating a defensive armor for the leg. It is to be distinguished from מְאֹלָה, same (Isa. xi, 4), which Gesenius thinks was a sort of military shoe like the Roman calces, and it probably was similar to the greaves of the Assyrians, as represented in their sculptures, which not only protected the leg, but covered the upper part of the foot like our gaiters, and seem to have been laced up in front; in other cases they appear to have extended over the whole thigh (Layard, Nineveh, ii, 261). See Armor.

Gre'cia (Heb. Yawwər, יָוֵר, l. e. Jawwər [q. v.], as usually rendered), the Latin form (Dan. vii, 21; x, 20; xi, 2) of the country elsewhere termed Greece (q. v.).

Grek'ian ( Heb. in the plur. Benēy Ḥay-Yeowsim', בנים הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלי, sons of the Israelis, Joel iii, 6; in the Apoc. 'Eλλανίς, 1 Macc. vi, 2; viii, 9, 18; 2 Macc. iv, 15; xii, 2; in the N. T. Ἑλληνσίς, a Hellenist, Acts vii, 1; ix, 29; xii, 20), the name of the people elsewhere called Greeks (q. v.).

Grecian Architecture. Grecian architecture differs from other styles of ancient architecture in this, that it was devoted almost solely to religious uses. Its chief aim was to supply permanent and worthy temples as residences of the deities, as, during the early history of Greece, the images and statues of the deities were placed in the hollow trunks of trees and under canopies for protection. Most of the elements from which the Ionic order of architecture was developed are easily traced to an Assyrian origin, as is seen in the ornamentation of the

---

Fig. 1. Plan of the Treasury of Atreus (from Lübbe's Geschichte der Architektur).

Fig. 2. Section of the Treasury of Atreus.
columns and walls of the Treasury of Atreus at Mycenae. On the other hand, the elements of the Doric order were mostly adopted from the more severe and stately temple architecture of Egypt. Under the extraordinary aesthetic feeling and culture of the Greeks, these elements, though of foreign origin, were developed and modified until, with the addition of certain native elements, there was produced a degree of perfection of architectural form, and of symmetrical and harmonious combination of parts into a unique whole, that has never been surpassed in the whole history of architecture.

The tendency to Oriental luxury and individual power that characterised the treasure-houses of the τησπορεία was checked by the overthrow of their chiefs and the establishment of democracy. From the time of the τησπορεία till the accession of Alexander the Great, Grecian architecture (as well as sculpture and painting) was devoted almost solely to the service of religion.

In addition to the Ionic and Doric orders, a third order, the Corinthian, was developed in Greece. It was, however, but little used until after the time of Alexander, when true religious feeling and patriotic sentiment had given way, throughout Greece and its colonies, to Oriental sensuous enjoyment and luxury.

The greatest variety and artistic freedom pervaded the Grecian architecture, both in the development of the individual members and in the general planning of the temples. All of the moldings and the ornamentation were drawn with a free hand, and not by mathematical instruments, as was the case in Roman and Gothic architecture. With all of this variety and freedom, the typical character of the Grecian architecture was well preserved. The Doric order was the favorite, as the best adapted to the spirit of temple architecture. More than one order was frequently introduced, however, into the same edifice. From the erection of the earliest Doric temple, that of Neptune at Corinth, there was a gradual progress in the development of elegance of form in the single members of the edifice, and in the development of symmetry and harmony in the entire structure. During the earlier history of Grecian architecture, polychromy was used to a great extent. Later, the ornamentation became more sculptural. But color was used to develop the relief of the architectural forms of the capitals, the cornices, and the panels of the ceilings, until the period of decadence of the Grecian architecture.

Great care was taken to select the best sites for these temples. Oracles were consulted for their location. The temples of tutelary deities were usually placed on the highest ground in the city. They thus commanded, in many cases, most magnificent prospects. They were also thus seen at a great distance. The temples were sometimes surrounded by sacred groves, or by groves of olive and orange trees. The temples were often surrounded also by sacred inclosures, within which were frequently erected altars, and even temples to other deities. The temples of Mercury were usually placed on lower grounds; those of Mars, Venus, Vulcan, and Esculapius outside of and near the gates of the city. The front was always adorned with an equal number of columns—of four, six, eight, or ten. On the sides the number of columns was usually unequal. As the length of the temple was usually double the breadth, the number of columns at the side was thirteen for six on the front; seventeen for eight on the front. The proportion between the diameter and the height of the columns and of the space be-
of the deity. This cella opened to the east, that the first light of the morning might fall upon the image of the deity. Sometimes there was another room in the rear of the cella (as the treasury in the Parthenon at Athens). The gables contained groups of sculpture illustrative of some event connected with the mythology of the deity to whom the temple was dedicated. The metopes of the friezes frequently contained also smaller groups of sculpture. Upon the walls of the portico were frequently long series of sculptures.

The entire temple was erected primarily as a residence for the deity. It could contain but few persons at a time. Sacrifices, ceremonies, and processions were performed without the temple. Beside the statue of the deity, to whose service the temple was erected, were often placed smaller statues of friendly deities. Statues of priests were sometimes placed in the vestibule of the cella. Thank-offerings, sometimes of great value, were often placed upon the walls both of the cella and of the portico. An altar upon which offerings were placed often stood before the deity. But sacrifices were performed upon an altar placed before the entrance, but within the view of the image of the deity.

The other edifices of Grecian architecture were, like the temples, for the benefit and use of the entire population. They consisted mainly of fortifications, fortified entrances (propylaea), and halls of justice (basilicas). These partook of the general style of architecture in which the temples were built.

So different in principles of construction, and in the object for which they were designed, were the edifices of ancient Greece, that only with the greatest modification of detail can they be adapted to the wants of modern life. Least
of all is the Grecian temple adapted to the purposes of a Christian church.

The history of Grecian architecture extends from the 7th century B.C. till the conquest of the Orient by Rome. The greater part of the earlier monuments of this architecture are found in the western colonies of Sicily and Grecia Magna. Most of the ancient temples in Greece itself were destroyed by the Persians. Most of the temples in Ionia and the further Orient were built during or after the reign of Alexander the Great. The Doric style prevailed mostly in Sicily, Grecia Magna, the Peloponnesus, and the northern part of Greece. The Ionic and Corinthian styles prevailed mostly in Asia Minor, while all three styles were found in Attica, and especially in Athens.

In Sicily there were over twenty temples that were famous for their size and splendor. They were mostly built in the 5th and 6th centuries B.C. The largest of these was the temple of Jupiter at Selinus, which was 260 feet long and 170 feet wide. The temple of Diana at Syracuse is remarkable for the indications of the influence of Egyptian architecture in its style and construction. The temple of Minerva at Syracuse was famous for its costly ornamentation. Hiero II built also at Syracuse a colossal altar, which rested on a lofty base 625 feet long and 73 feet wide, and was remarkable for the elegance of its architectural proportions. In Agrigentum were three imposing temples, the largest of them, that of Jupiter Olympus, being 844 feet long and 176 feet wide. At Paestum, in Italy, are the remains of two temples and of a basilica that rank among the finest ruins of Grecian architecture. They show still the heavy influence of Egyptian architecture upon the Doric style, but yet they are marked by great freedom of treatment and harmony of proportion.

One of the most remarkable temples in the Peloponnesus was that of Neptune at Corinth, of which but seven columns and the architrave above them remain. As the earliest ruins of Greek architecture extant, these are characterized by a heaviness of proportion that is not found in any later edifices. This temple dates from 630 B.C. The temple of Minerva, on the island of Egina, is remarkable for the traces of coloring yet remaining in the architectural ornamentation, and for the archaic character of the sculpture of the pediments, now in the Glyptothek at Munich. Among the most famous temples in Greece itself was that of Jupiter Olympus at Olympia. It was 206 feet long and 93 feet wide, and was adorned with most choice works of Grecian sculpture.

The glory of Grecian architecture is, however, to be seen in the city, with all its temples, was utterly destroyed by the Persians 480 B.C. First among the temples of the newly rebuilt city was that of Theseus. This is to-day the best preserved of all ancient Grecian temples. In symmetry of proportion it surpassed all other temples that were built before it. The second temple in the new city was that of Victoria Aptera. This temple was taken down by the Turks in the 17th century to build a battery with. All of its parts were found in 1885, and the temple was completely restored. It is one of the most graceful monuments of Grecian architecture. The Parthenon at Athens is, however, the crowning glory of Grecian architecture. It was erected 448 B.C. Its length was 290 feet, and its breadth 102 feet. In the perfection of proportion of all the parts, and in the harmony of their union in an entire edifice, the Parthenon equals or surpasses all other edifices ever erected by the hand of man. It was also adorned with statues and other works of sculpture by the best sculptors that Greece or the world has ever produced. The Erechtheum and the Propylaeum also showed the freedom with which the Greek architects varied the plans and construction of their temples. Without losing the character of the architecture, or grace of proportion and unity of effect. Nearly equal to the Parthenon was the temple of Diana at Eleusis, in which the mysteries were performed. These are few ruins of the famous temple of Apollo at Delphi, which was burnt in the 6th century B.C., and the rebuilding of which was hardly completed at the time of the Roman conquest.

In size and costly magnificence, the temple of Diana at Ephesus exceeded all other temples of Grecian art. This magnificent edifice was completed in B.C. 400. It was 425 feet long and 220 feet wide. Erostratus set fire to it in B.C. 404, but it was rebuilt with renewed magnificence by Alexander the Great. It was plundered by the Goths, and later overthrown by an earthquake. It furnished much of the material for building the church of Santa Sophia (q. v.), and still its colossal ruins are the wonder of the antiquarian. The temple of Apollo at Didymus, near Miletus, destroyed by the Persians B.C. 496, and rebuilt B.C. 390, was one of the edifices in which the Oriental origin of the Ionic order is most plainly seen. It was also one of the largest and most elegant temples of antiquity. The Mausoleum at Halicarnassus was so large and costly as to be reckoned among the wonders of the world. It was 410 feet long, had nearly the
shape of an arc of a circle, and was 140 feet high. Though built in a period when noble inspiration had left Greek art, it was marked by an elegance of execu-
tion that was not surpassed in any edifice erected
during the history of Greek architecture. The chief
works of Greek architecture in Africa were in Cyrene,
and especially in Alexandria, which was this city. All the
resources of a luxuriant architecture were called into
requisition in the erection of every class of edifices
that should adorn a new and gorgeous capital city.
(For the literature upon Greek architecture, see
the article Architecture of Greece.)

1. Greece is sometimes described as a country con-
taining the four provinces of Macedonia, Epirus, Achaea
or Hellas, and Peloponnesus, but more commonly
the two latter alone are understood to be comprised in
it. We will consider it as composed of Hellas and Pelop-
onnesus. By this we mean to be no question that
the four provinces were originally inhabited by
people of similar language and origin, and whose reli-
gion and manners were alike. Except upon its north-
ern boundary it is surrounded on all sides by the
sea, which intersects it in every direction, and naturally
gives it the character of maritimeness. It was also a
very mountainous country, abounding in eminences
of great height, which branch out and intersect the
land from its northern to its southern extremity, and
form the natural limits of many of the provinces into
which it is divided. At the southern point of Corinth it is separated
into its two great divisions, of which the northern was
called Αίτωπος or Peloponnesus, and the southern
the Peloponnesus, now called the Morea. The moun-
tain and sea are thus the grand natural characteristics
of Greece, and had a very considerable influence on
the character of its inhabitants, as is evidenced in the re-
ligion, poetry, history, and manners of the people.

The Greek nation had a broad division into two
races, Dorians and Ionians, of whom the former seems
to have long lain hid in continental parts, or on the
western side of the country, and had a temperament
and institutions more approaching the Italic. The
Ionians, on the contrary, retained many Asiatic usages
and tenets, and were, therefore, witnessing the effects
of the sudden and overwhelming change so thoroughly cut off as the Dorians from Oriental con-
nection. When afterwards the Ionic colonies in Asia
Minor rose to eminence, the Ionian race, in spite of the competition of the half Dorian Ελλανις, continued to at-
tract most attention in Asia.

Of the history of Greece before the first recorded
Olympiad, B.C. 776, little that can be depended upon
is known. There is no doubt that from very remote
periods of antiquity, long prior to this date, the coun-
try had been inhabited, but facts are so intermingled
with legend and fable in the traditions which have
come down to us of these ancient times, that it is im-
possible with certainty to distinguish the false from the
true (Grote, Hist. of Greece, pref. to vol. i.).

After its conquest by the Romans, B.C. 146, Greece contin-
ued for one thousand three hundred and fifty years to be as a
nearly as possible a portion of the Roman empire.
Literature and the arts, however, long after the Latin conquest
in 1304, Greece was divided into feudal
principalities, and governed by a variety of Roman,
Venetian, and Frankish nobles; but in 1321, with the
exception of the dukedoms of Athens and Nauplia,
and some portions of the Archipelago, it was reunited to
the Constantinopolitan empire by Michael Paleologus.
In 1488 it was invaded by the Turks, who completed its
conquest in 1481. The Venetians, however, were not
so speedily disposed to retire as to throw all the
country during the sixteenth and seventeenth cen-
turies was the theatre of obstinate wars, which con-
tinued till the treaty of Passarowitz in 1718 confirmed
the Turks in their conquest. With the exception of
Maina, the island of Salamis, remained under their despot-
ic sway till 1821, when the Greeks ran away
from their lethargy, and asserted their claim to a na-
tional existence. The revolutionary struggle was con-
tinued with varied success and much bloodshed till the
great European powers interfered, and the battle of
Navarino, in 1827, secured the independence of Greece,
which was reluctantly acknowledged by the Porte in
1829. In 1831 Greece was erected into an independent
monarchy: it retains its classic name, and nearly its
ancient limits, comprehending the Morea, or ancient
Peloponnesus, south of the Gulf of Corinth, now Gulf
of Lepanto, and the province of Livadia, and the island
of Grecia proper, with part of Thessaly and Epirus,
north of that gulf; besides the island of Nergopont,
the ancient Euboea, and other smaller islands in the
Archipelago. The Republic of the Ionian Islands,
Cephalonia, Zante, Corfu, and others on the western
coast of Greece, is under the protection of Great Brit-
ain.

2. The relations of the Hebrews with the Greeks were
always of a distant kind until the Macedonian
conquest of the East: hence in the Old Testament the
mention of the Greeks is naturally rare. See JAVAN.
It is possible that Moses may have derived his geo-
graphical outlines from the Egyptians, but he does not
use them in Gen. x. 2-5, where he mentions the de-
scendants of Javan as peopling the isles of the Gen-
tiles. This is merely the vaguest possible indication
of a geographical locality; and yet it is not improba-
ble that his Egyptian teachers were almost equally
in the dark as to the position of a country which had not
at that time arrived at a unity sufficiently imposing to
arrest the attention of its neighbors. The amount
and precision of the information possessed by Moses
must be measured by the nature of the communication
by which we can conceive as existing in his time between Greece
and Egypt. Now it appears from Herodotus that pri-
or to the Trojan War, there was there a tradition of
transit, sacred and mythological, set from Egypt towards Greece;
and the first quasi-historical event which awakened
the curiosity of the Greeks, and stimulated the imagina-
tion of the Egyptian priests was the story of Paris and Helen
(Herodotus, ii, 48, 51, 52, and 112). At the time of the
Exodus, therefore, it is not likely that Greece had ent-
tered into any definite relation whatever with Egypt.
Withdrawn from the sea-coast, and only gradually
lighting their way to it during the period of the Jdg-
ges, the Hebrews could have had no opportunity of form-
ing connections with the Greeks. From the time of
Moses to that of Joel we have no notice of the Greeks
in the Hebrew writings, except that which was con-
tained in the communications of these ancient times,
and it was natural that they should mark the similarity of sound between
יָנָן ייֶרֶם and Ιοάννης, and the application of that name
to the Asiatic Greeks would tend to satisfy in some
measure a longing to realize the Mosaic ethnography.
Accordingly, the O.-T. word, which in the A. V. is
Greece, Greeks, etc., is in Hebrew יָנָן, יאָוָן (Joel iii,
Dan. viii, 21): the Hebrew, however, is sometimes retained (Isa. lxvi, 19; Ezek. xxvii, 13). In Gen. x, 2 the Sept. has καὶ Ἰώνας καὶ Ἑλιας, with which Rosenmuller compares Herod. i, 56–58, and professes to discover the two elements of the Greek race. From Ἰωνας he gets the Ionian or Pelagian, from Ἐλιας (for which he supposes the Heb. original מַעֵלָה), the Hellenic element. This is excessively fanciful. See Elishah.

The Greeks and Hebrews met for the first time in the slave-market. The medium of communication seems to have been the Tyrian slave-merchant. About B.C. 800 Joel speaks of the Tyrians as selling the children of Judah to the Grecians (Joel iii, 6); and in Ezek. xxvii, 13 the Greeks are mentioned as bartering their brazen vessels for slaves. On the other hand, Bochart says that the Greek slaves were highly valued throughout the East (Geogr. Sac. pt. i, lib. iii, c. 8, p. 175); and it is probable that the Tyrians took advantage of the calamities which befell either nation to sell them as slaves to the other. Abundant opportunities would be afforded by the attacks of the Lydian monarchy on the one people, and the Syrian on the other; and it is certain that Tyre would let slip no occasion of replenishing her slave-market. See Tyre.

Prophetic notice of Greece occurs in Dan. vii, 21, etc., where the history of Alexander and his successors is rapidly sketched. See Goat. Zechariah (xi, 13) foretells the triumphs of the Maccabees against the Greco-Syrian empire, while Isaiah looks forward to the conversion of the Greeks, among other Gentiles, through the instrumentality of Jewish missions (lxvi, 19). For the connection between the Jews and the quasi-Greek kingdoms which sprung out of the divided empire of Alexander, see Antiochus; Ptolemy.

The presence of Alexander (q. v.) himself at Jerusalem, and his respectful demeanor, are described by Josephus (Ant. xi, 8, 3); and some Jews are even said to have joined him in his expedition against Persia (Heest. ap. Joseph. c. Apion, ii, 4), as the Samaritans had already done in the siege of Tyre (Josephus, Ant. xi, 8, 4–6). In 1 Macc. xii, 5–28 (about B.C. 180), and Josephus, Ant. xii, 4, 10, we have an account of
an embassy and letter sent by the Lacedaemonians to the Jews. The most remarkable feature in the transaction is the claim which the Lacedaemonians prefer to kindred with the Jews, and which Aesop professes to establish by reference to a book. It is by no means unlikely that two declining nations, the one crouching beneath a Greek-Syrian invader, and the other beneath a Roman yoke, should draw together in the face of the common enemy with which they were so often at war. (I. ii, 91, note) regard the affair as a piece of pompous trifling or idle curiosity, at a period when "all nations were curious to ascertain their origin, and their relationship to other nations." See OIANAS.

The notices of the Jewish people which occur in Greek literature are collected by Josephus (con-
tra Apion, i, 22). The chief are Pythagoras, Herodotus, Chorillus, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Hecataeus.

The main drift of the argument of Josephus is to show that the Greek authors derived their materials from Jewish sources, or with more or less distinctness refer-
ted to Jewish history. For Pythagoras, he cites Hermippus's life; for Aristotle, Clearchus; but it should be remembered that the Neo-Platonism of these authorities makes them comparatively worthless; that Hermippus, in particular, belongs to that Alexandrian school which maintained that the Hebrews had borrowed their traditions with the philosophy of Greece, and propitiated the genius of Orientalism by denying the merit of originality to the great and independent thinkers of the West. This style of thought was further developed by Iamblichus, and a very good specimen of it may be seen in Le Clerc's written (Itinera, vii, 18). It has been ably and vehemently assailed by Ritter, Hist. Phil. b. i, c. 8. Herodotus mentions the Syrians of Damascus as confessing that they derived the rite of circumcision from the Egyptians (ii, 104). Bähr, however, does not think it likely that Herodotus visited the interior of Palestine, though he was acquainted with the sea-coast. (On the other hand, see Dahlman, p. 55, 56, Engl. transl.) It is almost impossible to suppose that Herodotus could have visited Jerusalem without giving us some more detailed account of it than the merely incidental notices in ii. 139, and iii. 5, not to mention that the site of Κιδουνίς, or Caditys, is still a disputed question. The victory of Pharaoh-
Necho over Josiah at Megiddo is recorded by Herodo-
tus (comp. Herod. ii, 159 with 2 Kings xxiii, 29 sq.). 2 Chronicles xxvii, 2 is singularly like a verse that Josephus should have omitted these references, and cited Herodotus only as mentioning the rite of circumcision. The work of Theophrastus cited is not extant; he enumerates among other oaths that of Corbus. Che-
rilus is supposed by Josephus to describe the Jews in a book now lost; if so, it is the same treatise, withoder other circumstances to affect it, the Greek tongue and Greek feeling spread far and sank deep through the Macedonian dominions. Half of Asia Minor be-
came a new Greece, and the cities of Syria, North Palestine, and Egypt, were deeply imbued with the same influence. See Greece, 2.

The Greeks were eminent for their appreciation of beauty in all its varieties; indeed, their religious creed owed its shape mainly to this peculiarity of their mind, for their logical acuteness was not exercised on such subjects until quite a later period. The puerile or in-
decent fables of the old mythology may seem to a mod-
er reader to have been the very soul of their religion; but to the Greek himself these were a mere accident, or a vehicle for some embodiment of beauty. What-
other the other varieties of Greek religious ceremonies, no violent or frenzied exhibitions arose out of the na-
tional mind; but all such orgies (as they were called) were imported from the East, and had much difficulty in establishing themselves on Greek soil. At quite a late period the managers of orgies were evidently reg-
arded as mere jugglers of not a very reputable kind (see Demosthenes, 4, § 179, p. 813); nor do the Greek states, as such, appear to have patronized them. On the contrary, the solemn religious processions, the sacred games and dances, formed a serious item in the public expenditure; and to be permanently exiled from such spectacles would have been a moral death to the Greeks. Wherever they settled they introduced their
native institutions, and reared temples, gymnasia, baths, porticoes, sepulchres, of characteristic simple elegance. The morality and the religion of such a people had subjects since the fall of the Byzantine empire. The kingdom was enlarged in 1883 by the annexation of the Ionian Islands, which until then had been subject to the sovereignty of Great Britain. The total area in 1881 amounted to 24,970 square miles, the town population in 1881 to 1,856,412, and in 1889 to about 2,179,298.

The great majority of the people of Greece belong to the Greek Church (q. v.), which is in Greece (since 1888) independent of the patriarch of Constantinople, and constitutes a national Church, which the patriarch recognised in 1850 by the so-called Tomos. The supreme management of ecclesiastical affairs is in the hands of a Holy Synod, consisting of five bishops and an officer of the government. At the beginning of the revolution the higher clergy consisted of 20 metropolitan, 5 archbishops, and 12 bishops; in 1869 there were 18 metropolitan, 13 archbishops, and 16 bishops. The number of male monasteries was, on the advent of the regency which was established after the expulsion of the Turks, about 400, and the number of nunneries from 30 to 40, together with about 800 inmates; in 1869 there were 138 monasteries of monks and 4 nunneries, the former with 1,500, the latter with 150 inhabitants. There are about 3905 parish churches, with 8200 priests. The secular clergy and the monks are generally but little educated, but enjoy, nevertheless, great respect among the people, the majority of whom are firmly attached to their Church. For the orthodox Greek Church there are 4 archbishops in Lydia (Chalcis and Eubea, *Etolia and Acarnania, Phthiotis, the metropolis see of Athens, Megara and Egin- nai), with 4 bishops; in the Morea, 6 archbishops (Argo- lides, Corinth, Patras and Elis, Mantinea and Cyarnia, Mystras, Thermopylae, Mani), 6 bishops; in the Archipelago, 1 archbishop (Syros and Tinos) and 3 bishops; in the Ionian Islands, 4 metropolitan, and 3 bishops. The Roman Catholics, who are mostly the descendants of families which immigrated at the time of the Crusades and during the rule of the Venetians, number about 18,000, chiefly in the Ionian Islands, and the Archipelago, and have in 2 archbishoprics, at Naxos and Corfu, and 4 bishops. There are a few thousand Mohammedans in Eubea, and a few hundred Protestants and Jews in the commercial towns.

The labors of Protestant missionaries began in 1829, and have ever since been carried on without intermission. The American Board of Missions, the Episcopal Board, and Baptist Board were all concerned in the work. The Rev. Dr. King, who arrived in Athens in 1829, when it sent out Messrs. Robertson and Hill. These gentlemen, in the outset, started upon the conciliatory course, under the impression that the Greek Church would be freed from its evils by liberal education. On the contrary, it was the Church that was virtually sold to the Greek government, which for a time, gave every encouragement to the American missionaries. In 1830 the representative of the American Board assisted in the establishment of the first college in Greece which was established under government assistance. Soon after this three other missionaries arrived in Greece, who opened schools in the mountains. In 1841, suddenly, and without any apparent provocation, the Church party made war against missionary operations, and attempted to extinguish the Gospel light. These persecutions ended in the banishment of Dr. King from the country. This action became the means of introducing the American Board into the mission field of the Kalopothakes, who had become acquainted with Protestantism in one of the schools of Dr. King, and who had subsequently spent four years in the United States to prepare for missionary work in his country, started in Athens a religious newspaper, the *Star of the East*. In 1869, Dr. King again went to Greece, he found the paper prospering, and two regular Church services were conducted every Sabbath in Athens. In 1869, Dr. Kalopothakes and Mr. Constantine published a daily paper, a weekly paper, and a children's paper, and also a number of cheap religious books. One of the chief results of the Protestant mission has been the increased circulation of the Bible, which is proved by the fact that in 1859, when Dr. Kalopothakes first opened the Bible depot at Athens, he did not sell 100 copies of the New Testament, whereas in 1868 he disposed of 3000.

Popular education has made considerable progress since the establishment of independence. There were 750 primary schools in 1856; 38 pro-gymnasia or Hel- lenic schools, with 165 teachers and 4900 pupils; 11 gymnasia (organized after the model of those of Germany), with 67 teachers and 1160 pupils; an ecclesiastical ('ussian') seminary, and a national university established in 1837, with a library of more than 80,000 volumes, an observatory, and botanical garden. See Wiggars, *Kirch. Statistik*, i, 179 sq., 207 sq. (A. J. S.)

Greek, a term not found in the A.Y. of the O.T., where either Jews is retained, or, as in Joel iii, 6, the word is rendered by Greeks. In Maccabees Greeks and Grecians seem to be used indifferently (comp 1 Macc. i, 10; vi, 2; also 2 Macc. iv, 10, Greek). In the N.T., on the other hand, a distinction is observed, *Eλλανος* being rendered "Greek," and *Ελληνικός* "Grecian." The difference of the English terminations, "The Episcopal Board, a Jew (Rev. op. cit.); etc.", is explained. (See Overkamp, *De distinctiones inter Judaeos et Graecos, et inter Graec et barbaros*, Grvpb. 1782; Amnell, *Hist. E.T. Illustrata*, Upral. 1759. *Ελληνος* in the N.T. is either a Greek by race, as in Acts xvi, 1-6, xviii, 17, Rom. i, 14; or more frequently by a Greek spirit, as in *Eλληνος* properly "one who speaks Greek") is a foreign Jew; opposed, therefore, not to *Ἰουδαίος*, but to *Εβραῖος*, a home-Jew, one who dwelt in Palestine. So Schleusner, etc. according to Salmacius, however.
the Hellenists were Greek proselytes, who had become Christians; so Wolf, Parkhurst, etc., arguing from Acts xii, 20, where 'Æle·lvp·tai are contrasted with 'Iv·w·n·i in 19. The question resolves itself partly into a textual one, Grisbach having adopted the reading 'Ælπρατωι, and so also Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others. See ελεπρατωι.

Christian is a name usually given to the largest branch of the Oriental or Eastern churches (q.v.). It comprehends all those Christians following the Greek or the Greco-Slavonic rite, who receive the first seven general councils, but reject the authority of the Roman pontiff and the last article of the Western Church. The title "Greek Church" is hardly an appropriate one. A communion embracing several other nations and languages besides the Greek, each performing divine worship in its own tongue, and in which, out of sixty-six millions of Christians, perhaps fifty-nine millions are Slavonians, and pray in the Slavonic tongue, cannot properly be called Greek merely because its ritual is derived in great measure (by no means exclusively) from Greek sources, and because it was once united with the Greco-Roman empire (Palmer, Disquisitions, p. 9). The Church is the Holy Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church." The Greek Church has not, like the Roman Catholic Church, one head, but consists of eleven different groups, which, in point of administration, are independent of each other (see below, Statistic), though they fully agree in point of doctrine. The Orthodox Eastern or Russian Church as a separate body begins with the interruption of ecclesiastical communion between the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople. After the establishment of the imperial residence at Constantinople, it was the natural ambition of both the bishops of Constantinople and the emperors to enlarge the authority and prerogatives of the see of Constantinople (q.v.). In 861 the first Ecumenical Council of Constantinople gave to the bishops of Constantinople, because it was the New Rome (διὸ τῷ νέῳ τῶν μετὰ τοῦ Πατριαρχείου), the "precedence of honor" next after those of ancient Rome. The canon was not recognised by the churches of Rome and Alexandria, but the authority of the bishop of the imperial residence naturally rose, and in 451 the Council of Chalcedon not only confirmed the precedence already given, but also, under his jurisdiction the dioceses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, and grounded the ecclesiastical privileges, in the case of the new as well as the old Rome, upon the political distinction of the two cities. The Roman legates protested against this canon, and pope Leo the Great did not recognize it, but when the emperor Justinian Anaxarios, by an imperial edict, acquired a kind of superiority over the other three patriarchates of the East, and assumed the title of Ecumenical Patriarch. The support given by patriarch Acacius of Constantinople (471-489) to the Hemiotos (q.v.) led in 496 to the excommunication of Acacius, together with the emperor and the patriarch of Alexandria, by pope Felix III, who also charged him with encroaching upon the rights of the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. For thirty-five years (484-519) the communion between Constantinople and Rome remained interrupted, most of the Eastern bishops siding with Acacius, while those of Syria, Libya, the Caucasian, and Antich, and the converts in the vicinity of Constantinople, ranged themselves on the side of the pope. The withdrawal of the excommunication by pope Hormisdas involved a complete acknowledgement of the supremacy of the pope, and the reunion in 498 of the patriarchs of Constantinople continued, and pope Gregory the Great in vain endeavored to prevail upon the pious John the Faster of Constantinople to relinquish the title Ecumenical Patriarch. The antagonism of the two churches was increased by the support which several of the patriarchs of Constantinople gave to the iconoclast emperors, and by the complete political separation between the East and the West. When Photius, after ascending the patriarchal see, could not obtain the recognition of pope Nicholas, he excommunicated the pope, and arranged the whole Latin Church for her doctrine of the twofold procession of the Holy Ghost and the addition of "Filiusque" (q.v.) to the creed, for the practice of clerical celibacy, and for denying to the pope the power of administering holy communion. As the rival of Photius for the see of Constantinople, Ignatius, was a declared partisan of the pope and the Latins, the struggle for the possession of the see grew added to the animosity of the party of Photius against that of the Latin arch. After the death of emperor Michael III, Ignatius returned to the see, and a council at Constantinople under his presidency, which by the Latins is accounted as the eighth ecumenical council, established in 869 the union between the two churches. After the death of Ignatius in 877, Photius again became patriarch. A council held by him in 879 repealed the decisions of the Council of 869. The papal legates were induced by Photius to approve the acts of this council, which the Greek Church numbers among the ecumenical, but pope John rejected it, and excommunicated Photius and the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria. Leo IV, and his successor, Stephen, accepted the demands of the pope. Peace between the two churches was preserved until the middle of the 11th century, when Michael Cerularius (q.v.) was, though a layman, elected patriarch, contrary to the canons of the Council of 869, and the emperor Leo VI, by the election of Legate to this dignity. Cerularius, in union with bishop Leo of Achirola, the metropolitan of Bulgaria, wrote a letter to bishop John of Trani, in Apulia, who was asked to communicate it to the bishops and priests of the Franks, and appealed to the pope. Besides this, a letter of the pope to Leo IV, and his successor, Stephen, accepted the demands of the pope. Peace between the two churches was preserved until the middle of the 11th century, when Michael Cerularius (q.v.) was, though a layman, elected patriarch, contrary to the canons of the Council of 869, and the emperor Leo VI, by the election of Legate to this dignity. Cerularius, in union with bishop Leo of Achirola, the metropolitan of Bulgaria, wrote a letter to bishop John of Trani, in Apulia, who was asked to communicate it to the bishops and priests of the Franks, and appealed to the pope. Besides this, a letter of the pope to Leo IV, and his successor, Stephen, accepted the demands of the pope. Peace between the two churches was preserved until the middle of the 11th century, when Michael Cerularius (q.v.) was, though a layman, elected patriarch, contrary to the canons of the Council of 869, and the emperor Leo VI, by the election of Legate to this dignity. Cerularius, in union with bishop Leo of Achirola, the metropolitan of Bulgaria, wrote a letter to bishop John of Trani, in Apulia, who was asked to communicate it to the bishops and priests of the Franks, and appealed to the pope. Besides this, a letter of the pope to Leo IV, and his successor, Stephen, accepted the demands of the pope. Peace between the two churches was preserved until the middle of the 11th century, when Michael Cerularius (q.v.) was, though a layman, elected patriarch, contrary to the canons of the Council of 869, and the emperor Leo VI, by the election of Legate to this dignity. Cerularius, in union with bishop Leo of Achirola, the metropolitan of Bulgaria, wrote a letter to bishop John of Trani, in Apulia, who was asked to communicate it to the bishops and priests of the Franks, and appealed to the pope. Besides this, a letter of the pope to Leo IV, and his successor, Stephen, accepted the demands of the pope.
John Lomaterus, to enter into a union with Rome. At the Council of Lyons, 1217, delegates from the Greek Church were present, and they, as well as the emperor Michael Palaeologus, declared in favor of union. But the son and successor of Michael, Andronicus, was a decided opponent of the union, and imprisoned the patriarch. In 1244, the emperor John Palaeologus II, and the patriarchs Philotheos of Constantinople (1268-1287), Niphon of Alexandria, and Lazar of Jerusalem, also re-entered into communion with Rome, and sent to pope Clement VI their profession of faith. At the Council of Ferrara, which began in January, 1438, the emperor John Palaeologus VI, his brother, the patriarch of Constantinople, representatives of the three other patriarchs, many bishops, priests, and officers, and altogether some 700 Greeks and Orientals, were present. After a long discussion of the points differing between unionists, on July 5, 1439, signed by the pope, the Greek emperor, the cardinals, the patriarchs and bishops of both churches, with the sole exception of the bishop Markos Eunikes of Ephesus. See Ferrara; Florina. But this union was short-lived. On the return of the Greeks to their homes, their sects was repudiated by the large body of the priests, monks, and people. The great majority of the bishops themselves yielded to the public pressure and renounced the union, and soon after, in 1458, the fall of Constantinople opened the way for the attempted reconciliation. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem declared in 1660 their readiness to accept the union, but, as usual, this declaration bore no practical fruit. Many attempts to effect a general union have since been made, but without effect. Only small bodies of Greeks, especially through the influence of the Catholic government of Poland, have entered into and remained in union with Rome, receiving from the pope permission to retain the use of the Greek language at divine service, and some other peculiarities of the Greek Church. See United Greek Church. Pope Pius IX, on ascending the papal see, invited the bishops of the Greek Church, in a circular letter addressed to them, to re-enter into the union with Rome. The Greek bishops replied by a letter, setting forth their reasons for not complying with the invitation. In 1868 the pope invited the Greek bishops individually to attend the coming council, but this invitation also was declined by every bishop.

The Greek Church comprised within its ancient limits, anterior to the Mohammedan conquests, Greece properly so called, the Peloponnesus, Eastern Illyricum, Asia Minor, Thrace, Thessaly, Epirus, Asia Minor, Egypt, and parts of Mesopotamia and Persia. Her territory in Asia and Africa was in the course of time almost wholly lost in consequence of the advance of the Mohammedans, and with the fall of Constantinople in the 14th century nearly all the ancient sees of the Church in Europe came likewise under the rule of a Mohammedan government. Other portions became subject to the Catholic governments of Austria and Poland, leaving only one single government, that of Russia, as the protector of the interests of the Greek Church. In Austria and Poland the Greek Church suffered some losses in consequence of the efforts of the governments of those two countries to induce the Greek bishops to accept the supremacy of the pope. In European Turkey the Church maintained, on the whole, her ground, as the Turks, though opposing, did not support it. The emperor John Palaeologus and his successors, however, again conceded to the patriarchs the right of appointing the metropolitan of Kieff. In 1164 the patriarch of Constantinople sent a new metropolitan to Kieff without even asking for the consent of the prince; but prince Rostislav, though willing to comply with the will of the emperor, declared that the election of the metropolitan would require the sanction at least of the government. Negotiations of the princes of Russia and the metropolitan of Kieff with the pope for a union of the Russian Church with Rome began in the 11th century. Some of them, in particular in the 12th century, were on the whole repulsed by the large body of the people and clergy in Galicia, and the metropolitan Isidore, who took part in the Council of Florence, really joined the union, but among the mass of the people and clergy it never gained ground. In 1668 the metropolitan Job of Moscow recognized the patriarch of Constantinople the first patriarch of Russia, and was recognized by the other Oriental patriarchs as the fifth patriarch of the orthodox Church. At the close of the 16th century an attempt was made to establish a union between the Russian Church and those of Georgia and Armenia, but it failed in consequence of the intolerance of the Russian patriarch. The attitude of the patriarch towards the metropolitan of Kieff induced the latter, with a number of other bishops of South Russia, and a population of about ten millions, to enter in 1594, at the Council of Brasz, into communion with Rome. The breach between the Russians and the Church of Rome was greatly widened by the elevation of the house of Romanoff to the throne and by the consolidation of the Russian nationality in its hereditary struggle against Catholic Poland. In 1657 and the three following years the Russian ambassador in Constantinople obtained from the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem an official recognition of the right of Russia to have the patriarchs of Russia elected by the Russian clergy, without obtaining the previous sanction of the Oriental patriarch. The Russian ambassador to Damascus in 1702, Peter the Great left the patriarchal see vacant, and in 1721 put the administration of the Church in the hands of a board of bishops called the Holy Synod. Since then the Church of Russia has been eminently a state church. Though in doctrinal union with the other branches of the Greek Church, it is, in point of ecclesiastical administration, entirely unconnected with them. At home it has been unable to prevent the growth of numerous dissenting sects; but the rapid growth of the Russian empire has made it not only by far the most numerous and important branch of the Greek Church in the present age, but the largest state church in the Christian world. (For a fuller account of the inner history of the Church, see Russia.)

The establishment of the independence of the Hellenic nation for the second time by the revolution of the present century created another independent Greek state church. In 1833, the regency of Greece, at the request of thirty-six metropolitans, declared the orthodox Oriental Church of Greece independent of every foreign ecclesiastical authority, and, after the model of the Russian Church, set up for the administration of the church a "Holy Synod." This independent constitution was recognized by the patriarch of Constantinople in 1836.
GREEK CHURCH

(For a fuller account of this branch of the Greek Church, see GREECE.)

The Reformed Churches which arose in the 16th century made also several attempts to establish an understanding with the Greek Church. The Augsburg Confession and Luther's Smaller Catechism were translated into Greek, and, very early after the Reformation, it was thus possible for the patriarch Joseph of Constantinople through a deacon Demetrius Mysus, who visited Germany in 1558. Another Lutheran embassy of a more imposing character, headed by the well-known Tübingen divines Andreae and Fritzsche, represented the ordinary protestant interest to the patriarchate of Jerusalem (1576 to 1581). But both missions remained without result. Negotiations with the Reformed Churches were opened by the patriarch Cyril Lukaris, who in 1590 issued a decidedly Calvinistic confession of faith. But he was not only unable to carry his Church with him, but also himself deserted and imprisoned; and, to cut off future attempts of this kind, a doctrinal declaration was signed by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and many metropolitans and bishops, which, by clear and decided definitions, draws a marked line between the Greek and the Reformed, in both Cyril's and Lukaris' Lettera. This exposition was generally adopted by the churches, and in a synod held in Jerusalem in 1672 it was adopted as the creed of the Greek Church. (See below.)

Several efforts have also been made by the Anglican churchmen to form a union with the Greek Church, which during the last ten years have received the official indorsement of the English convocations and of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The plan has found many friends even among bishops of the Greek Church, some of whom are members of a Society for Promoting the Unity of Christendom (see ENGLAND), which comprises Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Oriental Christians among its members.

II. Doctrine.—The Greek Church, in common with the Roman Catholic, recognizes the infallible authority of the first seven councils. Its particular doctrines are laid down in a number of confessions of faith, among which the most important are, the Confession of patriarch Gennadius (q.v.), and the Confessio orthodoci cæsare episcopis ecclésiæ pontifices. 4. 5. 6. Pe- trus Munch, in a document of 1642, which in 1653 was sanctioned by a synod at Yassy, in 1653 signed by all the archbishops, and in 1672 again sanctioned by a synod at Jerusalem, and declared to be an authentic exhibition of the doctrine of the Church.

The Greeks agree with the Roman Catholics in accepting the rule of faith not alone the Bible, including the Deuterocanonical books, but also the traditions of the Church. They deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son (see FILIOQUE), and reject the papal claim to supremacy and doctrinal authority. They admit the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, but differ in some of the rites used in their administration. They administer baptism by trine immersion, and confirmation in immediate connection with baptism, even in the case of infants. The right of administering confirmation is conceded to priests only. They do not observe the communion in both kinds, and even to children. (For their peculiarities in the sacraments of extreme unction and priestly orders, see EXTREME UNCTION AND ORDERS.) They forbid marriage altogether to bishops; priests and deacons are forbidden to contract marriage, and, in case of remarriage, must be married more than once, nor to a widow. Married priests must live separate from their wives during the time when they are actually engaged in Church service. They regard marriage as dissolable in case of adultery, and regard four marriages as utterly unlawful. They do not permit the use of grave images, with the exception of that of the cross. They observe four great feast days: the forty days of Lent, from Pentecost to the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, the fifteen days before Assumption Day, and the six weeks before Christmas; and, besides, the Wednesdays and Fridays throughout the year are fast days. At divine service they generally use the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, and on certain Sundays and festivals the liturgy of St. Basil. The liturgy of the Roman Church is in the Old Slavonic language; that of the Church in the kingdom of Greece, in modern Greek; that of the Church of Georgia, in the Old Georgian language. Instrumental music is forbidden, but singing is universally in use. The public reading of sermons is at times used, but not being turned towards the east; only at Pentecost is kneeling in use. The sign of the cross is in more frequent use among them than in the Roman Catholic Church, but in a different form. The preaching of sermons is not common; generally a homily is read from ancient collections. Corresponding to the breviary of the Latin Church is the Horologion, which contains prayers for different hours of divine worship, a complete calendar (Menologion), and different appendices for worship. Festivals peculiar to the Greek Church are the consecration of water on January 6 (Old Style) in the church of the Holy Spirit at Jerusalem, and the Jordan, and the orthodox Sunday (Estomiá), with a litany anathematizing heresies and in honor of the imperial patrons, the prelates, and martyrs of the Church.

III. Constitution and Statistics.—The constitution of the Greek Church is, in many respects, similar to that of the Roman Catholic Church. They reject the claims of the pope to a supremacy over the whole Church, and are only willing to recognize him as the patriarch of one great section of the Church. The higher clergy (Archiereis) are the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, who have to live in celibacy; the lower clergy are divided into the regular clergy (monks; also called, from the color of their dress, the black clergy) and the secular clergy (also called, in opposition to the regulars, the white clergy, although their dress is, in fact, often of a brown, violet, or other color).

In point of ecclesiastical organization, the Greek Church consisted in 1869 of eleven groups, which were more or less independent of each other, namely, 1. The patriarchate of Jerusalem, which has 15 sees (metropolitan and 1 archiepiscopal). 2. The patriarchate of Antioch, with 6 metropolitan sees. 3. The patriarchate of Alexandria: it has 4 metropolitan sees. 4. The patriarchate of Constantinople, which consists of 100 sees (90 metropolitan and 4 archiepiscopal). 5. The patriarchate of Russia, which has 65 sees (5 metropolitan, 25 archiepiscopal). 6. Cyprus, 4 sees (of which 1 is archiepiscopal). 7. Austria, 11 sees (2 metropolitan). 8. Montenegro, 1 see. 9. Montenegro, 1 metropolitan see. 10. Greece, 33 sees (the archbishop of Athens is ex officio president of the Holy Synod). 11. Rumania, 4 bishops in Wallachia and 3 in Moldavia. The people of Servia and those of Bulgaria desire for their bishops a similar independence of Constantinople. The statistics of the Greek Church, reported in 1869, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of sees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>61,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania (total)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Roumelia</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servia</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Empire (approximately)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64,381,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For fuller information on the several branches of the Church, see the articles RUSSIA; TURKEY; GREECE; AUSTRIA; SERBIA.
GREEK CHURCH, UNITED


Greek Church, United. This is the name of those Christians who, while following the Greek rite, observing the general discipline of the Greek Church, and speaking Greek in the Church, yet unite with the Church of Rome, admitting the double procession of the Spirit and the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and accepting all the doctrinal decisions subsequent to the Greek schism which have forces as articles of faith in the Roman Church. They have been allowed to keep the same law of discipline as among the other Greeks. They are also permitted to administer communion under both kinds. The United Greeks are found chiefly in Southern Italy, in the Austrian dominion, in Poland, in the Russian empire, and in Turkey. In Italy they are computed at 80,000; in Austria at about 4,000,000; and in Poland about 250,000. In Russia it is difficult to ascertain what their number is. As regards nationalities in Austria, they are divided into Rumanians and Rutenians—the former being settled in Wallachia, Transylvania, and Eastern Hungary; and the latter in Lower Galicia, and Northern Hungary. The union of the Greek Christians of Wallachia and Transylvania dates from the end of the 12th century. The union of the Gallic. Greeks or Rutenians is of much later date, about the close of the 17th century. The United Greeks, in 1868, had in Austria two archbishops, one for the Rumanian rite at Fogaras (with suffragan bishops at Sâmos-Uyar, Gran Wardenil, and Lagos), and one for the Rutenian rite at Lemberg (with bishops at Premisl, Kreuz, Eperle, and MankaCe). In Russia there is one bishop at Chelim. In European Turkey there is one bishop in Bulgaria; a patriarch in Antichic; three archbishops at Damascas, Emeas, and Tyre, and bishops at Aleppo, Beyroot, Boira, Balbeck, Faraul, Jerusalem, Hauran, and Sidon. See Annuario Pontificio for 1869. (A. S. J.)

Greekish (Eλληνική, Holenisk), another term (3 Macc. iv. 10) for Greek (q. v.).

Greek Language, Biblical Relations of the. In treating of the peculiarities of the Greek language found in the Sept., we may substantially adoptDr. Donaldson's article in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, s. v. The affinities between the Greek and the other branches of the Indo-Germanic family are copiously drawn out by Bopp, Comparative Grammar, etc. (Lond. 1861, 2 vols.). The affinities between the Greek and the German are discussed, as by E. Neumann, and by Neumann, in the G. For its coincidences with the Hebrew, see Philology, Comparative.

Greekish, another term (3 Macc. iv. 10) for Greek (q. v.).

Greek Language, Biblical Relations of the. In treating of the peculiarities of the Greek language found in the Sept., we may substantially adopt Dr. Donaldson's article in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, s. v. The affinities between the Greek and the other branches of the Indo-Germanic family are copiously drawn out by Bopp, Comparative Grammar, etc. (Lond. 1861, 2 vols.). The affinities between the Greek and the German are discussed, as by E. Neumann, and by Neumann, in the Germ. For its coincidences with the Hebrew, see Philology, Comparative.

I. Historical Character.—There has been much discussion as to the peculiar nature of the language used by the Septuagint translators and by the writers of the N. T. It would be useless to attempt to give an account of these discussions in this article. We shall simply indicate the main facts which have come out in the course of these discussions, stating at the same time the theory which seems to account most satisfactorily for the peculiarities of Greek which these writings present.

In the earliest stages of a language the dialects are excessive in number, and, even in small districts, the differences and the peculiar variations of its own. Such a case as this has been the case with Greek; for, though its dialects have generally been reckoned as four, we know that each of these was variously modified in various places. In course of time, however, one of these dialects, the Attic, grew to such a field that the conquestion, and almost all Greeks who wrote books wrote in that dialect, wherever they might have been born. The Attic which they used underwent some changes, and then received the name of the so-called common dialect. This dialect has been used by Greeks for literary purposes ever since the time of Alexander the Great down to the present age.

While Attic thus became the literary language, the various communities spoke Greek as they had learned it from their parents and teachers. This spoken Greek would vary in different places, and it would gradually become very different from the literary language which was used in writings. Now it seems that the language used by the Sept. and N.-T. writers was the language used in common conversation, learned by them, not through books, but most likely in childhood from household talk, or if not, through subsequent oral instruction. If this be the case, then the Sept. is the first translation which was made for the great masses of the people in their own language, and the N.-T. writers are the first to appeal to men through the common vulgar language intelligible to all who spoke Greek. This Greek thus used was, however, considerably modified by the circumstances of the writers; and hence some have, but rather unnecessarily, termed the Greek in question the Hebraistic or Hellenistic dialect. See HELLENISM.

II. Inflection.—Max Müller justly affirms that the grammar of a language is "the most stable part of its development, and therefore the ground of classification in all languages which have produced a definite grammatical articulation" (Lectures on the Science of Language, p. 74). Now the grammar of the Sept. and N.-T. in its very essential features from the common language approximates to the medieval Greek of Proechnodromus in the 12th century, and to the modern Greek of the present day, both of which are simply the language of the common people, as debased by time and vulgar usage. Thus the N.-T. and modern Greek have no dual. In their declension of nouns we find a mixture of dialects, such as, for instance, ας in the genitive singular of proper names in σ; and η in the genitive, and ρ in the dative, of nouns in ρα (στριξ, Acta xxv. 1; μεκρινος, Rev. xiii, 10, etc.). There is in both a change from the second to the third declension in the construct state of nouns in ας (ἄλεπος, θάλασς, ροδος, etc.). The N.-T., however, do not decline them so occasionally as the second declension. Both display great peculiarities in the forms for the comparative and superlative of adjectives, such, for instance, as μεγίστος, μεγίστος of the superlative, by means of the particle α of the genitive in δέμεναι. This is now the common form in modern Greek, δέμεναι being contracted into δέμαι.
person singular in the present passive or middle ends in modern Greek in the regular σας; so in the N.T. καὶ ἐξέστησεν καὶ ἔδεικνυτο. The third person plural of the imperfect active of contracted verbs in modern Greek ends in σας; so in Sept. and N.T. ἡδονέωσέν ἐμοί. There is a striking similarity in the conjugation of verbs in both. Both have a tendency to form all the parts of the verbs. But there are differences in the inflection with augment. Both avoid the use of verbs in μι, both generally strengthen true verbs by the insertion of a ν. Sometimes they change the vowel ε into α, as εἰσέλθη, in Jude 23 (see Cremer, s. v. εισέλθη). In- stance of this peculiarity be found in our texts of the classical writers, and a still larger number in our manuscripts of them; but it is to be noted that in them they appear as ritaries; in the New Testament their occurrence is more frequent, and in modern Greek they have passed into customary forms. Some of these forms have been set down as Alexandrian or Macedonian, but Sturz (De Dialecto Macedonicum et Alexandrinorum, Lipsiea, 1808) has entirely failed to prove that there was either a Macedonian or an Alexandrian dialect. The Macedonian and the dialect of the Hellenic forms ad- duced as Alexandrian which are not to be found in some earlier dialect. In fact, there is nothing in any of the statements to which he appeals to contradict the opinion that Alexandrians, like other Greek-speaking people, have developed up various dialects of their spoken language. The written language of the Alexandrians, as we know from the works of Philo and other residents in Alexandria, was the so-called "common dialect." Moreover, the Greek of the New Testament is to be found not in writings of any special locality, but in writings which made no pretensions to literary excellence, such as the fragments of Hesiodus, some of the apocryphal gospels, the apostolic constitutions, the liturgies, the Chronicon Paschale, and Malaee.

III. Syntax.—Here the peculiar elements that mixed themselves with the common spoken language in the N.T. writings make their appearance. The Hebrew element especially is noteworthy. The translators of the Septuagint went on the principle of translating as literally as possible, and consequently the form of the sentences is essentially Hellenic. Some of the writers of the N.T. were themselves Jews, or derived part of their information from Jews, and accordingly the form of portions of their writings, particularly in narrative, is influenced by Hebrew modes. At the same time, too much stress is not to be laid on the Hebrew influence, for the writers sometimes to differ from the classical types, not because they were Jews, but because they were simple plain-speaking (την γλωτταν εἰς τοὺς Ἑβραίους, Euseb., Hist. Eccl. iii. 24) men, who cared little about roundabout sentences. The Hebrew element shows itself in particular phrases and constructions, as in παίζειν τινα μετα τρισθαι; but the amount of this Hebrew element is not so great as it has often been supposed to be, and in some of the N.T. writers it is scarcely noticeable at all. Generally speaking, the syntax, like the grammar, has a tendency towards modern Greek. It has, like it, frequent recourse to the use of prepositions, and we find such expressions even as άδεστας εἰς τίρας (1 Thess. iv. 8). After the comparative σπάνιο is frequently used instead of ἕν in the N.T.; in modern Greek it is never employed. On account of the rarer use of the optative in which is attached to the infinitive by some of the writers, both the N.T. and modern Greek abound in the use of ἵνα with the subjunctive, and sometimes even with the indicative, as in Revelations. The neuter plural is more regularly joined with a plural than with a singular, and not living with it in modern Greek. Many other peculiarities in which the syntax and inflections of the N.T. and those of modern Greek agree might be noted. For the use of the Greek article, see Article.

IV. Vocabulary.—The words used by the N.T. writers show a still greater variety of elements. 1. Here we notice distinctly, also, the tendency towards the modern language, as, for instance, in the use of ωροφανς, to feed men, in the frequent employment of both synonyms and antonyms; the diminutives in ἔρημος and in τῆς ἐκκλησίας, which had originally the idea of vigor in them, and in a variety of adverbs and conjunctions rarely used by the classical writers. Some of these peculiar uses have been assigned to the supposed Alexandrian dialect; but in the discussions no attempt has been made to determine what may have been characteristic of Alexandrianism, and what may have been common in Greek conversation, though not in Greek writings.

2. In the words we find a Latin element, as might be expected. The Latin words used in the N.T. are not very numerous, but they show plainly that the writers had no other desire than to translate their common language. They do not translate them into Greek, as a scholar of those days or an imitator of Attic writings would have done. We find a few Greek phrases in the N.T. which have evidently been translated from Latin, such as συμβολικος λόγος—commission copula.

3. There are also several Aramaic words used in the N.T., especially by Christ. Most of these words and expressions are of a peculiar nature. They are almost all of them utterances employed on some solemn occasion. They were at one time appealed to as proof that Jesus regularly used the Aramaic in his address to others and to his people; but they have recently been adduced, and with considerable force, to prove exactly the contrary, that Jesus frequently used the Greek language in his public conversations as being more intelligible to all, but that, when powerfully moved or deeply touched, he employed Aramaic words, as being more expressive from their associations (Robert, Discussions on the Gospels, pp. i, ch. iv). Besides this, the Hebrew or Aramaic has exercised an influence on the meanings of some Greek words, as, for instance, in the use of ὁριον for a sex. In several instances, however, where this Hebrew influence has been set down as existing, a more satisfactory explanation is given in another way. Thus ἁμαρτήσειν is taken by some to mean liberality in 2 Cor. ix. 10, because they suppose that ἡμεῖς has this meaning in Psa. cxxii. 9, where the Sept. translates ἁμαρτήσειν. In both cases it may be doubted whether ἁμαρτήσειν ought to receive this meaning, and unquestionably the Greek Epistle to the Ephesians is too much simpler to suppose that Paul looks on liberality as an essential part of righteousness, and righteousness therefore as including liberality.

4. There is also another element in the vocabulary of a peculiar nature. This arises from the novelty of the teachings combined with their verbal moralism. The new thoughts demanded new modes of expression, and hence the writers did not hesitate to use words in senses rare, if not entirely unknown to the classical writers. This fact could not be fully illustrated without exhibiting the results of investigation into various characteristic words, such as ἀμαρτόνων, ἐκκλησίας, ἁμαρτήσεως, ἁμαρτίας, νίπτει, ἁμαρτίας, ἀμαρτίας ἄμαρτον, δόξα, δόξας, δόξα, etc. These results seem to us to form no inconsiderable addition to the proof of the divinity of Christianity, for the grand moral ideas that were expressed by some of them are unique in the age in which they lived, and are much simpler to suppose that Paul looks on liberality as an essential part of righteousness, and righteousness therefore as including liberality.
Like this notion of ζωή, but with them it was a speculation. They are continually reasoning about it. The writers of the N. T. treat it as an unquestionable reality. They found the writers of the N. T. separate from it every notion of material splendor or earthly renown, and use it to denote that spiritual irradiation of the whole man which takes place when God reigns in him, when the image of God is realized in him. Thus we come to God's glory when we fail to present the purity and holiness of his character and image in our characters. Thus the ζωή of the N. T. is purely spiritual and moral. Then, again, it is remarkable how, in the case of words like ἤχος, λαυράς, and βασιλεία, the meaning often of the Scripture writer and the writer who express them by the spiritually purifying power of Christ, which really and entirely cleanses both soul and body (Alexander, Αγαπητοί, τα χάριτα, p. 253). The moral fervor of the writers is also seen in their omission of certain words. Thus the sensuous υπόθεσις is never used except in the expression λακατάμα, which they had of love. The words ἀνθρώπων and τύμπανος are also unknown to the N. T., and, indeed, the writers do not use any word to express mere happiness: μακρακοτός is used several times to denote something more than mere happiness. They avoid any word connected with mythology, such as the compounds of θεός which, with its diminutive, is used in a peculiarly Jewish and Christian sense. The writers of the N. T. are also remarkable for confining a word to one meaning. Thus μυστήριον is a turning of the whole soul from evil to good, a change from evil to good, and another compound μυστήριον, which is used in the same sense, while Justin Martyr uses μυστήριον as a change from good to evil as well as from evil to good, and he employs μυστηριώτατος and μυστηριώτατος, as well as μυστήριον for the same idea.

V. Literature.—The works on the subject of this article are numerous. Many of them are enumerated and criticised in Winer's Grammatik des Neuen Testaments (Gießen, 1858, 8vo), and Schleiermacher's Grundriss der Neutestamentlichen Grammatik (Berlin, 1851, 8vo); see also Lipsius, Bibliae Graeciae Lectura (Lips., 1868, 8vo). Much information will be found in the works of various grammatical authors, such as Lobel's Ephemeris, and Jacob's Achilleu Titaus, and especially in a Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek, by E. A. Sophocles, published as vol. ii, new series, of the Memoirs of the American Academy (Cambridge and Boston, 1855). Much important and constructive matter is also to be found in the glossaries and articles given in the Pandion, a fortnightly periodical published in Athens.

The best Grammars of the N. T., next the above work of Winer (of which the fourth ed., Leipzig, 1858, was translated by Agnew and Ebbeke, Philadelphia, 1840, 8vo; and the 6th ed., Lpz. 1854, by Masson, London, 1855, 8vo; revised and compared with the 7th ed. by Thayer, Andover, 1869, 8vo), are those of Stuart (Andover, 1841, 8vo), and Trollope (London, 1841, 8vo). The doctrine of the oracle has been especially discussed by Sturtevant (in ed. Loc. 1796, 12mo) and Middleton (1st ed. Lond. 1808, 8vo). The syllogisms have been well treated by Tittmann (Lips. 1829—32, 2 vols. 8vo; tr. in the Bibl. Cabinet, Edinb. 1833—37, 2 vols. 12mo), Trench London, 1854, 8 N. Y. 1857, 12mo), and Webster (London, 1854, 8vo). Grimm's Nov. Test. Heiligenlexikon (Leipzig, 1814, 4 vols. 8vo) contains an account of the N. T. philology with that of the Sept., which his Scholhs Hellenistica (London, 1848, 2 vols. 8vo) extends to a comparison with Josephus, Philo, the fathers, and apocryphal works. The best Lexicons of the N. T. (translated) are those of Parkhurst (ed. Ross, London, 1829, 8vo), Pasor (ed. Fischer, Lips. 1774, 8vo), Schöttgen (ed. Krebs et Spohn, Hal. 1819, 8vo), Simonis (including the Sept., Hal. 1762, 4to), Schleusner (4th ed. Lips. 1791, 4 vols. 8vo), Bretecherneich (2d ed. Lips. 1822, 2 vols. 8vo), and Wahl (2d ed. Lips. 1822, 2 vols. 8vo), remodelled by Dr. Robinson (N. Y. 1850, 8vo). The latest are Wilkius Claris N. T. (Lips. 1868, 8vo), Cremer, Bibl.-theol. Worterbuch der N. T. Gründert (Gottha, 1866, 8vo), and Thayer's Gramm. (N. Y. 1887, 8vo).

Greek Versions of the Holy Scriptures. These, except the modern Greek version of the N. T., are confined to the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha (q. v.).

I. The Septuagint.—This is the most important of all the ancient versions, whether in the Greek or any other language. See Septuagint.

If. Aquila.—It is a remarkable fact that in the 2d century after Christ there were three versions executed of the Old Testament for the use of the Scipanic Jews. The first of these was made by Aquila (אֲקָלוּאָל, אֲקָלוּאָל), a native of Sinope, in Pontus, who had become a proselyte to Judaism. The Jerusalem Talmud (see Bar-Hebraeus, Bibl. Jebusca Rabba, iv, 281) describes him as a disciple of Rabbi Akiba; and this would place him in some part of the reign of the emperor Hadrian (A.D. 117-138). It is supposed that the object of his version was to aid the Jews in their controversies with the Christians; and that, as the latter were in the habit of employing the Sept., they wished to have a version of their own on which they could rely. It is very probable that the Jews in many Greek-speaking countries were not sufficiently acquainted with Hebrew to refer to themselves for the original, and thus they wished to have such a Greek translation as they might use with confidence in their discussions. Such controversies were it (must be remembered) a new thing. Prior to the preaching of the Gospel, there were none besides the Jews who used the Hebrew Scriptures as a means of learning God's revealed truth, except those who either partially or wholly became proselytes to Judaism. But now the Jews saw to their grief that their Scriptures were made the instruments for teaching the principles of a religion which they regarded as nothing less than an apostasy from Moses.

This, then, is a probable account of the origin of this version. Extreme literality and an occasional polemical bias appear to be its chief characteristics. The idiom of the Septuagint is very much different in order to produce what was intended should be a very literal version; and thus not only sense, but grammar even, was disregarded: a sufficient instance of this is found in the rendering of the Hebrew particle בּוּר by σις, as in Gen. i, i, σιν τῷ οὐράνῳ καὶ σιν τῷ γῆς, "quod Graeca et Latina lingua omnino non recipit, a Jerusalem." Another instance is furnished by Gen. v, 5, καὶ ἐπεζην Λέυ συνεκαλείσας τοὺς καὶ οὐσιοπαξιάν ἠτοικα." It is sufficiently attested that this version was formed for controversial purposes; a proof of which may be found in the rendering of particular passages, such as Isai. viii, 14, where ἣν ζείπον, in the Sept. ἥν συνεκαλείσας is by Aquila translated συνεκαλείσας; such renderings might be regarded perhaps rather as modes of avoiding an argument than as direct falsification. There certainly was room for a version which should express the Hebrew more accurately than was done by the Sept.; but if this had been thoroughly carried out it would have been found that in many important points of doctrine—such, for instance, as in the divinity of the Messiah and the rejection of Israel, the true rendering of the Hebrew text would have been in far closer conformity with the teaching of the New Testament than was the Sept. itself. It is probable, therefore, that one polemical object was to meet these criticisms in the New Testament of the Old Testament to appear to be inconclusive, by producing other renderings (often probably more literally exact) differing from the Sept., or even contradicting it. Thus Christianity might seem to the Jewish mind to rest on a false basis. But a really
Daniel, as rendered or revised by Theodotion, has so long taken the place of the true Sept. that the latter version of this book was supposed not to be extant, and it has only been found in one MS. In most editions of the Sept. Theodotion's version of Daniel is still substituted for that which really belongs to that translation. By the Jews Theodotion's version seems never to have been much esteemed. For literature, see Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, iii, 430 sqq. See Themistius, in Eusebius (Hist. Eccles., vii, 17; Demonstrat. Evang., vii, 1) and Jerome (Praef. in Erezum) to have been an Ebonite; so, too, in the Syrian accounts given by Assemani (Bibli. Orient., ii, 278; iii, 1, 17). Hence, to all intents and purposes, he is a Samaritan. There may have been Ebonites from among the Samaritans who constituted a kind of separate sect, and these may have desired a version of their own; or it may be that, as a Samaritan, he made this version for some of those people who employed Greek, and who had learned to receive more than the Pentateuch. But perhaps to such motives was added (if, indeed, this were not the only cause of the version) a desire for a Greek translation not so unintelligible as that of Aquila, and not displaying such a want of Hebrew learning as that of Theodotion. It is probable that the translation of Symmachus appeared prior to the time of Irenaeus, it would have been mentioned by him; and this agrees with what Epiphanius says, namely, that he lived under the emperor Severus.

The style of the work is good, and the diction periphrastic, pure, and elegant (Thieme, De puriss. Symmach. Lips. 1755; Hody, De Bibli. text. original.). It is of less benefit in criticism than that of Aquila, but of greater advantage in interpretation. It would seem from Jerome that there was a second edition of it (Comment. in Jerem. xxxii; in Noh, iii). For literature, see Furst, Bibli. Jud., iii, 399 sqq. See Symmachus.

V. The Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Versions.—Besides the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the great critical work of Origen comprised as to portions of the Old Test. three other versions, placed for comparison with the Sept., which, from their being anonymous, are only known as the fifth, sixth, and seventh, designations taken from the process which they respectively occupied in Origen's columnar arrangement. Ancient writers seem not to have been uniform in their notation which they applied to these versions, and thus what is cited from one by its number of reference is quoted by others under a different numeral.

These three partial translations were discovered by Origen in the course of his travels in connection with his great work. His knowledge of the Biblical texts that two of these versions (but without designating precisely which) were found, the one at Jericho, and the other at Nicopolis, on the gulf of Actium. Epiphanius says that what he terms the fifth was found at Jericho, and the sixth at Nicopolis, while Jerome speaks of the fifth as having been found at the latter place.

The contents of the fifth version appear to have been the Pentateuch, Psalms, Canticles, and the minor prophets: it seems also to have been referred to in the Syro-Hexaplar text of the second book of Kings: it may be detected in all the Hexaplar books in the Syro-Hexaplar text of the Christian doctrine of the New Testament. It appears from Jerome (in Jer. xxix, 17) that there were two editions of Theodotion's version.

There can be no doubt that this version was much used by the Alexandrian tradition. In the text of the Sept. were adopted from Theodotion: this may have begun before the Biblical labors of Origen brought the various versions into one concepctus. The translation of the book of Daniel by Theodotion was substituted for that of the Sept. in ecclesiastical use as early as at least the first part of the 9th century. Hence
when he executed his work, or else the hand of a Chris-
tian scribe must have meddled with it before it was
employed by Origens, which seems, from the small in-
terval of time, to be hardly probable. For in Hab. iii,
15, the translation runs, Ἵθ νηθετ ὀδος των λαω
των έαν ηρωη τον ραυμη των σω\nOf the seventh version very few fragments remain. It
has since contained the Psalms and minor proph-
phets, and the translator was probably a Jew.
From the references given by Origens, or by those
who copied from his columnar arrangement and its
results (or who added to such extracts), it has been
thought that other Greek versions have been of.
Of these, Εκθεσις probably refers to the Hebrew text,
or to something drawn from it; δι Σεφος, to the Old
Syrian version; το Σαμαριτανικον, probably a refer-
tance to the Samaritan text, or some Samaritan glos;
ο Θεληματις έ Αλλος, δι ιεραιτσιους, some unspeci-
ified version or versions.
The existing fragments of these varied versions are
mostly to be found in the editions of the relics of Ori-
gen's Hexapla, by Montfaucon and by Bahrth. (See
Epiphanius, De Ponderibus et Mensurae, cap. 17; Euse-
bius. Patrum. eccl. vi. 15; Jerome, Comment in T N. cap.
3.; Apology contra Ruffin ii. 84; Hefele, p. 560, sq.) See
Origens.
VI. THE GRECO-VALENTIAN VERSION.—A MS. of the
11th century, in the library of St. Mark at Venice, con-
tains a peculiar version of the Pentateuch, Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, and Da-
niel. All of these books, except the Pentateuch, were
published at the Aldisdon at Strassburg in 1784; the
Penta-
tateuch was edited by Ammon at Erlangen in 1790-91.
The version itself is thought to be four or five hundred
years older than the one MS. in which it has been trans-
mitted; this, however, is so thoroughly a matter of
opinion, that there seems no absolute. The author was
missing that one MS. may not be the original, as
well as the only one in existence. In any case, the MS.
cannot be considered earlier than the 14th century, or
the version earlier than the 9th. It is written in one
very narrow column on each page; the leaves follow
each other in the Hebrew order, so that the book begins
at what we should call the end. An examination of
the MS. suggested the opinion that it may have been
written on the broad inner margin of a Hebrew MS.,
and that for some reason the Hebrew portion had been
cut away, leaving thus a Greek MS. probability unique as a payment arrangement. As to the translation
itself, it is on any supposition too recent to be of im-
portance in criticism. It may be said briefly that the
translation was made from the Hebrew, although the
present punctuation and accentuation is often not fol-
lowed, and the translator was no doubt acquainted with
some other Greek versions. The language of the trans-
lation is a most strange mixture of astonishing and ca-
cophonous barbarism with attempts at Attic elegance
and refinement. The Doric, which is employed to an
answer to the Chaldean portions of Daniel, seems to be an
indication of his allowable affinities. The author was
probably a Christian of Byzantine, but not of Jewish ex-
traction. (See Eichhorn, Allg. Bibl. iii. 371; v. 748;
vii. 198; Dahler, Vers. Græc. Argent. 1786.) See
Vetride-Grekke.
Green is the rendering in the A.V. of the follow-
ing term in the original [see Color]: prop.
some form of the root πρώτος, πραγματικός, to be pale green, as grass or
an affrentlyed person, χαρακτις; also Νερός, de ake, early vegetation; other less appropriate or less usual
words so rendered are Ρεχθος, Gen. xxx. 97; Judges
vii. 8; Ezek. xxvii. 44; xx. 4; 47, more with sa (as in
Num. xi. 10), like πραγματικός. Like xxiii. 21, and like ἄρος, ἀριστίς, ἄρος, in Sxxi. 16, ἀριστίς, ἀριστίς, verdant with
foliage (in connection with "tree", etc., "fresh" in Pss. xxii. 10; "flourishing" in ver. 19); but in Esth.
6, the word is ναρκοτις, κάρπος, fine linen (q. v.). i. e. κάρπος, carassin. See also Zan (of Corn); l Fig.
Green, Aabbel, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian
divine, was born at Hanover, Morris Co., N. J., July
17, 1822. He was educated at Pennsylvania College,
where he graduated with high honors in 1844. He
was immediately appointed tutor in the college, and two
years after professor of mathematics and natural philos-
ophy. He was licensed to preach by the presbytery of New Brunswick in Feb.
1886, and, after declining a call from the Independent
congregation of Charleston, S. C., accepted one from
the Second Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia,
where he was installed in May, 1877, as colleague of the
Rev. Dr. Sproat. In 1878 he was elected a mem-
ber of the American Historical Society, and in 1790
the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church,
where he moved for a renewal of communications with the
College of New Jersey. He was a graduate of the
University of Pennsylvania in 1792, and in the
same year was appointed chaplain to Congress, which
office he held until 1800. In 1812 the College of New
Jersey was destroyed by fire, and Dr. Green,
who had been one of the trustees since 1780, was
appointed to fill the place of the president, Dr. Smith,
while the latter went on a collecting tour through the
States. The establishment of a Presbyterian Theo-
logical Seminary was first proposed in the General As-
sembly of May, 1809, and a board of directors having
been appointed in May, 1813, the latter charter for
Green for their purposes; he held the office until his
death. Being elected president of the College of New
Jersey in August, 1812, he accepted the appointment,
and resigned his pastoral charge. In the same year
he was made LL.D. by the University of North Caro-
olina. At the college he delivered a series of lectures
on the Abject's Catechism, which were afterwards
published by the General Assembly's Board of Publ-
ication (2 vols. 12mo) and in the Christian Advocate.
Reigning the presidency of the college in September,
1822, he took up his residence at Philadelphia, where he
published the next two years the Christian Advocate,
a religious monthly, writing the greater part of it him-
self, besides preaching to an African congregation for
two years and a half, and often supplying the pulpets
of other ministers. He died May 19, 1848. He
was a very abundant writer; his principal works, in addi-
tion to those already named, are, Ten occasional Ser-
mons (1799-1808)—Six Addresses, Reports, etc. (1793-
1836) History of Presbyterian Missions (1 vol.)—
Discourses on the College of New Jersey, together with a
History of the College (1832) etc. He also superintend-
ed an edition in 1827 of R. H. Pown's Left in MS. a biography of that great man. For several
years, beginning with 1804, he was the responsible ed-
itor of the General Assembly's Magazine. See Life of
Aabbel Green, V.D.M., prepared for the Press at the Au-
thor's request by R. H. Jones (N. Y. 1849, 8vo); Sprague, Annals of Edu., ii. 715; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 741;
Green, William, a divine of the Church of Eng-
lund, was a fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, and after-
wards rector of Hardingham, Norfolk. He wrote a
New Translation of the Psalms, with Notes (Loud.
1849),—A New Translation of Isaiah, with Notes (ch.
xiil-xliii, and Poetical and Doctrinal and Others.
An Old Testament, translated from the Hebrew, with
Notes (Camb. 1781, 4to). He died in 1794.—Europ. Mag.
GREENE, Thomas, bishop of Ely, was born at Norwich in 1586, and educated at Benedict College, Cambridge, of which he obtained a scholarship, and in 1608 a fellowship. After numerous prebendal, he obtained the vicarage of St. Martin’s-in-the-Fields, Westminster, in 1716. This he held in commune with the bishopric of Norwich, which he was consecrated on October 8, 1721, but was thence translated to Ely on September 24, 1728. George I, soon after his accession, appointed him one of his domestic chaplains. He died in 1738. He wrote, 1. The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper explained to the meanest capacities (London, 1710, 12mo) – 2. The Principles of Religion expounded for the Weak (id. 1726, 12mo) – 3. Four Discourses on the Last Things (London, 1784, 12mo.) – Hook, Eccles. Bibl. vol. v.

Greenfield, William, a celebrated linguist, was born in London April 1, 1799. In his thirteenth year he was apprenticed to a London bookseller. His love of the study of languages was so great that, while laboring all day in his master’s service, he acquired successively Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and several modern languages. In 1822 he submitted to Mr. Bagster, a publisher in London, the prospectus of a Polyglot Grammar of nearly thirty languages, on the principles of construction. He was authorized to publish the Complete Bible issued by Bagster in 1826. In 1828 he edited an edition of the Syriac New Testament, and in 1830 he prepared a revised translation of the N. T. into Hebrew, both for Bagster’s Polyglot. He published a Lexicon of the Greek N. T., followed by an abridgment of Schmidt’s Greek Concordance. In 1830 he was appointed editor of foreign versions to the British and Foreign Bible Society. His laborous strength, his death, and died Nov. 5, 1831.

Kitto, Cyclop. p. 178; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 794; Imperial Magazines, Jan. and Feb. 1834.

Greenham, Richard, an English Puritan divine, was born at or near Oxford, and educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. He was for many years pastor of Drayton, near Cambridge, where he died in 1651. He published a number of sermons, treatises, etc., which, after his death, were collected and published under the title The Works of the Rev. Richard Greenham, revised and published by H. E. (7th ed. Lond. 1821, fol.).–Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographia, i, 1812.

Greenhill, William, M.A., a learned and pious Nonconformist divine, was born in Oxfordshire. He entered Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1604, and obtained the living of Stepney in 1655. Having joined the Independents, he was one of the Commissioners of the Restoration, and died about 1677. His principal work is An Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel, with useful Observations thereon (Lond. 1648, 5 vols. 4to). A new edition, revised and corrected by Sherman, was published in 1659 (Lond. imperial 8vo).

Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographia, i, 1812.

Greenland, a region in North-eastern America of unknown extent northwards, stretches from its southern extremity, Cape Farewell, along the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans on the east, and Davis’s Strait, Baffin’s Bay, and Smith’s Sound on the west. It obtained its name from an Icelandic, Eric Raud (the Red), who led thither an expedition in 986 or 986, and founded two settlements on the west coast, called the Oestre and Westre Bygd (the east and west colonies). About centuries afterwards, the Westre Bygd was destroyed by the pestilence called the “black death,” combined with swept the arctic seas; and a century after this, the Oestre Bygd, in which the south of Greenland was visited, and its west coast explored, successively by Frolicher, Davis, and Baffin, the latter having advanced as far as lat. 78° N. (the limit of the inhabited country). More recently Dr. Kane has extended his explorations as far as lat. 82° 30’ N., or within 590 miles of the north pole. In 1868 and 1869 new expeditions to explore the coast were sent out from Germany. The most important incident in connection with this bleak region is the settlement, in 1711, of Hans Egede (q. v.), a Norwegian clergyman, at Godthaab (lat. 64° N.), and with him a colony of 43 men. The colony was supported by the Danish government till 1721, when the supplies were stopped; but a few years afterwards it was restored, and a new settlement was granted to the mission. Since that time the Danes have established thirteen different colonies or factories along the west coast, seven in North Greenland (north of lat. 67° N.), and six in South Greenland; the total population of the colony being about 10,000, inclusive of 250 Danish and 1000 American settlers. The Danish Society seeks to sustain various institutions formed in Greenland in eight different places. The Moravians, in 1886, supported in Greenland 6 stations, 25 missionaries, 56 native assistants, and their congregations had a total membership of 1501. See Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions; Schein, American Ecclesi. Almanac for 1869. (A. J. S.)

Greenaway, Peter, an Indian of the Lake Superior country, one of the first converts under the missionary labors of John Sunday (q. v.), was born in 1807, and became a Christian in 1820. He received license on Sept. 21, 1824, and was subsequently employed as an interpreter to Rev. Mr. Daughtery, of the Presbyterians Board, for several years. June 18, 1859, he was again licensed as a local preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church; and in 1862 he was admitted into full connection in the Conference, and ordained deacon November 5, 1865. He was in charge of the Ojibway Indian Mission. In 1864 he was again appointed in charge of the Pine River Indian Mission. In 1866 he was ordained elder, and returned to Pine River. He died of quick consumption, April 5, 1886. Among his own people he was an extraordinary influence. He was a laborious student, a good theologian, and a powerful preacher. The Indians in Northern Michigan are greatly indebted to him for their civilization and piety. – Minutes of Conferences, 1886, p. 170.

Greenwood, Francis William Pitt, a Unitarian minister, was born in Boston, Feb. 5, 1817. He graduated at Harvard in 1814, and then pursued his theological studies. He became pastor of the New South Church, Boston, in 1818, but was soon compelled, on account of his health, to go to Europe. He returned in 1821, and passed several years in Baltimore, where he became the Unitarian Minister. In 1824 he was made associate minister of King’s Chapel, Boston, and, after 1827, pastor. In 1837–38 he was associate editor of the Christian Examiner, to which he was an able and frequent contributor for many years. He died August 2, 1843. Dr. Greenwood was a man of rare gifts; an eloquent preacher, and a very accomplished writer. “He gladly acknowledged as Christian brethren those who led a Christian life, though their theological opinions might lead them to exclude him from the fellowship of the saints.” He published Chapel Lane Life, ed. Boston, 1827, 189pp. – Papers was Hymns (1838) – History of King’s Chapel (Boston, 1838, 12mo). – Sermons to Children: – Lives of the Twelve Apostles (1838) – Sermons of Communion (1842). – Sermons on various Subjects (1844, 2 vols. 12mo). – Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 786; Crit. Examiner, xxxvii, 227.

Greeting (prop. διαβαίνεται, shalom, peace; χαίρε, to wish joy; also χαῖρε, shawd, to ask after one’s health). See Salutation.

Grégoire, Henri, constitutional bishop of Blais, was born in 1615 near Lavaline, Dec. 4, 1790. He was educated at the Jesuits’ College of Nancy, entered the Church, and became teacher in the school at Pont-Mousson. When the French Revolution broke out he embraced its principles, and in 1789 he was elected a member of the States-general. He soon became distinguished for the boldness of his opinions on civil and
religious liberty; his eloquent efforts in favor of the Jews and the blacks placed him high among the friends of humanity. It was on his motion that the Convention in 1794 abolished negro slavery. He was the first among the clergy to take the constitutional oath. In Sept. 1792, he advocated the abolition of royalty in the Convention, yet proposed also the abolition of capital punishment, intending thus to save the king's life. In the Reign of Terror he had the courage to resist in the Convention the storm of invectives from the tribunes, and the threats from the Mountain. "Are sacrifices demanded for the country?" he said: "I am accustomed to make them. Are the revenues of my bishopric demanded? I abandon them without regret. Is religion the subject of your deliberations? It is a matter beyond your jurisdiction; I demand the freedom of religious worship." Later, he was one of five who opposed the accession of the first consol to the throne. In 1814 he signed the act deposing the emperor, and the next year, as member of the Institute, declined signing the additional act, which led, in the Restoration, to his expulsion both from that body and from the bishopric. He then devoted himself to literary and benevolent labors until his death, April 28, 1831. He had a large share in the foundation of some of the greatest institutions of that period, such as the Bureau des Longitudes, the Conservatoire des Arts et Mâiers, and the Institut National. Notwithstanding his clear reserve to his views of royalty, and his repeated refusals, in the worst periods of the Revolution, to abandon the Roman Catholic Church, he was treated by the authorities of that Church, on their return to power, not merely with neglect, but with cruelty. The archbishop of Paris refused him the last sacraments, except on condition of retracting the constitutional oath taken forty years before, and also refused him Catholic burial! His principal publications are Essai sur la régénération morale, physique et politique des Juifs (Metz, 1798);—Mémoire en faveur des gens de sang noirci. (Dominique, 1798);—La littérature des Nègres: recherches sur leurs facultés intellectuelles et morales;—Liberté de l'Eglise Gallicaine (1826, 2d ed.);—Histoire des sectes religieuses dans les quatre parties du monde (2d ed. 1826, 6 vols. 8vo);—Chronique religieuse (6 vols. 8vo);—Recueil de lettres encycliques: A. maîtres de la religion (18 vols. 8vo);—Hertzog, v. 318; Migne: Carnot, Mémoires de Grigoré (1837, 2 vols. 8vo); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xx., 882.

I. TONE.
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III. TONE.
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II. TONE.
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IV. TONE.
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V. TONE.
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VI. TONE.

\[ \text{music notation} \]

VII. TONE.
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VIII. TONE.
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The different character of the Gregorian tones depends entirely on the places of the semitones, which in the above example are marked with a \( \flat \). Several of the tones have various endings, some as many as four, while the second, fifth, and sixth tones have each only one ending. For a full and interesting account of the Gregorian church music, see N. A. Jansen's Grund-
Greek writer of the first part of the 10th century. Though always called "the monk," he was not, as he did not live in a convent, but practised an ascetic life at his own home. His spiritual guide was St. Basil the Younger, after whose death he wrote two memoirs of him, one of which survives in the Acta Sanc-
torum, March, iii, 667. With many absurd stories, it gives a gory account of the Saint's life, a valuable historical source. Fab-
bricius, Bibl. Græca, x, 206; Cave, Hist. Lit. anno 940; Hoef-

Gregorius Nazianzenus (Gregory of Naza-
lzenus, or Nazianzenus), one of the greatest of the Greek Church Fathers, was born either at Arianzus, a small village in Cappadocia, near the town of Nazianzus, or at Nazianzus, from which he derives his surname, and of
which his father was bishop, or else in the town of Nazianzus itself. The date of his birth has never been precisely settled, but it was probably about A.D. 329 (see Ullmann, Life of Gregory, Appendix II.). His pious mother, Nonna, devoted him when an infant to Christ and the Church. His education, which commenced at Cesarea in Cappadocia, was prosecuted next at Cesarea Philippi, and at Alexandria, and was finished at Athens, where he began a life-long intimacy with the Great. See Basil. He was also a fellow-student with Julian, afterwards the apostate emperor. Gregory, with a quick instinct, discerned the character of Julian even then, and said to one of his friends, "How great a scourge is here in training for the Roman empire!" He then remained at Athens nearly ten years, part of this time he was busy with his learning and rhetoric with great success. About A.D. 386 he returned to Nazianzus, where he intended to enter upon civil life. Shortly after he was baptized, and consecrated himself anew to the service of God, re-
solving the对象 of eloquence to serve no interests but those of God and the Church. But for his aged father, he would probably at this time have gone into the desert to lead an ascetic life, at least for some years. At home he remained, and devoted himself to the study of the Scriptures, living by a rule of life (the strictest self-denial). About A.D. 389 he visited Basil in his retreat, and remained a short time with him in the practice of ascetic and devotional acts. Returning home at the request of his father, probably to aid in the settlement of a difficulty into which the aged bishop had fallen by signing the Arimenian formula, which he denied. A.D. 389. Gregory, the amasius makes it A.D. 573. One of his friends, Anatolius, was put to death with severe tortures on a charge of magic, and the people of Antioch accused Gregory of complicity with him, but he was acquitted. His enemies then changed their strategy with incessant with his own sister: of this, too, he was acquitted. Weary of con-
tention, Gregory gave up his See to Anastasius, and soon after died (about A.D. 554). He distinguished himself by his hostility to the Aeccepl (q.v.). When the imperial troops rebelled in Persia, Gregory brought them back by an oration, which is preserved by Ev-
anglius, under the title Μανογορια πτος του σπραυτος; he wrote also λογος εις τις μαθροφές (σειρείας in μαθροφές 
μαθροφές); and both are given in Gallandi Bibl. Patrum, t. xii. See Evanglius, Hist. Eccl. v, 6, 18; vi, 4, 11, 18, 24; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Bibl. and Art., i, 338; Hoefner, Nova. Bibl. Générale, xxxi, 876.

Gregorius Cassianarius (Gregory of Cas-
seus), a presbyter of the city of that name in Cappadocia in the 10th century. He wrote a life of Gregory of Na-
zialzenus, which is given in a Latin version by Billenas, in his edition of Gregory of Nazianzus. It is also in
Surius, Vit. Sanc. May, 121. We have also of Gregorius of Grecian Art, in Patres Neniae in Comment. No-

Gregorius Monachus (Gregory the Monk), a
Iii, 32
if against a personal enemy. "He takes eloquence away from us," he says, "as though we were thieves who had stolen it." Elsewhere, addressing the hearers, he writes: "Everything else, riches, birth, glory, power, and all the vain pomps of earth whose brilliancy vanishes like a dream, I willingly abandon to you; I am willing to abandon all the hope which divine eloquence has put above things visible." And again: "It is our duty to render thanks unto God that eloquence has again become free." These two discourses, it must be admitted, are really nothing but pamphlets, exhibiting little of the charity and mildness which one would expect from a Christian, and was, in fact, bishop of the enemy. There is, nevertheless, a certain grandeur in the indignation which Gregory pours out against Julian. At the close of the second discourse the orator grows calmer, and endeavors to prevent revenge being taken on the partisans of Julian: he says: "Let not the facility of avenging ourselves lead us to forget the necessity of accommodating ourselves to God." Let us leave to God's judgment the chastisement of those who have offended us and be satisfied with seeing the people openly hissing our persecutors in the public places and in the theaters." Gregory, in his discourses with the people, is near being easily interrupted. Gregory had, in 365, brought about a reconciliation between his friend and Eusebius of Cæsarea. The latter dying in 370, Basil succeeded him as archbishop, and Gregory came to visit him in the year following. There was a contest between Basil and Anthimus, bishop of Tyana in Cappadocia, who pretended to be metropolitan of the province. Basil, in order to secure a useful ally, offered Gregory the bishopric of Saisina, a small unhealthy place on the frontier of the two provinces which divided Cappadocia. Gregory, after declining for some time, finally accepted, and was ordained bishop in 372; but the press of business and his recent ascetic life made him impatient of the office. He retired to Nazianzus, a bishopric without a bishopric, of Saisina, and spent his time in the solitude of the desert. The hermits, whom he assisted in the government of his church, he taught the people, defended the Church against the vexations of the Roman governors, and by his eloquence and spirit exerted that kind of religious supremacy which, in the early ages, formed part of ecclesiastical government. Toleration, ascribed to the christienne au quatorzième siècle, p. 183). Losing his father and mother almost at the same time (at A.D. 374), he retired to a convent of Seleucia. He was still there, living in a calm which, as he said himself, "the silence of heretics" could not disturb, when he heard of the death of Basil in 379. It affected him deeply, and he wrote a letter of encouragement and consolation to Gregory of Nyssa, the brother of his deceased friend. The Church of Constantinople had been for forty years a prey to Arianism, when Gregory was chosen as the most proper person to bring it back to orthodoxy. Though unwilling to be drawn out from the calm retreat so much enjoyed, Gregory permitted himself to be led by the advice of his friends and the interests of the Church. His emaciated appearance, the marks of severe penance and of sickness, and his voice, which had a pathetic monotony, gave great merit to the laughter and irony of the heretics at Constantinople. The orthodox had not a single church of their own in Constantinople; Gregory was therefore obliged to preach at first in a private house, which gave place, after a short time, to the chapel of the monastery of the episcopal palace of the real father of faith. He taught and defended the Nicene Creed before crowded audiences attracted by his eloquence. It is then he was surnamed the Theologus, on account of the profundity of his learning. His success excited his enemies still more against him and his life was several times in danger. Peter, patriarch of Alexandria, who had appointed him bishop of Constantinople, sided afterwards against him, and favored the pretensions of a synodical philosopher called Maximus, who caused the discipline of the Church to be changed. Once, it seems, Gregory said to a friend, "I was not bishop of Constantinople in the year of the world 380." Vainly did Theodotus urge St. Gregory to take possession of the church of St. Sophia at the head of a large troop of soldiers, assuring him of his protection, and causing a council assembled at Constantinople to condemn the majority of the clergy of the new bishop, and annul that of Maximus. He could not put an end to the intrigues and calumnies which pursued Gregory. Some bishops of Egypt and of Macedonia attacked the validity of his election on the plea that he was already bishop of Saisina, and that the canons for the transfer of a poor man to God and to me, Gregory offered to resign, saying, "If my election is the cause of trouble, throw me into the sea like Jonas, to allay the storm, though it was not I who raised it." This proposal was accepted with a haste which could not but wound the susceptibility of Gregory. Before leaving Constantinople, he ordained the people in the church of St. Sophia, and delivered his farewell address—the grandest of all his orations. "Forbear," said he at the close; "farewell, church of Anastasia, as called in remembrance of our piæa trust; farewell, my sons in faith; farewell, gentlemen of our assembly; farewell, all who dwell in Saisina, where, after forty years' wandering in the desert, we had for the first time settled the ark of the covenant; farewell, too, thou great and famous temple, our last trophy . . . farewell to you all, holy abodes of faith. . . . farewell, holy apostles, celestial colonists, my model in the combat I have sustained; farewell, episcopal chair, post at once so envied and so full of perils; farewell, ministers of God at his holy table . . . farewell, choir of the Nazarenes, harmony of psalms, pious watches, holiness of virgins, modesty of women, assemblies of widows and of orphans, glances of the poor turned to God and to me; farewell, hospitable houses, friends of Christ who have succored me in mine infirmities . . . . Farewell, kings of the earth, palaces, retinue, and courtiers of kings, faithful, I trust, to your master, but for the most part, I fear, faithless towards God . . . . . . farewell, exalt heaven your new orator the troublesome voice which displeased you is hushed. . . . Farewell, sovereign city, the friend of Christ, yet open to correction and repentance; farewell, Eastern and Western world, for whose sake I have striven, and for whose sake I am now striving, and for whose sake I shall strive, until the thoughts of this church, who protected me in my presence, and who will protect me in my exile; and thou, holy Trinity, my thought and my glory, may they hold fast to thee, and mayest thou save them, save my people! and may I hear daily that they are increasing in knowledge and in virtue." On his way to exile Gregory stopped at Cæsarea, where he delivered a funeral oration on St. Basil. In the year 382 he retired to Aranzus for quiet and repose. In 383 Theodosius invited him to take part in a council held at Constantinople. He declined, saying, "Tell the truth, I will always avoid these assemblies of bishops; I have never seen them lead to any good result, but rather increase evils instead of diminishing them. They serve only as fields for tournaments of words and the play of ambition. He added that, at all events, he would have preferred to die in Constantinople. He remained in retirement until his death in 389. A garden which he cultivated, a fountain, and the shade of a few trees, composed all his enjoyments. He divided his time between prayer and the writing of poems, in which he expressed his thoughts, hopes, and longings. He was essentially a naturally inclined to melancholy and melancholy. He is one of the most polished among the sacred writers of the 4th century, and...
ranks first after Chrysostom and Basil. The richness of his imagination, developed in the solitude in which a great part of his life was spent, gives to his writings a character which few contemporaries of men most intimate with the writers of that age. His letters are full of playful sprightliness, sometimes tinctured with a slight under-current of harmless irony. A severe critic might show some passages bordering on declamation and bombast. But these faults were general at the time in which he lived; and a writer, however great, always bears more or less the imprint of his day. He is commemorated as a saint in the Roman Catholic Church on May 9, in the Greek Church on the 25th and 30th of January.

St. Gregory the number of poetical pieces. During the reign of Julian, when profane literature was a forbidden pursuit for Christians, Gregory, considering it as a powerful aid to piety, attempted to supply the wants of his brethren by means of religious poems on the plan of the classics. He accused of stupefaction and ignorance (ναυτικοί καὶ κακοί ἀλόγοι) those who attempted to prevent the study of literature. "Most of his poetical works are religious meditations, which, in spite of the differences of time and manners, have still many points of affinity with the poetical reveries of the days of sceptical scepticism and social prostration" (Villehardouin, "R. Litt. 226 s. c. IV° siècle," p. 139). Gregory wrote also a large number of discourses or orations, both while administering the diocese of Nazianzum for his father and while defending orthodoxy at Constantinople. Among those discourses are funeral addresses and paeonies, e.g. those of Athanasius and Basil; inuncteas, the two discourses against Julian; σερμόνα on questions of morals, discipline, and dogmas. Most of those written in Constantinople, while he was opposing the Arians and Macedonians, are of the latter kind. These discourses are 156 in number. Some critics claim that the 45th, 47th, 49th, 50th, and 53d cannot be genuine. The Letters of Gregory amount to 242, on all subjects; some of them are quite uninteresting except as they contribute to throw light on the character of Gregory and of his age. Gregory of Nazianzus has often been named as the Ignorance (ἀναγνώσις) of his times, which is now generally attributed to Gregory Thaumaturgus. The Poems of Gregory number 156, differing very much from each other in length, subject, and metre; we find among them religious meditations, devotionals, literary compositions, 228 small pieces, which were collected and published by Muratorii in 1769. In some collections of his works is included a tragedy entitled Christ suflering (Χριστὸς παθήσων [ed. by Ellisen, Leipzig, 1855]), which is probably not his.

As a theologian, Gregory shows marks of the powerful influence of Origen. As to the Trinity, he earnestly defended the Nicene doctrines (Orationes, 27-31), and vindicated, against the Apollinarians, the humanity of Christ. In common with nearly all theologians before Augustine, he maintained side by side the doctrines of the necessity of grace and the freedom of the human will.


Gregorius Neo-Caesarianus, or Thaumaturgus, received the latter surname from the miracles ascribed to him. His proper name was Theodorus. He was born in the 3d century, of rich and noble parents, at Neo-Caesarea, in Pontus. He was educated very carefully, and had many religious reading and associations. It is of the church- ism by his father, who was a warm zealot; but losing this parent at fourteen years of age, his inclinations led him to Christianity. Having studied the law for some time at Alexandria and Athens, he accompanied his sister to Cæsarea, and there became the pupil of Orijen, about the year 302 of our Lord. He afterwards continued his tuition, during which he learned logic, physics, geometry, astronomy, and ethics, and what was of infinitely greater consequence, the knowledge of the true God and the Christian Scriptures. When Gregory returned to his native country, he was received with great respect, and he lived a private and retired life, but Pherdinus, bishop of Amasa, ordained him bishop of Neo-Caesarea, in which, and the whole neighborhood, there were only seventeen Christians. Gregory Nyssen, who has written an account of his life, says he was more perfectly instructed in the Christian doctrine by the Egyptian Egyptian, in which he heard and saw the Virgin Mary and St. John discussing together of the Christian faith! When they disappeared, he wrote down carefully all they spoke, which, as Nyssen says, was preserved in Gregory's own handwriting in the church of Neo-Caesarea in his time. There are other legends of miracles wrought by him, among them the following: On his way to take possession of his unpromising bishopric he was benighted, and obliged, through the inclemency of the weather, to take up his lodging in a heathen temple, the doors of which had been barred against him, and his frequent appearances to the priest, and for the offerings which he delivered. Gregory and his companions departed from this place early in the morning, after which the priest performed the usual rites, but the daman answered that he could appear no more in that place, because of him who had lodged there the preceding night. The pagan priest besought Gregory to bring the demon back. The saint laid on the altar a piece of paper, on which he had written, "Gregory to Satan—enter." The devils returned, and the pagan, astonished, was converted to Christianity. When Gregory arrived at the city a vast crowd of people came together, to whom he preached the gospel, and numbers were converted. As the number of believers increased daily, he formed the design of building a church, which was soon effected, all cheerfully contributing both by labor and money. This was probably the first church ever erected for the sole purpose of Christian worship. After having converted all the Neo-Caesareans except seventeen persons, he died full of faith and the Holy Spirit, rejoicing that he left no more unbelievers in the city than he found Christians at the commencement of his ministry. In the year 394 he attended the synod at Antioch, where Paul of Samosata made a feigned recantation of his heretical opinions. Gregory died most probably in the following year, certainly between A.D. 265 and 270. The many accounts of miracles ascribed to him do not rest upon the authority of
his contemporaries. We are chiefly indebted for an account of them to Gregory of Nyssa, who flourished a hundred years after Thaumaturgus, who wrote a panegyric relating to Gregory would not have been evidenced in every wonder of which he received a report without examination. Lardner, however, says that he will not assert that Gregory worked no miracles. The age of miracles was not entirely concluded, and had there been no foundation in truth, the wonderful stories relating to Gregory would not have been believed. He is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church on the 17th of November.

The creed of Gregory is very important, as showing us how clearly defined was at this time the faith of the orthodox Church. Episcopacy has been debased, but it is received as genuine by Bishop Bull and Dr. Waterland: it is as follows: "There is one God, Father of the living Word, the substantial wisdom and power and eternal express image: perfect Parent of one perfect, Father of the only begotten Son. There is one Lord, Only-begotten of God; it pleases him to signalize his in defence of the orthodox faith, in opposition to the Arians. He drew upon himself the vengeance of that party, and was banished from his see by the emperor Valens about 374. On the death of Valens in 378, he was recalled by Gratian, and restored to the possession of his see. A council was convened by Emperor Gratian, at which the Church of Nyssa to reform the Church of Arabia, and Palestinian bordering upon it, he visited Jerusalem and the holy places, as well to perform a vow as to settle peace and tranquility among them who governed the Church of Jerusalem. When he returned, he informed the emper- orey the emperor allowed him the use of the public carriages, so that, having a wagon at his own disposal, it served him and those who accompanied him both as a church and a monastery; they sang psalms, and observed their fasts as they travelled. He visited Beth-lehem, Nazareth, and the Mount of Olives; however, he was not much edified by the inhabitants of the country, who, he says, were very corrupt in their manners, and notoriously guilty of all sorts of crimes, especially murder. Therefore, being afterwards consulted by a monk of Cappadocia concerning the phenomenon of a luminous column, he replies in the affirmative, "that he does not think it proper for such as have renounced the world, and have resolved to arrive at Christian perfection, to undertake these journeys. Advise your brethren, therefore, rather to leave the body to its fate, that it may go to heaven," but he added: "it is only" "the idea of Gregory of Nyssa concerning pilgrimages. In 381 and the subsequent years, Gregory attended the Council of Constantinople. In this city he pronounced the funeral oration of his sister Macrina, and three years afterwards he was deprived by death of his wife, a woman of many virtues, who, in her later years, devoted herself to religious duties, and has been supposed by some to have become a deaconess. His own death took place in the beginning of the year 400.

As a theologian, Gregory had great reputation in his age. His theory shows independent and original thought, but contains many of the ideas of Origen. He maintained the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of Redemption, the freedom of the will, faith as the subjective, and the sacraments as the objective means of grace. His style was magnificent, he was an abundant writer, but his abundance too often degenerated into diffuseness; his style drags; his illustrations are often in questionable taste, and, being too fully developed, fatigue the reader. When attempting to be refined, he becomes subtle, and his grander passages on onomastics: have wearied us; one may many passages full of elevated views and true beauty, and animated by a warmth of feeling reaching even to enthusiasm. An analysis of his writings may be found in Clarke, Succession of Sacred Lives, i, 354 sq.; and in Dupin, Hist. of Ecc. Writers, cent. iv. They may be di-
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Viced into, 1. Doctrinal (chiefly relating to the Ariean controversy), 2. Exegetical; 3. Practical treatises; 4. Discourses; 5. Epistles and Panegyrics. Many of these have been published in separate editions. The first edition of his collected Works appeared at Cologne (1537, fol.), then at Basle (1562, 1571), and at Paris (1572). The first complete edition in Greek and Latin was that of Paris (1615, 2 vols. fol.); an Appendix appeared in 1618. This edition was reprinted in 1638 (edited by Gretzer, 3 vols. fol.). It is a large catalog of the separate editions of Gregory's writings in the Historia Francisca (in a new German version, Kirch. Gesch. 1. d. Franken Würzburg 1855, 1860), and by Giesebrecht (Breslau 1851, 2 vols.). See Löbel, Gregory, in the tours and short period. (Leips. 1838-1850, 2d ed. 1867); Kries, de Greg. Tour., etc. (Vat. 1838, 1850); Moschei, Church History, vol. vi. pt. ii. ch. ii. note 42; Clarke, S. Success. Sacred Literature, ii. 44; Neander, Church History, vol. iii. Dupin, Lectures, t. i. Hist. Litt. de la France, iii. 372; Hoefner, Nov. Biogr. Gén., xvii. 856.

Gregorius of Armenia (Gregory Illuminatus; Greek Photiesus, Armenian Luuaurwoc), first bishop of Armenia and apostle of Christianity in that country (3d century). Others had preached before him, but he was the first to organize Christianity thoroughly. Accurate information about him is wanting. The Bollandists (Acta Sanctorum, September, vol. viii) give a life of him professedly written by his contemporary, Agathangellus, but it is clearly spurious. He is the author of several Homilies, which have been published by his name (Venice, 1837). His name is held in just veneration in the Eastern churches, and he is also a saint in the Roman Calendar, Sept. 30. The United Armenians in Constantinople claim to possess his relics, which, in August, 1869, were transferred from one church to another. — Hoefner, Nouvelle Biogr. Générale, xvi. 868 (where the traditional account is fully given); Moschei, Church History, ii. 225; Malan, Life and Times of Gregory Illuminator (London, 1868). See Armenia.

Gregorius of Betica, bishop of Illiberis (Elvira in the ancient Betica, now Andalusia), 4th century. He is mentioned by Jerome (Chron. anno 371) as a vigorous Arianizer. The Arians, who were his relatives and kinsmen, and strove, but without success, to drive him from his see. Gregory wrote several works, and among them a treatise de Fide, which Jerome styles elegans libellus. The treatise de Fide contra Ariano, which is given as Gregory's in some editions of the fathers, is by Faustinus (q. v.)—Tillemont, Mémoires, x. 272.

Gregory of Heimberg, one of the boldest opponents of papal encroachments in his time, was born at Würzburg in the early part of the 15th century. He studied in the University of Würzburg, and took the degree of L.L.D. about 1430. We next find him at the Council of Basle in company with Eneas Sylvius (afterwards Pope Pius II), who, as appears from a letter to Heimberg in Goldast's Monarchia S. Rom. Imperii (vol. ii, p. 1632 sqq.) fully appreciated the character and talents of his colleague. Eneas took Gregory as his secretary, and the two opposed very successfully the papal encroachments on the domain of the temporal power. Heimberg, however, soon retired to Nuremberg, where he was elected synode, and acquired such reputation that all important questions in civil or ecclesiastical law were referred to his arbitration. His relations with Eneas Sylvius changed on the occasion of the latter's election to the papacy, and when he was finally raised to the see of Rome, the friends found themselves in complete opposition to
Gregory, the patriarch of the Bohemian Brethren. Among the earnest-minded Hussites of the Calixtine party, which began, about 1453, to form around Rokycan, elected but never consecrated archbishop of Prague, and to listen with enthusiasm to his sermons on the取消of the Church, the most prominent was Gregory, surnamed “the Patriarch.” The time and place of his birth are unknown. He was the son of a Bohemian knight, and the nephew of Rokycan, whose sister was his mother. Disappointed in his uncle, who was not willing to be a reformer practically; however, he seems to have decided on the side of the reformers, with a number of his friends, to the barony of Litits, and there founded in 1457 the Church of the Bohemian Brethren, or Unitas Fratrum. Accepting no ecclaiastical office in the same, he remained merely a lay elder, but was the life and soul of the organization. In its internal he wrote and published many letters, doctrinal treatises, and apologetic works, nearly all of which have perished. His doctrinal tendencies were derived mainly from Peter Chelicky, a Bohemian writer, who inveighed with stern rigor, from out of an isolated retreat, against the corruptness of that age. A letter of his about Chelicky [see his article on the Taborites and the Germ of the Moravian Church, in the Presbyterian Review of July, 1864.] In consequence, his views of Christian discipline grew to be extreme, and more than puritanical. These he impressed on the Church. Some of his eloquent points were the following: men of rank must strip themselves of the same, and lay down every worldly office, before they can be received into the Church; no member is allowed to go to law, or to testify before a civil court; judicial oaths are forbidden, and no member may keep an inn, or engage in any trade calculated to advance luxury. His object was to preserve the Church unspotted from the world, amid the fearful degeneracy which prevailed. At the time of his death, which occurred in 1473, at Brandels, on the Adler, in Bohemia, these and other similar regulations were in full force. Twenty-one and a half years later, in 1494, they were formally abrogated, and a more liberal policy was introduced. In the first persecution (1461) which came upon the Brethren, Gregory was frightfully tortured on the rack.—Palacký’s Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder, vol. v. (Prague, 1851), p. 725. The successor of Gregory was the nephew of Rokycan; Geidel’s Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder, vol. i., ch. iii.—The Geschichte der alten Brüderkirche, vol. i., ch. i.—Benham’s Notes on the Origin and Episcopate of the Bohemian Brethren, p. 1-120. (E. de S.)

Gregory, patriarch of Constantinople, was born at Calvritza (Arcadia) about 1740. He studied in the schools of Dimitzana (Morea), Athos, Patmos, and Smyrna; entered the Church, and, after being successively ordained deacon and priest, was, while yet a young man, appointed metropolitan of Smyrna. Most of the churches of the diocese were in ruins, and the Turks opposed their restoration, yet he succeeded in fitting some of divine worship, and endowed himself greatly to the Greek population by his zeal and virtues. In 1758 he was appointed patriarch of Constantinople. When the expedition of Napoleon I. against Egypt took place, the Turks accused Gregory of favoring the French, and deposed him. He withdrew to a convent on Mount Athos, where he buried himself not only in writing religious books, but in learning the art of printing. Being soon after reappointed patriarch, he established a printing-office in the episcopal palace. His duties were interrupted by the politic maneuvers, e.g., the envoys sent on a charge of favoring Russia. He had finally been reappointed a third time patriarch, when the invasion of the Danubian provinces by Ypsilanti in 1821 led
to the rising of the Greeks. Constantinople was their supposed aim, and it was rumored that the Greeks of that city, in the fear of the rising, murdered the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Turkish soldiery were daily killing the Greeks in the streets of Constantinople, and the patriarch's palace was pointed at as the arsenal where Christians kept their ammunition. The position of the Greek clergy, in view of this revolution, was so critical as to render the restoration of the patriarchate daily more critical. Gregory, following the traditions of his Church, which had always enjoined obedience to the temporal powers, excommunicated the leaders of the insurrection. He was intrusted with the custody of the Morousi family, the head of which had been killed. The priests and became a royal pleader. Gregory committed them allowed them to escape, and from that moment Gregory foresaw the fate which awaited him. Pressed to fly by his friends, he refused to leave his post, and on Easter celebrated public worship with all the splendor and solemnity habitual on that occasion among Eastern Christians. He was arrested on leaving the church, thrown into prison, and a few hours later hanged in front of the church as an originator of the insurrection. The chief members of the synod shared his fate, or were thrown into prison of the galleys. The day after the body of the patriarch was thrown into the sea by the Jews, but was taken out, put on board of a vessel, and sent to Odesa, where it was buried with great pomp, June 28. He compiled a Greek Lexicon, of which, however, only two volumes have appeared Constantinople (A.D. 571) as his capital, and the day after the death of his father, when he came into the possession of immense wealth, the greater part of which he devoted to the establishment of monasteries, six of which he founded in Sicily, and one at Rome, dedicated to St. Andrew, into which he retired himself, and was soon after ordained a deacon. Pelagius II sent his son-in-law, John, bishop of Perga, to Constantinople to secure the favor of the emperor, who had been alienated by the ordination of the pope without the imperial consent. He succeeded in his mission. On his return he assumed the government of his own monastery of St. Andrew, and at the same time was secretary to the pope. On the death of Pelagius, Gregory was chosen pope by the clergy and the people, and, much against his will, this election was confirmed by the emperor Maurice (A.D. 590). He was installed as pope Sept. 3, 595.

No sooner was the ordination completed than, according to custom, the new pope drew up his confession of faith, and sent it to the other patriarchs, viz., to the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In this confession he professed to receive the four Gospels, the first four Councils, to reverence the fifth, and assuming the title of Patriarch of Constantinople, adds, "Whoever presume to lessen the persons whom the councils have bound, or to bind those whom the councils have loosed, destroys himself and not them." This is apparent that even in the 6th century the authority of the councils was equal to that of the holy Scriptures. St. Gregory at this time was ready to receive him; for they who were chosen the time which Christ himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed with the plague and the sword; all things that have been predicted are now accomplished; the king of pride, that is Antichrist, is at hand; and what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him; for they who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and meekness are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition. Here Gregory treats the bishop of Constantinople as the forerunner of Antichrist for taking upon him the title of universal bishop. The Jews experienced some degree of favor from him. He assisted Theodolinda, queen of the Longobards, in converting that people to the Catholic faith. He likewise sent the clergy of Sardis, and he notably supported the mission to England to bring the British into relations with Rome. It was previous to his exaltation to the pontifical chair that, seeing one day in the slave-market at Rome some Anglo-Saxon children exposed for sale, he is said to have exclaimed, "They would be indeed not Angli, but angels, if they were Christians," and from that time he engaged his predecessor, Pelagius, to send missionaries to England. See England, Church of. At home he exerted himself strenuously for the preservation of Church discipline. The celibacy of the clergy was riveted upon the Roman system by the measures taken by Gregory. His course of action invariably was directed to strengthen the power of the Roman see; and, in fact, he was the father of the medieval Roman system. He held monastic institutions in great favor, made strict rules concerning them, and granted them special privileges. This feature of his career gained him the title of pater monachorum. One of the marked events of his pontificate was his contest with John, patriarch of Constantinople, and he assumed the title of universal Bishop (A.D. 595), which Gregory called "proud, heretical, blasphemous, antichristian, and abdolical." (Epist. 5, 18), and assumed to himself, in opposition, the title of "Servant of Servants" (Servus servorum Domini). "Whom do you imitate," says he, "in addressing yourself to me, a crafty, fickle, and ungodly man? Whom but him who, swelling with pride, exalted himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him?" It was then, in the opinion of Gregory, imitating Lucifer for any bishop to exalt himself above his brethren, and to presume that his see would be a rival to the pope's. The bishops were subject to him, himself being subject to none. And has not this been for many ages the avowed pretension and claim of the popes? We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff," is a decree issued by Boniface VIII in the fourteenth century. "The apostle Peter," continues Gregory, "was the first member of the universal Church. As for Paul, Andrew, and John, they were only the heads of particular congregations; but all were members of the same Church, and none would ever be called universal." The meaning of Gregory is obvious, viz., that the apostles themselves, though heads of particular congregations or churches, were nevertheless members of the Church universal, and none of them ever pretended to be the head of the whole Church, or to have power and jurisdiction over the whole Church, that being peculiar to Christ alone. This agrees with what he had said before, addressing himself to the patriarch, viz., "If none of the apostles would be called universal, what will you answer on the last day to Christ, the head of the Church universal? You who, by arrogating that name, strive to subject all his members to yourself?" For it was not the bare title of universal bishop that thus alarmed Gregory, but the universal power and authority which he apprehended his rival aimed at in assuming the title of Patriarch of Constantinople. While Gregory had been thus engaged, a mure has added, "Whoever presume to lessen the persons whom the councils have bound, or to bind those whom the councils have loosed, destroys himself and not them." This is apparent that even in the 6th century the authority of the councils was equal to that of the holy Scriptures. St. Gregory at this time was ready to receive him; for they who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and meekness are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition. Here Gregory treats the bishop of Constantinople as the forerunner of Antichrist for taking upon him the title of universal bishop.
In the year 596, Gregory sent Augustine, abbot of his monastery at St. Andrew at Rome, to convert those of the English who yet remained heathens, and under his auspices Christianity was established in the northern parts of the island. See Augustine; and England, Church of.

In several contests with the emperor Maurice, Gregory maintained his independence without popular acquiescence or support. He was a master of the Latin idiom, a penetrator of the rational spirit, and the author of the germinal Dieselian Grammar of Science, which has been translated into Latin. See Augustus; and England, Church of.

Gregory was a very voluminous writer. His letters amount to eight hundred and forty; and besides them he wrote a Comment on the Book of Job, comprised in thirty-six books; a Pastoral, or a treatise on the duties of a pastor, consisting of four parts, and, as it were, of four different treatises; twenty-two Homilies on the Prophet Ezekiel; forty Homilies on the Gospels, and four books of Dialogues. The Comment on the Book of Job (Moralia), being rather a collection of moral principles than an exposition of the text. It is translated into English in the Library of the Fathers (Oxford, 4 vols. 8vo). That work and the Pastoral were anciently, and still are, reckoned among the best writings of the Latin Church. They are held in such high esteem by the Gallican Church that all bishops were obliged by the canons of that Church to be thoroughly acquainted with it, and punctually to observe the rules it contained; nay, to remind their assistants of that obligation, it was written in Latin, and was read at the time of the ordination of the bishops.

The last years of Gregory's life were passed in great suffering from gout and other diseases, but he retained his vigor of mind and will to the end. He died March 12, 604. His career, according to the school and the doctrines of the Church, is worthy of imitation by all Christian nations.

See Augustine; and England, Church of.

In theology Gregory was a moderate Augustinian: he held to predestination, but not an unconditional predestination. He held also to the value of good works and penance as restoratives; and, in fact, he furnished a basis for the later system of works of supererogation, etc. He may be called the inventor of the doctrine of Purgatory, and of the modern Romanish doctrines of Masses and Transubstantiation. The better side of his life and character is set forth strikingly by Neander in his Dichterleben. The following extract will show how far later bishops of Rome have wandread his obligation. See also Bulgar. A history of the Church of Rome to the close of the Hase, Church History, § 130; Hook, Eccl. Biog. v., 497; Clarke, Succession of Sac. it., 354; Bayle, Dict. Hist. s. v.; Dupin, Ecclesiastical Writers (7th cent.); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, vii. 798; Millman, Litt. Christiano, i, 423-422; Bower, Lives of the Popes (4th cent.); Neander, Hist. of Dogmas, p. 396, 413, 418; Methods Quarterly Review, 1845, p. 524.
II. Pope, was a Roman by birth, and of a patrician family. He was early set apart for the clerical life, and educated in the College of Robert, king of France, at whose time he was librarian to the Roman see. Afterwards he went with Constantine as deacon to Constantinople, and succeeded to the pontificate on Constantine’s death, A.D. 715. He was a strenuous supporter of the powers of the papal see, and did much to establish its supremacy. Himself a Benedictine, he restored the monastery at Monte Cassino, under the severest rule of St. Benedict, as an example to other monasteries. In the year 727 began the famous contest between the emperor Leo Isauricus with the Iconoclasts, or Image-breakers, on one side, and Gregory II, with the papal see, on the other. The pope anathematized the emperor, and condemned the council he had held (to abolish the worship of images), abused his name, vilified his actions, and summoned the French to attack his authority in Italy. He died A.D. 731. His writings are of no great account: fifteen Letters, a Memorial, and a Liturgy are preserved in the Biblioth. Patrum, vol. ix. See Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. viii, pt. ii, ch. ii; Cave, Hist. Lit. i, 620; Gieseler, Church Hist. per. iii, div. i, ch. ii, § 4; Dupin, Eccles. Writers, cent. viii.

III. Pope, a native of Syria, succeeded Gregory II, and was a first rate figure of imagery as his predecessor, and contended, with all weapons, against the Iconoclasts (q. v.), and against the Byzantine court. He found considerable difficulty in maintaining his ground against the warlike prince Leutprand, and had recourse to the stratagem of fermenting discords among the Lombards themselves. His reign was an epoch in the temporal power of the popes: he was the first to rule the exarchate of Ravenna as sovereign, and he obtained by his legates (the first sent to France) the homage of Charles Martel, who, however, could not aid him with material force. He died Nov. 28, 741. Some pontificates remain. See Dupin, Eccles. Writers, cent. viii.

IV. Pope, a native of Rome, made pope A.D. 827. By taking, in 833, the part of the three rebellious sons of Louis le Débonnaire against their father, this pretense emboldened himself much with his clergy, especially those of France, who, favoring the cause of Louis, refused to receive either him or his decrees. Gregory wrote a Letter to them, which is among Aegidius’s Works, which shows him to be arbitrary and tyrannical, claiming obedience to him, though against the commands of their prince. There are three other Letters in the same, Concil. vol. vii, and Concillii Miscell., which evince the same spirit of grasping dominion. It was this pope who made the feast of All Saints general throughout the Western Church. He died A.D. 844.—Clarke, Succession of Sacred Lit. vol. ii; Baronius, Anales, t. xiv.

V (Bruno), Pope, was a native of Germany, son of the duke Otho of Carinthia, and nephew of Otho III, king of Germany. The latter caused him to be elected pope May 17, 998, when he was only 24 years of age. Eight days after, Gregory, in return, crowned his uncle Emperor of the West. As soon, however, as Otho had recrossed the Alpe, Crescentius, a powerful senator, noted for his opposition to the previous pope (John XV), foretold a revolution, took the title of consul, drove out Gregory, and appointed in his place a Greek of low birth, Philagathos, bishop of Placentia, who took the name of John XVI. The Council of Pavia (997) communicated both Crescentius and the anti-pope. Otho marched against Rome, and John XVI was made prisoner while attempting to escape. The servants of the emperor tore out his tongue, his nose, and his eyes, and Gregory caused him to be paraded through the streets of Rome covered with the insignia of his office torn into tatters, and sitting bound upon an ass. Crescentius, who had taken refuge in the castle of St. An- gelo, was beheaded, in spite of the articles of capitulation, which guaranteed his life. Otho took his widow away for a mistress. Robert, king of France, who had murdered his cousin Bertha without dispensation, Gregory condemned him to do penance for seven years, deposed the archbishop who had officiated at the marriage, and demanded that Bertha should be discarded. Robert, refusing to comply, was excommunicated; and so great was the fear inspired by this ecclesiastical punishment, that only two persons dared remain in the king’s service, and even they threw into the fire everything he had made use of, for fear of being contaminated by contact with it (P. Damiens, Opera, Paris, 1665, fol. Epist. v). At the end of three years Robert gave up his kingdom, and discarded Bertha, to whom he was much attached. Gregory died Feb. 11 (or 18), 999, not without suspicion of poison. Several letters and patents of Gregory are contained in Baluze, Miscell. vol. vi; five bulls in Ughelli, Bullett. storica, ii, 352—364; iii, 18; iv, 98; two in D’Achery, Spicilegium, vol. vi; one in De Marco, Marco hispanicas, p. 502; and four letters in Labbe, Concil. i, 762. See Baronius, Anales, xvi, 345 sq.; F. Paggi, ii, 262; J. B. de Glen, p. 183; A. Duchesne, i, 338; Hoeffer, Nouv. Ann. Génér. xxii, 789; Hoeffer, Die deutschen Päpste, i, 186.

VI. Anti-pope, was elevated, in June, 1012, to the papal see. He was a man of weak mind and political disposition to Benedict VIII. As he was not recognized by the emperor, Henry IV, he seems to have resigned, and to have ended his life in retirement.

VII. Pope, a Roman, whose original name was JOHANNES GRATIANUS, and who had had great repute for sanctity as a priest; obtained (A.D. 1044) the papal chair by the murder of Pope Gregory IX, and married a girl of noble family. Falling in this, he claimed the seat again, and there were three claimants at once—Benedict IX, Gregory VI, and Sylvester III. Rome was filled with brawls and murders, and Gregory himself wielded the sword with effect! In 1046 Henry III came to Rome, deposed all three of the rival popes, and seated Clement II in the apostolic chair. Gregory died in Cologne A.D. 1048. See Baronius, Anales, t. xvii; Hoeffer, Die deutschen Päpste, i, 224.

VIII. Hildebrand, the greatest man that ever occupied the papal throne. The exact place and year of his birth are not known; yet he is generally supposed to have been born about 1010 or 1020 at Siena in Tuscany, where, it is said, his father was a carpenter. He spent part of his youth at Rome in the service of pope Gregory VI, whom he accompanied in exile after he left Rome by order of the emperor. They went together to the convent of Cluny (France), and Hildebrand’s austerity and asceticism soon gave him such ascendency that he was made prior of the convent, though still quite young. He was not destined to remain long in seclusion. Henry III, after having regained the exclusive right of appointing popes, had made three in rapid succession, the latter of whom, Leo IX (Bruno, bishop of Toul), stopped at Cluny on his way to Italy. Hildebrand’s influence over him became so great that, laying aside the insignia of his office, he went to Rome in the garb of a pilgrim, and declared that his appointment could only be considered as valid if confirmed by the clergy and the people of Rome. His election being confirmed (1049), he called Hildebrand to Rome, and created him cardinal. Guided by Hildebrand’s advice, Leo IX attempted many reforms in the Church. Councils were assembled at Rome, Rheims, and Mayence, at which the pope declared that he was above any man, and in whose influence lay the justifying of cardinals arising from the state of the Church were discussed. The encroachments of lay authority, the laxity of the convents, the immorality of priests, the practice of selling ecclesiastical charges, and their consequent enslavement by the civil authorities, which resulted in filling the Church with persons devoted to the tempo-
rival powers—such were a few of the evils the Church was suffering with. Hildebrand directed all the measures of reform, under the authority of the pope. Leo IX died April 19, 1054. Hildebrand was then sent to the emperor by the clergy and the people of Rome to obtain his assent to the appointment of a new pope. Hildebrand proposed bishop Gebhard; the emperor proposed the archbishop of Milan, who was then only prevailed on, and the new pope was elected in 1055, under the name of Victor II, in the old Roman way, thus rendering the consent of the emperor a mere matter of form. Victor II, urged by Hildebrand, continued the reforms commenced by Leo IX. He assembled councils, and sought to return the Church to the state in which it was in great disorder, and still disturbed by the doctrines of Berengar (q. v.). Both the pope and the emperor dy- ing soon after, Stephen IX, an enemy of the new emperor Henry IV, was made pope. Hildebrand was not consulted about the election. This appointment, which resembled a challenge to the emperor, threatened to cause serious difficulties, and to overthrow the plans of Hildebrand, who wished to withdraw from the emperor the power of appointing popes in a more slow but surer manner. Stephen, however, died soon after his election with the sickle-clothing, the clergy, and the people to await Hildebrand's return before proceeding to another election. This advice was disregarded, and the powerful counts of Tusculum ap- pointed a bishop of Velletri entirely devoted to their interests. Stephen IX, on the death of the name of Benedict X. This election caused great trouble in Rome, and Hildebrand returned in haste from Ger- many. Backed by the power of Germany, he caused the bishop of Florence to be elected pope, under the name of Nicholas II, by an assembly held in Tuscany, and submitted the appointment to the approbation of the emperor in order to secure his protection. At the same time, to avoid the recurrence of irregular elec- tions by means of bribery, as had been the case in that of Benedict, he contrived a new method of election, ac- cording to which the choice should first be made by the cardinal bishops, and afterwards submitted succes- sively to the other cardinals, the clergy, and the people, all “saving the respect which is due to our beloved son Henry, at present king . . . .” Nicholas II dying in 1061, after a reign of two years, new trou- bles arose concerning the same mode of election. The cardinals chose Anselm, bishop of Lucca, under the name of Alexander II, but the Roman nobility and part of the population refused to recognise him, and appealed to the emperor, who assembled at Basle a synod of bishops devoted to his cause, which elected Cadalus, archbishop of Roma, for the name of Honorius II. Cadalus, like the other bishops of Lombardy, had been at open war with the sea of Rome. Had Rome yielded to his election, all the ground gained by Hildebrand would have been lost. Without any hesitancy, Hildebrand recognised the validity of Alex- ander II’s election, and the latter wisely chose the pow- erf ul monk for his chancellor. Cadalus, at the same time, advanced against Rome at the head of a German army, and the two popes, after duly excommunicating each other, fought at the doors of Rome. The Ger- mans were defeated, and Cadalus fled. The young emperor was taken away from his mother’s influence and put under the care of the archbishop of Cologne (Anno or Hanno), who caused Alexander’s election to be confirmed by the Synod of Goslar. Hildebrand, more powerful now than ever, continued to work with all his might for the reformation of the Church and the suppression of simony. About that time an occurrence took place which throws some light upon Hildebrand’s character, viz. his quarrel with one of the most virtu- ous and most austere men of that period, Peter Damian (q. v.). Hildebrand, by the unity of views and unity of aim, they disagreed on some point not known, and after that time the writings of the eloquent bishop are full of proofs of his resentment. At the death of Alexander II, Hildebrand himself was chosen pope in 1073. He accepted the nomination with re- luctance; contemporary writers say that the day of his election was one of great trial to him. This can readily be believed, for none knew better than he the dangers and difficulties of his new position, where he would have to act out the course already prevail- ing in the world for so many centuries. The history of his reign is the political and religious history of Europe in those times.

Hildebrand did not assume his title until he had re- ceived the approbation of the emperor Henry IV, to whom he dispatched messengers for the purpose. The emperor sent his own emissary, who, after a good deal of delay, confirmed his election, and Hildebrand assumed the name of Gregory VII. The great object of Gregory’s ambition was, as he expressed himself in a letter to Hugo, abbot of Cluny, to effect a total reform of the Church in the points already named, as having em- ployed his energies under the preceding popes. Greg- ory determined to remove the root of many of the ex- isting evils by taking away from the secular princes the right which they assumed of disposing of the sees within their dominions. He aimed at nothing less than a restoration of a true spiritual order in the world in the hands of the pope; and his whole reign was a struggle to secure this supreme dominion, which included, in its ideas, the absolute subordina- tion of the temporal powers of the world to the spiritual power of the pope. The emperor Henry IV, licentious and profane, and at war with his wife’s fami- lies, and therefore continually in want of money, was one of the most culpable in respect of simony. He disposed of sees and benefices in favor of vicious or in- capable men, and the bishops of Germany readily en- tered into his views of the pope’s authority. The feudal dependant on the imperial will. Gregory began by admonishing Henry; he sent legates to Ger- many, but to little purpose. His next step was to as- semble a council at Rome in 1074, which anathema- tized persons guilty of simony, and ordered the depos- ition of those priests who lived in concubinage, under which name, however, were also included those who lived in a state of matrimony, and it was decreed also that no one should be admitted to holy orders unless he made a vow of celibacy. This last regulation cre- ated great excitement, especially at Milan, where the custom of priests being married was still prevalent, as in the Eastern Church. “Gregory summoned another council at Rome in 1075, in which, for the first time, kings and other lay princes were forbidden, under pain of excommunication, from giving the investiture of sees and other benefices to any prelate, no matter how noble or illustrious. This was the beginning of the quarrel about the investiture which distracted Europe for many years after, and which may here require some explanation. In the early ages of the Christian Church, it would ap- pear that the body of the clergy, or presbyters of a town or district, together with the municipal council or notables, elected their bishop or chief pastor, and the Christian emperors did not interfere with the choice except in the case of the great patriarchal sees, such as Rome and Constantinople, the candidate to which, after being elected by the clergy and people, was re- quired to wait for the imperial confirmation. The Gothic kings of Italy followed the same system, as well as the exarchs of Ravenna after them, in the name of the Byzantine emperors. At Rome, and probably in the rest of Italy also, the laity participated in the election of their bishop, and till the 10th century; in the East they appear to have been excluded from it sooner. Charlemagne is said by some to have intro- duced the custom of putting the ring and crozier into the hands of new-elected bishops, while he required from the same the consecration by a majority of views and unity of aim, they disagreed on some point not known, and after that time the writings of the eloquent
son of this was, that the churches having been richly endowed by various sovereigns with lands and other temporalities, the incumbents were considered in the life, however, obtained their own disposal the temporalities of the sees, the sovereigns came gradually to appoint the bishops, either by direct nomination, or by recommending a candidate to the electors. Gregory, making no distinction between spiritualities and temporalities, considered the investiture as a spiritual act, insisting that the crown was emblematic of the spiritual authority of bishops over their flocks, and the ring was the symbol of their mystic marriage with the Church; although Sarpi observes, in his Treastise upon Beneftica, there was another ceremony, namely, the consecration of the bishop elect by pious consent of the metropolitan, which was the real spiritual investiture. But Gregory's object was to take away from laity all ecclesiastical patronage, and to make the Church, with all its temporalities, independent of the state. He would not admit of any symbols of allegiance to the emperor, and he contended that the estates of sees had become inseparably connected with the spiritual office, and could no longer be distinguished; and yet he himself had waited for the confirmation of the emperor before he was consecrated. See Investiture. The emperor Henry IV paid no regard to Gregory's excommunication, and he continued to nominate not only to German, but also Italian bishoprics. Among others, he appointed a certain Tedaldo archbishop of Milan, in opposition to Azzo, a mere youth, who had been consecrated by Gregory's legates, as at that time the last remaining metropolitan, which had opened the breach between the pope and the emperor, was lost sight of in the more extraordinary discussions which followed between them. Gregory had been for some time tampering with Henry's disaffected vassals of Saxony, Thuringia, and other countries, and he now publicly commended to the emperor his excommunication of himself from the charges preferred by his subjects against him. This was a further and most unwar rantable stretch of that temporal supremacy over kings and principalities which the see of Rome had already begun to assume. Henry, indignant at this assumption of power, assembled the emperors and abbots, at which many bishops and abbots were present, and which, upon various charges preferred against Gregory, deposed him, and dispatched a messenger to Rome to signify this decision to the Roman clergy, request ing the clergy to recognize a new pope. Upon this, Gregory, in a council assembled at the Lateran Palace in 1076, solemnly excommunicated Henry, and in the name of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, declared him ipso facto deposed from the thrones of Germany and Italy, and his subjects released from their oath of allegiance. Gregory, ob serves Platinus, in his Lives of the Popes, was the first who assumed the right of deposing the emperors, whose vassals he and his predecessors had been considered till then, and who had even exercised the power of deposing several popes for illegal election or abuse of their authority. This bold act of Gregory produced for a time the effect which he had calculated upon. Most of Henry's subjects, already ripe for rebellion, readily availed themselves of the papal sanction, and a diet was assembled to elect a new emperor. Henry, however, obtained a delay, and, the matter being referred to the pope, he set off for Italy in the winter of 1077, and, passing the Alps of Susa, met Gregory at the castle of Canossa, near Reggio, in Lombardy, which belonged to the countess Mathilda, a great friend and supporter of the pope. Gregory would not see Henry at first, having ascended upon his laying aside all the insignia of royalty, and appearing in the garb of a penitent in a coarse woolen garment and barefooted. In this plight Henry remained for three days, from morning till sunset, in an outer court of the castle, in very severe weather. On the fourth day he was admitted into Gregory's presence, and, on confessing his errors, received absolution, but was not restored to his kingdom, the pope referring him to the general diet. Henry then set up a law by which all the former decrees of the simoniacal law, supported by his Lombard vassals, and indignant at the humilitating scene of Canossa, recrossed the Alps, fought several battles in Germany, and at last defeated and mortally wounded Rudolf of Swabia, who had been elected emperor in his stead, and was supported by Gregory. Having now retrieved his affairs in Germany, he marched with an army into Italy in 1081 to avenge himself on the pope, whom he again deposed in another diet, having appointed Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, as his successor, under the name of Clement III. Gregory had meantime drawn his party by timely conferring on秾 Robert Cuscard, the Norman quor of Apulia and Sicily, who, however, could not prevent Henry from advancing to the walls of Rome; but the city was well defended, and the summer heats obliged Henry to retreat his steps towards North Italy, where his soldiers dispersed among the counties of the em pess Matilda. He repeated the attempt against Rome in 1088, but without success. It was finally agreed that a general council should decide the questions between the emperor and the pope. The council assembled at Rome in 1088, and Gregory did not again excommunicate the emperor, who continued without coming to any definitive result. In fact, Gregory's personal successes were at an end, though the principles of papal supremacy for which he contended took root and grew up in after times. In 1084 Henry is said to have invited the population of Tuscany, which had been discontented with the pope, to enter the city, which he did on the 21st of March, and immediately took possession of the Lateran, the bridges, and other important positions. Gregory escaped into the castle of St. Angelo, and the anti-pope Guibert was publicly excommunicated on Palatine hill, and declared himself to be the new pope. On the following Easter Sunday Henry IV was crowned by him as emperor in St. Peter's church. After the ceremony Henry ascended the capitol and was publicly proclaimed, and acknowledged by the Romans with acclamations. Hearing, however, that Robert Cuscard was advancing from Tuscany to Rome, he left the city and withdrew towards Tuscany. Robert came soon after with his Norman and Saracen soldiers, who, under the pretense of delivering Gregory, who was still shut up in the castle of St. Angelo, plundered and murdered all kinds of persons, and having come out of his stronghold, assembled another council, in which, for the fourth time, he excommunicated Henry and the anti-pope Guibert. When Robert left the city to return to his own dominions, the pope, not thinking himself safe in Rome, withdrew with him to Salerno, where, after conspiring a magnificent church built by Robert, he died, May 25, 1085. His last words were, 'I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile.' He probably believed what he said. Gregory's character was in many respects a grand and noble one. But impartial history decides that the good he accomplished was far more than counterbalanced by his fanatical enforcement of celibacy (q. v.), which has continued to this day to demoralize the Romanist clergy, and by his semi-blasphe mous assertions of almost divine power for the papacy. His earlier efforts for ecclesiastical reform were, no doubt, sincere and earnest; but at a later period he was led astray by the ambition of exalting his see over all the dignities and powers of the earth, spiritual as well as temporal. Not content with making, as far as in him lay, the Church independent of the empire, and at the same time establishing the control of the papal authority over the princes of the earth, objects which he left to be completed by his successor [see INNOCENT III], Gregory determined to destroy the independence of the various national churches. His object was to raise the pope to supreme pow-
er over Church and State throughout Christendom. By a constitution of his predecessor Alexander II, which he dictated, and which he afterwards confirmed, it was enacted for the first time that no bishop elect should exercise his functions until he had received his confirmation from the pope. The Roman see had already, in the 9th century, subverted the authority of the Holy Roman Empire, and the empire was gradually regain- ing the bishops, but now it assumed the right of citing the bishops, without exception, before its tribunal at Rome to receive its dictates, and Gregory obliged the metropolitan to attend in person to receive the papal commission. Archbishop of Amiens and bishop of Canterbury, with William Rufus, was owing to that monarch not choosing to let him go to Rome, whither he had been summoned. The practice of sending apostolic legates to different kingdoms as special commissioners of the pope, with discretionary power over the national hierarchy, originated also with Gregory, and completed the establishment of absolute monarchy in the Church in lieu of its original popular or representative form. This doctrine of papal absolutism in matters of discipline was by prescription and usage so intemized with the more essential doctrines of faith, that it was considered as a part of the faith itself. Gregory has defined all the skill of subsequent theologians and statesmen to disentangle it from the rest, while at the same time it has probably been, though at a fearful cost, the means of preserving the unity of the Western or Roman Church. The means and purposes accomplished and attempted by Gregory were (1) the abolition of the influence of the Roman nobility in the election of the pope; (2) the removal of all authority in the election of the pope from the emperors of Germany; (3) the establishment of the celibacy of the clergy; (4) the freedom of the Church in the matter of investitures. Great attention has been given to the history of Gregory VII, both by ecclesiastical and political writers, especially within the present century. See Dupin, Eccles. Writers (11th century); Mosheim, Ch. History, ch. xi, pt. ii, ch. ii; Neander, Ch. History, vol. iv, bk. iv, History of the Popes, i, 29 sq.; Hauck, Ch. History, § 181; Sir James Stephen, Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography, i, 1; also in Edinburgh Review, xxxi, 143; Guizot, Hist. of Modern Civilization; Bowden, Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII (London, 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Volck, Hildesheim and Aachen under Gregor VII (Weimar, 1813, 8vo; 2d ed. 1846, 8vo); Spittert, Gregor VII (Hamb. 1827, 4to); Greasley, Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII (London, 1829, 12mo); Madelaine, Pontificat de Gregoire VII (Paris, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); Cassan- der, Etalicher Hildesbiicher (Darmstadt, 1845, 4to); Soden, Gregor VII (Leipzig, 1855, 4to); Lohmeyer, Historie, iii, 140 sq.; Helfenstein, Gregor VII’s Be- strebungen (Frank., 1856, 8vo); Größer, Papst Gregor VII u. sein Zeitalter (ultramontane view; Schaffhausen, 1859-1861, 7 vols. 8vo); English Cyclopedia; Herzog, Real-encyklop. v, 384 sq.; Hofeer, Nov. Biog. Générale, xxii., 814.

VIII. (Albero de Mora), Pope, was a native of Benevento. He succeeded Urban III, Oct. 21, 1187, and died at Pisa Dec. 16, 1187. His short reign was unimportant. He has generally been considered as a learned, eloquent, and virtuous man. He attempted a crusade to the Holy Land, and the cardinals themselves promised to join him, and to contribute their riches towards the undertaking, but these promises were only given to be evaded. Gregory's last act was to attempt a reconciliation between the inhabitants of Pisa and those of Genoa.—Hofeer, Nov. Biog. Générale, xxii., 814.

IX. (Ugolino, count of Scagno), Pope, was a native of Anagni, and a relative of Innocent III. He succeeded Honorius III, March 19, 1227. He followed carefully the spirit of Ugolino, and of Innocent III, upholding the see of Rome as the master of all empires and superior to all kings. His consecration took place with unusual magnificence: he celebrated mass at St. John Lateran in vestments covered with gold and precious stones; then, mounting a richly-harnessed horse, and surrounded by cardinals clothed in purple and gold, he made a triumphant procession through the streets of Rome, which were decked with carpets and flowers for the occasion. The expenses of the processions Frederick II had not approved. The people party devoted to him in Rome became desirous to remove him from too close proximity with that city, and in order to achieve this, Gregory reminded him of his vow of visiting the Holy Land, and commanded him to go at once. At the mo- ment of Frederick's arrival in Rome, the archbishop of Milan, but Gregory, who believed his illness to be feigned, excom- municated him, and notified all the churches of it. Frederick, on the other hand, wrote to all the princes complaining of the pope's proceedings. Gregory, in return, excommunicated him again, and threatened to take the empire from him. Frederick, concluding this absurd threat, excited the Romans to revolt against Gregory, who, insulted even when saying mass, was obliged to retire first to Rieto, then to Spole- to, and finally to Perugia. Frederick, leaving Raymond of Rome to treat with the pope, embarked for Palestine with a large army. At the mouth of the Jordan, he met him, and, after several short engagements, the former acting for the pope, the latter for the emperor. Frederick, forestalled in Palestine by the emissaries of Gregory, badly seconded by the Christians of Syria, and, besides, being desirous of returning to Italy, where Raymond had been defeated by the papal troops, concluded a ten years' truce at the sultan of Egypt, and, though excommunicated, caused himself to be crowned king of Jerusalem, after which he returned to Europe. The pope, on hearing of his arrival, excom- municated him anew, and released his subjects from their allegiance. Frederick offered to submit, and asked for absolution; peace was in consequence concluded Aug. 28, 1230. The Romans again drove away the pope (July 20, 1232). He succeeded in going back to Rome in 1235. War soon broke out again. Frederick, having taken Sardisina, gave it to his natural son, Henry; the pope claimed it for himself, and, on the pre- ceeding any right to it, and neither would give it up to the other. Frederick was excommunicated a fourth time in 1239. Frederick marched against Rome, but Gregory died before he reached it, Aug. 20, 1241. The principal traits of Gregory's character were pride and ambition. He was a haughty man, and attached himself to the sultan of Egypt at any cost. In this he received no help except from the king of England, who gave tithes to the see of Rome in exchange for the deposition of a bishop. St. Louis, even when threatened with excom- munication, refused to free the clergy from their re- sponsibility to civil jurisdiction. Gregory was well acquainted with civil and canon law, and in 1234 published a collection of decretales which were often re- printed: Nova Compilatio Decretalium, cum glossa (1st ed. Mentz, 1478, fol.). There are also 31 letters and 191 fragments of his writings in Latin, and 56 letters in Ughelli, Italia Sacra; 9 in Vossius; 1 bull in Duchesne, Historia, v, 861; and 1 in Mabillon, p. 421, No. 106.—Hofeer, Nov. Biog. Générale, 814 sq.
Gregory

There are twenty-five epistles of Gregory in Labbe, 
Concil. vol. vi. Gerard Vossius published his Vita et 
Epistola (Grk. and Lat. Rome, 1587). See Bower, Hist. 
of Popes, vol. viii; Bonacci, Posit. Gregorii 
(Rome, 1711, 4to).

XI (Pierre Roques), Pope, born in 1529 at 
Mau- 
mont, in France, was nephew to Clement VI, who 
made him cardinal in 1350, and was for seven years age, and 
ex- 
hibited many rich benefices. He was elected pope 
December 30, 1370, and removed the papal court from 
Avignon to Rome in 1377. 
Wicilf measured this pope at 
Avignon, and went back to England disgusted with the 
vice of the priesthood. Gregory opposed all 
the plans of the Canterbury party; he condemned 
Lollard (q. v.) and his doctrines by a bull dated January 25, 
1376, caused the burning of Jeanne Daubenton, and 
condemned the writings of Wicilf. His pontificate 
was marked by gross nepotism. He died suddenly, 

XII (Angelo Corbaro), Pope, a Venetian, was 
elected pope Nov. 30, 1406, by the Roman 
cardinals, during the Western strife, while his rival Benedict XIII 
occupied the chair at Avignon. After long quarrels, 
both popes were deposed by the Council of Pisa, 1409, 
but Gregory did not yield until the assembling of the 
Council of Constance, which he summarily resigned 
(1415). He was made dean of the cardinals, and died 
Oct. 18, 1417, aged 92.—Hoofer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 
xxii, 821.

XIII (Ugo Boncompagno), Pope, born in 1502 
1502 at Bologna, succeeded Pius V May 15, 1572. 
He was one of the most learned priests of his time, especially 
in civil and canonical law. He was a man of mild 
temper and jovial habits, yet his pontificate is stained 
by his relations to the bloody massacre of St. Bar- 
tholomew (which he openly approved by a solemn 
Te Deum, and by striking medals in honor of it), 
and he was on a sentence of condemnation against 
queen Elizabeth. His reign was agitated and un- 
quiet throughout, and, amid the confusions caused by 
his attempts to confiscate many of the estates of 
the Italian nobles, he died, April 10, 1558. His reform 
of the calendar, however, will carry his name down to 
the latest posterity.—Mosheim, Church Hist. cont. xvi, 
sec. iii, pt. i, ch. i, n. 28; Ranke, History of Papacy, 
ii, 307 sq. See Calendar.

XIV (Nicolò Spandrati), Pope, was elected by the influence of the Jesuit party, Dec. 5, 1550. 
His short reign was taken up chiefly in efforts to 
sustain the league in France against Henry IV. He died 
Oct. 15, 1591.—Ranke, Hist. of Papacy, i, 536.

XV (Alessandro Ludovisi), Pope, was born at Bologna, 1553, made pope Feb. 9, 1621, and died July 
18, 1623. With the aid of his nephew, cardinal Lud- 
vico, he signalized his brief reign by several measures 
of great importance to the Roman Church. He urged 
on emperor Ferdinand to exterminate Protestantism 
from the empire; he established the College of the 
Propaganda [see Propaganda]; and he greatly in- 
creased the missionary enterprises of Rome in South 
America, Abyssinia, China, and India. The dominion 
of the Church was more widely extended in his 
righ than at any former period of her history.—Ranke, 
Hist. of Papacy, ii, 64 sq.

XVI (Bartolommeo Alberto Cappellari), Pope, was born at Belluno, Sept. 18, 1765. He became a 
Casaldolite Benedictine under the name of Malvo, and at 
twenty-five years was made professor of theology. In 
1799 he published the Priests of the Holy See and 
of the Church (Rome, 4to), a treatise vindicating the 
absolute power of the popes. In 1801 he became abbott 
of his monastery, and in 1803 general of his order. He 
was made cardinal and prefect of the propaganda in 
1810, and on the death of Leo XII he was elected pope 
Feb. 2, 1831. His reign fell in a stormy time. Imme- 
diately after his accession revolts occurred in several 
of the papal provinces. Bologna took the lead; the 
commotion spread swiftly from Bologna throughout 
Romagna, and soon reached all parts of the pope's 
dominions except the metropolitan city. The intention 
of the insurgents was to put an end forever to the tem- 
oral sovereignty of the pope, and to unite the states of 
Italy. But the movement was not well contrived; 
it was simply a spontaneous and justifiable outbreak of 
enfeebled national feeling excited by the French Revolution of 1830. Yet so utterly 
powerless and detested was the pontifical government, 
that, left to itself, it could not have survived the shock 
of this unorganized insurrection. Austria poured 
troops into the threatened provinces, and by a series 
of tactful measures brought about a complete submission 
and steady suppression of free thought. The Papal 
States were now the only part of civilized Europe in 
which municipal institutions were unknown, and where 
the laity were wholly excluded from the conduct of 
business and affairs. Many years the people of the papal 
States were busy in plotting revolts, and the government in prac- 
ticing expropriation on the largest scale, suddenly searching 
suspected houses, punishing the suspected without 
trial, and every way embittering the spirit of hostility. 
Plans were formed by the exiled patriots to unite all 
Italy in a confederation for the defense of freedom, but these 
plots were discovered and destroyed by the Austrian police 
before they were ripe for execution. All Europe looked 
with pity, but no state offered to interfere, lest conmotions in Italy should lead to disturbances else- 
where. The punished Italians themselves, in a mani- 
facto which they published in 1845, declared that the 
ennui of Gregory's government had risen to such 
a height that each one of them more than sufficed 
to give the right of loudly protesting against his breach 
of faith, his trampling upon justice, his torturing hu- 
mans nature and all the excesses of his tyrannical 
administration. In fact, the whole pontificate of Gregory was one long 
oppression of his subjects. At its termination there 
were between two and three thousand political prisoners 
in the papal dungeons! 
Gregory was not less active in strengthening the power of the Church than in crushing out liberty and 
harmony at home. He erected, in various countries, 
twenty-seven new bishoprics and thirty-two apostolic 
capitularies. In 1836 he gave the College De Propaga- 
dans to the care of the Jesuits, and he trusted and 
freed to order in every way. He opposed the Bible 
Societies and the general diffusion of the Bible, utter- 
ing violent encyclicals on these points. A better 
feature was his opposition to the slave-trade and to 
slavery. He put down the Hermenuts (q. v.) in Ger- 
mansy with the strong hand, and greatly enlarged the 
bulk of the Index Expurgatorius. The Jesuit mis-
ions were greatly fostered by Gregory, and societies 
to raise funds, such as the Oeuvre de la Foé (Soci- 
ety for the Propagation of Faith) in France, grew 
rapidly in extent and productiveness. Romanism 
increased under his pontificate in every country in 
Europe, partly in consequence of a natural reaction 
against previous depression, but largely, also, through 
the energetic activity of the pope. He died of cancer, 
June 1, 1846. Gregory wrote several Encyclical Epis- 
ticles, which are of value as showing the unchanged 
character of the papacy; and we publish...
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matics, etc. (London, 1845, p. 40, 8vo). See Parini, Lo Stato Romano dell'anno 1815 (Turin, 1841, 3 vols.); La Parini, Storia d'Italia; Ravno de deux Mondes, June, 1847; Morison, Dictionary of National Biography, 1848. See also Connell's Lectures on Hebrew Poetry (London, 1877, 2 vols. 8vo).—Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. i, 1332.

Gregory, John, a learned English divine, was born at Amersham, in Buckinghamshire, in 1607. In 1624 he was sent in the capacity of servant to Christ Church, Oxford, where he was placed under the tuition of Dr. George Morley, afterwards bishop of Winchester. Having been admitted into orders, he was appointed one of the chaplains of his college by the dean, Dr. Brian Dappa. In 1634 he published a second edition of Sir Thomas Rider's View of the Civil and Ecclesiastical State of Ireland, with Notes (4to). He acquired much reputation on account of the civil, historical, ecclesiastical, and ritual learning, and the skill in ancient and modern languages, Oriental as well as European, displayed in it. In 1641 he obtained the prebend of Salisbury, but was deprived of it at the Revolution. In 1646 he published Notes and Observations on some Passages of Scripture (4to), which were reprinted at different periods, and afterwards translated into Latin and inserted in the Critici Sacri. He died in 1646. An account of his life will be found in his Works (4th edit. London, 1684, 4to). Anthony Wood mentions the miracle of his age for critical and curious learning.—Fuller, Worthies of England; Hook, Eccl. Biog. vol. v; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl., i, 1322.

Gregory, Olinthus Gilbert, LL.D., was born at Yaxley, in Huntingdonshire, Jan. 29, 1774. He was educated under Mr. Weston, a celebrated mathematician at Cambridge, and graduated, at 12, at St. John's College. His examination in geometry and astronomy was very extensive, and at 19, a textile manufacturer of Morley, was placed under the tuition of his converted father's friend, a successful merchant. He possessed qualities of a still nobler and better kind than those of a scientific philosopher. He was a decided Christian—a man who had not only studied the literature of the sacred volume, but made it the rule of his life, as well as the source of his inward peace and hope. On what drrm and enlightened ground his own faith was established in the truth and fundamental principles of the Gospel, appears from his Letters to a Friend on the Evidence, Doctrines, and Duties of the Christian Religion (1st edit, 1813, 2 vols. 8vo); a treatise which has long maintained a high reputation. He also wrote Memoirs of John Mason Good, M.D. (London, 1828, 8vo);—Memoirs of the Rev. Robert Hall (prefixed to the editions of Hall's collected works); and a number of articles in the Ecclesiastic Review and other journals. He died Feb. 2, 1811.—Jameson, Relig. Cyclop. 283; English Cyclopaedia.

Grellet, Stephen (Étienne de Grellet du Mobili- lier), the fifth child of Gabriel Marc Antoine de Grellet, was born at Limoges, in France, Nov. 2, 1778. His parents were wealthy, and ranked high among the nobility. His father was comptroller of the mint, the friend and counsellor of Louis XVI, and was propriet-
GRETSER, JAKOB, a distinguished German Jew, theologian, and historian, was born at Markdorf (Susbia) in 1561. He joined the Jesuits at seventeen, and became successively professor of philosophy at Ingolstadt in 1589, of moral theology in 1592, and of scholastic theology in 1599. He continued in this office until 1610. He was afterwards engaged for literary activity, and wrote over one hundred and fifty works, mostly against the Protestants. He possessed much learning, yet was only an indifferent critic; and his style, which is flowing, is bitter and full of invectives against his adversaries. His principal works are: *Epistola de fonte divinae Scripturae* (Ingolstadt, 1589, 4to); *Integrae Rhetoriae Historia Ordinis Jesuici ab Elia Hasemillerio conscripta* (Ingolstadt, 1594, 4to); *De Sancta Cruce* (Ingol. 1598, 4to; last ed. 1616, fol.); *Locorum quosdam Tertulliianorum a persequentiae Fr. Landri Calarstanis depragrationibus Vindicato* (Ingol. 1606, 4to); *De Jure et More proboe condimentis, expurgandii et abolendi libros hereticos et nocivos* (Ingol. 1605, 4to); *Exercitationum theologicae Libri ses* (1604, 4to); *De Spontanea disciplinarum seu flagellarum Cruce* (1608, 4to; German by Vetter, 1612); *De Exegeesi catholicae scripturae* (Processius, 1606, 4to); *Defensione Bellarminiana* (1st ed. 1607, fol.; 2d ed. 1609, fol.); *De funere christianum* (1610, 4to). The catalogue of all his writings was published by himself in 1610 and 1612. A complete collection of his works was published at Ratibon, 1734-1741, 17 vols. 8vo. See Bayle, Dictionary; Etienne Baluze, *Oeuvres de l'ancien et du nouveau ycle*; Nicéon, *Mémoires*, vol. xxviii; Alemagne, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu*; Viit Greteri (at the beginning of his Opera omnia); Botrel, *Bibl. Soc. Jesu*; August. et Alods de Backer, *Bibl. des Ecritures de la Compagnie de Jesus*; Dupin, *Ad litteram. Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles. xlvii, 68; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xlii, 566.

Grevo or Greewe, Eugenst JAN, a Dutch theologian and Hebrew scholar, was born at Deventer, Sept. 4, 1754. He studied theology at Leyden, but refused in 1783 to sign the formula of union except as a *human contrivance*. He was elected representative in 1776, and became professor of Oriental languages and Hebrew antiquities at the University of Franeker in 1790. He wrote *Ultima Cypita Jobs* (39-42 ad graciam versionem recensita* (part i, Deventer, 1788, i, Burg-StEinfort, 1791, 4to); a Dutch translation of most of the Epistles of St. Paul (1790, 8vo); *Vaticiniam Nabham et Habacucam* (Amsterdam, 1753, 8vo); *Vaticiniam Bonum* et *notas adiecti E. J. Greve; accedit interpretatio belogica* (Amst. 1800, 2 vols. 8vo); etc. His posthumous works (in Dutch) have been published by Rhynvis Feith (Amst. 1813, 8vo). See Saxius, *Onomasticon litterarum*, part vili, p. 456; A. A. Loezer, *Laudatio E. J. Greve* (Leyden, 1815, 8vo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xlii, 566.

Grewe, Jan, a Dutch Remonstrant divine, was born in the duchy of Cleves about 1680. He was established first at Arnhem, then at Campen, and finally at Heusden. In 1619 he was expelled from the country for refusing to sign the confession of Dort. Returning again, he preached privately for a while, but was discovered, arrested, and condemned to remain for life in the prison of Amsterdam in 1619. His friends, however, liberated him in 1621, after he had remained 18 months in prison. This time he had improved by writing his most important work: *Trunal reformatio, in quo sanctoria et tutoria justitiae via judicii christiani exspectatur* (Amsterdam, 1622, 8vo). His pamphlet was the subject of a controversy between Remonstrants and the Synod of Dort, and the greater or more moderate vehemence of character of the rebeaved individual, naturally cause a certain modification of his grief, which is too apt to be lost sight of by archaeologists. The customs of the ancient Hebrews were in this respect little different from those of the modern Orientals, and therefore derive ready elucidation from the accounts of modern travellers. In the most
violent outburst of sorrow, in the instantaneous over-flow of lamentation, they wrung their hands above the head (2 Sam. xvii, 12); and beat thence with them (Nah. ii, 8; Luke xviii, 13; comp. Joseph. Ant. xvi, 7, 5; "νύφη, κόρης κατα"
; see Homer, Il. ii, 700; Herodotus, ii, 80; Lu-
clan, xxvi, 27). Apian, 483; Virlg, Anm. iv, 478; xii, 671; Mar-
tial, ii, 11, 5; Petron. 111), or smote them upon the thigh (Jer. xxxi, 19; comp. Polyb. XV, 27, 11; Hom. Odys.
xiii, 198; Paul. Tactul. il, 7, 42, see Douglael (Ancil. i, 274) or on
the head (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 10, 7; 1 Sam. xvi, 17) and on the
head and hair (Exb, ix, 3; Job i, 39; comp. Joseph. Ant. xvi, 3
9; xvi, 75; Barbehe, Chrom. p. 258; Virgil, Anm. xii,
787; Ovid, Met. x, 746; Apul. Met. i, p. 212, Bib.; Curti-
us, iii, 11, 35; Petron. 111, 113; Martial, ii, 11, 5),
stroked ashes (see Carpav, De cinerum op. Hebr. usu.
acqua liquir incineri, Hippon. iv, 7, 25; Philo, 2 Sam. x, 7; 2
1 Sam. ii, 12; 2 Sam. i, 3; xii, 19; xxv, 32; Neh. i, 1;
Ezek. xxvii, 30; Lam. ii, 10; Job ii, 11; 1 Macc.
iii, 47; iv, 39; xi, 27; 2 Macc. x, 26; xiv, 15; Judith
i, 3; 3 Macc. iv, 6; Rev. xviii, 19; Josephus, War, ii;
12, 6; 15, 4; Act. xx, 6, 1; comp. Josephus, War, xiv,
29, 9; xv, 27, 2, 15; Apian, 482; Hucb. 498; Diod. Sic.
i, 72, 91; Lucian, Luct, 12; Apulej. Metam. i, p. 212,
Bib.; see Burchhardt, Nubia, p. 475; Irwin, Tran.
p. 303, 307; Kirchmann, De funer. Rom. ii, 12; Mishna,
Yoma, i, 1;), or rolled themselves in dust and ashes (Ezek.
xxvii, 39; comp. Homer, Il. xiv, 244; xxiv, 610; Lucian, Luct, 12), tore the garments (see Hecu-
nus, De scisindia vestit. Aesculapis gentibus utiata, Jen.
1683; also in Uoginl Tox. xxi; Wichmannhausen,
De lacrimation vestitum ap. Hebr. Viteb. 1716; also in
Uoginl, xxvii: this reading, however, had certain restric-
tions, Oto, Lex. Robb. n, 360; see also Uoginl, De saecordia, ch. vi, in his Theoria, xxii) from their first
1 Sam. iv, 27; 2 Sam. i, 2, 11; iii, 31; 1 Kings xxvii, 27; 2
2 Kings iv, 8; vi, 30; xii, 14; xiv, 1; xxii, 11, 19; Earl.
iv, 3; Eph. ix, l; 1 Macc. ii, 14; ili, 17; iv, 39; v, 13; xi, 17; Jud. xvi, 5; Ep. Jer. 30; Joseph. War, ii, 15 and 4; Acts xiv,
14; Mishna, Mocd Katon, iii, 7; Shab. xii, 8; comp. Barbehe,
Chrom. p. 255; Herod. iii, 66; viii, 99; Lucian,
Luct. 12; Achil. Tat. iv, 6; Curtius, iii, 11, 29; iv, 19,
12; v, 18, 31; xi, 5, 17; Sueton. Cae. 33; Nero, 42;
Douglael Ancil. i, 118; Arveici, iii, 282), lacerated even
their face and body (Jer. xvi, 6; xil, 5; xvii, 5; Ezek.
xxvii, 17; comp. Apian. Pum. 46; Virgil, Anm. iv,
675; xii, 871; Cicero, Leg. ii, 23, 59; Petron. xvi,
111; Flittpell, Agya, ii, 57), though this last (see Wich-
mannhauscn, De corpora scintencium De mortu- 
endo, Viteb.; Michaelis, De in.cinera proprc mortunos in
his Observ. sacr. Aethenb. 1752, p. 131 sq.) was for-
bidden by the Mosaic law (Lev, xiv, 28; Deut. xiv, 1 sq.),
as it was in the twelve Roman table (Cic. Leg. li, 23 sq). These marks of deep grief were usually
combined together. At proper and regularly ap-
pointed seasons of mourning (for the deceased), people
were accustomed to fast (q. v.), put on mourning-
weeds [see SACKCLOTH], cover up the lower part of the
countenance (Ezek. xxiv, 17, 22; Micah iii, 7; comp.
Ezra, vii, 28) or the entire head (2 Sam. xvi, 30; xvi, 
39, 4; Jer. xiv, 3, 4; Homer, Od. iv, 154; vili, 92),
eglect to wash and anoint themselves (comp. Diod. 
Sic. i, 72 and 91), or cleanse their clothes (2 Sam. xiv,
GRIESEBACH appreciated, and rewarded with honors and appointments even of a civic nature; thus he was appointed to Griesbach's endeavors, the task of dig- and on other public occasions. He died March 24, 1812.

Griesbach's name is inseparably connected with the criticism of the text of the N. T., so much so, indeed, as to Griesbach himself, the text, and the subject entirely in the shade, and to form an epoch in that special department. In order to form a just estimate of his services, it is necessary to be thoroughly acquainted with the state of this science at the time. See CRITICISM, Bib-

Griesbach's studies in regard to the text were first in the directing and actual examination of various readings. This field had often been gone over before, and it was thought that much less would be discovered in it than was found afterwards by paying greater attention to the quotations of the Greek fathers, and to some versions heretofore but little noticed, such as the Philoxenian, the Armenian, and the Gothic. Next he attempted to establish, on the basis of the ideas of Bengel and Semler, a history of the ancient text as a necessary basis for every improvement of it. On this history, all the details of which have not, however, been completed, but have given great impulse to researches, Griesbach founded a new theory of criticism, the rules of which were to regulate the choice and value of the various readings in individual passages, and which was based essentially on a combi-

nation of historical facts and logical principles. Finally, and on the task on which his reputation chiefly rests, viz., the publication of a critically amended edition of the text of the New Testament. Till then, among nearly 360 editions, there had been but two forms of text, both originating in the 16th century, when criticism was yet in its infancy. They were the so-called Tectus receptus, which the Lutheran Church considered as unimpeachable; and the Complutensian, which circulated among the Roman Catho-

Bengel alone dared to depart somewhat from the former, and that only by introducing a few readings of the latter. Griesbach's innovation excited great alarm among the partisans of the existing texts. Joachim Hartmann, professor at Halle, attacked him in a pamphlet in 1775; but this, as well as other similar attacks, were answered by the preface of Griesbach's second edition. His editions of the N. T. ap-
pear to have been of two kinds: 1. Critical edition (Halle, 1774, pt. i, ii), containing the first three gospels arranged synoptically. To this belongs as vol. i (1775), the first edition of the Epistles and Revelation, and to the latter, as well as vol. i, a second (non-synoptical) edition of the gospels. The whole is now re-

wards reprinted, sometimes separately.

2. The principal edition (Halle, and London, 1796, 1806, 2 pts. 8vo), very complete, and with important prolegomena.

3. A costly edition (Leipzig: 4 vols. small 4to, or small folio, 1803-1807, in copper types; 4th and 5th pocket ed-

tions, Leipzig, 1806, 1825), like the preceding, but with the principal variations only. A new edition of the principal critical work of Griesbach was commenced in 1827 by David Schultze, but the first part only has appeared. The text of Griesbach has not remained intact in all these editions. It has often been used or referred to by others, and its peculiarity readings, at least, are always introduced in the new critical editions. The other critical works of Griesbach are, De codicibus ev. origines (1771); — Cure in historiarum textus epp. paul. (1777); — Symbole crucis ad supplementa et correlata referente (1793); — Commentarius crucis in textum Gr. N. T. (1794 sq.).

Little need be said of his other works. They are mostly academical essays on exegesis, history, and dogmatics, and were published by Gabler in 2 parts (Kleine Schriften, 1825). Some of them, however, possess yet a certain interest, as serving to show the progress made by the influence of the theologians, conservative at heart, but advancing nevertheless more or less with the times. Such was Gries-

bach, who was not only a middle-party in the so-called faction of progress. His Vorlesungen ü. Hermeneutik d. N. T., printed after his death (in 1815), belongs to the so-called school of grammatico-historical interpretation which prevailed during the author's life, and is such a work as would naturally be expected from a pupil of Semler and Ernesti.

"The peculiar principle of Griesbach's system consists in a division of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament into three classes, each of which is considered as an independent witness for the various readings of the manuscripts which it comprises. He thus contemplates the existence of three distinct species of texts, which, with respect to their relationship or affinity, are called by Bengel, families, and by Semler, Griesbach, and Michaelis 'recensions' or 'codices,' namely: 1. The 'Alexandrian' recension or codex, of which the manuscripts of the ancient churches, according to the citations found in the early Egyptian fathers, particularly Origen and Clements of Alexandria. 2. The 'Western' recension, which is identified with the citations of the Latin fathers, especially Cyprian and Tertullian, and was used by the Church of Rome. The task of regulating the text, which in the Constantinopolitan and the adjacent Oriental provinces, and have furnished the received text, called the Greek Vulgate. Each of these recensions has characteristics peculiar to itself, yet no individual manus-

script exhibits any recension in a pure state, but is as-

signed to the Alexandrian or Western class, as the pecu-

lar reading of each of those classes preponderate. Though Griesbach considers departures from the re-

ceived Greek Vulgate as various readings, he does not allow the existence of any standard text as a criterion for determining which are genuine or spurious read-

ings, his object being to show, not the character of par-

ticular deviations from any individual recension, but the general coincidence of manuscripts with one recen-

sion or another, rather than with any particular group. The received text does not regulate, but is regulated by his critical opinion of its comparative value; and the immense number of various readings form a floating medium in which the genuine text is considered to be in all in-

stances discoverable. How this is to be done is not at all apparent, nor is it at all necessary to determine the value of the readings by the number of classes by which they are supported, he constantly dis-

plays a very decided preference for the Alexandrian class, which he places far above the two others in the rank of authority; a few manuscripts of this recension being supposed to outnumber, with a multiplicity of such as be-

long to the Byzantine recension, which he regards as certainly the most trustworthy of all (Prof. Ixxi). The reason assigned by Griesbach for this decision is the fact that the Greek transcripts of this class contain a remarkably large number of suspected readings, owing to the fact that the scribe in these cases is not taken by the literate class in making successive alterations; and finding the coincidence of the numerous scriptural quotations of Origen of Alexandria with the celebrated Greek manu-

script of the New Testament from that city to be very extensive, he concludes that the most Mithraic of all the gospels is the Expanded Text of the 3d century, discovered the earliest, and therefore the most trustworthy, and that the Greek text of this manuscript is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex. The opening of the gospel of St. John, from which the text of the New Testament is derived, is so much like the text of the Griesbachian manuscript, that it is not surprising to find that the text of the latter is the true one of the original codex.
fathers and versions; and of the readings thus proved to be genuine is formed his corrected text of the New Testament. Against the complicated hypothesis on which Griesbach had based his corrected text, many very important objections were urged by learned Biblical critics of Germany (as by Hartmann, mentioned above), and in England, especially by archbishop Lawrence and Dr. Frederick Nolan. The primary fact enforced by Griesbach, that the Alexandrian readings which are supported by the quotations of Origen, possess the highest authority of all, is disputed by professor Matthie, of Moscow, in his critical edition of The New Testament, and with greater confidence by professor Martin Scholz, of Bonn, in the prolegomena to his complete edition, published on a system wholly at variance with that of Griesbach. The Alexandrian manuscripts are acknowledged by Scholz to be more ancient, but he asserts them to be more corrupt than any others, and contends that in Alexandria the alterations of the text principally originated. He divides all the manuscripts, not, as Griesbach, into three, but into two classes, the Byzantine and the Alexandrian, in which latter he includes the Western; and he gives a decided superiority to the authority of the Byzantine recensions, which, in opposition to Griesbach, he considers it desirable to be derived from the autographs of the evangelists and apostles themselves. The work by archbishop Lawrence on this subject is entitled Remarks upon the Systematical Classification of Manuscripts adopted by Dr. Griesbach (1834, 8vo). The learned author states that he considers Griesbach’s system a ridiculous notion, and that he has no principle whatever to guide him. ‘The most consummate critic that ever undertook an edition of the New Testament;’ but in the course of his critical strictures on the origin and execution of his plan of appreciating manuscripts, he employs the severest terms of censure, observing that Griesbach’s mode of investigation is unsatisfactory, his classification fallacious, and his statement of the number of readings inaccurate; that no such classification of the manuscripts of the New Testament is possible; the existence of three distinct species of texts being a fact only synthetically assumed, and not capable of any analytical demonstration; so that the student finds he is treading, not on solid ground, but on a critical quicksand.’ Griesbach was long and severely attacked by Trinitarian writers as an oppressor of the doctrine of Christ’s divinity, chiefly in consequence of his having restored the celebration of the communion of the bread and the wine, and expressing the view that there is one real body and one real blood in the celebration of the Eucharist. The laborious and minute learned work by the Rev. Dr. Nolan entitled The Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament, published in 1815, is chiefly occupied in presenting evidence to subvert the critical system of Griesbach, and to establish the position since the apostolical age that the word of God was written in the Byzantine, and not the Alexandrian, codices are the most worthy of reliance. ‘Griesbach’s theory,’ says Dr. Nolan, ‘is one of the most elaborate of those that have unsettled the foundation on which rests the entire cannon. His corrected text can be received only as a proof of the general corruption of the sacred Scriptures, and of the faithlessness of the traditionary testimony by which it is supported, since he states that the two principal classes of text, the Alexandrian and the Western, have been corrected. In his edition, the corrected Greek version exhibits 150,000 various readings, and has remained 1400 years in its present state of corruption; that there appears, therefore, to be no reservation by which the doctrinal integrity of the sacred Scripture can be ascertained; for if, in the apostolic and primitive ages, corruption was prevalent, whatever text the text gathered out of the immense number of various readings, it may be as well any other as that originally delivered by the inspired writers.’ Griesbach indeed declares, in his Symbolic Critic, that the manuscripts of the Gospels inscribed and printed on a system wholly at variance with that of Griesbach. The Alexandrian manuscripts are acknowledged by Scholz to be more ancient, but he asserts them to be more corrupt than any others, and contends that in Alexandria the alterations of the text principally originated. He divides all the manuscripts, not, as Griesbach, into three, but into two classes, the Byzantine and the Alexandrian, in which latter he includes the Western; and he gives a decided superiority to the authority of the Byzantine recensions, which, in opposition to Griesbach, he considers it desirable to be derived from the autographs of the evangelists and apostles themselves. The work by archbishop Lawrence on this subject is entitled Remarks upon the Systematical Classification of Manuscripts adopted by Dr. Griesbach (1834, 8vo). The learned author states that he considers Griesbach’s system a ridiculous notion, and that he has no principle whatever to guide him. ‘The most consummate critic that ever undertook an edition of the New Testament;’ but in the course of his critical strictures on the origin and execution of his plan of appreciating manuscripts, he employs the severest terms of censure, observing that Griesbach’s mode of investigation is unsatisfactory, his classification fallacious, and his statement of the number of readings inaccurate; that no such classification of the manuscripts of the New Testament is possible; the existence of three distinct species of texts being a fact only synthetically assumed, and not capable of any analytical demonstration; so that the student finds he is treading, not on solid ground, but on a critical quicksand.’ Griesbach was long and severely attacked by Trinitarian writers as an oppressor of the doctrine of Christ’s divinity, chiefly in consequence of his having restored the celebration of the communion of the bread and the wine, and expressing the view that there is one real body and one real blood in the celebration of the Eucharist. The laborious and minute learned work by the Rev. Dr. Nolan entitled The Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament, published in 1815, is chiefly occupied in presenting evidence to subvert the critical system of Griesbach, and to establish the position since the apostolical age that the word of God was written in the Byzantine, and not the Alexandrian, codices are the most worthy of reliance. ‘Griesbach’s theory,’ says Dr. Nolan, ‘is one of the most elaborate of those that have unsettled the foundation on which rests the entire cannon. His corrected text can be received only as a proof of the general corruption of the sacred Scriptures, and
other.—Methodist, No. 59; Minutes of Conferences, 1862, p. 71. (G. B. D.)

Griffin, Edmund Dorr, A.M., a Protestant Episco-
pal, was born at Newton, Pa., Sept. 18, 1804. Early in life he gave proofs of classical proficiency in the composition of some Latin poems and poetical ver-
sions, which were considered to possess rare excellence. In 1823 he passed A.B. in Columbia College with dis-
guished honor; and having studied theology two years in the New York Theological Seminary, he was ad-
mitted to deacon's orders in 1826. After supplying for a time a church at Utica, he returned to New York, and was appointed agent to the Gen. Theol. Seminary; he became rector of St. James's, New York, and the Associate Church of Bloomingdale, officiating also temp-
orarily in Christ's Church, New York, as assistant to Dr. Lyell. In 1828, his health failing, he sailed for Europe, and visited England, France, and Italy. On his return he commenced lecturing at Columbia Col-
lege, April 13, 1830, on the History of Literature, con-
tinuing the series with his friend, Prof. McVickar, who had been obliged to suspend on account of ill health. Griffin's lectures had great success; and measures were in progress for the formation of a new chair of history in the college expressly for him, when, during the vacation, he was seized with inflammation of the bowels, and died Aug. 31, 1830. His lectures were pub-
lished after his death by his friend McVickar under the title Remains of Rev. E. D. Griffin (N. Y., 2 vols. 8vo). They contain several pieces of poetry, some of which are in Latin; an account of travels through Italy and Switzerland in 1829; notes on France, Eng-
land, and Scotland in 1829, and extracts from his lectures, and some essays written while a student. See McVickar, Notice (in the Preface of the Remains of R. E. G.); Cyclop. of American Literature, ii, 393; Christian Review, iv, 856; Sprague, Annals, v, 671.

Griffin, Edward Dorr, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at East Haddam, Conn., Jan. 6, 1770, and graduated at Yale College in 1790 with distin-
guished honor. After teaching for a time at Derby, he studied theology under the guidance of Jonathan Edwards, and was licensed in 1792. He commenced his labors at New Salem, supplied at Farmington, and then was called to the Congregational Church at New 
Harford, of which he was ordained pastor in 1793. In 1800 he visited New Jersey, and supplied in Orange for a short time, when he accepted a call from Newark, where he was installed pastor in 1801, as colleague to Dr. M. Whorter, whom he succeeded as pastor in 1807. In 1817 he was invited to the directorship of the Union College. In 1809 he was appointed to the Bartlett professorship in Andover, and in 1811 was installed in Park-street Church, Boston. In 1812-13 he delivered his celebrated Park-street lectures. On resigning his charge in Boston he returned to Newark, and was in-
stalled in the Second Presbyterian Church in 1815. He interested himself warmly in the cause of the Africans, the American Bible and United Foreign Mission Soci-
eties. In 1821 he was appointed president of Willi-
ams College, and filled that office most ably and ac-
curately for twenty years, resigning it in 1836, and re-
tiring to Newark, N. J., where he died, Nov. 8, 1887. His ministry was marked by numerous revivals. Dr. Griffin was a man of large intellectual proportions. The peculiar cast of his preaching and other religious instructions and appeals was formed, more perhaps than in any other great mind, on that cherished habit of precise discrimination on the leading points of the prevalent theology. In his course of teaching in mental philosophy he drew the current distinctions with great accuracy and decision. His theological writings are distinguished by lucid and energetic state-
ments of the main points of the best views of the views of the time, and in such statements his ability was not surpassed by any man of the age. His taste for those theological distinctions, his high sense of their value, and his facility and satisfaction in using them, gave his most rhetorical pulpit discourses remarkable internal coherence and compactness, and enabled him to command the judgments of his hearers by the force of his eloquence. The great charm of his sermons was the intense light in which he placed some leading points of religious truth constitute the striking feature of his theological discussions. This trait is conspicuous in his Park-street lectures, his work on the Atonement, and some smaller publications on particular points of Christian doctrine. On the whole, the position and influence of Dr. Griffin are widely attested by the pro-
found and general respect for his memory, and by the evident fruits of his labors. His power of clear, penetrat-
ing, and, at the same time, of lofty and comprehen-
sive thought—his skill and force in argument, his theo-
ratical genius and culture, his eloquence, his majestic person and manner, all pervaded and controlled by his enlightened religious devotion, performed efficient serv-
vice for the Church, and placed him among the greater lights of his age* (J. W. Yeomans, cited by Sprague). He published The Eighteenth Century, the Atonement (1816, 12mo); — Divine Efficiency (1833, 12mo) — Casual Power of Re-
generation, etc. (1834), and numerous Sermons Ad-
dressed, Orations, and Lectures, from 1805 to 1833.— 
Sprague, Annals, iv, 26; Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan. 1858; 
Princeton, xi, 404; Am. Bib. Rep. iii, 856; N. A. Rev. 
xxxiv, 119; Cooke, Recollections of E. D. Griffin 
(Boston, 1866, 8vo).

Griffith, Benjamin, a minister prominent among the early Baptists in America. He was born in County Cardigan, South Wales, in 1688, and came to this country 
in 1710, settling in Montgomery township, Penn. He was baptized in 1711, called to the ministry in 1722, and ordained in 1729. He enjoyed a successful ministry, labored extensively, and churches still exist that were formed in the field of his itinerant labors. He published—1. A Treatise of Church Discipline: — 2. Vindication of the Doctrine of the Resurrection: — 3. An-
swer to " The Divine Right of Infant Baptism," printed by B. Franklin, 1747. He also wrote An Essay on the Power and Duty of an Association, and left it in MS. It was published in 1832. He died in 1768. (L. E. S.)

Grimshaw, William, a minister of the Church of England, was born in Lancashire, Eng., in 1708, ed-
cuated at Cambridge, and entered into holy orders in 1731. After spending some years as minister of Todm-
den, near Penshurst, he was appointed in 1747 to the per-
ceptual curacy of Haworth, in Yorkshire. In 1745 he en-
tered into a close union with the Methodists, acted as Mr. Wesley's assistant in what was known as the Haworth circuit, and until his death, which occurred April 7, 1763, was the mainstay of the connection in that part of the country. Mr. Grimshaw was the author of a Sermon in Defence of the Methodists, printed in 1749, and republished with his biography. He was of a cheerful, generous turn of mind, very courteous, and open as the day in his conversation with the people. Wherever he went, he was a natural orator, spoke with great fluency, and preached the Gospel with great ability and approbation." Wesley said of him, "He carries fire wherever he goes."—Myles, Life of Grima-
shaw; Crowther, Portraiture of Methodism; Newton, Memoirs of Grimshaw (Lond. 1798, 12mo); Stevens, 
History of Methodism, i, 256; Wesley, Works, iv, 117; 
vi, 750.

Grind (גָּרְנָד, gacen), to crush small, Exod. xxxii., 20; Deut. ix., 21; specially with a hand-mill, Judg. 
vi, 21; Num. ix., 8; also tropically, to oppress the poor by exacting, Isa. iii., 15. In the expression "let 
my wife grind for another," Job xxi., 10, it is put as the picture of abject poverty and degradation. "She 
becomes his mill-wench or wench; comp. Exod. xi., 5; 
Isa. xlv., 2). See Grits. In the earliest ages men
took the pains to roast the kernels of grain (Serv. ad Aes. i, 184), and to pound them (Pliney, xviii, 29) in a mortar (ὑμηλία, ἱερίδιον) with a pestle (comp. Numb. xi, 8), and this method of preparing it is still common (in small encampments) among the modern Arabs (Burckhardt, WAhaby, p. 36). Yet the hand-mill (ἡμηλία, ἱερίδιον, ἱερίαμολογία) is an ancient invention (see Virgil. Moret. 19), for it was early employed by the Hebrews (Numb. xi, 8), and continued in use by them to the latest age (being often alluded to in the Talmud under the name τῇ ἑλικίᾳ, or τῇ ἱερίδιῳ), and is still in common use (in villages) among the Orientals (Niebuhr, Baschr. p. 51; Trux. i, 150; comp. Laborde. Commentaire, p. 58). It consisted of two millstones (Plaut. Aesinar. ii, i, 16); the upper one (ἡμηλία, the sider, Deut. xxiv, 6; 2 Sam. xi. 21; or, fully ὑμηλία, the rider-piece, Judg. ix. 53; in Greek, ὑμηλὸς or ἱερίαμολος, Lat. calitus) was movable and slightly concave, so as to fit the surface of the stationary lower one (ἱερίαμολογία, Job xl. 18; Gr. μύλον, Lat. meta). It was (in poor families) worked by the women (Shaw, Trux. p. 292; (see Herod. iv, 2 and compare the tradition that king Zedekiah was thus treated, Esdr. Jer. Geach, iii, 445). An allusion to the noise of these mills, as being somewhat pleasing to the domestic ear (like that of a modern coffee-mill, which conveys an intimation of home comforts), seems to be contained in Jer. xxv, 10; Eccl. xii, 4; Rev. xxviii, 22; others, however, contend that those passages refer to the singing, or rather screaming, of the females employed, as a means of diversion during their toil, or to drown the grating of the millstones (Hackett, Illustra. of Script. p. 80). It was not lawful to distraint the family hand-mill for debt (Deut. xxiv, 6). In later times, large mills, worked by horses, were used (ὑμηλίαι, ἱερίδια, Buxtorf, Lexicon Chald. 2252), as by the Greeks (μύλος ὄνειρος, Matt. xviii, 6) and Romans (aesin molaris, Varro, R. R. i, 19, 5; Colum. vii. 1; Cato, R. R. x. 4; Ovid, Fast. vi. 518; Lucian. Anm. xxxix, 42; Apulej. Metam. vii. p. 158, Bip.; Digest. xxxiii, 17, 10), and as are still found in the East (Burckhardt, Schwecke. p. 41; Roscher, i, 161; Russell, Aleppo, i, 100). (On the subject generally, see F. L. Gotze, De pistrinum vet. Cygn. 1790; also in Ugolini Theauror. xxix. Hobeisel, De molis manus- sibus vet. Gedani, 1728; also in Ugolini, 1800; Beckmann. Erfyd. ii, 1 sq.; Monges, in the Memoires de l'institut Royal, classe d' Hist. iii, 441 sq.) See MILL.

The grinders (ἡμηλία, tockamak', fem. ones grinding, by allusion to females so employed) of Eccles. xiii, 3, are evidently the teeth, whose decay is an evidence of old age (comp. ἱερίαμολογία, tockamak', mill "grinding," ver. 4). See Cas- per-Plant.

Grindal, EDMOND, D.D., archbishop of Canterbury, was born in the year 1519, in Cumber- land. He was educated at Magdalen College, Cam- bridge, and was on all occasions distinguished as a learned man at the university. In 1550 he was selected by Rid- ley, bishop of London, as his chaplain. In 1553, on the death of king Edward VI, apprehending the persecution of the Protestants, he fled to Strauburg, in Germany, where he was well received. Dur- ing his residence abroad he devoted much time to the dis- cussion of religion, to his studies, to the study of the con- troversies of religion, to his studies, to the study of the controversies of religion, to his studies, to the study of the controversies of religion.

Joliffe, Tren. p. 37; Burckhardt, Arab. p. 187; Robinson, ii, 405, 650; Wellsted, Trux. i, 249; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 295; see Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. ii, 223; comp. Mishna, Tohor. vii, 4), but in large households, where it was severe toll (Artomid. ii, 42), by slaves (Arriaux, Vog. iii, 294; Burckhardt, Arab. p. 187), as a female employment (Matt. xxiv, 41; Luke xvii, 85), and that of the most menial kind (Exod. xi, 5; Isa. xlvi, 2; Job xxxi, 10; comp. Ecc. xlii, 3; see Odys. vii, 108 sq.; Simonid. Inam. 85 sq.; Plaut. Merc. ii, 3, 62; Theophr. Char. 5; Aristoph. Nab. 1585; Callimach. in Del. 242), but also as a male task, especially in punish- ment (Judg. xvi, 21; Lam. v. 13; compare Terent. Andr. i, 2, 29; Plaut. Proc. v, 8, 33; Aesinar. i, 1, 16; Epidic. i, 2, 42; Mostell. i, 1, 16; Polluce. Onom. iii, 8; Cic. Quint. 1, 2, 4; see Cod. Theodos. iv, 3, 7), such culp- ite being closely fettered (Terent. Phorm. ii, 3, 19; Plant. Pers. i, 1, 21 sq.), and even blinded (Judg. xvi, 21), by which means the giddiness arising from per- petually going round was at the same time avoided

\[\text{Griswold, Alexander Viets, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born April 22, 1766, in Simsbury, Conn., and died in Boston Feb. 15, 1843. He early evinced great capacity, and attained considerable proficiency in Greek and Latin, but unhappily abandoned his intention of taking a collegiate course. After studying law for several years, he decided to enter the ministry, and became a candidate for orders in 1794, officiating in the parishes of Plymouth, Harwinton, and Litchfield; was ordained in 1795, and continued in charge of the three parishes named until 1804, when he accepted Bristol parish, R. I. In 1809 he was chosen rector of St. Michael's, Litchfield, and had accepted the call, but, being elected in May, 1810, bishop of the Eastern diocese, then embracing Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Maine, he declined the invitation, and continued his ministry in Litchfield. He was consecrated in May, 1811, and for some years discharged the double duty of bishop and parish priest. The "year 1812 was signalized by an extensive revival of religion under his ministry," and "again and again his flock was visited with similar seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." In reply to objections made against such "awakenings or reformation," he published some papers on "Prayer-meetings and Revivals," in which he ably and zealously vindicated them from "the exaggerated charges of disorder, fanaticism, and delusion," and maintained that under proper guidance they promote the religious life and power of the Church. Yielding to the general desire that his residence should be more centrally located for his diocese, in 1829 he accepted the rectoryship of St. Peter's, Salem, Mass., and removed thither in 1830. He remained in Salem until 1835, when provision having been made for his independent episcopal support, he removed to Boston, and devoted the remainder of his life exclusively to his episcopal duties. In 1842 he was relieved by the appointment of an assistant bishop, which was his ardent wish, and he retired from his episcopal act. He died suddenly from heart disease. Bishop Griswold was eminently distinguished among the clergy of his Church for his evangelical spirit and earnest religious life. His chief works are, On the Reformation and the Apostolic Office (Boston, 12mo);—Sermons (Philadelphia, 1880, 8vo);—Prayers (N. Y.);—Remarks on Social Prayer-meetings (Boston, 1858, 12mo). See Stone, Life of Bishop Griswold (Philadelphia, 1844, 8vo); Sprague, Annals, v. 415—425; Christian Observer, July, 1848; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 744. (J. W. M.)

\[\text{Grissell from wheat appears from the Sept. in 2 Sam. xvii, 19; Prov. xxvii, 22, to be designated by the Heb. \textit{gul}, \textit{ruphah} (Vulg. \textit{prisca}, A. V. "ground corn," "wheat"). This kind of meal food is still very common in the East, and the Turks especially employ it in time of war (Faber, in Harmer, ii. 36). On the contrary, the \textit{milu}, \textit{kali}, or "parched corn," of 2 Sam. xxvii, 22, appears to be the roasted kernels of the new-ripe grain, which is still eaten in that manner in Palestine (Robinson, ii. 688). See CORN.\]

\[\text{Griszled (straw, spotted), party-colored or variegated, as goats (Gen. xxxi, 10, 19) or horses (Zech. vi, 3, 6).}\]

\[\text{Groat. The edge formed by an intersection of two vases (or curled ceilings). During the early part of the Romanesque period the groats were left perfectly plain, but later, and especially through the Gothic period, they were invariably covered with ribs (or mouldings).}\]

\[\text{Groningon School. See HOFFSTEDE.}\]

\[\text{Groningenists, a sect of Anabaptists (q. v.), who met at certain stated periods in the city of Groningen.}–Mosheim, History of the Church, ch. vii, p. 2, ch. vii, § 3.}\]

\[\text{Groot, Geert (Lat. Gerhardus Magnus), was born at Deventer in 1540, studied in Paris, and subsequently taught philosophy and theology in Cologne. Being possessed of a considerable property and of several prebends, he abandoned himself to a luxurious life, from which he was recalled by a serious sickness and the impressive exhortations of a friend, the Cartesian Henry More. Thoroughly reformed, he entered the monastery of Monkmueen, near Antwerp; but he left it again in three years, in order to become a traveling preacher. In union with Florence Radwy, he established at Deventer the Society of the Brethren of Common Life, which was consecrated by Gregory XI. He died at Deventer of the plague, August 20, 1384. He wrote De Veridica Preditione Evangelii;—De Sacris Libris Studianda (both in Kempis, Opera, t. iii). Thirty-three treatises of his remain in MS. See Ulmann, Reformers before the Reformation, vol. i. p. 281.}\]

\[\text{Groot, De. See GROOTUS; HOFFSTEDE.}\]

\[\text{Gropner, Johann, a German Romanist divine, was born at Soest in 1501, became successively canon of Cologne, provost of Bonn, and archdeacon and provost of St. Gereon of Cologne. He convoked a provincial synod in 1536 with the intention of effecting some reforms, and was afterwards sent by Charles V to the religious assembly of 1541 at Regensburg; he is even said to have framed the Interim which was there decided on. In 1548 he went to Soest, to reform the churches of that place agreeably to the Interim. In 1551, on the occasion of the reopening of the Council of Trent, the pope called him to Rome for the purpose of consulting with him. Here he died, March 12, 1558. Gropner belonged to the class of milder Romanists who, at the time of the Reformation, sought to reunite the Protestant and Catholic Churches of Rome by means of conciliatory measures. His principal works are, Anacritis (against the archbishop Hermann, Cologne, 1544);—Institutio catholica (1560);—Von wahrner u. bleibender Gegenwart d. Leb. u. Blutes Christi (1556);—Copula institutionis ad piatem (1557), etc.–Herseck, Real-Encykld. s. v.; Distinger, Kathol. Zeitschrift (vol. ii, 1844).}\]

\[\text{Grosseteste, Grosse-teste, Gosteste, Gostest, Grossthead, Groashead (Capito, "Qui cognominatus est pluribus GROSSTESTE-CAPTU," Triv.); Robert, bishop of Lincoln, a celebrated ecclesiastic, theologian, statesman, mathematician, astronomer, natural philosopher, poet, moralist, and teacher, in the first half of the thirteenth century. The various forms of the name indicate that it was a descriptive epithet, agnostem, or byname, rather than a family designation, which was still no common appellation. The nickname has been rendered fester; but the career of his bearer, who contended with pope and king, was the early counsellor of Simon De Montfort, the teacher, patron, and friend of Roger Bacon and Adam De Marisco, the colleague of the scarcely less eminent Robert Bacon and Richard Fitzakre. He has often been regarded as the first translator of Scripture into English, and as the precursor of the Protestant Reformation, and his continued reputation is mainly due to his strenuous and bold resistance to the corruptions of the Church at home, and to the vices of the papal court. The thirteenth century is one of the most active, bustling, eventful, and important periods, in the whole series of the ages.}\]
was prepared for the governance of his household (Mons. Francisc. Appendix. 12). The sons of the highest nobles, among them the noble Simon de Montfort, frequented the college, and were instructed in the liberal arts, to prepare them for the army, and to equip them for the arts of war and government. The college was established in 1228, and was under the control of the bishop of Oxford. The college was also a center for the education of the nobility, and was known for its strict discipline and rigorous academic standards. It was a haven for scholars and intellectuals, and played a significant role in the cultural and intellectual life of the time.

The college was not without its controversies, however. There were allegations of corruption and manipulation of the system, which led to the resignation of the college's head, Archdeacon Thomas, in 1232. The college was also involved in the political maneuverings of the time, with its members holding high positions in the government and the church. The college was a symbol of the power and influence of the nobility, and its members were often involved in the political and social affairs of the time.

The college was also a center for the study of the classics, and was known for its library, which contained many rare and valuable manuscripts. It was a place of learning and scholarship, and was held in high esteem by the intellectual and cultural elite of the time. The college was a symbol of the intellectual and cultural life of the time, and was a place where the highest minds of the day gathered to learn, teach, and exchange ideas.

The college was also a center of the arts, and was known for its music and drama. It was a place where the finest musicians and actors of the time performed, and where the highest standards of performance were set. It was a place of celebration and festivity, and was known for its elaborate and opulent celebrations.

The college was also a center of the spiritual life of the time, and was known for its devotion to the faith. It was a place where the highest minds of the day sought solace and comfort in the midst of the trials of the world. It was a place where the highest ideals of the faith were pursued, and where the highest standards of morality were set.

The college was also a center for the intellectual and cultural life of the time, and was a place where the highest minds of the day gathered to learn, teach, and exchange ideas. It was a place where the highest standards of scholarship were set, and where the highest ideals of the faith were pursued. It was a place of celebration and festivity, and was known for its elaborate and opulent celebrations. It was a place of devotion and faith, and was known for its devotion to the faith. It was a place of learning and scholarship, and was held in high esteem by the intellectual and cultural elite of the time. It was a symbol of the intellectual and cultural life of the time, and was a place where the highest minds of the day gathered to learn, teach, and exchange ideas.
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mission for the king's benefit. This was the prelude to the Provisions of Oxford and the Barons' War. In November of this year, bishop Grosseteste, with his friends, fled to England, were arrested by the papal court to look after the appeal of his chapter on the subject of visitation. He is thus present at the General Council of Lyons in 1245, which had been summoned for the condemnation, excommunication, and deposition of the emperor Frederick II. He does not appear prominent among the processions, and the general action of the pontiff, whose cause was assuredly that of national liberty and independence against the menace of universal imperialism. In the autumn of this ominous year Grosseteste returned to England, having obtained an excommunication in regard to his authority. His right of visitation was acknowledged, but a comparison of his letters with the statements of Matthew Paris demonstrates that he did not obtain all that he demanded from the pope. It is equally erroneous to suppose that he sacrificed any principle in urging to the Roman court the natural rights of his see. The attempt was made to Boniface, the new archbishop of Canterbury. There is no abatement of his principle, or of his resolution. He resumes his visitations, and extends them to the rich monasteries. They provoke fresh opposition, and occasion much complication. At the king's request, he writes upon the rejection of the sacerdotal and kingly powers. Despite all of his labors, he steadily maintains his course. He contends in Parliament against the exactions of the king and the intrusion of foreigners into English benefices. He continues as dean and chancellor of Oxford, is in no degree a minister of the king; he is seated in offices of prudence and charity, especially in ministering to the wants of poor scholars. He is indefatigable in his own pursuits. To this period must be referred the accusatory letter of Adam de Marcisco accusing him from excessive study and "Vetustissima studia quod inducibiliter nosse visa atque spiritus evanuit et attentum corporis habitudinem, exasperant affectionem et rationem omnubilat" (Ep. xxxix.) The renewed resistance to his visitations, particularly by the monks in the north of England, the personal attacks, and his differences with Boniface of Savoy, his archbishop, and the uncle of the queen, compelled him to make another visit to Lyons in 1250. He was coolly received by Innocent, and, at the close of an excited conversation, exclaimed, "Oh, money, money, how powerful you are, especially at the court of Rome!" He had anticipated the denunciations of Dante and Petrarch. He gave larger development to his honest indignation in the celebrated sermon on papal abuses which he preached on the 10th of May before the pope and three of the cardinals. This daring re- buke was not calculated to conciliate favor at court, and he turned his face homeward in December "tristes et vacuius." He came back wounded in spirit, and burdened with age, care, and anxiety for the future. He contemplated the resignation of his bishopric — no unusual procedure at that time—and seclusion with his books; but he was induced to renounce this purpose by the representations of Adam de Marcisco and other friends—perhaps by the authority of the archbishop—and the fear that the temporalities would be despoiled by the king during the vacancy. The determination to retain his high station was moral, not pecuniary, or in the repression of scandals. Matthew Paris censures with great bitterness his severity in putting down monastic luxury, but admits the righteousness of his purpose. His first open breach with the pope occurred at this time. He had refused the pontifical request to induct an Italian, ignorant of English, into a rich cure. He was suspended for a short time in consequence. This did not arrest his reforming ardor. He excommunicated the Norwegians, being brother bishops, placed an interdict on the church to which he had been presented. In the great Parliament of London, October 13, 1292, he opposed the king's demands, fortified by the pope's bull, and induced his brethren to join in a firm refusal of the application for a new subsidy. On this occasion he made the celebrated prayer made in the names of the Latins benefited in England by Innocent, and found that they reached 70,000 marks, or three of the clear revenue of the crown. He addressed a formal appeal to the lords and commonalty of England to suppress this disastrous spoliation (Ep. cxxxi). It was the first direct claim of popular support to the clerical and political dissensions, and indicated the course to Simon de Montfort as a popular leader. His conduct was still more decided and menacing at the Parliament of May, 1258. In this year, the last of his long and useful life, Grosseteste gave the final arrest to Innocent IV, and by one notable act, in strict accordance with his whole previous career, secured the highest public favor, and won the renown by which he is chiefly remembered. He rejected the pope's demand of a canony at Lincoln for his nephew, Frederick of London, converting his refusal into a strong argument and striking condemnation of the infamous "non-obstante" and "provisionis" of the papal procedure. It was a note of preparation for Edward III's celebrated '"Statute of Provisors' nearly a hundred years afterwards (1446). This event is recorded by Matthew Paris, who, in his history, speaks with the characteristic "filiiilet et obedientem non obedi, contrado, et rebelle" (Ep. cxxviii.) The pope was thrown into uncontrollable rage by this letter, but his rage was exchanged for equally unseemly joy when he heard of the death of Grosseteste within the year. This event occurred at Burgh Castle, Saxony, in October 1293. His remains were buried in Lincoln Cathedral, where they were joined about four years later by those of his friend, Adam de Marcisco, "God so providing that, as they were lovely and amiable in their lives, so in death they should not be divided" (Lanercost Chroni- cle). The contemporaneous and posthumous fame of Grosseteste insured a copious crop of legends. He was supposed to have prophesied the ensuing civil war, which he might have done without any extraordinary illumination. On the night of his death, Alberic, the ring- ing in the sky were heard by Mr. Bishop of Lincoln, and by some Franciscan friars in the neighborhood. He appeared in a portentous dream to Innocent IV in his last illness. Miracles were attributed to him, and in 1307 the king requested his canonization. To him was also ascribed the talking head of brass, which has been sometimes assigned to Friar Bacon, and sometimes to Friar Bangay; but this arose from his reputation as a magician, and not as a saint. His books he bequeathed to the Franciscans at Oxford, out of friendship for Adam de Marcisco, or out of regard for the school which he had taught, governed, cherished, and organized. The services rendered by Robert Grosseteste to the University of Oxford have been too little appreciated. Character, Requirements, and Influence.—There was no one in the age in which he lived who displayed higher excellences than Grosseteste: Matthew Paris, whose temperament and associations bred prejudice, attests his pre-eminent virtues. The elegance of his manners attracted admiring comment; the placidity and placability of his disposition were the result of his early training; and when pronounced upon him after his death by the University of Oxford was entirely just: "No one knew him to neglect any good action appropriate to his office or his charge from fear of any man; he was ever ready; for martyrdom if the sword of the executioner should pre-
sent itself." This testimony is re-echoed by Adam de Marisco. He was essentially a reformer without being an innovator. He "stood upon the ancient ways" to restore, preserve, or improve what was good and old. In this sense he was a reformer in Church and State, in education, in letters, and in philosophy. He is regarded as a reformer of the Reformation—as a herald of either Lollardism or Lutherananism. His career tended to that result, but it was unforeseen and undesigned. He is devoted to the order of the Church, solicitors for Catholic orthodoxy, imbued with the spirit, sentiments, and doctrines of his community; his points are also confirmed by his letters (Epp. lxxii, cxxii). Notwithstanding the sternness and severity of his ministry, there was great gentleness in his demeanor, with moderation and prudence in his private and public counsels. He seems to have been withal a very moderate opinion of his own judgment, and habitually sought aid from others whom he deemed wiser than himself. He was easily charmed with simple amusements, enjoyed a jest, and had a rich vein of native humor, as numerous anecdotes attest. This lofty character was sustained and irradiated by the glory and splendor of his accomplish- ments. These can be only imperfectly appreciated from his remains published or preserved. They must be estimated from the commendations of his own and of immediately succeeding times. His pupil, Roger Bacon, calls him "apostolissimus Latinarum," and "apostolissimus in Christianum homo" (these letters Minus, p. 317, 320), and remarks that "Grosseteste alone knew the sciences" (Opus Tert. c. x.; Compend. Stud. c. viii); that "Robert, bishop of Lincoln, and Brother Adam de Marisco, were perfect in all wisdom, and that no more were perfect in philosophy" than these two, and Avicenna, and Aristotle. Roger Bacon, in Op. Tert. c. xiv; that the said Robert and Adam were "the greatest clerks in the world, perfect in divine and human knowl- edge" (Ibid. c. xxii). Tyssington speaks of him, "cumus comparatio ad omnes doctores modernos est usit comparatio solo ad lexum quando sleeputur." The range of his acquirements will be partially illustrated by the number and variety of his writings. He is credited with a consummate mastery of all existing science, and with a knowledge of the three learned professions. Roger Bacon distinctly assigns to him the adoption or the improvement of the Experimental Method (Roger Bacon, Op. Tert. c. viii). Several poems, Latin, French, and even English, are attributed to him; and he certainly en- couraged the use of the English tongue in preaching, and it may have been, from his employment of the still rude vernacular, that he became the most popular as well as the most influential of all his days. It is said to have been familiar with Greek and Hebrew, but we are assured that he attained only in advanced life a sufficient mastery of the former to translate Greek books (Roger Bacon, Op. Tert. c. xxv), and then not with- out more competent assistance (Comp. Stud. c. viii). The vast influence which he exercised over his con- temporaries and our succeeding times is ably present- ed by Luard (Pref. p. lxxxv, ix): "No one," says he, "had a greater influence upon English thought and English literature for the two centuries which followed his time; few books will be found that do not contain some quotations from Lincolniensis, "the great clerk Grossetest." 

Writings.—The works of Grosseteste have been dis- covered and reported at 200 and 300. The difference of estimation, as well as the magnitude of the sum, may be explained by loose modes of enumeration, as indicated by the comparison of the lists of Roger Bacon's treatises with his actual remains. Divisions or chapters were frequently accounted separate productions. The same works were circulated under different titles. Many of the later are recorded under only elaborate or rate epiplies or occasional essays, which would now pass as tracts. Many compositions were assigned to him of which he was guiltless; many fathered upon him to secure the favor of his name. But, after all such rectifications, the multitude and multiplicity of his writings must have been amazing, especially when regarded as the leisure fruitage of an active life. Most of them have been lost, destroyed, or forgotten. Le- derer has summed up the best he could of the Repertoire as a reformer of the Franciscan order and Le- derer has summed up the best he could of the Franciscan order and Grossetestus in consideration of his own eager exploration of the Franciscan resources at Oxford at the time of the dissolution of the monas- teries: "Sumnum Jupiter! quid ego illic inveni! Pul- veram autem inveni, tales araneam, lineas, basilas, ritum denique et aquilem. Inveni eliam atque librum, sed nemo nos habet. Sermones vero, biblia, eodem nominibus. Much, however, remains, the greater part of which is still unpublished. In Pegge's Life of Grosseteste— "the scarcest of modern books"—the list of his writings fills twenty-three quarto pages, closely printed. Similar catalogues are given by Leland, Tanner, Odi- din, etc. These it were unreasonable to repeat or re- view. He was the reputed author of a religious ro- mance in verse, Chastite d'Amour, and of the didactic poem Manuel Poche, translated by Robert de Brunne. Richard Hambpel's Pricks de Conscience has also been referred to him. He may have been the compiler of the rude draft of these noted productions, or may have provided the crude materials with which they were constructed. We know from many sources that the venerable bishop was devoted to music, and "smite with the love of sacred song." Polycarpus Leyer sacnscribentem metris accesserit Minus, p. 317 "et assidue animam, of which many versions exist in Anglo-Norman, English, Greek, Provençal, French, German, Walloon, Spanish, Italian, Danish, and Swedish (Lat- ine Poems of Water Maps, ed. Wright, p. 55-106, 321, 940), and whose echoes may have occasioned Tennyson's Two Biresses. Grosseteste in the Order of Solomon from many moral and theological treatises, and a copious collection of sermons. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle and Boethius, and translated several works from the Greek. He wrote on agriculture, digested according to the cal- endar, The Buke of Hawmburde, and of Plantsynge and Graftynge Trees and Vynce, according to Wynkyn de Worde's title of the version printed by him. This was probably compiled from Palladius and the Geoponica. We trace in the letters of Adam de Marisco his uniting interest in all physical research and contempor- neous history, and from his sayings we learn that he wrote De Iride, de Cometes, et de aŭlia (Comp. Stud. c. viii), including probably a discussion of tides. Other works have been alluded to already. But the most in- teresting of his remains, for the knowledge of the man and of his age, is the large volume of his letters, from which much of his influence, as it is reputed by Mr. Luard, this notice has been principally drawn. 

Authority.—The fascination of Grosseteste's name has in successive centuries excited the enthusiasm of biographers, but has rarely resulted in the accomplish- ment of their designs. Bishop Barlow, of Lincoln; Samuel Knight, the biographer of dean Colet and Erasmus, and Anthony à Wood, collected materials for his life. William, archbishop of York, previously bishop of Lincoln, the successor of lord Bacon in the custody of the seals, mediated the publication of Gros- seteste's life and writings in 1657, but was prevented by the outbreak of the Great Rebellion. Edward Browne, of Clare Hall, designed a life of the great bishop, but was anticipated by death in 1659. Dr. Samuel Pegge achieved his biography, which is valuable, but unattainable. Other authors, some of which have been previously referred to, are Leland, Script. Hist. Brit.; Ball, Script. Ill. Mog. Brit.; Tanner, Bibliotheca; Wharton, Anglica Sacra; Oudin, Script. Eccles.; Pope Blount, Cons. Celebr. Auct.; Godwin, De Praestantibus Angliae; Cave, Script. Ech. Hist.; Warner, Hist. Antarctica; and many others. The works of Luard; Monumenta Francicae, ed. Brewer, containing Eccleston, De Adventu Fratrum Minorum, and Ada-
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mi de Murisco Epistola, with valuable appendices; Rogeri Baconis Opera Anecdot., edit. Brewer; Royal and Historical Letters regni, Henrici VI. The last four were put upon the British Treasury in continuation of the task of the Record Commission. To these authorities should be added the Chronicles of Matthew of Paris, Matthew of Westminster, Roger of Wendover, Capgrave, Trivet, Risbanger, and Lanercost. See also Lechien, Robert Grotsete (Leipzig, 1867). (G. F. H.)

Grostete, Claude, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Orleans in 1617. He studied law and was admitted to the bar by the Parliament of Paris in 1655, but afterwards devoted himself to theology, and in 1675 became pastor of Lisy. In 1689 he accepted a call to Rouen, but soon after returned to Lisy, where he remained until the revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685. Obliged to leave France, he went to England, and died at London in 1713. He wrote Traité de l'Inspiration des livres saints du N. T. (Amst. 1655, 8vo): — Entretiens sur la correspondance prêterelle de l'Eglise angloise avec les autres Eglises réformées (Hague, 1708, 12mo): — Relation de la Société établie pour la propagation de l'Evangile dans les pays étrangers, avec trois sermons (Rotterdam, 1708): — Nouvelles Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des trois Commissaires où l'on voit les déclarations de M. le colosse Grotse, sur le projet de l'Harmonie (Hague, 1708, 8vo): — La Partie du cerisier de l'Harmonie (Amst., 1710, 12mo): — Charitsis Angiolica (about 1712): — Le Docteur du christianisme, en quatorze sermons sur le Ps. cant. 8, 9, et les quatre sentimens du roi Esteban sur sa maladie, sa convalescence et sur sa chose après son convalescence (Hague, 1713, 8vo): — Sermons sur divers textes (Amsterdam, 1715, 8vo). See Vie de Claude Grostete (prefixed to his Sermons sur divers textes); Haag, La France Protestant; Hoefer, New Bibliographie Générale, xxii, 190.

Grosvener, Benjamin, D.D., an eminent Dissenting minister, was born in London Jan. 1, 1675, and educated at the academy at Attercliffe, Yorkshire. Mr. Grosvener entered upon his public ministry in the year 1699 as a Baptist. Soon after he was chosen to succeed Mr. Slater as pastor of the Presbyterian congregation in Crosby Square. To this charge he was ordained July 11, 1704. His popularity as a preacher, his solid judgment, added to a lively imagination, his great anxiety for the conversion, and fervent entreaties, his being appointed to take a part in several important lectures which were then carrying on in the metropolis. In 1730 the University of Edinburgh presented him with the degree of D.D. He continued at Crosby Square till the year 1745, when he was compelled to relinquish his pastoral office. He died October 27, 1758. A catalogue of his published pieces, chiefly occasional sermons, amounting to about thirty in number, may be found in Wilson, History of Dissenting Churches. A volume of his Sermons, with a Memoir by J. Duines, was published in 1808 (Newport, 8vo). Jones, Christian Biography; Skeats, Free Churches of England.

Grotius, Hugo (Dutch name De Groote), one of the most illustrious names in literature, politics, and theology. He was born at Delft April 10, 1583, and in his boyhood gave signs of extraordinary ability. At eleven he was sent to the University of Leyden, where he remained three years, devoting himself especially to theology, law, and mathematics. In 1597 he maintained two theses on philosophy, and wrote in praise of Henri IV, in Latin, a poem entitled Triumphant Gallia, which he dedicated to M. de Buzeval, the French Ambassador. He accompanied the Dutch embassy to Paris, where he was introduced to the king, who gave him a brilliant reception. On his return home, 1599, he entered on the practice of law, but devoted himself also to literature. Each year was marked by a new book, or by a new edition of some important work from his hand. In 1607 he married Mary of Heigersberg, a lady of excellent family, and of high moral and intellectual qualities. In 1608 he published his celebrated treatise More Libertas, his first essay in treating the law of nations. Appointed pensioner of Rotterdam in 1613, he foresaw the difficulties in which the country would soon become involved, and only accepted office on condition that it should be made permanent. He was a member of the right of entering the States-general, where he was thrown into close relations with Barneveldt the elder, with whom he formed a lasting friendship. In 1615 he was sent to represent Holland in a conference held in England on the subject of the Greenland fisheries. During his stay in England, Grotius had several conferences with Casaubon on the means of uniting the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, a problem to which he devoted a great deal of thought and labor throughout his life. After his return to Holland he took an active part in the religious discussions which were soon to divide the country, and in which he was always found on the side of freedom. He had at all times favored the views of Arminius, whose enulogy he published in 1609. Though not then, as he afterwards became, a skilled theologian, he was especially attracted by the system of Arminius, and his views on predestination were afterwards strengthened by study and reflection. And, indeed, the Arminian doctrine, which, discarding the Calvinistic dogmas of absolute predestination, teaches that man is free to accept or to refuse grace, could not fail to suit a mind such as that of Grotius. It was held by the majority of the Dutch states and supported by Goer (q.v.) and his party attempted to obtain the proscription of the Arminians, the states did their utmost to prevent it, and enjoined on both parties to tolerate each other. The Gomarists then incited the people to disobey the states; revolts took place in various towns, and some Arminian ministers were driven out of their churches. Grotius, who had previously helped his friend Uttenboeert with his advice when framing the Acta Remissarium, in which the Arminian principles are laid out, framed, together with Barneveldt, a new edict of toleration which was voted by the states. But fresh disturbances occurred every day, and the states, by a decree dated Aug. 4, 1617, gave to the town magistrates the power of raising troops to put down insurgents. This decree was passed without the participation of the stadtholder Maurice of Nassau, who had for a long time been seeking occasion to act in conjunction with Barneveldt and the Republican party. He therefore availed himself of the opportunity offered him by this decree, which, he asserted, disregarded his rights as captain general. He at once sided with the Gomarists, approved all their plans, and forbade the soldiers to obey the civil authorities. Shortly before these events, Grotius had been sent to conciliate the authorities of Amsterdam, who were opposed to the Arminians. His failure in this mission, with the increasing troubles and perils of the country, caused him an illness. During the disturbances, he wrote several works in defence of his party, in which, in order to justify the measures taken by the Dutch States, he attempted to prove that the state has the right to regulate all that relates to the discipline and even the dogmas of the Church. He also applied himself to show that the Arminian doctrine was not in agreement with fathers and the councils. The Gomarists, beaten in argument, employed violence to overcome their adversaries. In 1618, Maurice, backed by the States, undertook to coerce the towns, which, on the ground of the sovereignty guaranteed to them by the constitution, had declared war on the order treating More as illegal and forbidding their raising troops. Holland was invaded by the troops of the stadtholder, who gave free vent to his anger. Assembling eight members of the States, he made them decree the arrest of Barneveldt, Grotius, and Hogenbeets, under the accusation of being "en-
GROTIUS

mies of their country for having attempted to resist at
Utrecht the sudden seizure of the prince. The magistrates of
Rotterdam and of some other cities of Holland protested
against this open violation of their rights, but were
deposed. The Synod of Dort, which the Gomarists, sure of having the majority of the clergy on their side, had for a long time demanded, in order to obtain a con-
demnation of the doctrines of their adversaries, was then
assembled. See Dort. In consequence of the decisions of Dort, some of the Arminian ministers were
exiled, others put in prison. See ARMINIANS.

The Gomarists, with the partisans of Maurice, commenced
in Nov. 1618, the trial of the three prisoners. Twenty-
six witnesses were called from the city of Amsterdam, two
were appointed to judge them. After hearing, under appearance of legality, murdered Barneveldt in spite
of the remonstrances of Du Maurier, ambassador of France, and a friend of Grotius, they began the trial
of the latter. He declined to recognize their compe-
tence, claiming that he could only be judged by the
States of Holland. His remonstrances were of no avail;
five hours' time and one sheet of paper were all the
facilities afforded him for his defense. He was
condemned on the 18th of May, 1619, to perpetual im-
prisonment. He was at liberty conditionally. Pursuant
to this sentence, he was conveyed on the 6th of June,
in the same year, to the fortress of Loeveesteyn, situated
at the extremity of an island formed by the Maas and
the Waal. His wife was allowed to share her hus-
band's imprisonment, but Grotius' father was refused
permission to visit him by the Synod. During his imprison-
ment, Grotius, contrary to the learned flippancy of Chrestian's court, and resolved
on quitting Sweden. The climate, also, did not agree
with him. The queen, having in vain tried to retain
him in her service, made him a present of a large sum
of money, and of some goods, which she gave him a vessel, in which he embarked for Lubeck on the
2th of August; but a violent storm, by which his ship
was tossed about during three days, obliged him to
land on the 17th in Pomerania, about 15 leagues from
Dantzig, whence he proceeded towards Lubeck. He
arrived at Rostock on the 20th, very ill from the fa-
tigues of the journey, and from exposure to wind and
rain in an open carriage; he died on the 29th of Au-
gust, 1645, in the sixty-third year of his age. His last
moments were spent in religious preparation, and he
died expressing the sentiments of a true Christian.

His body was entombed to Delft and deposited in the
grave of his ancestors, where a monument was erected
to him in 1781. (English Cyclopedia.)

Of the many claims on posterity of this distinguished
man, we have only to consider those which relate to
theological and critical studies of theology. We
notice, first, his exegetical writings. His "Annotations on the O. and N. T." (Abb.
notat, in libro evangeliorum et varia loca S. Scripturae [Amst. 1641]), Annotation in Epist. ad Philemonem [ib. 1642, 8vo; 1646, 8vo], Annotation in varia loca S. Scripturae..., Annotation in varia loca S. T. [ib. 1644, 2 vols., 4to], Annotation in varia loca S. T. [ib. 1644, 2 vols., 4to; 1647, 2 vols., 4to] remained for a long time unknown almost to
all except Arminian divines, and some Calvinists even
spoke of them as dangerous works; for instance, Abr. Calov in Bibl. V. et N. T. Illustrat. The chief cause of the present popularity of Grotius's exegesis is purely
philological and historical character. In this respect Grotius may be considered as the forerunner of Ernesti.

Valuable, however, as these writings are in this re-
spect, the notes and comments which heinserted in his Apology characteristic of his classical training and
style, and the critical and exegetical character of his work De Juris Publici et Privati, which was published in the next year. During his residence in France he was constantly anno
d with importunities to pass over to the Roman Catholic religion. But,

though he was tired of the country, and received invi-
tions from the duke of Guise, and the king of
Denmark, he declined them. Gustavus Adolphus also
made him offers, which, after his death, were repeated
by Ozenstern in the name of queen Christina. In
the mean time the stadtholder Maurice died, and his
successor seeming less hostile to Grotius, he was in-
duced by the extraordinary generosity of his friends to return. He arrived at Rotterdam in September,
1631, and the news of his return excited a great sensa-
tion throughout all Holland. But, in spite of all the
efforts of his friends, he was again obliged to leave the
country, and went (1632) to Hamburg, where he lived
1633, and then to the electoral court at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, who appointed him councillor
to the queen of Sweden, and her ambassador at the
court of France. The object of the embassy was to
obtain the assistance of France against the emperor.
Grotius arrived at Paris in March, 1635; and although
he had many difficulties to encounter from Richelieu,
and afterwards from Mazarin, he maintained the rights
and promoted the interests of his adopted sovereign
with great firmness. He continued in his post till 1644, when he was recalled at his own request. Har-
ting his position of chief minister by the abdication of
his return at Dieppe, and on his landing at Amster-
dam (1645) was received with great distinction,
and entertained at the public expense. From Amsterdam he proceeded by Hamburg and Lubeck to Stockholm,
where he was received in the most flattering manner
by the king, who, however, did not employ him in
the learned flippancy of the court, and resolved
on quitting Sweden. The climate, also, did not agree
with him. The queen, having in vain tried to retain
him in her service, made him a present of a large sum
of money, and of some goods, which she gave him a vessel, in which he embarked for Lubeck on the
12th of August; but a violent storm, by which his ship
was tossed about during three days, obliged him to
land on the 17th in Pomerania, about 15 leagues from
Dantzig, whence he proceeded towards Lubeck. He
arrived at Rostock on the 20th, very ill from the fa-
tigues of the journey, and from exposure to wind and
rain in an open carriage; he died on the 29th of Au-
gust, 1645, in the sixty-third year of his age. His last
moments were spent in religious preparation, and he
died expressing the sentiments of a true Christian.

His body was entombed to Delft and deposited in the
grave of his ancestors, where a monument was erected
to him in 1781. (English Cyclopedia.)

Of the many claims on posterity of this distinguished
man, we have only to consider those which relate to
theological and critical studies of theology. We
notice, first, his exegetical writings. His "Annotations on the O. and N. T." (Am-
notat, in libro evangeliorum et varia loca S. Scripturae [Amst. 1641]), Annotation in Epist. ad Philo-
menon [ib. 1642, 8vo; 1646, 8vo], Annotation in varia loca S. Scripturae..., Annotation in varia loca S. T. [ib. 1644, 2 vols., 4to], Annotation in varia loca S. T. [ib. 1644, 2 vols., 4to; 1647, 2 vols., 4to] remained for a long time unknown almost to
all except Arminian divines, and some Calvinists even
spoke of them as dangerous works; for instance, Abr. Calov in Bibl. V. et N. T. Illustrat. The chief cause of the present popularity of Grotius's exegesis is purely
philological and historical character. In this respect Grotius may be considered as the forerunner of Ernesti.

Valuable, however, as these writings are in this re-
spect, the notes and comments which heinserted in his Apology characteristic of his classical training and
style, and the critical and exegetical character of his work De Juris Publici et Privati, which was published in the next year. During his residence in France he was constantly anno
d with importunities to pass over to the Roman Catholic religion. But,
the Mount, but this should only have been the preparatory step to a full elucidation of the points wherein the imputation of Christ differs from that of antiquity. Thus, also, it was quite correct in the elucidation of the O.-T. prophecies to reject the practice of an arbitrary typology of separate passages taken without regard to their original historical connection. But Grotius went towards the other extreme, and gave at least a show of generality; he made of a remnant, merely of a fragment, a whole; he made of the O. T. everywhere in the O. T., while Grotius found him nowhere. On Grotius's merits as an interpreter, see Segara, Oratio de Hugone Grocio, illustri humanorum et divinorum N. T. scriptorum interprete (Ultr. 1785, 8vo); Meier, Gesch. d. Schriftenverkehr (iii, p. 434 sq.).

In 1652, Grotius was called into an inquiry by the Stadtholder of the States of Holland as to the O. T. is contained in his exposition of the 1Sa 26:23 in the Annotations on Matt. i, 22, which is worthy of being studied.

In the field of Apologetics Grotius achieved a great and enduring success by the publication of his treatise De sacrate religionis christianae (1627; often reprinted). The best editions are those of Clerecus (1709, 1717, 1724, 8vo) and of J. C. Köcher (Jena, 1727, 8vo; Halle, 1784-89, 3 vols. 8vo). It was translated into German by Hoff (Chemnitz, 1768, etc.); French, by Le Jeune (1630, 1669); into English, by Clarke (1793), by Middleton (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Arabic, by Pocock (1660, etc.), and even into Chinese and Malay. The first plan of it was drawn up by Grotius in 1652 while a prisoner at Loovereit. The original object of this prison work, which was written for the express purpose of qualifying himself for a visit which should come in contact with the heathen, arguments in defense of their faith. But when translated into Latin prose it found its way into the highest circles of educated men, and was, until very recently, a standard text-book on the evidences of Christianity. In this work Grotius may be said to have erected apologetics into a science, and thus rendered immense service, even though his treatment of the subject does not meet all the wants of the present age. It is divided into six books, of which the first treats of the existence and attributes of God; the second, of the excellence of the doctrine and ethics of Christianity; the third, of the authenticity of the books of the New Testament; the last three, of objections supposed to be made on the part of pagans, Mohammedans, and Jews.

Grotius accepts the Arminian system as regards the doctrine of predestination. He pronounced clearly for the universality of divine grace, without, however, falling into Pelagianism, an accusation often brought against him, but which he vigorously repelled. See his Conciliatio Dissertationis de re libertatis praedestinationis, in which he terms his Doctrinæ ad Pelagianam sicut ad dogmatam quæ sub eo nomine tradatur, both treatises are given in his Opera Theologica, vol. iii. He also refuted in his Christologia the accusation of inclining to Socinianism in his views on the doctrine of redemption. He defended the doctrine of the expiatory nature of the death of Christ against the Socinians in his Defensio fidei catholici de satisfactione Christi adversus F. Soci- nium (Leyden, 1617; often reprinted). The Socinians answered in the person of Crelly by the Responsio ad Librum Grothii de Satisfactione, which was refused by Stillingsfeet, etc. But the orthodoxy, on the other hand, attacked Grotius on account of his theory of the atonement; and it is certainly true that he differs as well from the theory of satisfaction of Anselm as from the orthodox system both of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. In place of a real satisfaction, Grotius substitutes a solutio on the part of God for the sake of Christ; he saw in the death of Christ more a substitutum than a satisfactory act; it was not a penal example, by which, on the one hand, the majesty of God's law was vindicated, and, on the other, his horror of the sin of the world was exemplified in a most striking manner. Baur (Versammlung, 1852) gives a clear, and, in the main, fair account of the Grotian theory of atonement, from a translation of part of which, by the Rev. J. Swain, in the Bibliotheca Sacra for April, 1852, we extract the following:

'The fundamental error of the Socinian view was found by Grotius to be this: that Socinians regarded God in the work of redemption as holding the place of a creditor or, in short, as a creditor, whose simple will is a sufficient discharge from the existing obligation. But, as we have in the subject before us to deal with punishment and the remission of punishment, God cannot be looked upon as a creditor, or an injured party, since the act of inflicting punishment does not belong to the cognizance of the creditor, or of the creditor's servant. It is not one of the rights of an absolute master or of a creditor, these being merely personal in their character; it is the right of a ruler only. Hence God must be considered as a ruler, and the right to punish belongs to the ruler as such, since, as demonstrated, not for the punisher's sake, but for the commonwealth, to maintain its order, and to promote the public good. The act of atonement itself is defined in general as a judicial act, in accordance with which one person is punished in order that another may be freed from punishment, or as an act of divorce, by which a husband or wife is divorced. This is the ground on which all positive laws are relaxed. The threat of punishment in Gen. ii, 17, contains in itself, therefore, the implied right to dispense with the infliction of that punishment, and that, too, without supposing any essential change in God himself, since a law in relation to God is nothing having an internal force and authority of its own (zichts inneheurts), but is merely an operation or effect of the divine will. The objection that none but the guilty person himself can receive the punishment which is due to his crime is answered by the distinction that although every sinner, as such, does, according with the very idea of sin, deserve punishment, still it is not a matter of absolute necessity that this punishment should be actually inflicted. As, therefore, the remission of punishment is a thing which is not in its nature impossible, and as the circumstances of each particular case do decide how far such remission shall really be admitted. If the authority of law is not to be dangerously weakened, it should be admitted only in cases of the greatest exigency. Such a clear case is that which is offered in the case of the very subject, on which we have been dealing, the case where, by the actual infliction of the punishment, the entire race of man becomes devoted to death; and as, on the one side, the possibility of the remission of punishment cannot be denied, so, on the other, it cannot be shown to be absolutely unjust that one person should be punished for another's sin. The essential thing in punishment is that it should be inflicted in consequence of sin, not that it should be inflicted upon the person who committed the sin. If, now, it admits of no doubt that a superior may properly inflict upon a subject, as the punishment of another's sin, whatever he might properly inflict upon him irrespectively of another's sin, then may God, without incurring the charge of injustice, permit Christ to suffer and die for the sins of men. This course, then, being in itself a permissible one, the only question is why God actually determined to do it. As the Scripture says that Christ suffered and died for our sins, we are to infer that God purposed not to forgive sins so numerous and so great without a striking penal example, in order to show his displeasure at sin by some act which should in strictest propriety be termed a penal act. And besides this inward reason, lying in the very nature of
the Deity, and called in Scripture the wrath of God, the was the additional consideration that the less sin is punished more lightly it will be regarded. Prudence itself, therefore, must lead the Deity to exact the punishment, especially where such punishment has been justly intended beforehand. Thus, in the penal example furnished by the death of Christ, there is exhibited at once the divine grace and the divine severity, the hatred of God against sin and his care for the maintenance of the law. And this is the mode of relaxing the laws which jurists themselves pronounce the best in the contexts of composition; because, if the court were to hold that the least injury is done to the authority of the law, and the design with which the law was made is effectually secured, when one who is charged with the delivery of a thing is free from his liability on its full value, for theft of a thing and the same value are terms very nearly related. Such a composition may take place not only with respect to things, but also with respect to persons, when it can be done without injury to another.

In these few statements is contained the entire theory of the Grotius. The real object of consideration in this main proposition: God neither would nor could forgive the sins of men without the setting up of a penal example. This is done by the death of Christ. Hence the death of Christ is the necessary condition of the forgiveness of sin, and what it always actually means in the theory, is this: that upon the idea of a penal example and of its presupposed necessity, and the question for us now to consider is how, by means of that idea, it stands related, on the one hand, to the theory of the Church which it would defend, and, on the other, to the Socinian theory which it would conflict.

As to its relation to the satisfaction-theory held by the Church, it will be seen at once that it asserts the necessity of the death of Christ in order to the forgiveness of sin, in a sense wholly different from that which the Church intends. The idea of the necessity of the death of Christ is necessary only as a penal example, then its necessity is grounded, not in the very nature of God himself, not in the idea of absolute justice, by which sin, guilt, and punishment are inseparably bound together, but merely in that outward relation which God holds to men. The connection, therefore, the design of punishment is an inherent, internal connection, founded in the very nature of sin; the design of punishment is merely to prevent sin; or, in other words, it is connected with sin only in consequence of a positive law emanating from God as the supreme Ruler. Hence the final ground upon which Grotius goes back to prove the necessity of instituting a penal example is merely the penal sanction contained in Gen. ii, 17. The advocates of the satisfaction-theory, indeed, go back to the same sentence, but only to remark in it a necessary connection between the divine justice. Grotius, on the contrary, takes the absolute idea of divine justice entirely away; for he affirms, in opposition to Socinus, that justice is an attribute which belongs of itself to the very nature of God, but at the same time asserts that the actual exercise of the attribute depends on the will of God, it is precisely the same as the assertion of Socinus himself, that penal justice is the effect of the divine will; and if he further says that God does what he does not without a cause, still the ultimate ground is not God's absolute nature, but his absolute will, which in itself equally competent to punish or not to punish.

Here, then, is an important distinction between the theory of Grotius and that of the Church. The main point in the Church's theory of satisfaction is that, if Christ had not made a strict and perfect satisfaction for men, they could not have been released from sin. Socinus objected to this that satisfaction and forgiveness were contradictory ideas. This assertion Grotius, in the name of the Church, which he so strongly maintained, could not admit. He therefore replied that satisfaction and forgiveness were not strictly simultaneously; that, according to the conditions established by God, the latter then first follows the former when a man by faith in Christ turns to God and prays him for the forgiveness of sins. This distinction could not be made if the objection of Socinus is to be successfully met, and the two ideas are to be permitted to stand side by side. But Grotius could not stop here. If it is only a penal example that is furnished by the death of Christ, the idea of satisfaction, strictly speaking, has no further relevancy. As, however, Grotius wished to retain this idea, he brought to his assistance a peculiar distinction which is made in law between the two ideas denoted respectively by the terms solutio and satisfactio. If, said Grotius, the very thing which is owed be paid satisfaction and remission must, why should in this case the thing, by another in the debtor's name, then the discharge of the debt takes place by that very act; but it is to be called a discharge, not a remission (remissio). Not so, however, when something else is paid than the specific thing which was due. In this case, there is a discharge of the debt, a discharge, according to the creditor or ruler, an act of remission as a personal act; and it is this kind of payment, which may be either accepted or refused by the creditor, which is properly called, in the technical language of the law, satisfaction. While, therefore, it was the original design of Grotius, in all this, merely to prove, in opposition to Socinus, that the idea of satisfaction did not exclude that of remission, what he really did was to substitute in place of the common idea of satisfaction a totally different one; for the common idea of satisfaction re-essentially supposes the supposition that Christ has rendered precisely the same thing which men themselves were to have rendered. If, now, such a payment (solutio) be, as Grotius asserts, no remission (remissio), but only a discharge (liberatio), then it must be conceded to Socinus, which was the thing contested by Grotius, that the liberalis was to be substituted for the solutio. This is a contradiction and excludes each other, or, in other words, that the satisfaction which was made by Christ does not render the name of satisfaction in the sense which the common theory of the Church connected with that expression. But Christ has not made any satisfaction in this sense, if he has not truly and perfectly rendered for men what they were to have rendered for themselves, then the idea of satisfaction can be applied only so far as he has given to God something, whatever that something may be, in place of that which was to have been rendered by men themselves in their relation to God. This, then, is the precise meaning of the theory of Grotius, and the difference between it and the satisfaction-theory of the Church. The idea of satisfaction is let down from its full and real import to the idea of a mere rendering of something; Christ has made satisfaction in a sense that he has not made any satisfaction; so far as he has given to God something with reference to that end. This something is that penal example without the setting forth of which God could not have forgiven the sins of men.

Many of the writings of Grotius are important in the sphere of Church History: such are, for instance, his Hist. Gothorum, Vandalorum et Longobardorum (1605); and his Annales et hist. de rebus Britannicis ab obtine Philippi Africani regis aetate ad annum 1603. He also states in a letter several questions of ecclesiastical jurisprudence in his De imperio summorum pontificum circa sacra (Opp. theol. iii, p. 201), in which he sides with Arminius in
favor of the territorial system against the opinion of Gomara. The theological writings of Grothus are collected under the title Opera omnia theologica (Lond. 1679, fol. 8 vols.). The first vol. contains a Life of Grothus, with his Amot in V. T.; vol. ii contains the Amot in N. T.; vol. iii includes his miscellaneous theological writings. There has been many lives of Grothus, none of them adequate except Brandt, Hist. zum heiligen des Heeren Huig de Groot (Amst. 1727, 2 vols. fol.). See also Lehmann, Grothi Mones ab iniquis obstructationibus vindicati (Delft, 1777; Buriginy, Vie de Grothus (Paris, 1752, 2 vols. 8vo), translated into English (Lond. 1754, 8vo); Butler, Life of Grothus (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Cruzier, Luther und Grothus (Heidelb. 1816, 8vo); Cras, Laudatio H. Grothus (Amst. 1796, 8vo); Luden, H. Grothus nach seinen Schicksalen und Schriften dargestellt (Berlin, 1806, 8vo); Seegeg, Orat. de Grothus (Utrecht, 1785, 4to); Bayle, Dictionary, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, v., 365 sq.; Niceros, Mémoires pour servir, vol. xix.; Schrock, Kirchengeschichte, v., 216; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxiii., 197 sq.; Piper, Kalender, 1867; Nichols, Calvinism and Arminianism, ii., 582-641; Shedd, Hist. of Doctrines, ii., 547 sq.

Groves, the representative in the A. V. in certain passages of two Heb. words. 1. גְּרֶם (or גְּרֶמֶה, asherah') (from גְּרֶמֶה, to be upright). Selden was the first who endeavored to show that the Granum or Grumus of the Sept. and Vulg. is generally rendered grove, in which our authorized version has followed them—must in some places, for the sake of the sense, be taken to mean a wooden image of Ashethoreth (De Dies Syria, ii, 2). Not long after, Spencer made the same assertion (In Leg. Hebrom, ii, 16). Vitringa then followed out the same argument in his note on Isa. xvii. 8. Gesenius, at length, has treated the whole question so elaborately in his Thesaurus (p. 162) as to leave little to be desired, and has evinced that Asherah is a name, and also denotes an image of this goddess. Some of the arguments which support this partial, or, in Gesenius' case, total rejection of the signification grove for asherah are briefly as follows: It is argued that it almost always occurs with words which denote idols and statures of idols; that the verbs which are employed to express the making an Asherah are incompatible with the idea of a grove, as they are such as to build, to shape, to erect (except in one passage, where, however, Gesenius still maintains that the verb there used means to erect); that the words used to denote the destruction of an Asherah are those of breaking to pieces, subverting; that the image of Asherah is placed in the Temple (2 Kings xxiii. 7); and that Asherah is coupled with Baal in precisely the same way as Ashethoreth is (comp. Judg. ii, 18; x, 6; 1 Kings xviii. 19; 2 Kings xxiii. 4; and particularly Judg. iii, 7, and ii, 13, where the plural form of both words is explained as of itself denoting images of this goddess; see also 2 Chron. xxvii. 10; xxiv. 3, 4). Besides, Selden objects that the signification is even incongruous in 2 Kings xvii, 10, where we read of "setting up groves under every green tree." Moreover, the Sept. has rendered Asherah by Astrota in 2 Chron. xv, 16 (and the Vulg. has done the same in Judg. ii, 7), and, conversely, has turned every Naboth's groves in 1 Sam. vii, 8. See Ashethoreth: High-place.

On the strength of those arguments most modern scholars assume that Asherah is a name for Ashethoreth, and that it denotes more especially the relation of that goddess to the planet Venus, as the lesser star of good fortune. It appears, namely, to be an indisputable fact that both Baal and Ashethoreth, although their primary relation was to the sun and moon, came in process of time to be connected, in the religious conceptions of the Syrio-Arameans, with the planets Jupiter and Venus, as the two stars of good fortune. See Meni. We may instance the connection between Artemis and Selene; that between Juno and the planet Venus, mentioned in Cruzier, ii, 566; the fact that astra is also the name of the same planet in the religious books of the Tsalians (Norberg's Doctrinal, vol. ii, p. 20). It is in reference to this connection, too, that a star is so often found among the emblems with which Ashethoreth is represented on ancient coins. Lastly, while the word Asherah cannot, in the sense of grove, be legitimately deduced from the primitive or secondary signification of any Syrio-Aramean root, as a name of the goddess of good fortune it admits of a derivation as natural in a philological point of view as it is appropriate in signification. The verb עֵשֶּב means to prepare; and Asherah is the feminine of an adjective signifying fortunate, happy. See Asherah.

We must not omit to notice a probable connection between this symbol or image—whatever it was—and the sacred symbolic trees, the representation of which occurs so frequently on Assyrian sculptures, and is shown in the subjoined woodcut. The connection is ingeniously maintained by Mr. Ferguson in his Nineveh and Persepolis restored (p. 299-304), to which the reader is referred.
the Hindoo, and wsx as the Persian synonym. The tamarisk and its products were highly valued by the Arabs for their medicinal properties, and are described in several places under different names in Avicenna. If we refer to travellers in Eastern countries, we shall find that most of them mention the aškāl. Thus Prosper Alpinus (De Plantis Ægyptiis, c. ix. De Tamariscae asto vocata) gives a figure which sufficiently shows that it must grow to the size of a large tree, and says that he had heard of its attaining, in another place, to the size of a large oak; that its wood was employed for making a variety of vessels, and its charcoal used throughout Egypt and Arabia; and that different parts of it were employed in medicines. So Forskål, who calls the species Tamaricis orientalis, gives all as its

Arabic name, and identifies it with ezbel. So Belon (Observe. ii, 28). In Arabia Burckhardt found the tree called צד in the neighborhood of Medina, and observes that the Arabs cultivated it on account of the hardness of its wood. If we endeavor to trace a species of tamarisk in Syria, we shall find some difficulty from the want of precision in the information supplied by travellers on subjects of Natural History. But a French naturalist, M. Bové, who travelled from Cairo to Mount Sinai, and from thence into Syria, has given ample proofs of the existence of species of tamarisk in these regions. A minute description of the tree under its Arabic name is given by I. E. Faber, in Frib. und Reiesh. Opusc. med. ex mon. Ar. p. 137. It is very remarkable that the only tree which is found growing among the ruins of Babylon is a tamarisk. "The one in question is in appearance like the weeping-willow, but the trunk is hollow through age, and partly shattered. The Arabs venerate it as sacred, in consequence of the calf All having reposed under its shade after the battle of Hillah." (Rosenmüller, Bibl. Greg. ii, p. 20, from Ker Porter; comp. Ainsworth's Researches, p. 125.) From the characteristics of the tamarisk-tree of the East, it certainly appears as likely as any to have been planted in Beer-sheba by Abraham, because it is one of the few trees which will flourish and grow to a great size even in the arid desert. Besides the advantage of affording shade in a hot country, it is also esteemed on account of the excellence of its wood, which is converted into charcoal. It is of less valuable on account of the galls with which its branches are often loaded, and which are nearly as astringent as oak-galls. See TAMARISC.

3. It is now generally recognised (see Gesen. Thes. 50 b; Stanley, S. and F. 7, 76, 3; p. 124 note, 220 note) that the word Elun, ἔλον, which is uniformly rendered by the A. V. "plain," signifies a grove or plantation.

Such were the Elons of Manre (Gen. xiii, 18; xiv, 12; xviii, 1); of Moreh (Gen. xii, 6; Deut. xiii, 30; of Zaanain (Josh. xix, 83); of the pillar (Judg. ix, 6); of Meonom (Judg. ix, 57); and of Tabor (1 Sam. x, 8). In all these cases the Sept. has ἐλυς or πολυσυς; the Vulgate—which the A. V. probably followed—Vallis or Convalium; and in the last three, however, Quercus. See ELOM.

In the religions of the ancient heathen world groves play a prominent part. In old times altars only were erected to the gods. It was thought wrong to shut up the gods in temples. Hence, as Pliny expressively tells us (H. N. xi, 22), "trees were the first temples" (Titc. Germ. 2; Lucian, de Sacrific. 10; see Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 335), and from the earliest times groves are mentioned in connection with religious worship (Gen. xii, 6, 7; xiii, 18; Deut. xi, 30; A. V. "plain"); and this custom, though lost in high antiquity, refreshing shade, solemn silence, and awe-inspiring solitude, as well as the striking illustration they afford of natural life, marked them out as the fit localities, or even the actual objects of worship ("Lucos et in siletia ipsa adoramur," Pliny, xii, 1; "Secretum lucil... et admiratio umbra domo tibi sider numinis facta," Sib. Ep. xii; "Quo posses viso dicere Numen habet," Ovid, Fast. iii, 295; "Sacra nemus acculet umbrā," Virgil, Georg. iii, 384; comp. Ovid, Met. viii, 743; see Ezek. vi, 13; Isa. lxi, 5; Hos. iv, 13). This last passage hints at another and darker reason why groves were of great importance for the worship of the gods of idolatry; they conveyed the atrociies and obscenities of heathen worship. The groves were generally found connected with temples, and often had the right of affording an asylum (Titc. Germ. 3, 40; Herod. ii, 138; Virgil, Aen. i, 441; ii, 512; Sil. Ital. 8, 83). Some have supposed that the even the Jewish Temple had a νυμφαιος planted with palm, olive, and cypress (1 Sam. xiii, 17, 18), and olive (Psa. iii, 8), as the mosque which stands on its site now has. This is more than doubtful; but we know that a celebrated oak stood by the sanctuary at Shechem (Josh. xxiv, 26; Judg. ix, 4; Stanley, Sinai and Pal. p. 142). We may repeat mentioned of groves consecrated with deep superstition to particular gods (Livy, vii, 25; xxiv, 3; xxxx, 51; Titc. Ann. ii, 12, 51, etc.; iv, 73, etc.). For this reason they were stringently forbidden to the Jews (2 Esd. xxiv, 15; Jer. xvii, 2; Ezek. xx, 28), and Malachi (xvii, 18) lays down the law that it is forbidden to build the shade of any green tree where an idol-statue was (Fabric. Bibl. Antiq. p. 290). Yet we find abundant indications that the Hebrews felt the influence of groves on the mind ("the spirit in the woods," Wordsworth). They were selected for their solemn purity, such as great national meetings (Judg. ix, 6, 37) and the burial of the dead (Gen. xxxvii, 8; 1 Sam. xxxi, 14), Those connected with patriarchal history were peculiarly liable to superstitions reverence (Amos v, 5; vii, 19); and we find that the groves of Mamre were in a place of worship (Josh., H. E. ii, 4; Euseb. Vit. Const. p. 81; Roland, Palest. p. 714). There are in Scripture many memorable trees; e.g. Allon-bachuth (Gen. xxxvii, 8), the tamarisk (see above) in Gibeon (1 Sam. xxii, 6), the terebinth in Shechem (Josh. xx iv, 26, under which the law was set up), the palmtree of Deborah (Judg. iv, 5), the terebinth of the encampments (Judg. i, 37), the terebinth of wandering (Judg. iv, 11), and others (1 Sam. xiv, 2, 8; x, 8; sometimes "plain" in A. V., Vulg. "convalia").

This observation of particular trees was mentioned in the heathen religions. The particular worship of the gods may be traced from the interior of Africa not only into Egypt and Arabia, but also onward uninter ruptedly into Palestine and Syria, Assyria, Persia, India, Thibet, Slav, the Philippines Islands, China, Japan, and Siberia; also westward into Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and other countries; and in most of the countries here named it obtains in the present day; combined as it has been in other parts with various forms
of idolatry." (Poole, Gen. of Earth and Man, p. 139).

"The worship of trees even goes back among the Ira-
nians to the rules of Hom, called in the Zend-Avesta
the promulgator of the old law. We know from Her-
odotus the delight which Xerxes took in the great
plane-tree in Lydia, in which he bestowed golden or-
naments, and appointed for it a sentinel in the person
of one of the 'immortal Ten Thousand.' The early
veneration of trees was associated, by the moist and re-
freshing canopy of foliage, with that of sacred foun-
sains. In similar connection with the early worship
of nature were among the Hellenic nations the fame
of the sacred olive, and the evergreen pines and plat-
tanus in Arcadia. The Buddhists of Ceylon venerate
the colossal Indian fig-tree of Anurap-depaura. . . .
As single trees thus became objects of veneration from the
beauty of their form, so did also groups of trees, under
the name of 'groves of oaks.'" (Humboldt, Cosmos, i, 86, Eng. ed.). The custom of adorning trees "with jewels and mantles" was very ancient.

"(Isid., ed. H. ii., 14; Theod. ed. xxiv.; Ovid, Met. ivii, 723, 745; Arnob. de Gent., ii., 30; and even still exists in the East.)

The sacred trees of antiquity are well known (Homer, H. vi., 233; Od. i., 237; Soph. Tract. 746; Virgil, Georg., ii., 36; Sili. Ital. ii., 13); such a god had some sacred tree (Virgil, Eccl. vii., 61 sq.). The Christi-
ans are said to have worshipped a palm, and the Celts an
oak (Max. Tyr. Dialett. 38, in Godwyn's Mos. and
Art. ii., 1). On the Druidic veneration of oak-groves,
see Pliny, H. n. vi., 44; Tacit. Ann. xiv., 30. In the
same way, according to the missionary Olendrop, the
negroes have sacred groves, the abodes of a deity, and
which no negro ventures to enter except the priests")
(Pricharch, Nat. Hist. of Man, p. 525-539, 3d ed; Park's Travels, p. 63).

So, too, the ancient Egyptians (Raw-
linson's Herod. ii., 299). Long after the introduction of
Christianity it was found, necessary to forbid all
abuse of trees and groves to the purposes of supersti-
tion (Harduin, Act. Concil. i., 988; see Orelli, ad Tac.
Germ. 9). See Pehnen, De arbo non plantanda ad
allure Deli (Lipsi, 1725); Dresler, De levia religionis gentilis,
destitutis (Lipsi, 1740); Lakenhamer, Antiqu. Grac. ac-
rae. (Lipsi, 1786 sq).

GROVE, Henry, a Presbyterian divine of distinc-
tion, was born at Taunton, Somersetshire, Jan. 4, 1683.
He received his academic training under Mr. War-
ren at Taunton, whose school was in excellent repute.
At 22 he began to preach; at 23 he succeeded Mr. War-
ren as head of the Taunton Academy. At first he taught
ethics, but in 1725 he began to teach theology also. He
at the same time succeeded Mr. Japesh in his pastoral
charge at Fullwood, near Taunton, in which he con-
tinued till his death. In 1730 he published The Ex-
scription of our Saviour's Redemption considered, and the
same year, Some Thoughts concerning the Proof of a Future
State, from Reason. In 1729 he printed A Discourse
concerning the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper,
where he set that institution in the same light as bish-
op Hoadly. In 1734 he published, without his name,
Wisdom the First Spring of Action in the Deity, which
was animadverted on by Bolugu. He in 1736 published
A Discourse on Sufficient Proof. He died February 9,
1737-8. After his death came out by subscription his
Posthumous Works (1740, 4 vols. 8vo); also Sermons
(Lond. 1742, 2 vols. 8vo); Works published in his life-
time (Lond. 1747, 4 vols. 8vo); System of Moral Philos.
(Lond. 1742, 2 vols. 8vo); a Collection of Sermons by
Grove, prefixed to his Posthumous Works (1745; vol. 1);

GRUBER, Jacob, a Methodist Episcopal minister,
was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Feb. 3, 1878, of
German Lutheran parents. He was converted at four-
teen or fifteen; entered the travelling ministry, in the
Philadelphia Conference, in 1890; labored fifty years,
chiefly in Pennsylvania and Maryland, with abundant
usefulness, and died May 25, 1950. Mr. Gruber was
"a singular and extraordinary man." He was alike
remarkable for "strength and originality of mind, en-
emical depth of character, energy of character, and
power of endurance, extensive usefulness, and simplic-
ity and regularity of life." His conversion was pow-
erful, and, although driven from his home in youth for
his religious course, he kept his faith. Through his
long life his vigor and industry were untiring, and he
was ever ready to help any good cause until the year of
his death. Although eccentric, and often rude in style, he
was nevertheless a sound theologian and an able defender of Methodism. In the pulpit he
was sometimes grand and overwhelming. "He spent
thirty-twelve years on circuits, seven in stations, and
eleven as presiding elder. Many anecdotes are on
record of his eccentric wit and sarcasm, and of his
great control over men."—Minutes of Conferences, iv,
519; Wakeley, Heroes of Methodism, p. 407; Strickland,
Life of Gruber (N. Y. 1860, 12mo).

GRUNER, Johann Friedrich, a German theologian
and philologist, was born at Coburg in 1723. He study-
ed at the university of that city, and afterward at
Jena. In 1747 he became professor of Latin and of
Roman archaeology in Jena, afterwards professor of el-
oquence at Coburg, and in 1764 professor of theology at
Halle. He died March 29, 1778. His principal works, so far as they relate to theology, are, Mosis, Jovis
et Ieshu sacra (Jena, 1750); De Oilt Romanorum ade-
us Christianos causa (Coburg, 1755); De origine
Episcoporum et curorum in Ecclesia primitiva Jure (Halle,
1761); Anweisung z. geistlichen Beredemkeit (Halle,
1761); Versuch eines prymtischen Anwugs von d. Kirchenpraelazartheit und Christenheit (Halle, 1766);
Lehrbuch in d. Religion und d. Heiligen Schrift (Halle, 1773); Institutionum Theologiae dogmatische Libri tres
(Halle, 1777); Observationum criticalium Libri ii. (Jena,
1777). See Harlesius, Vite Philologorum, i, 254-255. Hoefler,
Deutschlands.

GRYNEUS, Johann, a Swiss Protestant theologi-
ian, was born at Leutelsingen (Basle) in 1705. He
acquired great proficiency in theology and the Oriental
languages, and was for seven years professor in the
theological faculty of Basle. He died in that city April
11, 1744. He wrote Gymnæus Theol. missic. (Basle,
1746, 8vo), a learned and valuable work.—Hoefler,

GRYNEUS, Johann Jacob, D.D., a Swiss Protes-
tant theologian, third son of Thomas Gryneus (q.v.),
was born at Berns Oct. 1, 1540. He studied at Basle,
as ordained deacon in 1550, and in 1556 succeeded
his father as pastor. In 1577 he became professor of
theology at Basle, and remained there until 1584, when
he removed to Heidelberg. In 1586 he returned to
Basle, where he died head pastor (anistes) of the city,
Aug. 30, 1617 (Aug. 31, 1618, according to Michaud).
He published Variarum Patrum Graecorum et Latinum
Monumenta orthodogmatica (Basle, 1569, 2 vols. fol.)—Ecdesiaestica Historia Eusebii Pamphilii, Ruff-
fini, Socratis, Theodori, Somm., Thodori, Egurgii, et
Dorothy, etc. (Basle, 1571, 1578, 1611, fol.);—Epitoma Sacrorum Bibliorvm, pars 1 (Basle, 1577, 8vo)—Char-
acter Christianorum, seu de fide, spe et charitati do-
trina, etc. (Basle, 1578, 8vo)—Synopsis Historie Hum-
inae, seu de prima hominis origine, ejusque corruptione,
reconciliatione, etc. (Basle, 1576, 8vo);—Chronologia
bravae Historie Evangelicae (Basle, 1580);—Schegraphia
Sacrae Theologiae (Basle, 1577, 4to);—Censura theologica
de prima Antichristiana et errorologica (Basle,
1584);—Theologia et Primaeterna Theologia (Basle,
1590, 3 vols.).—De virius illustrioris purorum opere De
reformati ecclesiae usus est (1602); and a large

Gryneus or Gryneus, Simon, surname Ma<er>, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Vehringen (Hohenzollern) in 1495. He studied at Pforzheim and Vienna, and early embraced the Reformation. He taught Greek at Heidelberg from 1524 to 1529. In 1534 he went to Tubingen, commissioned by duke Ulrich of Württemberg to reform the churches of that place. In 1536 he settled at Basle, where he died of the plague Aug. 1, 1541. Intimately connected with Melancthon, Luther, Calvin, Thomas More, and others, Gryneus was a zealous promoter of the Reformation, and, as such, was exposed to great dangers, but always managed to get out of them unharmed, thanks to his powerful protectors. He was present at the diets of Spiers and of Worms, and went to England in 1531 to confer with Henry VIII about his divorce. He was employed to collect the opinions of the Reformed theologians on that subject. A great admirer of the classics, he did much to promote the interests of English education in the German universities. He discovered in a convent on the Rhine the last five books of Livy (published by Erasmus, Basle, 1531, fol.). Gryneus published Latin translations of the works of Plutarch, Aristotle, and Chrysostom, the first Greek edition of the *Liberatae medici (Basle, 1537 and 40), and of the *Almagest of Pтолемей (Basle, 1538, fol.). He was also the author of *Nors Orbis regionum ac insularum veteri.bu incognitarum, etc. (Basle, 1532-1555, fol.). See Brucker, *Historia critica Philosoph. vol. iv, section iii, p. 103 sq.; *Historia Literarum, iii, 497; *Melch. Adam, *Vita Theolog. p. 56; *Athenea Rusticae, ii, 69-72; *Reimann, Hist. Lit. Histor. iv, 207; *Hoefer, *Nov. Biog. Générale, xxii, 272; *Burnet, *History of Reformation, pt. i, bk. ii; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop. v, 402; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography, i, 149.

Gryneus, Simon, a Swiss Protestant theologian and philologist (last of the eminent family of Gryneus), was born at Basle in 1729, and died in that city in 1799. He was a thorough theological and classical scholar, and well acquainted with French, English, and Latin literature. He published a translation of the Bible (Basle, 1776), and also versions of Juvenal, *Thom<us> à Kempis, and Erasmus’s *Exercitior Morum. He was appointed German Examiner of the English works against Deism. See M. Lutz, *Nekrol. denkm. Schweiz. a. d. xvi. Jahrh. ; Hoefer, *Nov. Biog. Générale, xxii, 275.

Gryneus, Thomas, nephew of Simon Gryneus major, and an eminent Protestant divine, was born at Vehringen in 1512. He was brought up by his uncle Simon, and became professor of the dead languages at Basle in 1529, and died in that city in 1729. He was a zealous promoter of the Reformation. The margrave Charles of Baden appointed him pastor and ecclesiastical superintendent at Röteln, where he remained until his death, Aug. 2, 1564. See Melch. Adam, *Vita Theolog. p. 191; Hoefer, *Nov. Biog. Générale, xxii, 273; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography.


Gualfrid. See *Gregory.


Guard. The Scripture terms used in this connection mostly have reference to the special duties which the body-guard of a monarch had to perform. See *King.

1. Tabl<ab>, तब्ला, originally signified a “cook,” and as butchering fell to the lot of the cook in Eastern countries, it gained the secondary sense of “executioner,” and is applied to the body-guard of the kings of Egypt (Gen. xxxvii, 36) and Babylon (2 Kings xxii, 11; Jer. xxii, 12; Dan. ii, 14). So Poliphæ, the master of Joseph, was captain of Pharaoh’s body-guard, i.e. chief executioner (Gen. xxxix, 1; i, 10, 12). In Egypt he had a public prison in his house (Gen. xii, 3-4). It is evident from Herodotus (i, 165 sq.) that the kings of Egypt had a guard who, in addition to their usual duties, had the care of the regular income of the soldier, also received a separate salary. In the paintings of marches and battles on the monuments, these royal guards are commonly seen to be employed in protecting the person of the king, and are distinguished by peculiar dresses and weapons (Wilkinson, i, 387, 405). During the reign of the Ptolemies, who in general adhered to the usages of the ancient Egyptians, the office of the commander of the body-guard was a very important one. They possessed the confidence of the king, and were often employed in the most important political transactions. Finally, the superintendence of the executions belonged to the most distinguished caste. In Babylon, Nebuzaradan, who held this office, commanded also a part of the royal army (Jer. xxxii, 15; liii, 19). See *EXECUTIONER.

2. Bidas, *बिड, properly means a courier, and is the ordinary term employed for the attendants of the Persian kings, whose office it was to run before the chariot (2 Sam. xv, 1; 1 Kings i, 5), like the *curators of the Roman emperors (Seneca, *Epist. 87, 126). That the Jewish “runners” superadded the ordinary duties of a military guard appears from several passages (1 Sam. xxii, 17; 2 Kings iii, 25; xii, 6; 2 Chron. xii, 10). It was their office also to carry dispatches (2 Chron. xxx, 6). They had a guard-room set apart for their use in the king’s palace, in which their arms were kept ready for use (1 Kings iv, 28; 2 Chron. xii, 11). See *FOOTMAN. They were perhaps the same who, under David, were called *Pelethites (1 Kings i, 1; iv, 27; 2 Sam. xv, 1). See *PELETHITE.

3. The terms mishām rēth, मिशामरेठ, and mishāmvar, मिशामवर, express properly the act of watching, or else a watch-station, but are occasionally transferred to the persons who kept watch (Neh. iv. 9, 22; vii, 3; xiii, 9; Job vii, 12). The A. V. is probably correct in substituting mishāmarto (मिशामर्त) for the present reading in 2 Sam. xxiii, 28, Benalaih being appointed “captain of the guard,” but mishāmvar (Am. vii, 14, 4) relates, and not privy councillor: the same error has crept into the text in 1 Sam. xxiii, 14, where the words
GUARDIAN ANGEL
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*"which goeth at thy bidding" may originally have been "captain of the body-guard." * See CAPTAIN.

The kind of this "captain of the bodyguard," for the Latin episcopus (rendered "executioner," margin guard, Mark vi, 27), properly a pike-men, kaliber, a kind of soldiers forming the body-guard of kings and princes, who also, according to Oriental custom, acted as executioners. The term curvatura, for the Latin custodia, i.e. custodie, a watch or guard, is spoken of the Roman soldiers at the sepulchre of Jesus (Matt. xxvii, 63, 66; xxviii, 11). The ordinary Roman guard consisted of four soldiers (rerudivium, "quartionem"), of which there were four, corresponding to the four watches of the night, who relieved each other every three hours (Acts xii, 4; comp. John xix, 28; Polybi- vi, 33, 7). When in charge of a prisoner, two watched outside of the cell while the other two were inside (Acts xii, 6). The officer mentioned in Acts xxviii, 16 (στραταναπόδηρης), "captain of the guard") was perhaps the commander of the Roman troops, to whose care prisoners from the provinces were usually consigned (Pliny, Ep. x, 65). See WATCH.

Guardian Angel, a term which represents a theory prevalent from antiquity, that human beings are accompanied through life by a special supernatural being (sometimes termed their "attendant genius"), whom they must obey for their guide and protection. Such has been thought to be the meaning of Socrates when he claimed a particular δαιμον as his spiritual counsellor. See ΔΑΙΜΟΝ. Among Christian writers the theory has been thought to derive confirmation from the statement of our Saviour respecting children, that "in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. xviii, 10); and from the declaration that angels "are all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation" (Heb. i, 14). A more cautious criticism, however, has usually held that these passages in the New Testament do not evidence the providence over the young and believers; and the peculiar form of the doctrine referred to appears to favor rather of a pagan than an evangelical origin. Monographs are named in Walsh, Bibliotheca Theologica, i, 178, and Volbeding, Index Programmatis, p. 116. See ANGEL.

Guardian of the Spiritualities, in England, the person in whom is vested the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of a diocese upon the death or translation of the bishop, or in cases of infirmity of the incumbent or bishop.—Eden, Churchman's Dictionary.

Guerre, a French herald, was born at Tronquay (Normandy) in 1678. He entered the order of the Benedictines of St. Maurit Oct. 21, 1696, became subsequently professor of Greek and Hebrew, and died librarian of the abbey of St. Germain des Prés, Dec. 29, 1729. He had a lively literary controversy with canoe Maceset, and wrote Grammatica HEBRÆICA ET CHALDAICA, etc. (Paris, 1724-8, 2 vols. 4to):—Lexicon Hebri- cum et Chaldeobicum (Par. 1746, 2 vols. 4to). Guer- rin only compiled this dictionary to Men inclusively; the following letters were the work of other Benedictines. See Le Cerf, Bibl. Hist. et crit. des Auteurs de la Comp. de St. Maur; Hoefer, Nouv. Bihk. Gén. xxii, 318.

Guastallines, a monastic order in the Roman Catholic Church, founded in 1584 by countess Torelli, of Guastalla. They were at first connected with the Barnabites, whom they assisted in their missions; but, as this led to disorders, they were ordered to take the vow of seclusion. They were also called the Apostolick order (Apostolic), which name was to remind them that they should be pure as in their lives as angels.

Guatemala. See CENTRAL AMERICA.

Gude, Gottlieb Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Laibach Aug. 26, 1701. He studied theology in the universities of Halle and Leipzig, and taught for some time in the latter. Having returned to his native city in 1727, he was made chief deacon in 1743, and archdeacon in 1745. He died at Lauban June 90, 1786. In 1742, he published De Canonicis Doctrinam inter Scripturae Interpretes (Lips. 1742).—De Christen Kaste nach dem rechten Wasserland (Hal.1726, fol.):—De Jurisdictionum Meritis in Scriptu- rorum (Lauban. 1728).—De mythis Maccabæorum et fa- torns Christi Interpretationes (Lips. 1729).—Grundliche, gründliche Erörterung über das Thema: Die Dichtkunst der Laubanner (Lauban, 1758).—Hoefer, Nouv. Bihk. Gen. xxii, 340.

Gugdo dah [some Gutgoda] (Heb.) with the art and the definite, kag-Gugdah—Akk., γιγδά, γιγδα, rent, or perch. θυδερόν; Sept. Γυδόδα; Vulg. Gugdah), the fortieth station of the Israelites during their wanderings in the desert, between Mount Hor and Jottath (Deut. x, 7); doubtless the same with Hor-MAGGDAD, through which they had previously passed between Bene-Jaakan and Jotbath (Num. xxxiii, 22). The name appears to be preserved in the present wady Khudhokhidh ("diminutions"), mentioned by Robinson (Res. 1, 267) as "a broad sandy valley which drains the remainder of the region between the Jerசefal and el-Mukhrah, and carries its waters eastward to the former." See EXODE. In this identification there are two later travelling publications (p. 213; Bonar, p. 266, 295). See HOR-MAGGDAD. Dr. Robinson suggests that Gugdah and Jottathah may be in the Arabah, near the junction of wady Gharun- del and wady-el-jeib (Res. ii, 685). See JOTBATH.

Gudele, Goulie, or Ergoule, Sr., a Belgian virgin, patroness of Brussels, is said, according to tradition, to have been born in Brabant about 600. She was the daughter of St. Amalberge, and was educated by her godmother, St. Gertrude, abbess of the convent of Ni- vele. In 664, Gertrude having died, Gudule went to reside with count Witger, the second husband of her mother. While there she led a life of extravagant asceticism, and, according to the Romish legend, accumulated such a stock of good works that God gave her the power to work miracles both during her life and after her death? She died Jan. 8, 712, and was buried in the church of St. Michael, Brussels, which was subsequently called after her, and is now called Church of St. Gudule. She is commemorated on the 9th of January, and is the object of special veneration throughout Belgium. See Ruth d'Aan, Vie de St. Gudule (Brussels, 1708, 12mo); Bailleit, Vie des Saints (vol. i, Jan. 8); Hoefer, Nouv. Bihk. Générale, xxii, 382; Butler, Lives of the Saints, i, 8, 9.

Guebres. See PARSEES.

Guédier de Saint-Aubin, Henri Michel, a French theologian, was born at Gournay-en-Bray June 17, 1695. He studied at Paris, and received the doc- tor's degree from the Sorbonne Oct. 29, 1723. He be- came professor in that institution in 1730, and his libra- rian in 1736. Some time after he obtained the abbey of St. Valmer. He was acquainted with Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, English, and Italian, besides history, theology, and kindred sciences. For fourteen years he decided all cases of conscience presented to the Sor- bonne. He died at Paris Sept. 27, 1742. He wrote, Histoire saison des deux Alliances (Paris, Didot, 1741, 7 vols. 12mo), which Mortier considers a good concord- ance of the O. and N. T. At the end of every part are remarks and arguments on the designs of the sacred writers, and on the authenticity and inspiration of their writings.—Laducat, Dict. historique; Mortier, Dict. Hist. (edit. 1769); Hoefer, Nouv. Bihk. Gen. xxii, 586.

Guepharytzenius, Codex. See WOLFENBUT- TEL MANUSCRIPTS.

Guelphs and Ghibellines, the names given to two great mediaval parties which acquired a pre- eminent celebrity especially in Germany and Italy, inasmuch as their contests made up a great portion of the history of those countries from the 11th to the 14th cen- turies, and which claim notice here because of the close
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connection of their party strives with the ecclesiastical
history of that period, and the use which the papacy
made of them to increase its power and authority.
According to the most reliable authorities, the word
Guelph, or Guelf, is derived from the "Welfi," a baptismal
name in several Italo-German families, which may be
traced even up to the 9th century in a line of princes
who migrated from Germany to Italy. In the 11th cen-
tury, when it appears there as the name of several
chiefs of the ducal house of Saxony. Gibellines is re-
ferred to "Wasilbingen" (anciently Wilsabingen), a town
of Württemberg, and the patrimonial seat of the Hohen-
staufen family. The party conflicts originating in the
rule of the Guelphs, and the Ghibellines, and prob-
elably also the party names, are of earlier date, but
the first recorded use of these terms to designate the
opposing parties occurred A.D. 1140, in the great battle
of Weinsberg, in Swabia, fought between the partisans
of Conrad of Hohenstaufen and those of Henry the
Lion, of the house of Welf, rival claimants of the
imperial throne. In this battle the followers of Conrad
rallied to the cry of "He Wasilbingen!" and those of
Henry to the cry of "He Welf!" These party cries,
transferred to Italy, subsequently the chief theatre of
theological ecclesiastical disputes between Guelphs and
Ghibellines, or Guelfi, in the Italian language, the former
designating the supporters, and the latter the opponents
of the imperial authority, which generally vested in the
Hohenstaufen house. The opposition to this authority
arose from two sources, viz. (1) from the cities and
municipal corporations jealous of their local rights and
liberties, and (2) from the popes, who, jealous of the
power of the German emperors, and irritated by their
exercise of authority in ecclesiastical matters,
especially in regard to investitures (q. v.), favored the
party of the Guelphs, and, indeed, became the represent-
ative leaders thereof. Hence the term Guelph came to
signify in general those who favored the Church's
independence of the State, and the maintenance of mu-
cipal liberty as against the partisans of a supreme and
centralized civil authority represented in the em-
peror. This statement, however, seems not to hold
good always, since in the multiplied and complicated
conflicts of these parties an interchange of the distinct
principles and objects of each appears to have taken
place in certain instances, and the interests of the
hierarchy by no means always coincided with the
aspirations of the cities and municipalities. Hence,
now ever freely it evoked them to advance its own ends.
The contest of the papacy for supremacy over the civil
power, organized and definitely directed to its object
by Gregory VII (q. v.), culminated in the pontificate of
his arch-enemy (q. v.), when, "under a young and
ambitious priest, the successors of St. Peter attained
the full merit of their greatness." (Gibbon, vi, 36,
Harper's ed.), and "the imperial authority at Rome
breathed its last sigh" (Muratori, Annali. Ital. anno
1190).

In the contests of the Ghibellines and Guelph par-
tisians historians note "five great crises," viz. (1) in 1055,
under Henry IV; (2) in 1127, under Henry the Proud;
(3) in 1140, under Henry the Lion; (4) in 1150, under
Frederick Barbarossa; and (5) the pontificate of Inno-
cent III. After the decline of the imperial authority
in Italy, in the conflicts between opposite parties among
the nobility and in the cities, Ghibellina was used to
designate the aristocratic party, and Guelph those pro-
fessively favoring popular government. But the party
name, as thus defined, did not always represent the real
principles involved in the conflicts of the two factions.
In course of time the contest "degenerated into a mere struggle of
rival factions, availing themselves of the prestige of ancient
names and traditional or hereditary prejudices" (Chambers),
so that in 1278 pope Gregory X used the following
language: "Guelphus aut Ghibellinus, nomina ne illis quisdem, qui illis proficient, nona.
nonem, quod signifiit, nemo intelligit" (Muratori,
Sergius, rerum Italicarum, xi, 178); and in 1384 pope
Benedict XIII forbade the further use of the terms and
"we read little more of Guelphs and Gibellines as ac-
tually existing parties." The conflict of principles in
ecclesiastical as well as civil polity which these terms
once served to represent may be traced through every
subsequent age, and has not, even in this 10th century,
cessation to the present day. (Cyclop. s. v.; New American Cyclop., viii, 547-8; Hoe-
Des Francais (see Index); Ranke, Hist. of Papacy (see
Index); Herzog, Real-Encycl. xvii, 659 sq. (J. W. M.)

Guénée, Antoine, a French abbot, was born at
Fontainebleau, 1747. He studied at Paris, entered the
Church, and attained high degrees in the univer-
sity. For twenty years professor of rhetoric at the
college of Plessis, he travelled through Italy, Ger-
many, and England to acquire a knowledge of their
languages, and on his return published several trans-
lations. He afterwards wrote Les Lettres de quelques
Juifs against Voltaire, for which he was made canon
of the cathedral of Amiens, and afterwards attached
to the chapel of Versailles by cardinal de la Roche-
Aymon. During the Revolution he was imprisoned for
ten months in the巴士底狱, and after his libera-
tion lived in retirement with his brothers in stroke
at Fontainebleau Nov. 27, 1808. Among his publications are:
Les Temoinage de la Résurrection de Jésus Christ ex-
aminées suivant les rôles du barreau (from the Engl.
of Sherlock, against Woolston, Paris, 1758, 12mo); —
La Religion chrétienne décrit par le témoignage de
tous les peuples de la Terre (from the Engl. of Lyttelton,
with the addition of two discourses by Seed); — Sur l'Excel-
ence intarissable de l'Ecriture (Paris, 1764, 12mo); —
Observations sur l'histoire et sur les prêches de la Résurrec-
tion de Jésus Christ (from the Engl. of West, against
Wolstenholme, London, 1767, 12mo); — Les
Juifs portugais, allemands et polonais à M. de Voltaire
(Paris, 1769, 8vo); often reprinted, with additions, as
1815, 4 vols. 8vo; 8th ed. Paris, 1817, 8vo; Lyon and
Paris, 1857, 8 vols. 12mo; transl. into English by Le-
fanu under the title Letters of certain Jews to Voltaire
(Dublin, 1777, 2 vols. 8vo); — Recherches sur la Judé
considérée principalement par rapport à la liberté de
son toread, depuis la copie des Babyloniens jusqu'à nos
temps, in Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions,
vol. I (1808); — Les Juifs de France, or the Jewish
Society, of which he had been elected member in 1778. —
Dacier, Notice sur l'abbé Guénée (at the head of the 7th
ed. of Lettres de quelques Juifs, etc., Paris, 1815); Qué-
vard, La France littéraire; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gén.,
xxii, 381; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, i, 1851.

Guertier, Nicholas D., a learned Protestant
divine, was born at Basel in 1624. He studied at the
university of that city, and in 1655 became professor
of philosophy and rhetoric at Herborn. He after-
wards became professor of theology at Hanau, and in
1696 at Bremen. From thence he removed to De-
venter in 1729, and to Franeker in 1767. He died in
1771. His principal work is Systema theologica pro-
phetica, cum indicibus necessariis (Utrecht, edito se-
cunda emendata, 1724, 4to).—Darling, Cyclop. Bibl.,

Guest. See HOSPITALITY.

Guest-chamber (særgæhæ, a lodging-place, l. e.
proper name, as rendered in Luke i, 7, 8, as room
of entertainment, and so used by the Saxon, at 1 Sam. ix,
22; Neh. iii, 5; Ezek. xxi, 44), the σακάσιον, or
spare apartment in an Oriental dwelling (Mark xiv,
14; Luke xxii, 11). See House. At the public fes-
tivals these may naturally be supposed to have been
placed at the disposal of strangers attending Jerusalem
for that purpose. See INN.

Gui. See GUIDO.

Guibert de Nogent, a French scholastic theolog-
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Gibrard, Anti-pope, was born at Parma in the 11th century. He was never formally consecrated, but he was said to be descended from the counts of Augeburg. Made archbishop of Ravenna through the influence of the emperor Henry IV. He was elected pope by a council held at Brescia (hostile to Gregory VII) in 1080, and took the name of Clement II. His greatest act of authority was the formal excommunication of Gregory VII in 1086; in turn, put him under the ban, and never consented to grant him absolution. Gibrard took Rome by force, but in 1089 was compelled to leave the city. He died at Ravenna in 1100. His election gave rise to the sect of the Libertines, who claimed that the emperor alone possessed the right of appointing popes. The sect was condemned by several councils, and finally disappeared towards the end of the 12th century.—See Artand, Hist. des souverains Pontifes, vol. ii; Art de Verifier les Dates; Hoenfer, Nouve. Biog. Géner. xxii, 514; Herzog, Real-Encycl., v, 498 sq.

Gibert of Ravenna. See Gibert (Anti-pope).

Guide (the rendering, more or less proper, of various Heb. words; Gr. ὑποψις). Such was Hobab invited by Moses to become to the Israelites in the wilderness (Num. x. 31, "that thou mayest be to us instead of eye"). See EXOD.

Guido de Aresso, or Guis, a Benedictine monk of the abbey of Pomposa, noted in the history of music. He was born at Aresso about 990, and early distinguished himself by his talent for music, which he taught in his convent. Numerous inventions (e.g. counter-point) have been attributed to Guido without due regard to his originality; but he did render great service to music by his ingenious simplification of the existing methods of notation. He wrote Micrologus de Disciplina Artis Musicae, "or Brief Discourses on Music, in which most of his inventions are described, as well as his method of instruction." His doctrine of solmisation is, however, not found in that work, but set forth in a small tract under the title of Argumentum nunc Canus inveniendi. He died about the middle of the 11th century, but the exact date of his death is unknown. See BURNEY, History of Music: GERBERT, Scriptores Eccl. Musica Sacra: HOEFNER, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 511; HERZOG, Real-Encycl., v. 411.

Guido de Bres, an evangelist and martyr of the Walloon Church, was born at Mols in 1540. He was brought up in the city of Rome, but by searching the Scriptures arrived at the knowledge of evangelical truth, and was compelled by persecution to escape to London, where he joined the Walloon Church organized under Edward VI, and prepared himself for the ministry. He afterwards returned to his native country as evangelist and travelling preacher, in which capacity he showed great zeal, first at Lille, where there was a large sect Protestant community, which was destroyed by imperial decree; and then returned to Ghent, where he published a polemic tract out of the fathers entitled Le bâton de la foi. He then went to prosecute his studies at Geneva, where he became a determined adherent of Calvin. Returning to his country, he resumed his evangelical labors, reorganized the three principal centers of the French speaking peoples of Brabant, and Valentienne, and made the whole of southern Belgium and northern France, from Dieppe to Sedan and from Valenciennes to Antwerp, the field of his indefatigable activity. Valentienne, which had become almost entirely Protestant, was stormed by Noircarmes in 1567. Guido was editor of that work, and was taken to prison. After seven weeks of imprisonment he was hanged, with the young La Grange, on the last day of May, 1567. Guido, though in the prime of life, leaving behind him a wife and several
young children, met death not only calmly, but cheerfully. While in prison he had written letters of consolation to his mother, to whom he was much attached, and to his congregation; the latter epistle, containing a thorough refutation of the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, is to be found in the Histoire des Martyrs (Geneva, 1617), together with a life of Guignard and La Grange (p. 751-811). Guido's prediction that the seeds of Protestantism he had so carefully sowed would grow with greater strength after being watered with his blood, has been fulfilled. To him the Dutch Church owes the fact that, instead of becoming a mere branch of the French (Cercle de la Fortune Française) Reformed Church, it has remained between the two, a shield and a blessing for both. Guido drew up in 1569 a confession of faith, after the model of the French Confession drawn up in 1559 at Paris. This confession he submitted to Calvin, by whose advice he changed it in some particulars, and, after obtaining the assent of the principal Reformed churches in the Netherlands, he published it in 1562 as the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands, sending a copy of it, with an appropriate and remarkable introduction, to King Philip II. The theologians of Geneva declared that the Netherlands might adopt the French Confession as it stood; but Guido probably foresaw that the adoption of a confession exclusively their own, in French and Low-Dutch, was the only means to form a united church in that country, inhabited by people of many tongues and speaking two languages. See Le Long, Kort historisch Verhael van den oorsprong der Nederlandse hervormde kerken onder Krijgs, etc. (Amsterdam, 1743, 4to); G. Brandt, Historie der reformatie in en omstreken der Nederlanden (Amsterdam, 1671); Teyp en Dermont, Geschiedenis der Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk (Breda, 1813, 2 vols.); and especially Van der Kemp, de Eere der Nederlandse hervormde Kerk (Rotterdam, 1880).—Herzog, Rec. Encyclop., v, 412; Motley, Rise of the Dutch Republic, vol. 1; Christian Intelligencer, March 14, 1861.

Guignard, Jean, surnamed Briquevard, a French Jesuit of the 16th century, and, during the League, rector and librarian of the college of Clermont at Paris. After the attempt of Jean Châtel against the life of king Henry IV, the Jesuits were charged with being implicated in the affair, as the would-be assassin was one of their pupils. Their houses were searched, and some violent writings of Guignard against the king were discovered. He defended himself by saying they had before the king's permission to the Roman Catholicism, and that since that time he had always taught obedience to the royal authority and remembered the king in his prayers. He was condemned of high treason, sentenced to be hanged, and his body burnt. The execution took place on the same day, Jan. 7, 1559. He persisted to the last in asserting his innocence. The next day all the Jesuits were banished from Paris. Some Jesuit writers—father Jouveney, for instance—in writing the history of the order, have represented Guignard as a martyr. See Sully, OEuvres de l'Etoile, Journal des Hommes; L'Histoire III; De Thou, Hist. lib. xxi; Simondi, Hist, des Francais (see Index); Hesfor, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxil, 566. (J. N. P.)

Guignes, Christien Louis Joseph de, a French Orientalist, was born at Paris Aug. 25, 1759, and died in the same city March 9, 1845. He was instructed by his father, Joseph de Guignes, in the Oriental language, having Chinese as a special study. In 1784 he was appointed French resident in China and consul at Canton, and before his departure thither he was also appointed correspondent to the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. After spending 17 years in China he returned to France, having meanwhile communicated to the academies several interesting and useful papers, which were published in their Mémoires. In 1808 there issued from the imperial press of China, under the title of Vahr, Fleur d'or de France, Rallot dans la intervalles des Armées 1784 à 1801 (3 vols. 4to, with fol. atlas of maps and plates). Among the grand literary projects of the reign of Louis XIV was the publication of a dictionary of the Chinese language, but the project has not been realized, and was apparently abandoned. The imperial government of Napoleon I determined to revive and complete the enterprise, and de Guignes, by a decree dated Oct. 22, 1808, was selected to compile such a work. In 1818 it appeared from the imperial press, bearing the title of Dictionnaire de la langue française, impair, l'ordre de S. M. l'empereur et roi Napoleon le Grand, etc. (Paris, fol.). This work proved to be, in the main, only an adaptation of the Han-tz-i-giu (i.e. Occidental interpretation of Chinese characters), a Chinese-Latin vocabulary by a Franciscan missionary to China, Basile de Glemonts, whose modest but valuable labors de Guignes had appropriated without acknowledgment. The plagiarism was discovered, and severely but justly censured by the critics of the time, and the effect was undoubtedly to diminish the appreciation of any additions or improvements made by de Guignes. See Guignes, Notice biogr. Q. Ann. Acad. phil., 1828, 1829; New American Cyclopaedia, viii, 555. (J. W. M.)

Guilbert. See Guir bert and GIlbert.

Guilbertines. See Gilbertines.

Guil, William, a divine of the Church of Scotland, was born at Aberdeen in 1586, and educated at Marischal College, then recently founded, with a view to holy orders. Before he entered the ministry, however, he published a treatise entitled The New sacrifices of Christian Incense to Christ and The only way how we can come in that perfect position. He was very soon after called to the pastoral charge of the parish of king Edward, in the presbytery of Turiff and synod of Aberdeen. In 1617, when James I visited Scotland with a view to establish episcopacy, and brought bishop Andrews, of Ely, with him, to assist in the management of that affair, the latter paid great regard to Guil; and the following year, when Andrews was promoted to the see of Winchester, Guil dedicated to him his Moses Unveiled, pointing out those figures in the Old Testament which allude to the Messiah (new ed. Edinb., 1619, royal 8vo). He wrote several works against Popery; an Exposition of Solomon's Song (Lond., 1656, 8vo):—An Explanation of the Apocalypse (Aberdeen, 1656);—Exposition of Second Samuel (Oxford, 1659, 4to). He was a man of great learning. In 1640 he was made principal of King's College, Aberdeen, but, giving up his taking part with the monarchy, he was deposed by the Parliamentary commissioners in 1651, and died in 1657. See Shirreffs, Life of Guil (Aberdeen, 1799, 2d ed. 8vo); Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 746; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1582.

Guil. In the Middle Ages, religious clubs or mutual benefit societies, embracing men and women, were established in nearly every parish church. They kept yearly feasts, supported annals for the repose of deceased members, sometimes also hospitals for the relief of decayed members, and always collected alms for their sick and poor. On certain anniversaries they met, dressed in the almsman's habit, wearing liver green gowns and hoods, usually of two colors, and the badges of their patron saint. In the monasteries, kings, nobles, and benefactors were admitted as lay members, and in the parish societies as honorary members. "The members were divided into several classes relating to the guild ranks and obedience to the superiors." Of late, the Ritualists in the Anglican Church are endeavoring to revive the guilds, and quite a number had been re-established up to the year 1869. A list of them is given in the Church Union Almanac for 1869 (Lond. 1869).—Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s. v.

Guilain. See Gislain.
GUILLAUME. See WILLIAM.

Guillumine or Guillelmette, a Bohemian enthusiast of the 13th century. She went from Bohemia to Milan, where she gave herself out as the daughter of King Louis of Bohemia. She pretended to have been conceived in a miraculous manner, like Christ. She professed to have the mission of saving bad Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans. Her pretended visions and semblance of sanctification gained her many adherents. The mysteries of her system are said to have been greatly in vogue in Bohemia and Hungary. She died in 1290, according to Moréi (1300 according to Bosi), and was buried with great honors in the monastery of Chiaravalle, near Milan, founded by St. Bernard. The sect continued under the management of a priest, Andrew Sammita, and of a nun of the convent of Humiliati, whom Guillaumine had herself pointed out for her successor. Six years after, however, their secret practices were revealed, and the women were imprisoned and punished. Saramita and Porovana were burnt after being condemned by the Inquisition, as was also the body of Guillaumine, disinterred for the purpose. The house where the sect met was razed, and a hermitage erected in its place; it became afterwards part of a convent of Carmelites. Some writers have attempted to refute the accusation of immorality made against the sect. See Bosi, Chron.; Maillon, Musée; Mém. de la Soc. d'Anthrop., 1814; Hocque, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 714 sq. (J. N. P.)

Guillon, Marie Nicholas Silvestre, a French priest and distinguished humanist, was born at Paris Jan. 1, 1760. He studied at the colleges of Du Plessis and Louis-le-Grand, and acquired great proficiency not only in theology, but in medicine, natural sciences, and mathematics. Received as professor in the university in 1789, he founded the Church, and was chosen by his colleagues to direct the Course of Polytechnic and Humanism, and disinguished as a preacher. He was afterwards almoner and librarian of the princess of Lamballe until her murder, Sept. 1792. He then fled to Sceaux, where, under the name of Paste, he practiced medicine for some time to avoid persecution. He afterwards removed to Meaux, and in 1798 to Paris. Some time after he became connected with the abbot of Fontenay in the publication of the Journal général de Littérature, des Sciences et des Arts. After the restoration of Roman Catholic worship he became honorary canon and librarian of Paris cathedral of St. Paul, and then professor of rhetoric and homiletics in the theological faculty, and almoner of the college of Louis-le-Grand. He was afterwards successively appointed almoner of the duchess of Orleans in 1818, and inspector of the academy. His ready acquiescence in the Revolution of 1830 excited the displeasure of the clergy, and it was with great difficulty the king succeeded in obtaining his appointment as bishop of Beauvais. In this position he attended the last moments of the abbé Grégoire (q. v.), to whom he administered the sacraments. Severely censured for this, he referred the matter to the pope, resigning his bishopric in the mean time. Thanks to the interference of the court, the matter was settled, and Guillon was appointed bishop of Morocco in partibus infidelium, July 7, 1833. In 1837 he was appointed dean of the faculty of theology; but, when the French government entered into union with Rome, Guillon was sacrificed by being sent to Dreux to keep the chapel which had successively received the remains of several children of the king. He died in Montfortmill Oct. 16, 1847. He was a most prolific writer. Among his theological works we notice the following: "Quaestiones," ed. by a priest of Paris (Paris, 1798, 8vo); "Collection ecclé., ou recueil complet des ouvrages faits depuis l'ouverture des désirs généraux relativement au clergé (Paris, 1793-1792, 7 vols. 8vo, under the name of Baruel);" "Parii. des Révolutions pour le repos et la sûreté de l'Eglise (Paris, 1791, 8vo, often reprinted);" "Brefs et Instructions au saint-siège relatifs à la Révolution française, etc. (Paris, 1793, 2 vols. 8vo);" "Discours prononcé dans l'église de St. Sulpice, à l'invitation de l'Eglise romaine (Paris, 1802, 8vo);" "Hist. générale de la Philosophie ancienne et moderne, etc.; ou supplément à la Bibliothèque choisie des Pères grecs et latins (Paris, 1835, 2 vols. 8vo, and 4 vols. 12mo, 1848, 4 vols. 12mo);" "Hist. de la nouvelle Hérésie du ciel" (Paris, 1835, 3 vols. 8vo);" "Examen critique de la Lettre du Gilbon, de l'Abbe de M. Sibulier (Paris, 1841, 8vo)." See Léon Laya, Notice biog. (Moniteur de Dec. 15, 1874); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 736 sq.

Guillou, See Sin.

Guilt, besides its proper significance, occurs in the A. V. in the sense of italiq, as a rendering of τάξις, Num. xxxvi, 31; τιμωρία, Matt. xxvi, 66; Mat. xiv, 64; and ἐφίλω, Matt. xxiii, 18, like the Lat. reus.

Guion. See Guyon.

Guiscard, or Guichard de Beaulieu, an Anglo-Norman poet, who flourished probably in the reign of Stephen of Angoulême, in the beginning of the reign of Henry II of England. He is known by a poem of some length bearing the title of Sermon of Guiscard de Beaulieu (le sermon Guichart de Beaulieu in the Harleian MS.), which is a satire against the vices of his day. According to this poem, Guiscard, disgusted with the follies and vanities in which he had passed his youth, retired to a monastery. Walter Mapes, a contemporary, or nearly contemporary writer, states (De Nugiis Curial. dist. i, c. 13) that Guiscard was a man distinguished for his wealth and valor, who in his old age surrendered his estates to his son, and, entering a Cistercian monastery, became so eminent a poet in his vernacular (Anglo-Norman) as to be styled the "Home of the laity" (Isaorum Homerus). Of the Sermon, which is all now known of his writings, there is a MS. of the 12th century in the British Museum (MS. Harl. No. 4986), and an imperfect one in the Bibliothèque Impériale de France (No. 1856—given by De Juyss as No. 2560). From this last MS., an edition of the Sermon was published by Judinal (Paris, 1834, 8vo). This poem is written in the versification of the earlier metrical romances, and exhibits considerable poetical talent, and fine language and elegance of manner. —Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. Anglo-Norman Period, p. 131; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 771. (J. W. M.)

Guise, HOUER of, the name of a branch of the ducal family of Lorraine, which, during the reign of Francis I, established itself in France, where it was conspicuous in its hostility to the Protestant cause, and played a leading part in the religious wars of the 16th century. The three following members of this family were the most prominent for their abilities, and for bigoted and unscrupulous antagonism to the Reformed party, viz.

1. Charles, cardinal of Guise, better known as cardinal of Lorraine, was born at Joinville Feb. 17, 1524, and died Dec. 26, 1574. He was made archbishop of Rheims in 1538, created a cardinal in 1547, and was employed on several important embassies. In 1558, at an interview with the cardinal Granville at Jérone, he laid the foundations of the alliance between the Guises and Spaine, which continued through, and exerted an important influence on, the civil wars in France. He was present at the Council of Trent (1562), where at first he favored the demand for reform and the superiority of councils to the pope, but was too ambitious to adhere to such principles throughout. Under Francis I he was made governor, and himself, the administrator of the finances. His char-
actor is thus portrayed by De Felice (p. 71): "The cardinal Charles de Lorraine, archbishop of Rheims, and Roman Catholic, was the most prominent victim of that sad day. In 1575 he received, in an encounter with the Calvinists, a face-wound, which gave him the name of Balafré (the scarred), an epithet also applied for a like reason to his father. In 1576 he was active in the fighting less than two miles from the castle of the crown of France for his brother, and to the tiares for himself. So Pius V, somewhat anxious concerning the pert he was playing in the Church, habitually called him the pope on the other side of the mountains. For the rest, he was a priest without settled convictions, yet at the Council of Augsburg he was described as "to please my good masters the Germans," as says Brantôme; he was decried for his evil habits, which he did not even care to hide, and raised the booting of the populace on quitting the dwelling of a courtesan; lastly, he was as pusillanimous in the face of danger as he was arrogant in prosperity." He was, however, a protector of letters, and Rheims owes to him its university. He left some letters and sermons.

II. FRANÇOIS DE LOHRNAINE, brother of the preceding, and second duke of Guise, was born Feb. 17, 1519, at the castle of Bar, and died Feb. 24, 1563, of wounds received on Mount Joze, close to the village of Bar-le-Duc, to be slain by his guards.—Hoefer, Nouvelle Biogr. Générale, xxii, 756-9, and 784-6; De Felice, Hist. de l’Ordre de la Toison d’Or, 200-3. He was the fourth son of the cardinal de Guise, to be slain by his guards.—Hoefer, Nouvelle Biogr. Générale, xxii, 756-9, and 784-6; De Felice, Hist. of the Protagonists of France (London, 1853, 12mo); Wright, History of France, 1, 660-718; Sambon, Histoire des Francs (see Index); Roos, New Gm. Biog. Dict. vol. ii, 443; Huc, Hist. de la Révolution française (see Index); New Amer. Cyclopædia, viii, 568, 564; English Cyclopædia, s. v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v. (J. W. M.)

Gulf (χειμαρρος, a chama), an opening or impassable space, such as is represented to exist between Elysium and Tartarus (Luk exvi, 26). See Hades.

Gullich or Guliachi, ABRAHAM VAN, was born at Heemstede, near Amsterdam, in 1579. After studying at Nimegue and the University of Leyden, he was appointed professor of theology at Nimegue, Jan. 17, 1667. Near the close of the same year he became ordinary professor of philosophy and eloquence, and extraordinary of theology, in the gymnasium of that place. In 1672 he was appointed professor of the Carthusian philosophy in the University of Franeker. He died Dec. 31 of the same year. While at Hamburgh he published a philosophical work entitled Disputationes philosophiae. His theological works are, (1) Theologiae Pesantissimae Disputationes, 1675-6 (2nd edition, 1664); (3) volume is appended a treatise on Hermeneutics, entitled Hermeneutica Sacra bipartita:—(2) Libri Propheticorum Vet. et N. Test. compropium et analysis (Amst. 1694). See Geschichte der Niederlandische Historiche Kerk door A. Spyck en J. Dernmont, D. ii; Glasius, Gescbl. Nederland, D. i; also J. Schotanus, Sterringa, Oratio funebris in obitu A. Guliachi. (J. P. W.)

Gulielmus. See William.

Gulloth (Γυληθα, fountain; Sept. Γυληθα and λυγηθα, Vulg. irrigium; Eng. Vers. "springs"), the name of two plots given by Caleb to his daughter, at her special request, in addition to her dower (Josch. xv, 16: Judg. i, 10); from which passages it may be inferred that they were situated in the "south land" of Judah, and were so called from the copious supply of water in their vicinity. See Achar. The springs were "upper" and "lower" possibly one at the top and the other at the foot of a ravine or grot; and they may have derived their unusual name from the supposed variance being different to that of the ordinary springs of the country. The root (Ϡʔʔ) has the force of rolling or tumbling over, and perhaps this may imply that they welled up in that bubbling manner which is not uncommon here, though apparently most rare in Palestine (Stanley, Palestine, Append. § 55). Dr. Rosen (Carlsch. der Deutsch. Mähr. Gesch. 1857, p. 56 sq.)
Gundulf, founder of a sect in Arres and Liege in the 11th century. In the year 1026, Gerhard, bishop of Cambrai and Arres, caused the arrest of a number of persons who were adherents of the heretical doctrines in his diocese, and in various parts of the north of France. A synod was convened at St. Mary's church, in Arres, for their trial. Their rules commanded them to forsake the world; to bring into subjection their fleshly lusts and passions; to support themselves by their own labors; to remain in Arres, and in 1026, to exorcise love to all who felt inclined to adopt their mode of life. This confession, joined with their well-known practices of washing each other's feet, led to the belief that they differed from other Christians only in a devoted attachment to the letter of Scripture. But Gerhard professed to know more of their rules than they acknowledged publicly. He had caused himself, he says, to be initiated into their worship by some proselytes, and so learned all their tenets. They appear to have held the following principles: "The holy Church is called to be the kingdom of God, to have all the precepts (Acts iv. 32), and all the consciences of men, to preach the gospel to all nations chosen by election. Admission into it is signified by the imposition of hands, after a confession of faith and taking certain vows. Besides the regular assemblies in the church, there are prayer-meetings, in which the disciples wash each other's feet. The apostles and martyrs are venerated, but saintliness is nowhere hidden. The fulfilment of the law constitutes righteousness, which alone works salvation. Disobedience in the elect, and disregard of their professional vows, entail everlasting condemnation on them. Neither penance nor conversion can afterwards avail them. These people rejected the Roman Church, the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, the respect shown to bishops, the whole hierarchical system, and even all clergy whatever. "Dogmatic, liturgical, and constitutive traditions are worthless and of no account. All the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church are rejected, especially baptism and the Lord's supper. The consecrated elements of the Lord's supper are nothing more than what they appear to our senses. At the last supper, Christ did not really give his disciples his body for food and his blood for drink. Marriage and all sexual intercourse are to be avoided, the church is not holy, hence worship does not derive any special virtue from its being held in them. The altar is but a heap of stones. Fumigations and the ringing of bells are useless ceremonies. Croases, crucifixes, images, etc., tend to idolatry."

Bishop Gerhard charged the Gundulfans with holding these and similar opinions, but they refused to acknowledge them. They attempted only to defend their views regarding baptism, but finally announced that they were ready to recant their errors. Then the bishop and other members of the clergy solemnly condemned the heresy, excommunicated its originators in case they did not repent, and made the prisoners sign a Roman Catholic statement of the doctrines on which they had held heretical opinions, translated from Latin into the vernacular; after which the prisoners were released, the synod closed, Gerhard wrote a copy of its acts to the bishop of Liege, who applied himself also with great zeal to the suppression of the heresy. These acts, which are the only source from which we can gather the details of this affair can be obtained, are to be found in Archbishop's Spicilegium (2nd edit., i. 607-624), and in Mann's Concilia (xiii, 433 sq.). Still they give no information as to the rise and development of this party, nor on its relation to those which arose before and after it in the same and neighboring districts. Gundulf appears to have made northern France the exclusive field of his exertions, and it was probably there he had made the converts which were afterwards arrested at Arres. His connection with them was probably an imitation of Christ's association with his disciples; they called him the Master, and, as already stated, considered the imitation of the apostles as their highest aim. Gundulf may have been himself a working man who went to that country because the trades, and especially that of weaver, were in a prosperous condition. There, he probably found a body of disciples among his fellow-workers, whom he instructed in his principles, and whom he afterwards sent as travelling workmen to propagate his views in their own districts. Of the end of Gundulf's career nothing is known. The period of his greatest activity was 1026, and he was already in Arres in 1026. As we see no mention of search for him having been made by order either of Gerhard or of the bishop of Liege, although his disciples had proclaimed him as their chief, it is probable he was out of the reach of both, and had perhaps been already removed by death. We have no further information as to what became of the sect afterwards, and, at any rate, it continued, if at all, in secret. Similar sects have existed at all times in the bosom of the Romish Church, and they are generally found to represent vital piety as opposed to the corruptly Christianized life of Rome. Among the earliest was the Mittelalterlicher, p. i. p. 39 sq.; Herzog, Recl.-Encycl. v. 414 sq.; Neander, Ch. History, iii. 597.

Guni't (Heb. Guni, גוני), dyed [Gesen.] or protected [Fürst]; Sept. 'Pouvi, but in 1 Chron. vii. 18, 'Pouvi, Vulg. Guni), the name of two men.

1. One of the sons of Naphtali (B.C. ante 1856, but not necessarily born before the migration to Egypt) (Gen. xvii. 31; Num. xxvii. 48; 1 Chron. vii. 18). His descendants are called Gunites (Num. xxvii. 48).

2. Father of Abdil, and grandfather of Ahi, which last was chiefest of the Gileadite Gadites (1 Chron. v. 15). B.C. between 1093 and 792.

Guni'te (Hebrew with the art. lqy-Guni', גוניט, Sept. i 'Pouvi, Vulg. Gunites, A. V. "the Gunites"), a general name of the descendants of Guti, of the tribe of Naphtali (Num. xxvii. 48).

Gunn, Walter, was born in Carlisle, Scholaric Co., N. Y., June 27, 1715. He was graduated at Union College in 1840, and studied theology in the seminary at Gettysburg. He was licensed by the Hartwick Synod in 1842, and the following year was ordained as a missionary to foreign lands. He soon sailed for India, where he labored in faith, and with perseverance and success until his residence in the United States, which occurred at Guntown July 8, 1857. Mr. Gunn was the first missionary from the Lutheran Church in the United States who fell in the foreign field. He exerted an influence in India which still lives. He was a man of faith and love, a missionary in the highest sense, of whom the "world was not worthy." (M. L. S.)

Gunn, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Caswell Co., N. C., March 13, 1797, and died at Lexington, Ky., Sept. 8, 1853. He removed in early life to Tennessee with his father; became, while a mere youth, an active member of the Church; was licensed to preach before 21 years of age, and joined the itinerancy in 1819. He spent his subsequent life in ministerial labors, mainly in the state of Kentucky, filling with great acceptability and usefulness the positions of circuit and station preacher and presiding elder, and died in the full assurance of the faith he preached to the others and so beautifully exemplified in his life. He published, in connection with another minister, The Christian Psalmsim (Louisville, Kentucky), and also another work, chiefly selections of the preceding, and entitled The Christian Melodist. - Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vii. 622; Minutes of Conf. of M. Church South. (J. C.)

Gunning, Peter, D.D., an eminent English High-church bishop, was born at Hoo, in Kent, in the
year 1618, and was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge. He became fellow and tutor of his college, and distinguished himself as a preacher, but on account of his zeal for the king's service he was ejected, and afterwards was made chaplain to Sir Robert Shirley, at whose death he obtained the chapel at Exeter House. Strangford. Sir Robert promised his son-in-law that as long as his son should be rewarded; he was created D.D. by the king's mandate. He was one of the censurers selected by the bishop to maintain the High-church cause at the Savoy Conference (1651), and was the principal disputant with Baxter. He had a Romanizing tendency, and advocated papistry, for in 1662 he composed a paper for the Anglican church of Chichester, and in 1674 was translated to Ely, where he died in 1684. He wrote largely on the controversies of the time, and especially The Paschal or Lent Past Apostolical and Perpetual, recently reprinted in the Library of Angora, vol. iv. of Hook, Eccl. Hist. vol. v; Neal, History of the Puritans, iii, 90, 168; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1. 1655.

Gunpowder Plot, a conspiracy formed and matured in the years 1604-5 by some English Romanists to blow up with gunpowder the Parliament House, and thus destroy the king, lords, commons, and representatives of England when assembled as the opening of Parliament, with the hope of being able, during the resultant confusion, to re-establish their faith in the kingdom, or, at least, avenge the oppressions and persecutions of their adherents. At the accession of James I to the throne of England, the Catholics, who had been banished, or, at all events, a great relaxation in the rigor of the penal laws against them, and were greatly exasperated on finding that not only were their hopes in this regard disappointed, but that increased severity was employed towards them; were, therefore, on the 5th of November, when they were yearly seated on his throne, in Feb. 1604, 'assured his council that 'he had never any intention of granting toleration to the Catholics,' that he would fortify the laws against them, and cause them to be put into execution to the utmost.' The concever of the design of taking so indifferent a nation and brutal a regency was Robert Catesby, of 'ancient family and good estate,' who had once absconded and then returned again with increased ardor to his early faith. He made known his scheme first to Thomas Winter, a 'gentleman of Worcestershire,' and next to John Wright, who belonged to a highly respectable family, and the justice of the Court, and was mentioned in prison (Nov. 19, 1605) by a fellow-conspirator (Fawkes), "these three first devis'd the plot, and were the chief directors of all the particularities of it." Winter refused his assent to the plan until an effectual undertaking was obtained from him. The plot was to take place on the 5th of November, the most meditated time of the year for Spanish influence in England, and to be carried out by the English Catholics by a clause to that effect in the treaty then negotiating between England and Spain. He accordingly went to the Netherlands to further that object, where he learned from the Spanish ambassador that it could not be accomplished. He, however, met at Ostend an old associate, Guy Fawkes (q. v.), and foreseeing in him an efficient coadjutor in Catesby's scheme, induced him to return with him to England without making known to Fawkes the particular nature of the plot. Fawkes, though not the projector or head, became by far the most notorious member of the conspiracy, and popular opinion long represented him as a low, cruel, and mercenary ruffian; but he appears to have been by birth a gentleman, and of a nature chivalrously daring and unshifful, but thoroughly perverted by a blind fanaticism, a man of confidence, and of a self-willed turn of his own fancy and its adherents as the essence of Christian virtues. Soon after the arrival of T. Winter and Fawkes in London, a meeting was held at Catesby's lodgings, at which there were present the four already named and an additional member of the conspiracy, Thomas Percy. The business of the meeting was "the present service to the interest of the earl of Northumberland." These five, at Catesby's request, agreed to bind themselves to secrecy and fidelity by a solemn oath, which, a few days afterwards, in a lonely house beyond St. Clement's Inn, they took on their knees in the following words: "You swear by the blessed Trinity, and by the sacrament you now propose to receive, never to disclose, directly or indirectly, by word or circumstance, the matter that shall be committed to your knowledge. Be it for the execution thereof until the rest shall give you leave." They then went into an adjoining room and received the holy sacrament from father Gerard, a Jesuit priest, who was, it is said, ignorant of their horrid project. A few particulars of the plot were then communicated to Fawkes. Petre, an agent of the king, and the plan then agreed on. Percy, whose position as a gentleman pensioner would prevent any suspicion arising therefrom, rented of a Mr. Ferriss, on May 24, 1604, a house adjoining the Parliament buildings, the keys of which were given to Fawkes. A considerable sum of money was raised in London, and who assumed the name of John Johnson, and the position of servant to Percy. They took a second oath of secrecy and fidelity to each other on taking possession of the house, but before their preparations were completed for beginning the work of mining through the cellar, the Commons, on the 15th, prorogued Parliament was prorogued to Feb. 7, 1606. They separated to meet again in November, and, in the mean while, another house was hired on the Lambeth side of the river, in which wood, gunpowder, and other combustibles were placed, to be removed in small quantities to the cellar of the house of Petre. A man was put in charge of Robert Kay, or Kayes, an indigent Catholic gentleman, who took the oath and became a member of the band. On a night in December, 1604, the conspirators, having provided themselves with tools and other necessaries, and other implements were placed to work on the mine, Fawkes acting as sentinel. The wall separating them from the Parliament House was found to be very thick, and more help was needed; so Christopher Wright, a younger brother of John Wright, was taken in on oath, and Kay brought over from Lambeth. The work was carried on secretly, the conspirators begin- ning the labor with discussions of future plans. They agreed in the policy of proclaiming one of the royal family in the place of James, as they supposed his eldest son, prince Henry, would be present and perish with his father in the Parliament House, Percy undertook to blow up the Parliament building, the same or the mine were exploded; and, in default of Percy's success, arrangements were made to carry off the princess Elizabeth, then near Coventry under the care of lord Harrington. 'Horses and armor were to be collected immediately,' they said, 'in case Percy should not lay any safe plan for saving the lives of Roman Catholic members of Parliament. While the matter was thus progressing, Fawkes reported the prorogation of Parliament to Oct. 8, and they separated until after the Christmas holidays. In January, 1605, John Grant, a Warwickshire gentleman, and Robert Winter, eldest brother of Thomas Winter, were admitted to the conspiracy, and shortly after them Thomas Bates, a servant of Catesby, and the only participant in the plot not of the rank of a gentleman. While going on with the work in Feb., 1605, they were alarmed by some noises, and Fawkes, who was about to work on the stove of the cell where the iron, brass, and other (86 lbs.) was conveyed from its place of concealment at Lambeth into this cell, and covered up with stones, bits of iron, and fagots of wood. All was ready in May, and the conspirators separated to await the meeting of Parliament. Fawkes went to the Netherlands on a mission conducted in distant relations of the earl of Northumberland. These five, at Catesby's request, agreed to bind themselves to secrecy and fidelity by a solemn oath, which, a few days afterwards, in a lonely house beyond St. Clement's Inn, they took on their knees in the following words: "You swear by the blessed Trinity, and by the sacrament you now propose to receive, never to disclose, directly or indirectly, by word or circumstance, the matter that shall be committed to your knowledge. Be it for the execution thereof until the rest shall give you leave." They then went into an adjoining room and received the holy sacrament from father Gerard, a Jesuit priest, who was, it is said, ignorant of their horrid project. A few particulars of the plot were then communicated to Fawkes. Petre, an agent of the king, and the plan then agreed on. Percy, whose position as a gentleman pensioner would prevent any suspicion arising therefrom, rented of a Mr. Ferriss, on May 24, 1604, a house adjoining the Parliament buildings, the keys of which were given to Fawkes. A considerable sum of money was raised in London, and who assumed the name of John Johnson, and the position of servant to Percy. They took a second oath of secrecy and fidelity to each other on taking possession of the house, but before their preparations were completed for beginning the work of mining through the cellar, the Commons, on the 15th, prorogued Parliament was prorogued to Feb. 7, 1606. They separated to meet again in November, and, in the mean while, another house was hired on the Lambeth side of the river, in which wood, gunpowder, and other combustibles were placed, to be removed in small quantities to the cellar of the house of Petre. A man was put in charge of Robert Kay, or Kayes, an indigent Catholic gentleman, who took the oath and became a member of the band. On a night in December, 1604, the conspirators, having provided themselves with tools and other necessaries, and other implements were placed to work on the mine, Fawkes acting as sentinel. The wall separating them from the Parliament House was found to be very thick, and more help was needed; so Christopher Wright, a younger brother of John Wright, was taken in on oath, and Kay brought over from Lambeth. The work was carried on secretly, the conspirators begin-
family in Gloucester;" was admitted into the plot and sent to Iome, not to reveal the project, but, on its consummation, to gain the favor of the Vatican by explaining that its object was the re-establishment of Roman Catholicism in England. A further prostration of Parliament to Nov. 5 having been made, the conspirators were led, in consequence of the repeated proclamations, to fear that their plot was suspected; but Thomas Winter's examinations, made on the day of prorogation, served to reassure them. "Catesby purchased horses, arms, and powder, and, under the pretext of taking a shooting party, went to each of his friends in the Shrewsbury, as if for a hunting party; Ambrose Rookwood, of Suffolk, who owned a magnificent stud of horses; and Francis Tresham, who "engaged to furnish twenty;" but when he arrived, the prince was not at home, having intrusted his secret to him. As the 5th of November drew near, "it was resolved that Fawkes should fire the powder by means of a slow-burning match, which would allow him time to escape before the explosion" to a ship ready to proceed with him to Flanders. The other events of the plot—delivering the prince of Wales and prince Charles, the prince Elizabeth should be proclaimed, and a "regent appointed during her minority." On another point they failed to harmonize so fully. Each conspirator had a friend or friends in Parliament whose safety he wished to secure, but to communicate the project to so many persons involved too great a risk, and it was concluded that no express notice should be given them, but only such persuasion, upon general grounds, as might deter them from attending. Many of the conspirators were averse to this resolution; and angering against Montague, in particular, for his sisters who had married lords Stourton and Mounteagle. On a refusal of Catesby and other leaders to allow him to notify directly Mounteagle, it is said he hinted that the money promised by him would not be forthcoming, and ceased to be a holder of the meeting. It is probable he suspected Mounteagle, for this nobleman unexpectedly gave a supper, Oct. 26, ten days before the meeting of Parliament at a house at Hoxton which he had not lately occupied, and while seated at table a page brought him a letter indicating that he had received it in the street from a stranger, who urged its immediate delivery into Mounteagle's hands. The letter warned Mounteagle not to attend the Parliament, and hinted at the plot, and was on the same evening shown by Mounteagle to several lords of the council, and on Oct. 31 shown to the king also. The conspirators suspected Tresham of having betrayed them, and accused him of it, but he stoutly denied it. They were now thoroughly alarmed; some left London, and others concealed themselves; but Fawkes remained courageous at his post in the cellar, notwithstanding the hourly increasing intimidation that was known to him. On the evening of Nov. 4 the lord chamberlain visited the cellar, saw Fawkes there, and, noticing the piles of faggots, said to him, "Your master has laid in a good supply of fuel." After informing Percy of this ominous circumstance, Fawkes returned to his post, where he was arrested about 2 o'clock on the morning of Nov. 5 by a company of soldiers under Sir Thomas Knevet, a Westminster magistrate, who had orders to search the houses and cellars in the neighborhood. On Fawkes's person was found a watch (then an uncommon thing), some small instruments, and a key. Some news, and behind the cellar door a dark lantern with a light burning. They removed the wood, etc., and discovered the gunpowder also. Fawkes was taken before the king's council, where he boldly avowed his purpose, only expressing regret for its failure, and, in reply to the king's inquiry "how he could have the heart to destroy his children and so many innocent souls," said, "Dangerous diseases require desperate remedies. He utterly refused to name his accomplices, and neither temptations nor tortures, whose horrible severity is shown by the contrast in his signatures on the 8th and 10th of November, could induce him to implicate others further than their own actions had already done, while at no time would he admit the act to have been premeditated, refusing to plead guilty on his trial because the indictment contained averments implicating them. For the connection of the Jesuits with this conspiracy, see Garnett; Jesuits; and the authorities given at the end of this article.

Catesby and John Wright had departed for Dunchurch before Fawkes's arrest, and the other conspirators, except Tresham, fled from London after that event. They met at Ashby Legders, and resolved to take up arms, and endeavor to excite to rebellion the Roman Catholics in Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Staffordshire, and elsewhere. But their action was complete, and their efforts only served to point them out as members of the conspiracy. They were pursued by the king's troops, and at Holbeach the two Wrights, Percy, and Catesby were killed, and Rookwood and Thomas Winter wounded in a conflict with the troops. The other events of the plot—Tresham died in the Tower of disease; the remaining seven, viz., Digby, Robert and Thomas Winter, Rookwood, Grant, Fawkes, Kay, and Bates, were tried on the 27th January, 1606, and executed on the 80th and 81st of that month. This diabolical plot resulted fearfully against the Romish state, and its memory is still a bulwark of Protestant feeling in England. The revolting atrocity of the deed performed by these misguided men must ever excite horror and reproach; but we may hope that candid minds in this more tolerant age, while judging them, will condemn the offenses, despise the works, and despise the attempts which bred such fanaticism, and the spirit of persecution which aroused it to action.

The 5th of November, in commemoration of this plot, is called Guy Fawkes's Day, and until recently a special service for it was found in the ritual of the English Church. It was ruled, but is now kept by the church. It was first kept in 1606, and is still kept as such in England, especially by the juveniles. The following account of the customs pertaining thereto is abridged from Chambers, Book of Days, ii, 540-50. The mode of observance throughout England is that he who dresses up a figure in cast-off clothing (with a paper cap, painted and knobbed with paper strips, insisting ribbons), parading it in a chair through the streets, and at night burning it in a bonfire. The image represents Guy Fawkes, and, consequently, carries a dark lantern in one hand and matches in the other. The procession visits the houses in the neighborhood, repeating the time-honored rhyme—

"Remember, remember,
The fifth of November,
The gunpowder treason and plot;

There is no reason
Why the gunpowder treason
Should ever be forgot!"

Numerous variations of the above rhyme are used: for example, at Lisle, the following:

"The fifth of November,
Since I can remember,
Gunpowder treason and plot;
This is the day that God did prevent,
To blow up his king and Parliament.

A stick and a stake,
For Victoria's sake.
If you won't give me one,
You'll be sorry, you will.
The better for me,
And the worse for you!"

It is an invariable custom on these occasions to solilo-
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GUTHER was as obnoxious as that of Hermes. His philosophical treatment of the Christian doctrines was deemed in a very derogatory tone by Goethe. He also gave great offence by daring to criticise high authorities, as Thomas of Aquinas. Still greater dissatisfaction was created by his dualistic theory concerning mind and body. His works were denounced in Rome; on April 10, 1857, his works were put on the Index of prohibited works, and the Pope appeared charging him with errors in the doctrine of the Trinity, of Christology and Anthropology, and an over-estimation of the powers of reason. Günther, and with him most of his adherents, submitted to the Index condemned as canonically invalid. He died on January 20, 1867. Günther himself was deeply affected by this humiliation, and expressed the hope that his philosophy might be supplanted by something better. He died Feb. 24, 1863, in Rome.

Guptha. See Jotapata.

Gur (Heb. id. נֹּב, a sheep, fully נֹּבָּא, מַעֲלֶ֖ה גָּרָ֑עָה; Sept. נְבָעָ֖ה, תֶּרֶם נֹּבָּא; Pesh. غُر, i.e. access of the sheep; Sept. να ἀναφέρειν Πεσην, i.e. the coming up to Gurr), a place or elevated ground in the immediate vicinity of (2) Ibleam, on the road from Jezreel to Beth-haggan, where Jehu's servants overtook and mortally wounded the flying king Abaziah (2 Kings ix, 27), B.C. 883. It is, perhaps, the little knoll marked on Van de Velde's Map about midway between Zenin and Jerahmeel. See Ibleam; Gur-baal.

Gur. See Whelp.

Gur-baal (Heb. id. גָּרָ֖א, a sheaf; Sept. וֹרַפָּא, Vulg. Gurbath), a place in Arabia, successfully attacked by Uzziah (B.C. 805) (2 Chron. xxxvi, 7); hence on the confines of Judæa; probably so called from having a temple of Baal. From the rendering of the Sept., Calmet infers that it was in Arabia Petraea. Arabian geographers mention a place called Baal on the Syrian road, north of El-Medinah (Marashid, s. v.). The Tarqum reads "Arabs living in Gerar"—suggesting נֹּבָּא instead of נֹב. See Gerar.

The ingenious conjectures of Bochart (Phaleg, ii, 22) respecting the Meluhim, who are mentioned together with the "Arabians that dwell in Gur-baal," may be considered as corroborative of the identification (compare 1 Chron. iv, 89 sq.; see Ewald, Jer. Gesch. i, 322). See Muhumin.

Gurgoyle. See Gargoylo.

Gurley, Phineas Denmark, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born Nov. 12, 1816, at Hamilton, Madison County, N. Y., and died Sept. 80, 1868, in Washington, D. C. During his infancy his parents removed to Paraisoville, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., where, at the age of fifteen, he joined the Presbyterian Church, and soon after entered Union College, where he graduated in 1837 with the highest honors of his class. The same year he entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and graduated there in Sept. 1860, having been licensed to preach the April preceding at Cold Spring, N. Y. He accepted straightway a call to the First Presbyterian Church of Indianapolis, Ind., from which a strong minority had separated and organized a second church (New School), with the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher as pastor. In this place he remained for nine years with great success, the church being blessed with revivals and largely increased numbers; but in 1850, for the benefit of the health of his family, he removed to Dayton, Ohio, where for four years like success attended his ministry as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in that city. In 1855, yielding to the wishes of his brethren, he accepted the pastorate of the F-street Presbyterian

It money from the passers-by in the formula "Pray remember Guy!" or "Please to remember Guy!" or "Full and tender Zarah!" he accused the bond of being. In former times the burning of Guy Fawkes's effigy was in London a most important ceremony. Two hundred cart-loads of fuel were sometimes consumed in the bonfire in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and thirty Guys would be glibbed and the rest into the moat of the house. A boat and a ship were kept up in the Clare Market by the butchers, who the same evening paraded the streets with the accompaniment of the famed "narrow-bone-and-claeve" music. The uproar occasioned by the shots of the mob, the ringing of the church bells, and the torches that could be only put out by water, founded the present day.—Jardine, British Criminal Trials (Library of Entertaining Knowledge), vol. ii; Pictorial Hist. of England, iii, 20-32 (Chamber's ed.); Knight, Popular Hist. of England, iii, 321-37; ibid., Old England, ii, 151-62; Chambers, Book of Days, ii, 540-56; Hume, Hist. of England, vol. iv; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s. v. See Fawkes. (J. W. M.)

Günther, Anton, a prominent Roman Catholic philosopher of modern times, was born Nov. 17, 1785, at Lindenau, in Bohemia. He studied philosophy and law at Prague, Leghorn, and Paris. He was professor of the Realschule of Leghorn, and tutor in the family of prince Breslau, and took priestly orders in 1820. He was then for several years vice-director of philosophical studies at the University of Vienna. The professorship of philosophy, for which he was a candidate at the earliest solicitation of his friends, he did not obtain, in contrast to the efforts made by the opponents of his philosophical views. The life-work of Günther was to attempt, in opposition to the prevailing philosophical systems, which he regarded as more or less unchristian, the establishment of a thoroughly Christian philosophy. He desired to show that the teachings of divine revelation, being the absolute truth, need not only not to shun the light of reason, but that, on the contrary, reason itself will lead the sound thinker to an acceptance of the Christian philosophy, which he thought had found its most complete expression in the Roman Catholic doctrine. The first work of Günther was the Vorschrif zur speculativen Theologie (Vienna, 1826; 3d enlarged edition 1846), which contained the theory of creation; and it was followed in 1829 by the theory of the incarnation. These works at once established for him the reputation of a great and the foremost philosopher of the Roman Catholic Church. The University of Munich conferred upon him the title of Doctor Philosophiae, which, however, the illiberal government of Austria did not allow him to use. Günther, who lived in great retirement, continued to publish a series of philosophical works, and was for several years professor of philosophy at the Catholic University of Vienna. (1820-1830).—Süd-und Nordlitteratur (1823).—Januarius für Philosophie und Theologie (published by him conjointly with his friend Dr. Pant, Vienna, 1833).—Der letzte Symboliker (with special reference to the works of Mührer and Baur, 1834).—Theses & Scripula: zur Transformation der Persönlichkeitsanschauungen neuester Zeit (1835).—Die Jute-Mithys in der deutschen Philosophie der gegenwärtigen Zeit (1837).—Erathüsae und Herculae (1842). He also published from 1845 to 1854, conjointly with his friend Dr. Veith, a philosophical annals. He was in some of his works did he undertake to develop a philosophical system as a whole, but he contributed ample material for a new system. He was, in particular, acknowledged as one of the keenest and most powerful opponents of the pantheistic schools, and the adherents of all schools of Germany. The "Güntherian philosophy" (Günterische Philosophie) came to establish itself at many of the Roman Catholic universities, and for a time shared with the school of Hermes (q. v.) the control of philosophical studies, namely, in Germany. The Jesuits, and the Ultramontane school, the school of
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Church in Washington, D.C., with which, in 1859, the Second Presbyterian Church of that city united. Dr. Gurney remained until his death pastor of the united body, worshipping in a new edifice, and called the New York Avenue Church. He was elected chaplain to the United States Senate in 1859, and was the pastor of several presidents of the United States, among them of the present, and in the last dying scene of whom his dying moments he was present. The following incident which then occurred illustrates forcibly the spirit and power of his Gospel ministrations. When the patriot president had ceased to breathe, Mr. Stanton, secretary of war, turning to Dr. Gurney, said, "Do you think there is anything I can do?" and when the pastor paused, Dr. Gurney, addressing the weeping relatives and sympathizing friends, replied, "Let us talk with God;" and, kneeling, offered "a most touching and impressive prayer, which even in that dark hour of gloom lighted up with sunshine every sorrowing heart." Dr. Gurney was a member of the General Assembly (Old School) in 1866, and chairman of its judicial committee; was made moderator of the General Assembly held in 1867, was chosen a member of the committee of fifteen appointed to confer with a like committee of the Southern Presbyteries of this Synod on the subject of the union of the two Presbyterian bodies in the United States, and "was the author of the amendments to the basis of union adopted by the joint committee in Philadelphia, and subsequently adopted by both assemblies." His health failed in 1867, and, after vainly seeking its restoration in rest and change of scene, he returned to his duties among his people. Great earnestness and single-ness of purpose, with an ever-active zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, characterized his life. See Memoir Sermon on Dr. Gurney by W. E. Schenck, D.D. (W. Chalmers, 1869), and New York Observer, Oct. 8, 1868. (J. W. M.)

Gurnall, William, an English divine, and a "man of great excellence of character," was born in 1617, was educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and was minister at Lavenham for 35 years. He became a rector in 1614, but did not receive episcopal ordination until the Restoration. He published a volume of Sermons (1660, 4to), but is best known as the author of The Christian in Complete Armor (1st ed. 1656-1659, 3 vols. 4to; new ed. 1844, 1 vol. 8vo), of which an edition, with a biographical introduction by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, was published in 1865 (Lond. 2 vols. imp. 8vo). This work is described by Dr. E. Williams (Christian Preacher) as "an excellent book to those who are seeking expressions of deep thought, generally well supported; sanctified wit, holy fire, deep experience, and most animated practical applications." Gurnall died in 1679. See Biographical Introduction by Ryle in the edition last named above, and Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 740. (J. W. M.)

Gurney, Joseph John, an eminent minister of the Gospel, Christian philanthropist, and theological writer, was born at Earlham Hall, near Norwich, England, Aug. 2, 1788. The family of Gurney, or Gourney, sprang from a house of Norman barons who followed William the Conqueror into England. Such was his reputation for wisdom, discrimination, and sound scholarship, that lord Morpeth, when in Philadelphia, used to say, "Mr. Gurney is authority upon any subject in London." Although his family for two centuries deservedly wielded great influence in Norfolk, his large reputation is based upon his individual character and merit. In early manhood he dedicated himself to the service of his directing master, and made an open Christian confession as a member of the religious Society of Friends, in which Church he became an illustrious minister, being instrumental in winning many souls to Christ in Great Britain and Ireland. In 1801 he was one of the original draftsmen of the Great Britain Missionary visits to the continent of America, and spent three years (1837-40) in North America and the West India Islands, preaching Christ with powerful demonstrations of the Gospel character. He often joined his ministry, the celebrated and excellent Elizabeth Fry, in labor in the British prisons. The apostolic character of his preaching is shown in the volume of sermons and prayers delivered in Philadelphia in the winter of 1838, and taken in small-hand by Edward Hopper, Esq. Possest with the spirit of the divine, he dealt in the faithful steward, and his large-hearted and well-directed benevolence was "like the dew, with silent, genial power, felt in the bloom it leaves along the meads." He was the associate of Clarkson, Wilberforce, his brother-in-law, Sir T. Powell Buxton, and others, in the successful efforts for the emancipation of the negro, and voluntary therefor to be silent or unsympathizing when others needed his voice or his purser. Eminent as were his gifts and acquirements, his simplicity of character and humility, and, more than all, his conformity to the will of Christ, made him the sweet and willing minister and servant of all. In this capacity he served his generation according to the will of God. In his Christian authorship, his influence for good will extend to successive generations. His principal writings are as follows: Observations on the distinguishing Views of the Society of Friends (this is a selection of the best of his writings); containing the author's latest revisions, and an introductory treatise of great value, should supersede former editions):—Essays on Christianity:—Biblical Notes on the Daily of Christ (an illustration of the texts relating to this subject):—Essays on the habitual Exercise of Love to God as a Preparation for the Understanding of a Friend on the Doctrine of Redemption:—Hints on the portable Efficacy of Christianity:—Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath:—Guide to the Instruction of young Persons in the holy Scriptures:—On the moral Character of our Lord Jesus Christ:—Christianity a Religion of Motives:—An Account of John Stanford:—An Address to the Mechanics of Manchester:—The Accordance of geological Discovery with natural and revealed Religion:—Familiar Sketches of the late William Wilberforce:—Chalmeriana:—Sabbath Sermons, and other Pieces:—A Winter in the West Indies:—A Journey in North America, described in familiar Letters to Amelia Opie:—Thoughts on Habit and Discipline:—Terms of Union in the Bible Society:—Puritanism traced to its Root:—Notes on Prisons and Prison Discipline, etc. His last publication was an elaborate apologium and Christian declamation upon his faith. In him was illustrated the Scripture, "The path of the just is as a shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." He fell asleep in Jesus Jan. 4, 1847. See Memorial issued by London Yearly Meeting, J. B. Brathwaite, D.D.; J. Gurney, with Selections from his Journal and Correspondence (Norwich, 2 vols. 8vo); Hoefer, New Biog. Gindrale, xxii, 854; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 750. (W. J. A.)

Gurtlerius. See Guertler.

Gury, Joseph Pierre, a Roman Catholic theologian, whose works on moral theology have obtained a great notoriety by the many offensive doctrines which he defends. He was born Jan. 23, 1801, entered in 1824 the Society of Jesus, became professor of moral theology at Valis, in France, and died April 18, 1866, at Merceur, in the Auvergne. He wrote a Compendium Theologiae moralis (4th ed. Ratisbon, 1868; German translation, Ratisbon, 1869), and Casus Conscientiae in praecipuis quaestionibus Theologiae moralis (Ratisbon, 1869), of which many editions have been published in France and other countries, and have been introduced as text-books into a number of ecclesiastical seminaries. In the Diet of the grandduchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, the government was in 1869 charged by the liberal party for allowing the Roman Catholic bishop of Metz to introduce this work into the diocesan seminary, on the ground that it teaches,
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In many cases, disobedience to the government, and principles incompatible with a civilised form of government. See Linsa, Das Handbuch Gyr’s und die christliche Ethik (Friesberg, 1889). (A. J. S.)

Gush-Chalab. See Gischala.

Gustavus I, Vasa, the first Protestant king of Sweden, was born at Lindholm, Sweden, May 12, 1496. He descended, both on the paternal and maternal side, from noble Swedish families, and his original name was Carl Eriksson. Since he was the son of the councillor Eric-Johansson. From 1512 he was educated for a statesman at the court of the Swedish administrator, Sten Sture. In 1516 and 1517 he took an active part in the war against the Danes, but was treacherously made a prisoner by the Danish king, Christian II, and carried to Denmark. He escaped in September, 1519, landed in Sweden in May, 1529, aroused the peasants of Dalecarlia to a revolt against the Danish rule, and was proclaimed by them head of their own and other communities of Sweden. The forcible abdication of Christian II put an end to the Scandinavian union, and the Swedish crown was proclaimed Gustavus as king. Being a decided adherent of the Reformation of Luther with whom he carried on a correspondence, Gustavus declined to be crowned by the hands of the Roman Catholic bishops, and postposed the coronation, which did not take place until 1526. In 1548 he formally joined the Lutheran Church, the cause of which he promoted with great eagerness, and even severity, crippling the power of the Roman Catholic clergy by enormous imposts and finally (1544) forcing the Lutheran doctrines upon all his subjects. Like many other Protestant princes of that time, he arrogated to himself an undue influence upon the Church, assuming in 1540 the highest authority in ecclesiastical matters, and thus burdening Sweden with the pernicious system of an oppressive and even intolerant state-churchism. By an act of the Diet of Wismar, 1555, his town was declared heretical in his male descendants. On the whole, Gustavus was one of the best and wisest princes of his time. "He had found Sweden a wilderness, devoid of all cultivation, and a prey to the turbulence of the people and the rapacity of the nobles; and, after forty years' rule, he left it a peopled and civilized nation, with a full exchequer, and a well-organized army of 15,000 men, and a good fleet, which were both his creations. He promoted trade at home and abroad. Every profession and trade received his attention and fostering care, and schools and colleges owed their revival, after the decay of the older Roman Catholic institutions, to him. He made commercial treaties with foreign nations, and established fairs for foreign traders. In his reign roads and bridges were made in every part of the country, and canals begun, one of which has only recently been brought to completion. In his relations with his subjects Gustavus was firm, and sometimes severe, but seldom unjust, except in his dealings towards the Romish clergy, whom he despised with something like rapacity of all their lands and funds. To him the various tribes of Lappe were indebted for the diffusion of Christianity among them, and the Lutheran missionaries, while the Finns owed him the first works of instruction, Bibles and hymn-books printed in their own language. Gustavus was methodical, just, moral, and abstemious in his mode of life; an able administrator; and, with the exception of a tendency to avarice, possessed few vices that are unworthy of esteem." He died Sept. 29, 1560. (A. J. S.)

Gustavus II, Adolphus, king of Sweden, was the grandson of Gustavus I (q. v.) by his youngest son, Charles IX, at whose death he succeeded to the throne of Sweden. Gustavus, who had been strictly brought up in the Lutheran faith, determined to quell some disorders at home, arising from the disputed succession of his father (third son of Gustavus Vasa), who had been elected king on the extinction of his nephew Sigismund, king of Poland (son of John III, the second son of Gustavus Vasa), whose profession of the Roman Catholic religion made him obnoxious to the Swedish people, and virtually annulled his claims to the crown. He reconciled the Estates by making them meet, restrained the warlike spirit of his people, and, in 1612, unsuccessfully, but obtained from the Czar in 1617, by virtue of the treaty of Stolbow, several places, and renounced all claims to Livonia. The numerous exiles who, during the reign of his father, had fled to Poland, were permitted to return, and thus he threw open the frontiers of the Polish insular states of the Baltic islands to the inhabitants of the world. In 1630 he built Gothenburg anew, and founded or renewed sixteen other towns. He was eagerly intent upon enlarging the powers of the sovereign by reducing those of the Estates. In 1621 he was involved in a war with Poland, and gained Livonia and Courland, and carried the war into Prussia. Several revolts in Sweden, which broke out in consequence of the heavy taxes, were promptly quelled. In the summer of the year 1630 he went to Germany with an army of about 15,000 men to support the Protestants in the war against the emperor, having thus taken the charge of the government and the care of his infant daughter Christina to his chancellor Oxenstierna. After carrying on the war triumphantly for two years [see Thirty Years' War], he fell at Lützen, Nov. 6, 1632. Although Gustavus was eminently a warrior, he made many salutary changes in the internal administration of his country, and devoted his short intervals of peace to the promotion of commerce and manufactures. He was pre-eminently religious, and his success in battle is perhaps to be ascribed not only to a better mode of warfare, but the stricter discipline which he enforced, but also to his own moral influence which his deep-seated piety and his personal character inspired among his soldiers. The spot where he fell on the field of Lützen was long marked by the Schenkenstein, or Swede's Stone, erected by his servant, Jacob Ericson, on the night after the battle. Its place has now been taken by a noble monument erected to his memory by the German people on the occasion of the second centenary of the battle held in 1832. Other monuments were erected between Goslar and Herzogsaal (1840), and at Bremen (1883). A statue made by Forberg was set up in 1862 in Burg in 1884. In 1832 Protestant Germany established in his honor an association for the support of poor Protestant congregations. See Gustavus Adolphus Society. Biographies have been written, among others, by Oldenbourg (Lpz., 1842), Sparck (Lpz., 1844), Gröner (3d ed. Stuttg., 1852), Freywell (Gm. town, Lpz., 1852), Heilig (Lpz. 1854), Flüche (Gustav Adolf u. der dreissigjährr. Krieg, Dresd. 1840 sq., 4 vols.), H. W. Thiersch (Nördlingen, 1868), and Droysen (vol. 1, Leips. 1869). (A. J. S.)

Gustavus Adolphus Society (Gustav-Adolf Verein), a union of members of the Evangelical Protestant Church of Germany for the support of their persecuted or suffering brethren in the faith. It originated as follows. On the occasion of the second secular anniversary of the battle of Lützen [won by Gustavus Adolphus] (q. v.) at the cost of his life, on Nov. 6, 1622), held in that city Nov. 6, 1822, Schild, a merchant of Leipzig, proposed that a memorial should be erected to the champion of Protestantism. By the influence of Dr. Grossmann it was afterwards resolved that, in memory of his conflict of storm and stress, a commis-

sion must be formed in honor of the Protestant hero, having for its object the succor of the Protestant communities suffering from persecution in Roman Catholic countries. An association was soon formed at Dres-

den and another in Leipzig, and the two were united in 1834. The society thus formed was very popular in Saxony and Sweden. Its funds were chiefly the
fruit of house and church collections. On the anniversary of the Reformation in 1841, Dr. Zimmermann, of Heidelberg, addressed an appeal to Prof. G. T. Martineau to spread the work of uniting the various branches of the association for the support of such Protestant communities as required and were worthy of help. In order to effect this, and to incorporate in it the Leipzig and Dresden associations, a preparatory meeting was held at Leipzig Sept. 16, 1842, at which the "Stiftsverband, Graf Schurth's Adolphus Institution" was formed. A general assembly was held at Frankfurt Sept. 21 and 22, 1843, in which twenty-nine societies were represented.

According to the rules adopted at this meeting, the object of the association is to succor all Protestants, whether Lutherans, Reformed, or Union churches, or any other who have given proof of their adherence to the principles of the evangelical Church. The means are furnished partly by the income of the permanent funds of the association, partly by donations, endowments, yearly collections, etc. The local societies send to the superior association their annual collections.

In every state (and for large countries in every province) there is a chief association, with which the others are connected as auxiliaries. The revived union of these three parts is under the absolute control of the society which collects it; one third is sent to the central society, with directions as to the application of it, or is even sent direct to its destination; and the remaining third is placed at the disposal of the central society. The central association consists of twenty-four members, elected by the members of the chief associations; nine of them (including the president, treasurer, and cashier) must be residents at Leipzig, the other fifteen must be non-residents; every three years one third of the members go out of office. This central association represents the society in all its general business, and when occasion presents, appoints a committee to inquire into the case of parties applying for assistance, and reports on it to the chief associations. In the general assemblies, which are held in different parts of Germany, the state of the association is discussed, the accounts adj usted, questions of general interest settled, etc.

In 1846 there were thirty-nine chief associations, viz. eight in Prussia, two in Saxony, three in Hanover, and in the other states each one, except in Bavaria. The government of Bavaria, on Feb. 19, 1844, forbade the formation of branch societies, on the receipt of gifts from the society; but this prohibition was annulled Sept. 16, 1849, and representatives of Bavaria appeared at the general assembly of 1851. Austria permitted the establishment of societies by the "Protstant'sagian" of April 8, 1851. At the general assembly held at Nuremberg in 1862, two central societies (Hauptvereine) of Austria, Vienna and Medias, were received, the first embracing the German provinces and Galicia, and the latter the German part of Transylvania. The organs of the association are the "Bote der Evangelischen Vereine" of G. A. I., published by Zimmermann and Grossmann, Darmstadt, since 1843, and similar ones for Thuringia and Brandenburg. Numerous occasional sheets, reports, etc., are issued by the association.

The society has not been entirely free from internal troubles. While some of its members have sought to confine its operations within the strict limits of the evangelical confession, others have desired to see it based upon humanitarian principles, and thus to receive even Jews and Roman Catholics into membership. The conflict most important in this respect occurred at the general meeting of 1846, at Berlin, where the delegates refused, by a vote of thirty-nine against thirty-two, to recognize Dr. Rupp as the delegate of Königsberg, on account of his having seceded from the national Church. Great excitement spread throughout Germany, and for a moment endangered even the existence of the association. The question was settled in the Assembly of Darmstadt in 1847, when it was resolved that the society should acknowledge the right of all denominations to voting at the general assembly, and would accord the credentials of all delegates. The strict Lutherans have generally kept aloof from the association on account of its support of Reformed and Union churches. The means of the association have been steadily increasing. Up to 1841 the receipts amounted to 172,777 thalers. "Gustavianus Adolphus Vereini" appropriated 107,666 thalers to 979 communities (224 in Germany and 155 in other countries). From 1848 to 1858 the central and branch associations received legacies and donations amounting to 50,000 thalers. Sweden and the Netherlands (where the first Gustavianus was founded in 1832) have contributed 120,000 thalers to the German association, and helped to swell its funds. According to the report for the financial year 1863-64, the expenditures amounted to 189,000, by which 723 poor congregations were supported (100 in Germany, 4 in North America, 10 in Belgium, 27 in France, 7 in Holland, 3 in Italy, 269 in Austria, 43 in Prussian Poland, 4 in Portugal, 4 in Switzerland, and 1 in Turkey). At the general assembly held at Dresden in 1865 it was announced that the society, since its foundation in 1842, had expended in the support of Protestant congregations 2,678,256 thalers. The receipts from the last year were stated to be 194,000 thalers. The number of congregations supported by the society amounted to 904; of these, 12 were in America, 348 in Prussia, 301 in Austria, 39 in France, 8 in Belgium, 60 in Rumania, 16 in Holland, 4 in Italy, 5 in Russia, 6 in Switzerland, and 1 in Spain. The total amount expended by the society from its beginning to the close of the financial year 1867-68 in supporting new and poor Protestant congregations amounted to 3,205,879 thalers. Aside from its external efficiency, the society has also been beneficial to the internal life of its own churches by its many institutions, and is a notable instance of Christian activity for the national Protestant Church of Germany. Its appropriations are made as much as possible in a form to give permanent rather than temporary relief to weak churches. See Zimmermann, D. Gustavius-Adolphus Vereini (Darmstadt, 1857); Allg. Real-Encyk., vii, 272.

Guthlac, Sr., a Mercian saint, who died in 714. His early life was a wicked one, he even being the leader of a band of robbers; but, abandoning his evil ways at the age of 24, he retired to the monastery of Repton, where he learned to read, and studied the lives of the hermit fathers. He then took up his abode on the desolate isle of Croyland, where, we are told, his temptations and trials paralleled those of Anthony, but acquired for him extraordinary favors and consolations from God. He died at the age of 47, and his sanctity, according to the legend, wrought posthumous miracles, which brought about the erection of the abbey of Croxley, famed for its libraries and seminaries, and the church of Turketel (q. v.), abbot thereof in 948. See Life of Guthlac, by Felix of Croyland, in Mabillon's Acta Sanctorum, Ord. S. Benedicti, iii, 263-284. Butler, Lives, etc., April 11; Jameson, Legends of the Monastic Orders, ch. 8, 4; Wright, Hist. Brit. Lit. (Anglo-Saxon Period), p. 262-8. (J. W. M.)

Guthrie, William, an eminent clergyman of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, was born at Pitfo-
Gutter (Gαττα, ταμπόν) occurs in the proposal of
Paul while attacking Jesus, that some one should
'get up to the gutter and spit the Jewsbot' (2
Sam. vi, 8). The Sept. here renders 'with the sword'
(γίγαλσαι, and the Vulg. "roof-pipes" (domum
futuri). The word only occurs elsewhere in Psa. xiii,
7 (Sept. and Vulg.: cæcturus, English Vers. "water-
spouts"). Gesenius supposes it to mean a souter-course.
Dr. Boothroyd gives 'secret passage,' and in Psa.
xiii "water-fall." It seems to refer to some kind of
subterranean passage through which water passed;
but whence the water came, whether it went, or
the use to which it was applied, cannot be determined,
though we know that besiegers often obtained access
to besieged places through aqueducts, drains, and
subterranean passages, and we also know that Jerusalem
is abundantly furnished with such underground
avenues. See JESUS.

In account of Jacob's artifice for producing party-
colored young among his flock, by placing peeled rods in
the drinking-troughs (Gen. xxx. 38, 41), the word for
"gutter" in the original is מַגָּכָה, rack'at, vessels
overflowing with water (as in Exod. ii. 16) for cattle.

Gützlaff, Karl Friedrich August, missionary to
China, was born at Stettin, in Pomerania, in 1802,
and attracted attention at an early age by his zeal in
study, and by the promise of activity which his youth
afforded. To open for himself the work of mission
fulness at home, but having resolved to devote himself
to missionary labor in foreign parts, he volunteered to
go to the Dutch settlements in the East, under the
auspices of the Netherlands Missionary Society. Before
proceeding thereto he came to England, where he met
Dr. Morrison, the eminent Chinese scholar and mis-
sionary, and received a strong bias towards China as
his ultimate field of labor. In 1828 he proceeded to
Singapore, and it is said that before he had been there
two years he was able to converse fluently in five
European languages, and to read as many as as many
more. In August, 1828, in company with Mr. Toul-
min, Gützlaff went to Siam, where he remained more
than a year. In 1831 he went to China. Between
1831 and 1834 he made three voyages along the coast,
and published an account of his observations. From
1834 to 1838 he was chaplain and interpreter in the
British government as interpreter and secretary to the
minister. An attempt to land in Japan (1857) was
unsuccessful. In 1844 he established, conjointly with
the American missionary Roberts, two Chinese, and
others, a society for the propagation of the Gospel in China,
which in 1860 had forty preachers. In 1849 he re-
visited Europe, and, by his personal exertions, gave
a new impulse to missionary effort for China. He
returned to China in 1850, and died at Victoria on the
9th of August, 1851. His way of life has been de-
scribed as follows: The whole of the early morning
was devoted to the religious instruction of successive
classes of Chinese who came to his house. From
ten till four he was occupied with government duties.
After a very brief interval he went out for the rest of
the evening to publish his lectures, which were given
from house to house. He also, from time to time, made
excursions to different places, accompanied by native
teachers. All this toll was voluntary and unremuner-
ated, for, except when he first went out to the East, he
was not connected with any missionary society. A
few friends in New York and London sent occasional-
ly, we believe, some contributions for purchasing books
and medicines, but the work was mainly carried on at
his own cost. He was a man of generous, self-denying
spirit, with an ardent love for the salvation of those
in labor indescribable. He early inured himself to hard-
ships, and in his devotedness to his work of spreading
Christian truth he was regardless of privations and
dangers. His medical skill and great learning often
opened a way for him where few Europeans could have
made headway, and whenever he was known he was
beloved by the natives. They used to say some-
times that he must be a descendant of some Chinese
family who had emigrated to the islands of the Western
Ocean. Whatever may be the permanent results of
Gützlaff's labors in the East, it is certain that his ef-
fors for the cause of religion, and of Christian civiliza-
tion in China, deserve to be held in the grateful
remembrance of the Church. He translated the New
Testament into the language of the Middle Kingdom.
He made himself thoroughly acquainted with the social
life of the Chinese, and even introduced himself among
their numerous secret societies, concerning the most
important of which, the Triad, he wrote a memoir,
published in the Journal of the London Asiatic Society
(1849). He never lost an opportunity of disseminating Christi-
nity among the Chinese. Of his visit in 1850 he gave a
description in the Journal of the London Geogra-
phical Society, vol. ix, 1819. The English gave his
name to an island situated some seventeen miles from
the mouth of the Yang-tze-Kiang. He wrote, besides
the above-mentioned papers, Observations on the
Kingdom of Siam (in the Journal of the London Geo-
grphical Society, vol. viii, 1848)—Journal of three
Voyages along the Coast of China, with Notices of Siams,
Corea, and the Loo-Choo Islands (Lond. 1833)—Sketch
of Chinese History, ancient and modern (Lond. 1834,
2 vols. 8vo)—China opened, or display of the Topogra-
phy, History, Religion, and Correspondence of the Chi-
inese Empire (Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo)—The Life of
Tiou Kang, the last Emperor of China (Lond. 1835,
8vo)—Hist. of the Chinese Empire (2 vols. 8vo), which
was also published in German, etc.—See Hoefer, Nouv.
Biblo. Générale, xxii, 223; Methodical Quarterly Review,
Jan. 1852; American Quarterly Review, vol. xvii; Quart.
Rev. (Lond. ii, 458); Allibone, Dictionary of Authors
i, 751.

Guy.

See GUIDO.

Guyon, Jeanne-Marie Bouvier de la Motte, an
eminent French mystic, was born at Montargis
April 13, 1648. She was educated in a convent, and
in early youth showed signs of great quickness of
mind. At seventeen she wished to take the veil, but
her father was strongly opposed to her consent. In 1664
she was married to M. Jacques Guyon, a rich pensioner, for
whom she had no affection. Her marriage was not a happy
one, in consequence of the tyranny of her husband and
mother-in-law, who, acting under the advice of her
confessors, endeavored to withdraw her from the
ward prayer and retirement to which, at the age of
twenty, she began to addict herself. Vanity and co-
quetry were her besetting sins, and, to conquer them,
she thought it necessary to purify herself by "good
works" and bodily mortifications. She read largely in
mystical writers, especially Kempis, Francis of Sales,
and the life of St. Francis of Assisi, which she had
imitated. A Franciscan monk taught her to "look
within instead of without" for peace, and to "seek
God in her heart." Her doubts and fears fled: "I
was on a sudden so altered that I was hardly to be
known by my former self," she said. She formed a
plan on dated this conversion from July 22, 1699. Her
domestic troubles continued, but she could now bear
them patiently. In 1676 her husband died, leaving
her with three young children. Her religious feelings
now increased in intensity. She believed that she
had certain interior communications of the divine will,
but was often deeply distressed about the state of her soul. In 1672, on the anniversary of her conversion, she made "a marriage contract" with Christ, and signed it in her own blood! She formed an intimate acquaintance with Lacombe, a Barabino mystic, who, from 1656 to 1658, became her confessor. In 1681, on St. Magdalene's Day, on occasion of a storm, she says, "My soul was perfectly delivered from all its pains." She soon after went to Paris, was exorhited in what she considered a miraculous manner to devote herself to the service of the Church, and went to Geneve to be a missionary among Protestants. Her family then urged her to resign her guardianship of her children, which she did, giving up all her fortune to them, retaining only sufficient for her subsistence. Soon after, D'Arnaut, bishop of Geneve, wished her to bestow this pittance upon an establishment, of which she was to be made priora. She declined, and left Gex for the Ursuline convent at Thono, where Lacombe became her "father confessor." Her work habilitated the priest as an ally of laity in dreams and revelations of bliss. Both Lacombe and Madame Guyon soon, however, began to gather waves of the Christian life, and of the true nature of faith; but the errors of Romanism and mysticism were too closely incorporated with her mental habits to be got rid of, and she reconciled to the Ursuline convent at Thono not only "salvation by faith," but "indifference to life, to heaven, to hell, in the entire union of the soul with God." She returned to Gex, and there, in prayer at night, it was revealed to her that she was "the spiritual mother of Lacombe," her relations to him became more intimate than ever, and she occasionally afterwards to great but groundless scandal. Lacombe seems to have been a weak man: he finally died in a madhouse. The bishop of Geneve became alarmed, and sought to be rid of his dangerous protégée. Madame Guyon now wandered for some years (1685-1686), visiting Turin, Grenoble, and other places. At about this time also she began to write. Her first work (begun at Gex) was Les Torrnes Spirituels (published in her Opuscules, Cologne, 1704, 12mo). The "torrents" are souls tendency to lose themselves in the ocean of God. Her work habits the writer as an ally of laity in dreams and revelations of bliss, but principally demonstrates her unfitness as a pattern or teacher of experimental godliness. At Grenoble she found herself "suddenly invested," as she expresses herself, "with the apostolic state," and able to discern the condition of those that spake with her, so that one received from her was changed from an impious man in the morning till eight at night speaking of divine things. "There came," she says, "great numbers from all parts, far and near, friars, priests, men of all sorts, young women, married women, and widows; they all came after the other, and God gave me that which satisfied them in a wonderful manner, without my thinking or caring at all about it. Nothing was hidden from me of their inward state and condition. . . . I perceived and felt that what I spake came from the fountain-head, and that I was only the instrument through which it passed. I heard in the exhibition of Solomon's Song and of the Apocalypse appeared in 1684 at Grenoble. Her notes were written under a quasi inspiration: she had dreams, visions, and marvellous manifestations. "Before I wrote I knew nothing of what I was going to write, and after I had written it, too. She received the true Church, and she says, in the singular autobiography which she has left of herself. Another of her works of this period was Moyen court et tres facile pour l'onais, which was published, and rapidly ran through five or six editions. This was received with great favor, and was translated into many languages and was translated into many languages and many tongues. In July, 1686, accompanied by Lacombe, she returned to Paris, where persecution and tribulation awaited the wanderers. The "Quietism" of Molinos was condemned by the pope in 1687, and there was no peace or rest for the mystics or their abettors in Paris. In 1688 Madame Guyon was shut up (chiefly through the instigation of her brother, the Barabino Lamothe, who bitterly hated her doctrines) in the convent of the Visitation at Paris. In 1689 Madame de Maintenon procured her release, and she and soon gathered round her a circle of admiring and devoted friends, among whom was Fénelon, who formed an affection for her which was "stronger than persecution or death. A storm soon arose: Harlay, Bishop of Carcassonne, prohibited her writings, and other bishops followed his example. The court took notice. Madame Guyon demanded of the king, through Madame de Maintenon, a dogmatical examination of her writings. A commission was appointed, consisting of Bossuet, Fénelon, the abbé Trenson, and the bishop of Chartres. At the end of six months thirty articles were drawn up by Bossuet, sufficient, as he deemed, to prevent the mischief likely to arise from Quietism, which were signed by Madame Guyon, who submitted at the same time to the censure which Bossuet had not on her writings in the preceding April. Notwithstanding this submission, she was officially involved in the persecutions of Fénelon, the archbishop of Cambray, and in 1695 was imprisoned in the castle of Vincennes, and thence removed to the Bastille, enduring the hardest treatment, and subjected to repeated examinations. In November, however, she was released, when she retired to Abria, to the house of her daughter, where she passed the remainder of her days in quiet and repose, in acts of love and charity, and in writing books. No reproach of her enemies and persecutors ever escaped her lips. All the neighborhood loved her; and her bitterest foes admitted that all the charges brought against her moral character had been false and scandalous. Her last will begins as follows: "I protest that I died in the faith of the Catholic, apostolical, Roman Church; having no other doctrines than these; believing all that she believes, and condemning, without the bishop of Chartres, all that she condemns." She died June 9, 1717.
and joy in the Holy Ghost! How few such instances
do we find of exalted love to God and our neighbor;
of genuine humility; of invincible meekness and un-
bounded resignation! So that, upon the whole, I know
not whether we may not search many centuries to find
another woman who was such a pattern of true hol-
liness" (Wesley, Works, vii, 562, 565). See also Curry
in Methodist Quarterly Review, July, 1898, which con-
tains a discriminating estimate of Upham's Life and
Religious Opinions of Madame Guyon (N. Y. 1844-1850;
2 vols. 12mo).—Comp. Christian Reviser, iii, 449; xvi,
51; American Biblical Re postory, iv, 606 (third series);
New Englander, vi, 105.

Gymnosophists (Γυμνοσοφοστα), an ancient sect of
Hindoo philosophers, who distinguished themselves
outwardly from others by dressing aside. They were
believers in metempsychosis, and often sought to
facilitate their transmigration by committing suicide—
generally by burning themselves alive. They placed
the height of wisdom in contemplation and mystic prac-
tices to mortify carnal instincts. They inculcated utter
disregard of temporal advantages. This sect furnished
for a long time councilors to the kings, and stood
in high consideration. They were divided into two clus-
ers, the Guyonians and the Gypians, or Gypisiae,
in the time of Alexander the Great, belonged to
this sect. See Farkis, as also Cicero, Tusc. Quaest. v,
27; Plutarch, Vit. August. c. 65; Arrian, Indica, xii;
Quintus Curtius, viii, cap. iv; Strabo, § 712-719.

Gypsies, Gipsy, or Gypsi (a corrupt form of Egyptians),
the English name of a singular vagabond race of people,
with a language and customs peculiar to themselves,
found throughout the whole of Europe, and in parts of Asia,
Africa, and America, and everywhere noted for their averse
to the habits of settled life, and for the practice of deceptive
tricks and thieving. They bear different names in different
countries. In France they are called Boe-
kméniens (because they first came thither from Bohem-
ia, or from boëm, an old French word meaning
sorcerer, because of their practiseing on the credulity of
the vulgar); in Spain, Génzóos or Zionci; in Ger-
many, Zigenen; in Italy, Zingari; in Holland, Hoedren
(nestrians); in Sweden and Denmark, Tartari; in
Scalian countries, Tygami; in Hungary, Czigájok;
in Turkey, Tchémengel; in Persia, Sisèch; in Arabia,
Harami, etc. Various nicknames are also applied to
them, as Cogonze and Gareuz in France; Zieh-Gamer
(wandering rogues) in Germany, and Tcheller in Scotc-
land. They call themselves Rom (men or husbands;
comp. Coptic Rém), Oslo (black), or Sinte (from Ind;
therefore Zinsel, or black men from Ind).

Origin and History.—In the absence of any histori-
cal records of their migrations, their original country
and the causes which drove them thence to scatter
so widely over the earth have been the subject of
speculation among the learned, and various theories
have been proposed as solutions of the mystery of
their origin and history. Some writers have connect-
•ed them with the Συγγυς, mentioned by Herodotus
(6.10) as a people of the sea, and others have
seen the Lower Danube, and the Συγγύς, described
by Strabo (§ 590) as living near Mount Caucasus, and
practising Persian customs. Others have referred them to Syria, Turkey, Nubia, Coptomantes, Assyria, Ethiopia, Morocco, etc., but the fact which the Gypsys, at their appearance in Western Europe, gave of themselves, claimed "Little Egypt" as the original home of the race, whence they were driven in consequence of the Moslem conquests. According to one version, God himself had doomed them to this vagabond life because their forefathers had refused hospitalities to the shepherds. Alternatively, the Gypsys were supposed to have come to Egypt with the infant Saviour—"a notion which, curiously enough, been partly revived in our own day by Roberts, with this difference only, that he proves them, from the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, to be the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, and their wanderings to be the predicted punishment of the various iniquities of their forefathers" (Chambers). We owe to the once-prevalent belief that they were from Egypt the origin of the English term Gypsys and the Spanish Gitano. The results of investigations by various scholars within the last hundred years in the fields of comparative philology and ethnology prove beyond reasonable grounds of doubt that the theories above named are erroneous, and that we must look to India, "the nursing home of nations" (iclita genium maxtrix), as also the fatherland of the Gypsys, as soon as it is shown that in more universal and particularly received opinion that they came to Europe from Hindustan, either impelled by the ravages of Tamerlane, or, more probably, at an earlier date, in quest of fresh fields for the enjoyment of their vagabond life, and the exercise of their propensity for theft and deception. The vision of their origin rests upon the supposition of the physiological affinities with Asiatic types of men, as well as on the striking resemblances between the Gypsy language and Hindustani, and the similarity of their habits and modes of life to those of many roving tribes of India, especially of the Nats or Bazegurs, who are styled the Gypsys of India, and are counterparts of those in Europe, both in other respects and also in having no peculiar religion, since they have never adopted the worship of Brahma. The Nuts are thought by some to be an aboriginal race, prior even to the Mongols, to which the Egyptian history, written about the same time, once the Gypsy statement of an Egyptian origin with the clear evidences of a Hindoo one, would find their ancestors in the mixed multitude that went out from Egypt with Moses (see Exod. xii, 38; Numb. xi, 4; Neh. xi, 8). The old and the new, according to this view, passed onward to India and settled there, and their descendants, subsequently, bands of Gypsys migrated to Europe, probably at different times and by different routes (see Simson).

The earliest supposed reference to Gypsys in European literature is contained in the German paraphrase of Genesis, written about A.D. 1122 by an Austrian monk, in which mention is made of "Ishmaelites and braziers, who go peddling through the wide world, having neither house nor home, cheating people with their tricks, and deceiving mankind, but not openly." In the 15th century, Gypsys established themselves in Hungary and Wallachia, and began to spread over Western Europe in considerable numbers; one of their bands, which appeared at Basle in 1422, numbered, according to the old Swiss historians, 150,000. These were under a kind of feudal leadership of so-called dukes, knights, etc., and, telling the story of their expulsion from Egypt and penal pilgrimage, sought to excite sympathy. At first they were well received as Christian pilgrims performing their allotted penance; but the deception was soon found out, and their thefts and impostures on the credulity of the people soon caused them to be regarded as nuisances and pests to society. Very stringent laws, even by the cruelst laws were enacted, and in most places enforced against them, without, however, extirpating them, or seriously diminishing their numbers. After the middle of the 18th century more humane views in regard to them obtained, and measures were employed to improve their social and moral condition, with some degree of success. The foundation for their improvement was formed at Southampton, England, in 1832, by the Rev. George Crabbe, and a school has been established at Farnham, in Dorsetshire, in which Gypsy children are instructed in the knowledge of Scripture, where they are at the same time trained for service in the missions amongst the Gypsys, and taught how to lead a useful life in the countries to which they may be sent, and to adopt the character and customs of the people among whom they settle. The number of them who adopt more settled modes of life is increasing, according to Simson, who further states that Gypsys have been found occupying honorable and responsible positions in public as well as private life, and reckons the celebration of the John Bunyan Gypsys. Greliman estimated the number of Gypsys in Europe at 700,000 to 800,000. Simson (p. 439) considers those that estimate far too low, and thinks there are at least 4,000,000 in Europe and America. The Gypsys, as a race, have no religion, and, indeed, are usually considered as atheistic or at least monotheistic, but having no fixed ideas, their language containing no word signifying God, soul, or immortality. But the sacrifice of horses, which, Simson asserts, formerly constituted a part of the Gypsy marriage ceremonies, and is still a necessary part of a valid divorce ceremony, not only in India, but in all other places, is an idea that is very distasteful to all Hindoo mythological conceptions. See GANGES. They have, for policy's sake, often conformed, so far as necessary, to the religion of the country in which they roved, but Velasquez says sarcastically, "The Gypsys' church was built of lard, and the dogs ate it." In regard to the moral virtues, little can be said. They are described as squallid, thievish, treacherous, and revengeful, and their most strongly-marked virtue, viz. a strict regard for the corporeal chastity (locke) of their women, is sadly disfigured by the permission allowed them to employ the grossest licentiousness in manner merely in order to allure others to vice for the sake of gain as procurers. Some of them show great aptitude for music, and the choirs of Moscow owe their chief excellence to them, and among the Hungarian Gypsys are the most celebrated of the famous and celebrated bands in Europe. They have a field for the display of the religious activities of this age, full of difficulties, yet provocative of effort, and Christians should zealously labor and pray for the conversion of this race, assured that its evangelization and consequent moral and material elevation will be one of the grandest of the victories of the Gospel over degradation and sin promised to the Church of Christ in its conflicts here.

Language and Version.—The Gypsys call their language Rommany, and modern philological researches prove that it belongs to the Sanskrit family. It has doubtless received additions and modifications from the languages of the countries in which the race has sojourned, yet it is still so nearly the same with modern Hindustani that a Gypsy can readily understand a person speaking in that dialect—a fact which tends to verify the statements made estatic to the Gypsys and Romany, with which the Gypsys have cherished their ancestral tongue. Mr. George Borrow, who devoted himself to the study of their language and life, translated the whole of the New Testament into the Spanish dialect of Romany, and in 1838 printed at Mahalburg, in the Spartan edition of which, as far as the eighth chapter, he had been assisted by Gypsys. This version was found to be perfectly intelligible to the Gitanos, and copies were eagerly sought after by them, not, Mr. Borrow thinks, because of the truth it contained, but from a desire to see and read their broken Jargon in print. He remarks: "The
only words of assent I ever obtained; and that rather of a negative kind, were the following from the mouth of a woman: 'Brother, you tell us strange things, though you say you do not lie; a month since I would sooner have believed these tales than those this day I should see one who could write Romany.' The following specimen of the version is from Bapst's Bible of every Land, p. 111—Luke vi, 27—29: 'かれ tamis penelos a sangue sos lo Jumelais: Cameld a jires dasch-mamnet & juntos de camel sangue choro. Bjarad a june sos seremelis & a sangue, y mangueld & Debel por junej os arqueralan sangue choro! 27 Y o sos curar tuce andro yque mejilla, ditem tambien a aaver. Y o sos niobclaire tucej o uchebati, na o impida illugarrem tambien a fur.' For further information on the Gypsies and their language, see the following works: Peyssonnel, Observations historiques et geographiques sur les peuples barbares qui ont habite les bords du Danube et du Pont-Euxin (Paris, 1765, 4to); Fray, Annales regum Hungariae ab annum Christi D.LXV., de ductu (Vienna, 1764-70, 5 pts. fol.); Greimes, Historische Versuchs über die Zigeuner (2nd ed. Gottingen, 1787; English translation by Roper, Lond. 1787, 4to); Bischoff, Deutsch-Zigeunerméhisches Wörterbuch (Ilmenau, 1827); Kogalchichian, En- quête sur l'histoire, les Mœurs et la langue des Cigéins (Bourdeaux, 1846); Orsi, Ricerche sugli Zingari (Milan, 1841); Pott, Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien (Halle, 1844—5, 2 vols. 8vo—"the most wonderfully thorough and exhaustive book ever written on the subject of the Gypsies and their language"); Von Heister, Die Geschichte und geschichtliche Notizen über die Zigeuner (Königsberg, 1842); Désirat, De la misére et de la dispersion des Bohémijens en Europe (in 5th vol. of the Bibliothéque de l'école de Chartres, 1844); Böhtlingk, Die Sprache der Zigeuner in Russland (St. Petersburgh, 1852); Borrow, The Zingari (London and New York); Bacher, Reisetagebuch der Zigeuner (Leipsic, 1855); Simonsen, A History of the Gypsies (N. Y. 1855, and Lond. 1866, 12mo); Roberts, Gypsies, their Origin, Continuance, etc. (Lond. 8vo); Brand, Popular Antiquities (Lond. 1842, 3 vols. post 8vo), ili, 45—53; Thos. Browne, Works (London, 1852, Bohn's ed.), ii, 204—6; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, or New American Cyclopaedia, vol. ii, 612 sq. (J. W. M.)

GYROVAGI, scolding monks. The monasticism of Occidental Europe at an early period took the form of common life in monasteries. Ascentics and hermits were generally obliged to connect themselves with their brethren in convents. Monastic life was also less regular; the same monk could live in different convents as occasion served, and was sometimes even a member of two monasteries at the same time; for occasional latitudinarianism was by no means unknown. It is told of an English abbot by the name of Vangaris (cf. Bower, Antiquities, i, 114—17), that he would not allow his monks to take any vow, either religious or secular, without his consent, and that he would not allow them to wear any visible sign of consecration, such as the tonsure, until he had given his approval.”
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SUPPLEMENTARY.

Endeavor, CHRISTIAN, MOVEMENT is a general designation of a recent effort to promote personal and social religious experience and activity. The following pledge is taken by all its members:

"Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I promise Him that I will strive to do whatever He would like to have me do; that I will make it the rule of my life to pray and read the Bible every day, and to support my own church in every way, especially by attending all her regular Sunday and midweek services, unless prevented by some personal cause of conscientious guilt; and that, just as far as I know how, throughout my whole life, I will endeavor to lead a Christian life."

As an active member, I promise to be true to all my duties, to be present at all our meetings, and to take part, with all the confidence of an Endeavor heart, under the banner of Jesus. If obliged to be absent from the monthly meeting of the section, I will, if possible, send at least a verse of Scripture to be read in response to my name at the roll call.

Notions and Progress.—In the winter of 1880-81, a revival visited the Williston Congregational Church, of Portland, Me., in the progress of which many persons, especially youth, were happily converted under the ministrations of the pastor, the Rev. Francis E. Clark, D.D., who, together with his devoted wife, had for several years been particularly earnest in similar work in the congregation and community. Out of this grew a formal organization, Feb. 2, 1881, by the signature of pledge and constitution to the above effect in the parsonage of that church by 57 young persons as active members, and 6 officers as associates; to this the name of "The Williston Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor" was given, and the object and methods laid down were substantially those embodied in the later constitution and by-laws of the succeeding movement, the earlier stages of which we give mostly in the language of Short History of the same, published by the society itself (Boston, 1894, 12mo).

1. Early Spread.—The first knowledge of this experiment given to the world was contained in an article published in a religious weekly, in Boston, Aug., 1882, entitled, "How One ChurchCarest for Its Young People."

This, and others which followed it, at once brought letters from pastors and Christian workers in all parts of the country. First they came singly, then in pairs, and then in scores, almost every day, and they have kept coming in constantly increasing numbers ever since. One of the first pastors to introduce this system of Christian nurture among his young people was Rev. C. A. Dickinson, then pastor of the Second Parish Church of Portland, now pastor of Berkeley Temple, Boston; and no small share of the success which has been since is due to his wisdom and counsel. The second society, however, was established in Newburyport, Mass., by Rev. C. P. Mills, in the same year that the movement originated; while another gentleman who soon threw himself into the movement with characteristic energy was Rev. James L. Hill, then of Lynn, and now of Medford. The first president of the United Society was Mr. W. J. Van Patten, of Bangor, Me., a son whom the generosity of the congregation, at his pastor's house, on that winter evening in 1881, was Mr. W. H. Pennell, teacher in the Williston Sunday-School of a large class of young people. Among others conspicuous in the early history of the movement were Rev. S. W. Adirondack, of Woodford, now of Lowell; Mr. J. W. Stevenson, of Portland; Ell Manchester, Jr., of New Haven, Conn., and others whose names we cannot mention.

2. Conventions.—For some months, in fact for years, little was done in a systematic or organized way to establish societies. One of the first developments of the new work was naturally in the line of annual conventions, the first of which was held June 2, 1882, in the Church of our Lord, Cambridge, Mass. There were some 30 societies represented there, though doubtless there were others, which were not then known to the conference. The program of the convention was as follows. In the afternoon of "The Prayer Meeting," "The Experience Meet-

The next annual conference was held in the same city of Portland, Nov. 19, 1883, and another in the same, and a third the next year at Portland. A large growth over the preceding year was noted, though statistics were obtained from only 23 societies with 2800 members. Of these 23 societies, the report says 5 were organized in 1881, 21 in 1882, and 27 in 1883 in the first five months of 1884, showing that an impetus to the work was given by the little convention of the year before. Seventeen of these societies were located in Maine, and 22 in Mass. While the other 12, 5 were in New York, and the rest scattered throughout the West, a very large one being organized in the First Congregational Church of Oakland, Cal. At this convention those questions which have since been so fully and satisfactorily discussed, and the annual business performed by the Rev. W. J. Van Patten, afterwards the first president, was chosen treasurer, and vice-presidents were elected from the states and provinces.

After this convention the society held on the even tenor of its way, growing rapidly and steadily, but did not call another convention until Oct. 16, 1885, when it was convened in Kirk Street Church, Lowell, the church of which Rev. C. A. Dickinson had become pastor. This was a twoday convention, and was a large, enthusiastic meeting, though only 106 delegates from out of the city were in attendance. The treasurer reported that the society had nearly trebled during the past year, having grown to 121 societies, with 6442 members.

The next annual convention convened July 9 and 10, 1886, at Ocean Park, a charming seacoast resort near Old Orchard Beach, Me., and was by far the largest and most important of the kind to that time.

Not only was this convention notable for good speeches, but for the tone, spirit, and wise and far-reaching plans. The idea of securing a general secretary, who was to give all his time to the work, was here broached: $1200 was raised to defray his salary, his position being considered so important that the "United Society of Christian Endeavor" was founded and incorporated under the laws of Maine. At this convention Mr. Van Patten was chosen president in place of Mr. Pennell, who had served the society so faithfully and acceptably for three years past.

The society had now grown to 156 societies, with 14,028 members in all parts of the country. They had begun to be reported in foreign lands, and, also, and news came of flourishing Christian Endeavor societies in Poonooch, Honolulu, and other foreign lands. From this convention the work received a fresh start, and everywhere where the churches began to establish societies.

Mr. Geo. M. Ward, of Lowell, was chosen secretary, and Mr. W. M. Shaw, of Boston, became the treasurer of the society. Headquarters of the United Society were established at No. 8 Beacon Street, Boston, but were soon removed to more commodious rooms at No. 50 Bromfield Street, and later to its present headquarters at 446 Washington Street, Boston, which was occupied by the General Convention, Rev. F. H. Clark was chosen president of the United Society and editor of Christian Endeavor Literature, a position which he occupied until his death in June, resigning the pastorate of Phillips Church, South Boston, to accept the position.

Some of the great features of the recent growth have been the establishment of state unions in nearly all the states of the Union, many of these patterned after Connecticut, which led the way in the state organizations. The establishment of local unions in hundreds of places, the adoption of the "Vacation Bible," as the official representative of the societies, have been some of the
causes which, under the blessing of God, have increased the influence of the growth of the church in the present time, with their hundreds of thousands of members in America, and millions added thousands in Great Britain and all missionary lands.

The conventions of 1866 and 1867, both held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., were without precedent in their dignity and power. They were attended, the first by 1000 and the second by 9000 delegates.

The Second Annual Convention was held at Chicago, July 5-8, 1868. Over 6000 delegates were present from thirty-three states and territories. The addresses and papers were of a high order of merit.

The Eighth Annual Convention was held at Phila-delphia, Pa., Oct. 3-6, 1874, and over 9000 delegates were present, representing thirty-one states and territories, Ger-many, Turkey, Canada, Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia. The convention was held in the city of St. Louis, Mo., June 19-23, 1890. Over 6000 delegates were present from thirty-seven states, territories, and provinces.

The Third Annual Convention was held at Minneapolis, Minne-sota, July 9-13, 1951. Over 14,000 delegates were present from nearly every state in the Union and the provinces of Canada.

The Eleventh Annual Convention, held in New York City, August 4-7, 1870, was the most enthusiastic convention. Its numbers were enormous, a conservative estimate placing them at 25,000. The exer-cise of the convention received the same fame that the hands of the press, both secular and religious, speakers of the highest eminence, both in church and state, made the grandest of the greatest brilliancy meetings. This convention was especially memorable on account of the large number of delegates it attracted from the states and provinces, and some of the addresses made by Hodge, Chinese, and native Africans were indeed remarkable. The convention was in the form of an account of 1,000,000 with the exclu-sions of sentiment in regard to the Sunday closing of the World's Fair.

The Twelfth Annual Convention, held in Montreal, Can., July 6-9, 1893, was the first international conven-tion of the Baptist churches of this continent. Many things conspired to reduce the attendance, notably the World's Fair, and the failure to secure reduced rates from the Union Pacific. But, in spite of this, yet in 1893, over 10,000 dele-gates enjoyed what many have called the most practical and spiritual convention ever held. The experiment of hav-ing the meetings in the afternoon and organizing meetings of equal merit, was tried and worked successfully.

4. Denominational Societies.—The year 1891 saw the submersion of all protestantism in the agitation for separate denominational societies, to the exclusion of the Christian Endorsement name and inter-denominational fellowship. The Euphrates Leagues of the Methodist Church of Canada have adopted the name "Euphrates Leagues of Christian Endorsement," and hold full fellowship with each organization. The Baptists have formally de-cided to admit to their young people's union Baptist so-cieties with all that they do in the realm of denomina-tional societies strictly denominational. The Free Baptists have their "Advocates of Fidelity in Christian Endorsement." The Evangelical Association has named its organizations "Keystone Leagues of Christian Endorsement." It is be-comes evident that the number of Christian Endorse-ment should go wherever the principles go, and where-ever the inter-denominational fellowship for which it stands goes.

4. A World-wide Movement.—In the spring of 1888, Dr. Clark visited England in the interest of Christian Endorsement, and again in the spring of 1911. Large and enthusiastic meetings were held, and the young people's union societies to move hand in hand. In 1991 there were 190 societies in England alone, which had increased to 1000 Jan. 1, 1994. In the month of Aug.-vust, 1889, Dr. Clark, with Mrs. Clark, and their son Gen., set out on a journey around the world in the interest of Christian Endorsement, at the invitation of many friends in Australia, Japan, China, India, Turkey, Spain, and England. This year of travel was not for the purpose of travel, but to paint the Christian Endorsement, inspiring those already formed, of learning how Christian Endorsement adapts itself to new conditions, and of promoting the hopes of the country a deeper interest in the missionary countries visited.

Altogether this important Christian Endorsement journey could be considered to have seen no accidents, and no detention from any cause. Out of the large number of appointments, not a single one was missed. Over 500 addresses were made by Dr. and Mrs. Clark, before audiences that aggregated largely 100,000. The jour-ney in speaking to our audiences we made the greatest effect at the addresses were made, largely through interpreters, in more than twenty different languages.

The Christian Endorsement movement began in Canada, since Dr. Clark was born there, and some of its most interesting developments have taken place in the University of Western Canada. The Christian Endorsement societies, the larger number of which are in western Canada, are from 500 to 1200, in provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba each over 100, while Quebec has about 150. The rest are in Alberta, Assiniboia, British Co-
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II. Principles and Methods.—Under this head we con-consider the statement given in the above pamphlets.

The first section is the Baptist mission stations at Tom-\noo, Bangtik, and Rauigoon.

Three societies are reported from the land of the Shah. One is at Hamedan, and the other two are at Teheran. The first is made up entirely of men and boys, as in Persia, and not a single woman or girl has a Baptist. Every member of this society is a total abstainer, and indeed, this society began as a temperance society. In the land of the Shah, the matrons and monastics are mingled, and all of them are very earnest in preserving the law from all.

At least fifteen Christian Endorsement societies are found on the continent of Africa, besides the thirty that exist in Madagascar. The members of these are in Cape Colony and Natal, while the others are in the Orange Free State, Guines, and Liberia.

1. Fundamental Purpose.—1st. The Society of Chris-tian Endorsement is not, and is not to be, an organization independent of the Church. It is the Church at work for and with the young, and the young people at work for and with the Church. Many of us have, for the sake of the Church, for the sake of the Church, be the mind, and seek for the fullest co-operation of the school and society, of the pastors and members in carrying on our work. The Society of Christian Endorsement can always afford to wait rather than force itself upon an unwilling Church.

2. Since the societies exist in every evangelical denomina-tion, the basis of the union of the societies is one of common faith in Christ, and of common methods in the study of the Holy Scriptures, and mutual Christian affection, rather than a doc-trinal or social unity. The Christian Endorsement Societies of the evangelical Christians can unite without repudiating or being disloyal to any denominational custom or tenet.

5. The purely religious feature of the organization is always to be paramount. The Society of Christian Endorsement Centre about the prayer meeting. The strict praying of the "prayer-meeting pledge, honestly interpreted, is as an experience has proved, essential to the continued success of a society of Christian Endorsement.

6. The Society of Christian Endorsement sympathizes with temperance and all true moral reform, with wise philanthropy, and with patriotism. In all the work we do, we are at home and abroad; yet is not to be used as a convenience by any organization to further ends other than its own.

5. The purely religious feature of the organization is always to be paramount. The Society of Christian Endorsement Centre about the prayer meeting. The strict prying of the "prayer-meeting pledge, honestly interpreted, is as an experience has proved, essential to the continued success of a society of Christian Endorsement.

7. The Society of Christian Endorsement sympathizes with temperance and all true moral reform, with wise philanthropy, and with patriotism. In all the work we do, we are at home and abroad; yet is not to be used as a convenience by any organization to further ends other than its own.
"Second, the covenant obligation embodied in the prayer-meetings, which can be no true society of Christian Endeavor.

"Fourth, strenuous loyalty to the local church or denomination with which each society is connected. This loyalty is maintained through the pledge of the whole idea of the movement, and, as statistics prove and pastors testify, is very generally exemplified in the lives of active members. Thus the Society of Christian Endeavor, in theory and practice, is as loyal a denomination as the world knows, as well as a broad and fraternal inter-denominational society."

"Fifth, we reaffirm our increasing confidence in the influence of the original fellowship, through which we hope, not for organic unity, but to fulfill our Lord's prayer, that "they all may be one." This fellowship already extends to all evangelical denominations, and we should greatly deplore any movement that would interrupt or impede such a movement.

"The Minneapolis Convention unanimously adopted the following: "Resolved, That, as from the beginning, we view the "Evangelical" as a personal faith in the divine-human person and atoning work of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, as the essential element, though suggested by Dr. Clark in the second article ever written concerning the movement,—"The Christian Endeavor," in The Sunday School Journal, 1861, have had a more gradual growth. Their most enthusiastic advocates are found in Australia. The words "Young People" and "Christian Endeavor" have been adopted by the South Australian Christian Endeavor Union, in order to make room for the admission of their increasing Senior Christian Endeavor Societies.

"4. Other Features.—(a.) Lift-Savers. Among the most important forces in the Christian Endeavor movement is the large number of men whose noble and brave lives are to a large extent debarred from Christian influences—the lift-savers along our sea and lake coasts.

"A national committee was formed, whose chairman is Rev. B. E. Young, and whose secretary is Rev. J. Lester Wallis, of Jersey City. Every state in the Union now has its representative on this committee, whose business it is to organize the Endeavorers for work among these lift-savers. The efforts are being made in all directions to spread the gospel among these lift-savers. It was this consideration, together with the need of furnishing an organization for the militant Christians who are commercial travellers, that led to a remarkable gathering in Philadelphia, Nov. 14, 1899. At this time the "Travellers' Christian Endeavor Union of America was organized, with Mr. F. D. Wing, of Palmyra, N. J., as the president, and Mr. J. Howard Breed, Ich, First Street, Philadelphia, as the secretary."

"(b.) Floating Societies. One of the first to be developed of Christian Endeavor societies, and one of the most important thus far, was the work among the seamen who wander life and many hardships make religious service a great sacrifice. The first Floating Society of Christian Endeavor was formed at the United States revenue marine steamer Dartmouth at New York, on Nov. 1, 1890. This steamer was at Woods Hole, Mass., in April, 1890, where twelve of the sailors signed the pledge, organized a society, and held their first society meeting. State superintendents of Floating Society work have been appointed by many state unions, leaders in this work being California, Maine, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, and Washington. Some societies are found in mariners' churches and some in labor unions. This work has been largely extended through the earnest efforts of Miss Antoinette P. Jones, of Falmouth, Mass."

"(a.) Army, Police, Prison, and Indian Societies. Christian Endeavor societies are also doing good work in the United States, among policemen, army soldiers, prison guards, and in the state prisons of Wisconsin and Connecticut.

"Great success has attended the work of the societies among young Indians."

"Christian Endeavor Day.—More and more widely the second day of February, or some day near it, is signalized by the many beautiful exercises of the last two or three years a capital custom has arisen, which has become so much a part of every Sunday school to recommend these societies to older workers. A collection is taken up by the societies on this day for the mission of the societies and its respective denominations. These collections are planned for long beforehand, in most instances, and have brought large sums into missionary work.

"(f.) Questions of the Day.—Christian Endeavor societies and local unions are giving special attention to such questions as missions, temperance, Sunday school, Sunday observance, citizenship, and systematization and proportionate giving to the work of God. Conferences have been arranged and practical methods adopted to push these various reforms."

"Public Agency.—The United Society is a bureau of the union, through the President, and other officers, thousands of letters of inquiry, supports one general secretary, and in general seeks to spread the Christian Endeavor idea. It levies no taxes, receives no contributions, and assumes no authority whatever over any local society. Each society, next to the Lord, is accountable to no authority that of its own church and its own pastor; every society is its own affair, and its representatives are its own church. Any member of an evangelical church can become a member of the United Society with voting power by paying one dollar into its treasury each year, or by paying twenty dollars at one time for life membership."

"III. Statistics.—The following summary is given in the society's Year-book and Almanac as the numerical results in the various fields up to Oct. 1, 1898:

**UNITED STATES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Young People's</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Territory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Societies</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td></td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3911</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>4380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOMINION OF CANADA.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Young People's</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOMINION OF CANADA—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia.</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total.</strong></td>
<td><strong>313</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOREIGN AND MISSIONARY LANDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa.</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia.</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmah.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Islands.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan Islands.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1593</strong></td>
<td><strong>1660</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECAPITULATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States.</td>
<td>10,984</td>
<td>4,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion of Canada.</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign and Missionary.</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World-wide total.</td>
<td>23,197</td>
<td>4,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total membership.</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,614</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Literature.—Besides the above publications, and a large number of pamphlets and tracts on the subsidiary ends and operations of the society, its principal periodical organ is The Golden Rule; and two of its most notable small volumes are A Decade of Christian Endeavor, by Dwight M. Pratt (New York and Chicago, The Revell Co., 1891, 8vo), and tome: a Hand-book of Christian Endeavor Methods (Boston, at the society’s office, 1893, 8mo).

Ewpworth League is an organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, similar to and in some sense growing out of the Christian Endeavor societies of the Calvinitic churches. Its members are required to sign the following pledge:

I will constantly seek for myself, and do what I can to help others, to attain the highest New Testament standard of experience and life. I will obtain from all forms of worldly amusements forbidden by the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and I will attend, as far as possible, the religious meetings of the chapter and the Church, and take some active part in them.

I. History.—The following epitome of the origin and progress of the society in taken from its Annual for 1894:

The Ewpworth League was formed at Cleveland, O., May 28, 1886, at the union of the Oxford League, the Young People’s Methodist Alliance, the Young People’s Christian Endeavor, the Young People’s Union, and the North-Ohio-Conference Methodist Episcopal Alliance. The leagues which had not been merged into Oxford Leagues were unrepresented. From the beginning to November, 1942, Dr. H. B. Hulburt and Doherty were its secretaries, and the central office was the Sunday-school Rooms, 150 Ninth Avenue, New York City. The General Conference in May, 1892, formally adopted the League and made it a department of the Church, and at the central office at 47 Washington Street, Chicago, 11. In November, 1893, Rev. Edwin A. Schell was chosen General Secretary by the Board of Control, and the number of chapters on the four anniversaries were as follows:

May 15, 1890. | 1,292 chapters |
May 15, 1891. | 5,092 |
May 15, 1892. | 5,106 |
May 15, 1893. | 6,109 chapters

2. We condense the following account of the above five original sources of the Ewpworth League organization from Four Wonderful Years, by Dr. Joseph F. Berry (New York, 1893, 12mo):

a. The Young People’s Methodist Alliance came into existence Aug. 25, 1883, in a woody grove on the Desplaines in a camp-ground, not far from Chicago, where Dr. Asbury Lewis was preaching the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification. One day two young women met by appointment under a certain tree for prayer and conversation. The next day a larger group strolled off to the sequestered spot for conference and prayer. This group grew and grew each August, until on Aug. 27, there were twenty in attendance. These meetings were later joined by ministers, one of whom, Mr. H. Date, proposed a permanent young people’s society, to keep alive and spread the holy enthusiasm thus aroused. This was accordingly done on the date above mentioned, with a membership of 30, which was soon increased to 80, with Mr. Date as president. In August, 1885, the constitution was made national in its scope, its name herefore being “The Young People’s Christian Alliance.”

b. The Methodist young people’s league was formed in December 1885, after started under the title of The Alliance (Herold), a special course of devotional, daily study of the Bible, and the formation of local alliances in the churches. The pledge then adopted was as follows:

I will in all things seek for myself, and do what I can to help others, to attain the highest New Testament standard of experience and life. I will obtain from all forms of worldly amusements forbidden by the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and I will attend, as far as possible, the religious meetings of the chapter and the Church, and take some active part in them.

This pledge was not required of associate members. Three motives were in use: (1.) “Holiness to the Lord;” (2.) “We live to make our own Church a power in the land, while we love every other Church that exalts our Christ;” (3.) “All for Jesus.”

In the fall of 1886 several district and camp meetings joined the Alliance, increasing the membership to 1900. In 1887, there were over 50 local societies, and over 2000 names on the roll. During 1888 the membership again doubled. In July and August of that year several training-schools for Christian workers were held, and in September the first international convention of Methodist young people was held at Chicago under the auspices of the Alliance. In the nine months that followed 800 new societies were formed, and it is estimated that over 10,000 persons were converted in the meetings held by the Alliance. Some men were now kept busy in the field, and more than 100,000 circuits were quickly distributed. The average monthly expenditure was more than $400. The convention and training-schools gave a great stimulus to the work. In 1889 the Alliance had 410 local societies, and nearly 17,000 members; and on July 9 of that year its national convention, held at Annapolis, endorsed the action of the Cleveland Conference, and voted to merge itself into the Ewpworth League.

c. The Oxford League originated with Dr. (now Bp.) John H. Vincent, and was warmly endorsed at the centennial anniversary of the famous "Christmas Conference," in Baltimore, 1883. The purpose was to be stated as follows:

I. The commemoration of the meetings of certain students at Oxford, England, between 1792 and 1793, princip
pally under the leadership of John and Charles Wesley, from which meetings were developed the great religious awakening of the last century; by which the doctrine and applied the methods of the Primitive Methodist Church in their fulness to the world, and the power of the primitive Church once more established.

1. The existence of the fourfold objects of the original Oxford Club: 1. The more careful and devout study of the Holy Scriptures and the higher and newer personal Christian character; 2. The study of the Christian classics for literary culture; 3. The doing of methods for doing good to others.

The Oxford League was thoroughly denominational, though liberal-minded in its approach to all bodies of Christians. It was also specifically religious in its aim and methods. It claimed the consecration of every faculty and every opportunity of its members to the service of Christ.

Its success during the first years was not extraordinary, but gradually numerous chapters were established, and the names of the men who were its leaders increased. Until the winter of 1888-9, when the Board of Control somewhat revised its plans. Dr. J. H. Hurbut, the Secretary of the Sunday-School Union and Tract Society, gave it an impulse, and in sixty days 500 chapters were enrolled. It then resolved itself, as above stated, into the general Epworth League.

c. The Young People's Christian League originated with the late Rev. Dr. J. H. Twombly, who, early in 1887, presented a resolution at the Boston Methodist Preachers' Meeting, calling for a convention to promote the welfare of the young people of New England. Accordingly, a mass meeting was held March 3 in Bromfield Street Church, Boston, which appointed a committee to report a second similar convention. This latter was held in First Church, Boston, Oct. 26, 1887, when about 300 young persons were present, and reports were received from various young people's societies of New England, similar in object to that now proposed. A new organization was effected with the above title; a motto suggested by Bishop Vincent, "Look Up," was adopted, with a badge containing its initial letters. It aimed to unite the interests of the older societies, lyceums, guilds, bands, etc., with their local histories and associations as auxiliaries to the new League, without requiring them to abandon their former name, constitution, or plans of action.

The first annual meeting was held in Tremont Church, Boston, Oct. 17, 1887, with over 200 delegates present, representing 175 societies and 8000 members. It issued a call to the affiliated societies to aid in the consolidation with the Epworth League, as above mentioned.

d. The Methodist Young People's Union was the outgrowth of a meeting of certain alert pastors of the Detroit Conference, who broached the subject of a society for the social and religious culture of their young people at the Methodist Ministers' Meeting in Detroit in November, 1887. A convention was accordingly called, which met in Detroit, Dec. 12 and 13 following. Delegates from more than 50 churches and societies attended, and an organization was formed with the title, "Young People's Society of Detroit Conference." The movement spread with great rapidity. Inquiries for the model constitution devised were soon received from nearly every state in the Union and also from foreign parts.

At the annual meeting held in Saginaw, Mich., Dec. 4, 1888, the constitution was revised for the more general field indicated by the title before adopted. Provision was made for the publication of a monthly periodical to be called Our Young People, which after two years was enlarged into Our Young World, the official organ of the Epworth League, as a result of the consolidation then effected with the latter body.

e. The North-Ohio-Conference Methodist Episcopal Alliance was the outgrowth of a general desire similar to that above mentioned, by the members of the young people of Methodists. The subject was broached at the session of the Conference in Ashland, O., in September, 1888, and a resolution adopted, which resulted in the meeting of a committee of the presiding elders at Marietta, O., Dec. 6 following. The organization by the above name there proposed was in the way of successful operation when the whole project was merged, as above stated, the next spring, in the Epworth League.

II. Design and Methods. 1. The object of the League is to promote intelligent and loyal piety in the young members and friends of the Church; to aid them in the attainment of purity of heart and constant growth in grace, and to train them in works of mercy and help.

2. It seeks the accomplishment of this purpose by means of monthly meetings usually monthly meetings of each local society, at which papers are read and other exercises held, including especially prayer, reading the Scriptures and devotional singing, and reports from sub-committees appointed for the detailed operations of the society in the communities and as well as the spiritual work.

3. The operations of each chapter are conducted through the following departments, for each of which a special committee is annually appointed: (1) Spiritual Work; (2) Mercy and Help; (3) Literary Work; (4) Social Work; (5) Correspondence; (6) Finance. A vice-president and the secretary of each chapter is ex-officio chairman of each of these sub-committees.

III. Organization and Corporate Action. The general management of the League is vested in a "Board of Control," consisting of 15 members appointed by the presiding bishop, one of whom shall be a bishop and president of theEpworth League, and one of the Board of Control it- self; also of one member from each General-Conference district, to be chosen as the League organization in each such district may decide. There are four vice-presidents (two of whom must be laymen), a general secretary, a general treasurer; these, together with the president, the editor of the Epworth Herald, and the German assistant secretary, constitute the General League cabinet. The Board of Control elects the vice-presidents, secretary, and treasurer.

The subordinate forms of organization are the General Conference District Leagues, the Epworth Elder's District League, which have in a few instances only been realized, and the local chapter, which is the universal efficient body.

Membership in these last is constituted by election by the chapter itself, on nomination of its president, after approval by the cabinet. The pastor is a member of the chapter and the cabinet. There may be two classes of members: the active and the associate. The officers of each chapter are a president, four vice-presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, and a treasurer; and these, together with the pastor and the superintendent of the Junior League, form the cabinet. The president must be a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the other officers must be members of some evangelical denomination. The election of the officers must be confirmed by the Quarterly Conference, of which body the president becomes a member.

IV. Collateral Associations. These are specifically:

(1) The Junior Epworth League, which has particular care and culture of the children. Its scheme is a modification of the local chapter, the chief officer being a superintendent, appointed by the pastor, and other subordinate officers chosen by the members. (2) Epworth Guards have been in some places organized for a sort of military drill and co-operative work. (3) Extension to Other Bodies and Foreign Fields has taken place in the organization of similar Leagues in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, among the Germans of this country and abroad, as well as in several other countries.

V. Literature. A large body of publications, mostly small volumes and tracts or even leaflets, has already grown up. The best of these is Improver, adapted to the general organ of the League, entitled the Epworth Herald, with its supplement, the Junior Herald, and the Year-book above mentioned.
A Course of Reading is also recommended to the members, and a select Epworth Library, all of which, together with the above, and the necessary blanks for constitutions, certificates of membership, badges, uniforms, and other apparatus, are prepared and kept on sale at the headquarters of the League in Chicago, or may be ordered of any of the Methodist Depositories.

VI. Statistics.—The following tables exhibit those as reported for the year 1898:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States and Territories</th>
<th>No. of Members</th>
<th>No. of Churches</th>
<th>No. of Young Men</th>
<th>No. of Young Women</th>
<th>No. of Orphans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>15,017</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Territory</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10,070</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>26,025</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>22,411</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>20,412</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6,139</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>22,560</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>10,191</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>105,309</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Territory</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>11,458</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>88,396</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>19,173</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15,073</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>23,990</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>92,069</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>85,417</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>50,968</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>30,237</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>55,955</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>41,060</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>15,302</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>82,500</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>244,420</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>14,488</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2840</td>
<td>2999</td>
<td>240,200</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Territory</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>229,988</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2913</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>223,989</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>40,890</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>49,573</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>27,495</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Territory</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>17,208</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18,784</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>11,587</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>48,928</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epworth League chapters.......................... 11,200
Epworth League membership........................ 672,000
Junior League chapters.......................... 2,000
Junior League membership........................ 26,000
Subscribers to The Epworth Herald.............. 76,500
Students of the Reading Course (estimated)..... 7,500
Fourth anniversary programmes.................. 100,000
Companies of Epworth Guards.................... 95
State Leagues................................. 11
District Leagues............................... 385

Conference Leagues................................ 67
General Conference District Leagues............ 7
Epworth League Orphanages....................... 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States and Territories</th>
<th>No. of Members</th>
<th>No. of Churches</th>
<th>No. of Young Men</th>
<th>No. of Young Women</th>
<th>No. of Orphans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentine, S.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy, 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Islands, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden, 55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE END.
PLEASE RETURN TO
ALDERMAN LIBRARY

DUE
3.24.16

DUE